

VOL. 3

NO. 52

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House, and through a statement in the House to make available the following information to those citizens who have received notices of termination of tenancy as a group.

As hon. members will recall, legislation was introduced into the House of Assembly last week to give the necessary protection to such persons. Because of a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada which was handed down the 28th of May, certain revisions to this legislation have been necessary - The decision of the Supreme Court of Canada requires alteration in certain procedures in order to give this protection to the tenants. The legislation is now being drafted and will be introduced in the House within a few days.

I wish to make it abundantly clear that the purpose of the legislation will be to protect tenants who are not in breach of their leases and who are not in breach of the statutory conditions of The Landlord-Tenant Act but who, nevertheless, have collectively received so-called termination notices purporting to terminate their tenancy as of May 31, 1981.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, we look forward to receiving the legislation. I believe the real problem is that, typical of two or three pieces of legislation that have been brought in lately, including the legislation brought in in The City of St. John's Act and most other pieces of legislation,

MR. STIRLING: this piece of legislation was very sloppily handled. It was not a piece of legislation that was brought in properly, well thought out, but had to be taken back. And now the minister is trying to hang the reason on the Supreme Court decision. So, Mr. Speaker, when they get their act cleaned up and they bring in a piece of legislation they are prepared to debate, we will be quite happy to debate it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further statements.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). I wonder if - is the Minister of Labour and Manpower not here, Mr. Speaker?

MR. STIRLING: We do not have one.

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MOORES: We will wait thirty seconds.

MR. LUSH: - I will ask the question to the President of the Council. In the absence of the minister, in view of the fact now then, Mr. Speaker, that NAPE, one of the largest unions in the Province, I suppose among the largest union in the Province, in view of the fact that it now has called for the resignation of the Minister of Labour and Manpower respecting the minister's recent actions re certification of the IBEW, so in view of the fact that this, one of the largest organizations in the Province has asked

MR. LUSH: for the minister's - oh, now the minister is here, Mr. Speaker, so I will start the question all over again for the minister.

Mr. Speaker, the question to the minister is, in view of the fact that NAPE, one of the largest unions in the Province representing some approximately 13,000 workers, in view of the fact that they now have come out and asked the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) for his resignation, I wonder if this has changed the minister's decision in any way, shape or form, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I think it is very unfortunate that statements have been made by union leaders over the past few days and by members opposite. Everything that I have done with respect to the situation before the House at this present moment is absolutely 100 per cent aboveboard and appropriate and in the public interest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I state again, I received a letter from a gentleman who alleged certain things. One of the things that was alleged was that he requested a hearing in a reply to the Labour Relations Board and was denied a hearing. The Supreme Court of Newfoundland had ruled prior to this on another occasion that when in a reply, either side, the union or the employer, requests a hearing that the Labour Relations Board is duty bound to hear submissions, is duty bound under the Rules of Procedure, specifically Rule 91(c) of the Rules of Procedure of the Labour Relations Board. In this case it was alleged that they had requested a hearing and did not receive a hearing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN: Now, the letter that I wrote brought those concerns to the Labour Relations Board and, Mr. Speaker, I have not received a reply as yet.

MR. NEARY: You got your reply.

MR. DINN: I have not received, then, Mr. Speaker, an adequate reply -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: - from the Board, and when I do, of course, I will be informing the hon. House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Before I recognize the hon. member, and hon. members will know that I rarely do this during Question Period, but I would like to make an exception in this case because I know we have a group in the galleries who have to leave early and I hope members will allow me this exception. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I have the opportunity today on behalf of all hon. members to welcome to the galleries a group of fifty-seven students accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Young, Mrs. Stoodley and Mr. Percy from Grand Falls Academy Elementary School -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): which as hon. members know, is the town and which is the home of the Herder Memorial hockey champions for Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: And is also the great and historic town which has the same name as the district, the district of Grand Falls. I hope they enjoy their visit with us today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, since you are using unusual tactics today, can we then on this side also add to your greetings to the people in Grand Falls, and hope that this opportunity would be used by the government to announce that they are going to properly fund the Museum in Grand Falls-it is on the verge of bankruptcy -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - that these students would like to have?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon.

member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, this bit of information that the minister has now released for the first time in the House certainly makes the situation a little worse. The minister indicates that the ruling was made by the Supreme Court that if a request were made by either side then a hearing should be held. So there are two questions; you know, this looks like this is new information. The

MR. LUSH: never knew about this, he just accidentally stumbled upon this in the last day or so. He was using it on Open Line this morning. So it looks like this is a new bit of information. But if that were so, if that were so, why did not the minister just ask that this procedure be followed?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, because the matter was before the courts. And, Mr. Speaker, it was inappropriate for hon. members opposite, number one, to bring up a matter that was rightfully and logically before the courts.

MR. ROBERTS: After you writing them on it.

MR. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that I have an obligation under the Act, under the departmental Act -

MR. ROBERTS: No, you do not.

MR. DINN: I certainly do have. The hon. member should read, the hon. learned gentleman -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: - the hon. learned gentleman should read the Act so that he would understand the Act. Whether he understands the Act or not I cannot help the hon. gentleman, but he should at least read the legislation and he would understand what the obligations of the Minister of Labour and Manpower are. He does not understand. He has not read the Act. He does not understand. And, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely - there is an excuse for the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), but as I have stated before and as I state again, there is no excuse for the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) for not knowing what is in the legislation, number one, and, number two, not having read it, and, number three, not understanding it if he has.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, this situation reminds one of the old story of Johnnie being the only one in step. So on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister how can he account for the fact that 76 per cent of the organized workers in this Province, represented by five major unions - the Fishermen's Union and CUPE and IBEW and NAPE and the Building Trades - the fact that five of these unions representing 38,000 workers in this Province, just about 76 per cent, so in view of the fact that these unions, representing 76 per cent of the workers in this Province, believe that the minister acted inappropriately, that the minister went beyond his ministerial powers and ministerial authorities in this particular instance? So how does the minister account for the fact that so many of these unions and workers believe that the minister acted inappropriately and he himself believes that his actions were correct?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot for the life of me understand why certain individuals believe certain things. The hon. member might know but I do not have that sense. What I do know is what the legislation says. Now members of the union or employers' organizations may not like everything that is in the legislation. The legislation was made by this House in the public interest and, Mr. Speaker, everything - I will state this three or four times if the hon. member will listen -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DINN: - everything that is in the Act has been followed to the letter. Everything that is in the departmental Act with respect to powers and functions of the minister, everything that is within the Labour Relations

MR. J. DINN: , Act with respect to the powers and functions and duties of the minister , and everything with respect to rulings by the Supreme Court of Newfoundland has been observed with respect by the Department of Labour and Manpower. The minister has that responsibility to look after the public interest, is doing it. And hon. members opposite might not like laws and They might not like laws. They might not like the Labour Relations Act -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DINN: - They might not like the rules of procedure under which the Labour Relations Board functions , but the Minister of Labour and Manpower has the responsibility in the public interest and will continue to look after that responsibility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova, followed by the hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact now that five unions representing seventy-six per cent of the organized workers of this Province have asked for the minister's resignation, and have stated that these unions and these workers have lost confidence in the ability of the minister to carry on his job in a manner in which he should, in view of these facts, how can the minister carry on in this job as Minister of Labour and Manpower in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour and Manpower got elected by the biggest majority of any member sitting in this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: - more votes than any member in this House. Now the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) does not know this, he does not know that this is a statement of fact. All he has to do is call the Chief Electoral Officer and he will find out. There is a book written on it that nearly 4,600 votes -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: - the hon. member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) got in the last election.

MR. FLIGHT: Does that give you a licence to abuse the labour movement?

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, that is the biggest number of votes of any member now sitting in this House, bar none -

MR. FLIGHT: Does that give you a licence to abuse the labour movement?

MR. DINN: -Including the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), and the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) -

MR. FLIGHT: Does that give you a right to -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. DINN: - and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), and Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), who jumped into the water when then they thought they had an issue, jumped into the water because they thought they had an issue, Mr. Speaker, with respect to what we are talking about here in Question Period. They now know that they do not have an issue. If they had taken the time, which I doubt, to read the act under which I operate, to have read the Labour Relations Act, to have read the rules of procedure of the Labour Relations Board, to have read the various documentations that have come into their possession, then they would know the difference. They would know the difference if they were normal, ordinary human beings involved with the protection of the public interest in this Province and what the duties and responsibilities of the Minister of Labour and Manpower are. They would know. If they do not know, if they will permit me enough time, I will certainly explain it to them, and I will give it to them, for the benefit of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I will give it to them in baby talk.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) now says that lined up on his side, about his interpretation of his action, is the minister, lined up against his action are all the members of the Board, all of the unions, and now his final retreat is to say he got a majority in the last election.

June 3, 1981

Tape No. 2097

NM - 3

MR. STIRLING: Now the last offer that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) made was to the Federation of Labour; he said, "If you require my resignation just let me know and I will resign." Is he now saying that if a petition is taken up in his district of the people who believe that the man interferred, that is one thing, that they have lost confidence on questions of labour, is he now saying that it requires the people in his district to require his resignation? Is that the only basis? If a majority of the people in his

MR. STIRLING: district take up a petition saying, 'Stop being an idiot and damaging the credibility of the government'. Will you now resign? "Is that what he is saying?"

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what I will do with the hon. the Leader of the Opposition: If he wishes, on his wish, Mr. Speaker, I will resign and run in the district and have the hon. Leader of the Opposition run against me, and we will see -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: - and we will see that the hon. Leader of the Opposition, when he asks the people of Pleasantville to support him, will be confirmed with a bigger majority than I got in the last election, any day of the week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, any member of the labour movement who wants to run for any other party, either for the nomination for ours or the nomination - well, if I ask that, the nomination for the Liberal party, he might not even get the nomination - but the nomination of the Liberal party, or the NDP, if they want to run against me, I will resign today with the Leader of the Opposition - two seconds after he tenders his resignation, I will tender mine -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: - and the hon. Leader of the Opposition can run in Pleasantville and see how he will do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, I accept challenges from all those who disagree with me looking after the public interest of this Province and they can run representing any party - of course, they could not

MR. DINN: represent the PC party because I would get the nomination by a landslide. So, Mr. Speaker, the challenge is out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. He ran in Mount Scio, and then the next time he ran was in Bonavista where they did not know him. He ran in Mount Scio and lost miserably.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. DINN: The challenge is there for him to take up any time he wishes, tomorrow, the next day, issue the writ the minute after he resigns.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Any more questions? Any more supplementary questions?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, at least the Minister of Manpower has the intestinal fortitude to come into the House and face the questions. I am wondering where the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is who brought in this so-called roads programme a few days ago and is not in the House to defend it. I would like to ask the Government House Leader what is going on, whether or not they are on a shift system or where the ministry is? What is happening here?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to say to the nice hon. member if he wants to ask me a question nicely I will answer it, but I will try to answer it nicely anyway. Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Dawe) is right now, I think, about half way between here and Grand Falls. I think it is Grand Falls he is going to, Central Newfoundland, to

MR. MARSHALL: present awards to public servants in the area who have served this Province so well for twenty-five and thirty-five years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is about public business, as all hon. ministers are, you know. And as I say again and again, all anyone has to do, Mr. Speaker, is witness the Question Period and they will see that you can acquit yourself of the responsibilities of the public much better outside the House than in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is on the way to Grand Falls to present certificates when hundreds of people in Newfoundland are breathing dust and I would like to know what the situation is with the government's calcium chloride programme for this year. I would like for the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to tell us whether or not it is true that the material has not even been manufactured yet -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: - and not even on the way to Newfoundland.

MR. S. NEARY: What!

MR. WHITE: What poor planning we have seen in the past and it is typical now. I would like for him to tell us what the situation is.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give him

MR. MARSHALL: the exact stage of the calcium chloride programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, other people might choose to answer questions when they are being shouted at by people who do not have just ordinary, common decency of manners but I do not choose to.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the Government House Leader, the Acting Premier, (Mr. Marshall) whether or not it is true that the calcium chloride supposed to be spread on gravel roads in Newfoundland right now, this week, is not even manufactured, will not be manufactured for three or four more weeks, not be in Newfoundland until towards the end of July and probably will not get on the roads until August or September. Is that all true?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that in detail at the present time. Obviously, I cannot answer that any more than I can answer how many hairs are in the head of the Leader of the Opposition. But, Mr. Speaker, all I can say - and this I am sure of - is that the programme, Mr. Speaker, is an ongoing programme. It has been attended to by the Department of Transportation and we do not anticipate any undue problems with that programme this year any more than there were last year.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a supplementary on that same topic. It just goes to show how concerned this government is about the road conditions in this Province when the Acting Premier (Mr. Marshall) does not even know whether Central Newfoundland is going to get calcium or not this year, Mr. Speaker. That goes to show how concerned this government is. I would like to ask the minister: Are they concerned, are they seriously concerned about the road conditions outside of St. John's?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are seriously concerned about the road conditions outside St. John's. We are doing everything we can for it, Mr. Speaker, and as soon as possible we are going to have them paved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, at 90-10 by Ottawa?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. HANCOCK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Supplementary, the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, with that statement it is a wonder he does not choke on his own tongue, Mr. Speaker. They are concerned about! They do not even know if we are going to have calcium on the roads this year, Mr. Speaker.

I have a new question for the Minister of Health (Mr. House), Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the minister, is it true that the doctor in Trepassey, who is employed by his department who serves the communities of Portugal Cove, Biscay Bay, Trepassey, St. Shotts, Peters River, St. Stephens and St. Vincents is leaving that community?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any information to that effect. I will try to find out that information. If he is leaving, he is an employee of the department and usually they give a three month notice. I have not received a notice, nor has anybody brought it to my attention. And it is not normal to bring it to my attention; ordinarily if they cannot get a replacement, they will inform me. But I will try and find out that information.

MR. HANCOCK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementary, the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, from reliable sources I hear that that doctor is leaving tomorrow and it is quite amazing that the minister does not know he is leaving and he does not even know what is going on in his own department. I would ask him why is that, would he check and find out and see if that doctor is indeed going to be replaced by another doctor

MR. HANCOCK: in that area because the services are required of two doctors in that area which has large fish plants and the number of people in that area? I ask him if he would check and see, if that doctor is indeed leaving, would another one be coming to the area?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, all of the district medical offices, they are either filled or we have permission to fill them. In some cases we do not fill a position because there happened to be a fee for service person going in the area; if that is the case we would not fill the position. But what I am saying is, Mr. Speaker, it is not the responsibility, I do not think, of a minister - I want to acquaint the member with that - to be looking after that detail but certainly if there is a problem there and it would be brought to my attention and I will find out if there is any problem getting doctors there. Usually at this time of the year - it is the time when doctors do change and go to other places and there are graduations now - we usually are able to replace doctors. But as I say, I will get the information and I will give it to him because I do not think it is of that much interest to the House of Assembly.

MR. HANCOCK: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if the doctor is leaving how much notice does he have to give? Does he have to give three months notice or can he just get up and walk out with a day's or two day's notice?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, in a salaried position, usually it is a requirement that they give three months' notice. I spoke yesterday about another situation where a doctor gave a three months notice and left after one month. Now there is not

MR. HOUSE:

very much you can do about it, it is not good ethics, but, you know, I suppose I do not think it would be worth our while going and pursuing it any further from a legal point of view. When a doctor is fee for service in the area, there is no legal obligation on him there to give any indication when he is leaving or not but normally he does because, you know, it gives us the opportunity to go and try to seek another person to go in the area. So it is a three month notice in the salaried doctor's situation.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). The question concerns regulation 4(d) of the Schools Act which deals with the transportation of pupils. I would like to ask the minister whether her department or the government has any intention of repealing that. That is the section which allows pupils travelling on a school bus not to exceed the rated seating capacity if they are going over 50 kilometers per hour. I might point out that is the regulation which allows school boards to place three children in a school bus seat.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, there are not any immediate plans to make changes in the regulations and legislation governing the transportation of pupils. However, we have in the past and will continue to steadily make improvements to improve the level of safety for students. Just last year we made a change which limited standees on routes where buses had to travel more than 50 kilometers per hour, in effect cancelling standees on routes where the buses travel over the highway.

MR. J. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: This regulation is tantamount to a time bomb. It allows students, not only small students but any area where the buses travel under 50 kmh, which is quite a speed over unsafe roads in very many cases; this allows the school boards to put three in a seat and you have children in some areas of this Province like sardines in a can. And a number of communities around the Province have made representation to this side

MR. HODDER: of the House asking if this regulation will be in effect again in September. Because there are a number of communities which are asking now that they centralize schools, the school boards put the smaller schools, particularly for the smaller children, back into the small communities. Does the minister have any intention of doing something to change this situation?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, about \$15 million of public funds were spent last year on transporting students to and from school, that is, by spending by the Department of Education as well as by local school boards.

The present arrangement for loading buses conforms with safety standards by impartial safety agencies. We did make an improvement which I just mentioned, last year, to make unlawful, to stop the arrangement of having students stand on routes where buses have to travel over highways. The only routes now where students are allowed to stand are those where the buses do not have to travel on highways. You know, I am not saying that in some cases students

MS. VERGE: may not feel overcrowded, but the fact is that the present regulations conform with safety standards. It is safe. While there may be instances especially with older and larger students, where it might not be as comfortable as they would like, but, given the amount of money we have to spend, I think we are doing as good as we can, we are making progress as fast as we can expect.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: All I could gather from that, Mr. Speaker, is that the minister is putting money ahead of lives, because basically with the school bus situation in many areas of the Province, with school buses that travel over unsafe roads with three children to a seat it is a very unsavoury situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is that in light of the upcoming seat belt legislation, will the Department of Education require children, whether under 50 kilometers an hour or over 50 kilometers per hour, will the Department of Education be requiring that the owners of school buses put seat belts in those buses? Because, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that a school bus loaded with children in a head-on collision has more potential for loss of lives than as two cars colliding.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, there is not anything inherently unsafe when three children sit on the same seat of a school bus, this is according to impartial safety authorities whom the department receives advice from. And, as I mentioned, the capacity under present law for school buses conforms with safety standards. As for the possibility of installing

MS. VERGE: seat belts on buses, this is a question which has been looked at by various safety experts and specifically by the Education Department.

The advice which we have gotten differs from what was just stated by the member opposite. The advice which we have received from the experts is that there are many differences between school bus transportation and transportation in an ordinary passenger vehicle or car.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
I have to advise the hon. minister that the time for Oral Questions has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have now been able to get certain information averting to the question asked by the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) this afternoon about the calicum chloride programme. I want to tell him, or to advise the House, that we were slightly a bit later than usual, somewhat later than usual in ordering calicum chloride this year because of the fact -

MR. HODDER: They have no sense of control. Every year they do the same thing.

MR. MARSHALL: Just a second now. Well, I mean, Mr. Speaker,

MR. DOYLE: Hear the man out, now.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Well, do you want to hear it or not?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if you could tether the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, so a little bit later than usual and the reason for it was, Mr. Speaker, that it had to await on the passage of Interim Supply in this House before the department could order it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, when there was no vote of money the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman -

MR. HANCOCK: You deserve to choke.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman should know, I know they were not accustomed to it when they were in government, that you cannot spend money unless it is voted by the House. Mr. Speaker, so the debate, as everyone knows, in Interim Supply went inordinately this year, right into April, so there was a slight delay but that delay has been overcome. And we can advise the hon. gentleman that there will be the minimum of inconvenience to his constituents despite the antics of the hon. gentlemen last April.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further answers to questions?

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition. It is actually an ongoing petition but I will read the prayer of it first of all.

"We, the undersigned, support the efforts of the Western Newfoundland Historic Trust to have the Brake property, which is located in the community of Meadows, in the Bay of Islands district, restored and designated by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador."

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, on the petition today, which I will be passing on to the department concerned, there are thirty-seven names, but now we have in excess of 700 names. And what is of importance to me today in this petition with the additional names, is that we have people who are located on the North Shore of the Bay of Islands, we have them located also on the South Shore, Lark Harbour, York Harbour, the City of Corner Brook, Steady Brook, Little Rapids and Pasadena. And this, Mr. Speaker, goes to prove that there is universal agreement for this-and all areas of the Bay of Islands and in many places in the Humber Valley.

Now I can only say now, Mr. Speaker, that I do hope when the budget is passed provisions will be made to have the Brake property restored as an historic site. And this will certainly help people; it will especially help the young people in Western Newfoundland, who know very little about their past.

MR. WOODROW:

It would certainly help them to be able to relive the past. And as I stand here now I cannot help but think of the late Gerald S. Doyle who did so much to restore the past all over Newfoundland when he used to travel all over Newfoundland in his yacht in the Miss Newfoundland, especially the old song book he gave which gave us so many memories of what the past was like. So this will also bring many tourist dollars to the Bay of Islands area. Now I know, Mr. Speaker, much has been said about it over the past three or four months by me and by others and once we get the property bought, we will have then the work of restoring it. But it will be something to my mind like Kings Landing up in New Brunswick, up in Fredericton, which has done so much for the great province of New Brunswick. So I do feel sure that the good minister - he is not here at the time, but I feel sure that he will do his best in this regard. I have already talked with him. I have talked with the former minister, who is now the Minister of Highways (Mr. Dawe), and I am looking forward to hopefully having something done on this as soon as the Budget is passed in the House of Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

As I have done in the past, I will support the petition presented by the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow). This is a project that is needed and has the full support of the Opposition, the total support of the Opposition, and I hope that you will pass along to your constituents that at least on this side of the House you have the complete support of the Opposition in presenting this worthwhile cause.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I do not expect that very much will be done because this is not (a) having anything to do with the offshore oil, and (b) it has nothing to do with building a new Confederation Building, and (c) it is not part of the assistance to CN for the synchrolift. So then I would expect that regardless of how valiant and how hard the member tries, no matter how hard he tries, that there will be very little done by the government. As the Speaker knows, the government has a museum in Grand Falls which is the Mary March Museum and which is in dire financial straits, it is on the brink of being closed up, and the government's contribution is a measly \$9,000 from last year. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is

MR. STIRLING:

because when you step back you have to decide, What does this government focus its attention on, what are the things that are important to the people in Newfoundland and Labrador? For example, Mr. Speaker, the calcium chloride that goes on the roads, very important in various districts throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, should have been ordered in January, not ordered now, Mr. Speaker, after the Summer closes.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

I believe I have been very, very flexible, especially when you mentioned the matter about Grand Falls.

MR. STIRLING:

Well, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:

But the petition, as I understand it, is to restore the Brake property as an historic site.

MR. STIRLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. As it relates to the petition, you see, I have to show where the money - and I am sure that is what the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) is interested in, Where is the money coming from And in order to find out where the money is coming from you have to talk about the government philosophy and priorities for spending. And I was relating that to the petition. I will stick with the petition, Mr. Speaker, in saying, whether it is the museum in Grand Falls that requires the money or this restoration in the Bay of Islands, that the people on this side of the House will give complete and total support for the kinds of priorities that give credit for what it is that the people want, what is important in our past and what is real in our future.

Mr. Speaker, I do compliment the member. And by the way, while I am on it, Mr. Speaker,

MR. STIRLING: I will say that from my personal point of view, if the member would like to bring back his Resolution on Private Members Day for having The Lord's Prayer raised, I think it is time that we should examine that again. It was an excellent suggestion and is in keeping, Mr. Speaker, with the requirements of the -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

That is a bit irrelevant.

MR. STIRLING: Well, I am giving credit to the member, you see. The kind of member who could think of that could think of this.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member may very well feel like giving the hon. member credit, but the rules are that the comments should be towards the petition.

MR. STIRLING: That is what I would like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying on this side of the House that we certainly support the requirements for the people on the West Coast as brought in by the petition and they have our complete support, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the petition, the hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the hon. the member for Bay of Islands -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - on the petition he presented in the House of Assembly today.

AN HON. MEMBER: A super job.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I think it is important for all of us that we recognize the importance of our history and our identity and our past. Certainly, a fair amount has been done in recent years in this respect. There is obviously a lot more to be done and it is important that

MR. OTTENHEIMER: we give proper recognition to our history and to our heritage.

As everybody knows, in this area, as in every area, only so much money is available and that has to guide all of our considerations. But certainly the project petitioned by the constituents of the hon. member appears to be a very worthwhile one and certainly one that I am sure hon. members on this side of the House support as well. We all look forward, I know, to the day hopefully in the not too distant future when this Province will accrue unto

MR. OTTENHEIMER: itself the revenues it legitimately has so that we can give appropriate attention to so very many needs of so very many districts in Newfoundland. And I look forward to the day when we do get those revenues from our offshore and from our fishery resources, and from our forestry, and from our mineral resources, and this will enable us to do so many things in the area of social policy, in the area of our culture and our history and our heritage and in areas of health and education. And I am sure we all commend the hon. member on bringing this petition to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further petitions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The last day we were debating the motion that was moved by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), which is motion number 8 now on the Order Paper. And debate was adjourned I believe by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), who has about twelve minutes remaining.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This resolution is very important to all of Newfoundland and Labrador. Mr. Speaker, in June of 1980 the Board of Directors of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation made a recommendation to the Government of Newfoundland that had the unanimous support of all of the members of the Board as well as the management of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, and to quote, "reflect both considered judgement and the findings of an impressive series of technical, marketing, economic, financial and environmental analysis." We spent, from the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, \$15 million on that examination, Mr. Speaker. \$15 million. And what was their single recommendation? Mr. Speaker, their single recommendation,

MR. STIRLING: contained on page 23 of the presentation to the shareholders is, and I quote, "The Board of Directors of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation recommend to the shareholders," and the shareholders are the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, 51 per cent, and the Government of Canada 49 per cent, "Corporation recommends to the shareholders that the Corporation proceed with the 618 megawatt hydro electric development at Muskrat Falls on the Churchill River with the necessary transmission facilities to interconnect the Labrador and Island power networks with that source, including a submarine cable crossing of the Strait of Belle Isle."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that may need repeating for certain members on the other side of the House who have spoken against this resolution, which should have been brought in by the government but instead was brought in as a positive

MR. STIRLING:

action, a positive indication of the action that this Province should be taking by the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), the man who is our spokesman on mines and energy.

Mr. Speaker, in the last petition there was a petition looking for additional money to be spent. There are problems all over this Province requiring additional funds for salaries, for health, for roads. Where is it going to come from, Mr. Speaker? It is only going to come when this Province develops and proceeds with a plan to develop, for example, the energy sources and the labour that comes with it.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent, and I repeat, \$15 million, and we have the best, and again I repeat, 'technical, marketing, economic, financial and environment analysis,' in other words, the complete package for which we paid \$15 million. The Lower Churchill Development Corporation made the recommendation that is included in this resolution today, Mr. Speaker, and the government that controls the Lower Churchill Development Corporation is not acting on that recommendation after spending \$15 million to get the best advice that we could get.

Mr. Speaker, the confusion of having this recommendation from a corporation which we own and control, the confusion with the government's position that Muskrat Falls not be proceeded with is clearly in conflict. We have a government that owns, controls 51 per cent of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation. We have a government that spent \$15 million; the best advice from a professional board of directors was that we proceed. And, Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to realize that there is no communication between this government and that professional

MR. STIRLING: board of directors, unlike the situation in which you think that you own and therefore you control, it is obvious that this government, even though they own, have absolutely no control over what is happening by the board of directors which they appointed.

This professional board of directors spent \$15 million and made the recommendation that my colleague has brought in in this resolution. This should be a government resolution. It is very obvious, Mr. Speaker,

MR. L. STIRLING: that for all its good intention this government does not have a clear energy plan, it does not have a clear management plan which is being followed in a clear-cut and consistent manner. As an indication, Mr. Speaker, of the sloppiness of this government, I have been surprised with the complete lack of management skill, complete lack of management know-how and that they do not have this - as it was explained again here today, here in the middle of the Summer they have not yet got the calcium chloride that should be going on the dirt roads.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in the intervening time this government - this is a new piece of information for most of the people on that side of the House - this government has allowed the agreement between Lower Churchill Development Corporation and the government regarding the water rights, they have allowed that agreement to expire. That agreement, Mr. Speaker, ran out on the 24th. of May. On the 24th. of May that agreement ran out. It is now a piece of legislation that is going to be debated when the government gets around to bringing it in.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, in the same way as they ran out of money for the roads programme and they did not bring in an interim supply in enough time to have it debated and passed to order the calcium chloride, they have not brought in the legislation in time to have it extended before the deadline of May 24th.

So what are we into, Mr. Speaker? We are into a situation in which this government is now depending on Ottawa with the ultimate good faith. Ottawa right now, if they did not decide to proceed, Ottawa right now is not obligated to do anything

MR. L. STIRLING: with that \$100 million which this government has wasted back in 1973/74 and which Ottawa agreed to accept as capital. With this government's allowing the agreement to expire, we are now in a position where it has to be, one, the good faith and the agreement of this House to make it retroactive. Part of the indication of lack of management control and the sloppiness, they have not brought in the legislation to be debated as of this time. They did not consider it important enough to take a high priority in the order of debate.

Mr. Speaker, the recommendation by the Lower Churchill Development Corporation was brought in in June of last year. Nothing happened, Mr. Speaker! And since the provincial government does not share its information with the Opposition, on December 5th., 1980, we took some positive action. We recommended that if there is a dispute between the provincial government and the federal government about whether it should be Muskrat Falls or Gull Island, we recommended that representation be made to the federal government to have a start made on the five year construction plan to lay the cable between Labrador and the Island portion of Newfoundland and to start the construction work to complete the cross Labrador transmission lines and the cross island transmission lines..

Mr. Speaker, the whole of the output for Muskrat Falls can be used within Labrador and on the Island portion of Newfoundland. The whole of the Gull Island site could be used. Except, Mr. Speaker, we cannot proceed with the Gull Island site because in this \$15 million expenditure by the Lower Churchill Development Corporation they found that the Department of Development, that this government has not done their work and delivered the customers necessary for that development to go ahead.

June 3, 1981

Tape No. 2108

DW - 3

MR. L. STIRLING:

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that this government appears to be fooled by its own public relations programme in what was obviously a phony issue, the question of transmission across Labrador. This government has three separate distinct positions. But the truth of the matter in their Five Year Development Plan, Mr. Speaker,

MR. STIRLING: they call upon Quebec to share the transmission facilities at a reasonable rent - not free transmission corridor, that is not what is in their Five Year Plan Mr. Speaker; a complete difference between what they are saying publicly and what they are saying in their Five Year Plan.

Mr. Speaker, they have spent two years trying to convince people of Newfoundland and Labrador that the real problem was the transportation of hydro power across Quebec. Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for them to attempt to fool the public, but when they attempt to fool themselves with that kind of rhetoric the only people who suffer are the people in Newfoundland and Labrador. This Party is on record, Mr. Speaker, as being firmly in favour of the development of the Gull Island site for use in Newfoundland and Labrador, giving priority to the people in Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): One Minute.

MR. STIRLING: One minute?

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, that was examined, the Gull Island site was examined as part of this \$15 million study. The recommendation was that because the government did not have the markets, they had no other choice but to recommend - and it was a clear and unanimous recommendation by a Board of Directors who are professionals, who spent \$15 million, and their recommendation is the recommendation containing our resolution, Mr. Speaker, and that is that we proceed with the development of Muskrat Falls. And I would urge the government to now - it is not too late - urge the government to support this resolution and get on with the job.

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

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, before I point out some of the deficiencies in the arguments of members opposite, I think it would be relevant to refer to a few of the findings of this Lower Churchill Development Corporation Limited report which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) is relying upon but which he is conveniently quoting only certain sections of and very conveniently deleting and concealing from the people of this Province - concealing, Mr. Speaker, from the people of this Province - certain other information in the report.

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

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) knows that he cannot use that expression 'concealing information,' 'intentionally concealing information'.

MR. BARRY: What? What?

MR. STIRLING: He is imputing motives, Mr. Speaker, and he cannot do that.

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that the hon. member is concealing information in his argument. Surely heavens this is a democratic House where I am able to point out what he is omitting and leaving out from his argument.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, to the point of order, I would rule that there is no point of order but certainly just a difference of opinion between two hon. gentleman.

MR. BARRY: By the way, Mr. Speaker, I am keeping a running count on the spurious points of order that the Leader of the Opposition is raising and periodically I think we will announce to the House the number of these that he is rising on and at some point in time there is going to be

MR. BARRY: a point of privilege raised to deal with that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Barry's theorem.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, Barry's theorem is still in effect. Summary of findings: finding number one, Mr. Speaker, the development of the hydro electric sites on the Lower Churchill River at Gull Island and Muskrat Falls, the construction of the line and so forth, are all technically feasible; finding number one, Gull Island is technically feasible as well as Muskrat Falls. Subsequent findings: Gull Island is the most economic alternative in the long term to serve the Province's load. Gull Island, I repeat, is the most economic alternative. Again we see the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) trying to get the people of this Province, as his predecessors have done, into a less economic position, not to seize the most economic hydro electric development possible. The board goes on to make another finding. "The large quantities of Gull Island energy, surplus to Newfoundland's needs in the early years, emphasize the desirability of additional energy sales in order to take advantage of the favourable unit cost differential of this project in comparison with Muskrat Falls." A clear statement, Gull Island is preferable to Muskrat Falls provided there can be a sale of surplus energy. In other words, Mr. Speaker, provided there can be a sale of surplus energy West, if that is the best way to go, surplus energy sales at a price in the order of thirty mils per kilowatt hour

MR. BARRY:

would permit financing of the economically preferred Gull Island project. They do not say, Mr. Speaker, as was erroneously pointed out by the member for LaPoile, (Mr. Neary) supported by other members opposite, that they should sell at 30 mils per kilowatt hour, but it will be sufficient, Mr. Speaker, as of the date of this report to receive 30 mils per kilowatt hour. Again, members opposite, in the same strong bargaining position that their predecessors take, look upon a minimum as the best that they would ever be able to obtain. And the people of this Province know, Mr. Speaker, that the minimum price is the best that the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite would ever be able to obtain in any negotiation. In any negotiation, the minimum, the bare minimum, is the most they would be able to get.

Mr. Speaker, the findings go on. The Muskrat Falls project is a financially viable undertaking. It offers lower energy costs than the alternative energy sources available to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro which involve building oil and/or coal fired generating plants. We agree, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) hydro
in Newfoundland.

MR. BARRY: It does not say that. And the member for Windsor - Buchans again is concealing information from the people of this Province when he says that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the findings do not say that and the member for Windsor - Buchans cannot shout me down when I have the floor of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): I would ask hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) to restrain himself.

MR. BARRY: But the fact that Muskrat Falls is better than burning oil or burning coal, Mr. Speaker, does not mean it is better than Gull Island, and that is what members opposite are forgetting.

They go on to say, Mr. Speaker, 'A firm power purchase agreement between LCDC and Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, a river management agreement and Government of Canada financing support, are key requirements for project financability.' Where in the Resolution is there a reference to Government of Canada financial support? Where do they ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Canada provide the financing support that is necessary even for Gull Island? It is not there, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, in the Energy Programme for the people of Canada, page 83, "Provision has been made for equity tax -

MR. BARRY: A point of privelege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: A point of privelege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must inform the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that that is not a point of order. He wants to clarify remarks.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Again is noted his attempt to interrupt debate in this House by rising on spurious points of order.

To the point of privelege.

MR. BARRY: Let me go through item by item,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. STIRLING: He raised a point of privelege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, now

I asked the protection of the Chair.

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

I ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to restrain
himself.

MR. BARRY: Yes, Barry's Theorem is
still -

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

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I did not finish
the point of order. He had said that the federal government
had not done something which they, in fact, have done and
he knows the difference.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this is -

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, but the hon. the Leader of
the Opposition will have an opportunity to clarify those
remarks, you know, at another time instead of interrupting
the hon. member opposite when he is speaking.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I want the people of
this Province to know the tactics that the Leader of the
Opposition has to resort to. When a debate comes before
the floor of this House he is too cowardly, Mr. Speaker -
I withdraw that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: - he does not have the intestinal
fortitude, Mr. Speaker, to stand on his logic because his
logic is too weak. He does not have the arguments and
therefore he tries to prevent members on this side of the
House from speaking. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is one member
he is not going to prevent from pointing out the erroneous

MR. BARRY: logic, the fallacies inherent in the arguments, the weak arguments that he is presenting.

MR. STIRLING: Why do you not quote the truth from the (inaudible).

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all the reference - members opposite spend a lot of time belabouring the history of the CFLCo takeover and we have, Mr. Speaker, the allegation that it is a gigantic blunder. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province recognize that that CFLCo takeover was the first step in the grand design, Mr. Speaker, for this

MR. BARRY:

government getting back control of what the members on the other side of the House and their party had given away. Now, Mr. Speaker, consider what members opposite are saying when they say that CFLCo should not have been taken over by this government. They are saying that they want to see BRINCO today being in control of the water rights of the Churchill River and other water rights in Labrador. They want to see, Mr. Speaker, a company, the minutes of which have revealed, Mr. Speaker, that in 1972 when this government was attempting to negotiate with that company for a proper deal on the Lower Churchill development, that company had already, had already made a secret deal with the province of Quebec, Mr. Speaker, that would have resulted in just as bad a contract as the first contract that the members opposite and their party supported and which we now have to clean up. We have to clean up their mess, Mr. Speaker. There were just out-and-out, pure, factual errors in the argument last week, Mr. Speaker. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) spoke about \$160 million - \$169 million I think he said - plus another thirty-odd million for water rights. The information I supplied him with was that the \$160 million included those very valuable water rights, not to just the Lower Churchill River but to the entire Labrador water rights which had been given to BRINCO by members opposite and their party. And they are still, Mr. Speaker, supporting the same short-sighted, narrow-minded policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, members opposite, they are forgetting they are trying to inflate the price that was paid for CFLCo. They are erroneously stating the price that was paid, and at the same time they are conveniently ignoring, Mr. Speaker, conveniently ignoring the tremendous increase, escalation in the value of those -

MR. FLIGHT: What is the price?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, please! Am I going to have to do continue to yell to try and out-shout the Yahoos opposite?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Please give me the protection of the Chair?

MR. STIRLING: Yahoos is not parliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. gentlemen to my right to restrain themselves because it is every member's right to be heard in silence.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are listening.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, you point out the errors, the flaws in their philosophy and the philosophy of their party and they cannot take it because they know we are right.

Mr. Speaker, if we had not gotten BRINCO out of the picture, we would never be in a position to do as we are doing now, which is to rectify the injustice of that Upper Churchill contract, we would never be in a position to get a proper development of the Lower Churchill, we would never have been in a position to bring the dispute with Quebec to a head. We would be going through a third party, through a private corporation, and Mr. Speaker, the people of

June 3, 1981

Tape No. 2112

NM - 2

MR. BARRY: this Province know that that was the
first step in a very carefully ordered series of steps, the
culmination of which we are now arriving at where.

MR. BARRY: we have two court cases, and where we have legislation in front of this House, Mr. Speaker, that will finally permit us to clean up this terrible mess that was left by the party opposite when it was in power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) has already pointed out that an independent report tabled in this House in 1975 has confirmed that value was gotten for the money spent on the Lower Churchill Development at this stage -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. BARRY: - and that is the Province's investment in the Lower Churchill Development Corporation. I am not spending any more time on that point, it is dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, I could hardly believe, when I read the transcript, what the energy critic opposite said, when he said, on page 5138 of Hansard, that it was not a bad deal, Mr. Speaker, when originally made, that the only thing wrong with it was the length of the contract! Mr. Speaker, it was and still is an abysmally bad deal because anybody then or now would know that there had to be an escalation clause with respect to price if you have a contract as long as that.

And, Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wake up at night with cold shivers when I think of how close we came, Mr. Speaker, in past elections to having members opposite now being in a position to give away the hydro electrical heritage of this Province the same way that the members opposite gave it away the last time they were in power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have not had -
I do not think we have had one single statement of support
in this House for the position taken by this government in
fighting for the right to have wheeling and a power
corridor across the Province of Quebec. I do not think
there has been one expression of support -

MR. STIRLING:

Not true.

MR. BARRY:

- from members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, not only that,
they still do not understand; the energy

MR. BARRY: critic opposite get up and spells out the fact that a power corridor is all that is necessary. And then he goes on to say, 'and if you get a power corridor, you are going to have to give up your power for a long term until the transmission line that you are going to have to build in that power corridor is amortized.' Of course you will, Mr. Speaker; of course the Province will have to commit itself to the sale of power long-term if it has to rely only on a power corridor and a new transmission line—which is exactly why, Mr. Speaker, members opposite should be fighting with this government to see that we have wheeling rights over the existing transmission system, that we should have wheeling rights, Mr. Speaker, which has clearly, Mr. Speaker, been spelled out in correspondence tabled in this House, letters from the Premier to the Prime Minister of this country where we asked for presentations before the National Energy Board. And, Mr. Speaker, they still have not gotten the message. Mr. Speaker, they still have not gotten the message. They still do not understand. The energy critic -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: The energy critic, Mr. Speaker, still does not recognize that the main aim of any Newfoundland energy policy has to be to meet Newfoundland needs first. All he is talking about is a power corridor so that energy can be sold, when we want, Mr. Speaker, to have the right to transmit -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - to transmit electricity in the short-term, recallable, Mr. Speaker, as the President of the Council pointed out last week, recallable as we need

MR. BARRY: it in this Province. And the way to do that is for us to have wheeling rights over the existing Quebec transmission system.

MR FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. BARRY: Members opposite,- I cannot believe what I am hearing.

MR. FLIGHT: I cannot either.

MR. BARRY: The energy critic , Mr. Speaker, is saying,"Ah, ha! We have got it. Ah, ha! We have got it."Mr. Speaker, last Fall we first wrote the Prime Minister and published the correspondence. Last January - last January, Mr. Speaker- we made the submission to the National Energy Board and published that. The Opposition has copies. What is happening? Is it that they cannot read physically? Do they need glasses? Or have they just never learned to read or do they not understand what they read? I mean, what are they saying? And now they are going to try and say that they are learning something new here today. How many times do we have to publish government's position? How many times do we have to spell out the elements of a proper energy policy for them?

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh,oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I just cannot believe how weak they are in their energy policy. Now, Mr. Speaker, the same lack of knowledge is shown by the stress on the 30 mil power which is referred to in the LCDC report. The energy critic is treating that as though it were the sale of energy on a long-term basis, this notion he has got that you have to sell it for twenty years because all he is able to think up is a power corridor. Mr. Speaker, just as here in the Province today, here in the Province today we sell short-term interruptable power at a lower

MR. BARRY: price than you sell power which you commit for a year or two years or three years or five years, in the same way, Mr. Speaker, there would be different rates for power sales from the Lower Churchill depending upon the length of time that you commit the power, a basic fact of energy policy which the energy critic opposite and the Leader of the Opposition apparently cannot understand.

MR. FLIGHT: I understand it alright.

MR. BARRY: Can we give a seminar? I would be glad to set up a little seminar for him to try and point out some of the basics of rate setting which the Federation of Municipalities and every member of the general public who intervenes at a rate hearing in this Province understands. What sort of intervention are we going to have from the Liberal party of this Province at the hydro rate hearing? What sort of intervention are we going to have if it is this sort of -

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) it is the taxpayer's money you are going to -

MR. BARRY: - philosophy and policy that they are trying to impose on energy development in this Province?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the resolution - the resolution, the defects in the resolution are ridiculous. They are saying that Muskrat, Mr. Speaker, is the best option. Muskrat is better than coal or oil, but it is not better than Gull Island. We would love to see, Mr. Speaker, a whole series of small projects -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) compared to Hinds Lake?

MR. BARRY: - 200 megawatt, 300 megawatt 400 megawatt projects that we could do one after the other. This government prefers small projects, Mr. Speaker, but not if we have to accept the resolution of the members opposite and they are asking, Mr. Speaker, that the consumer of this Province be forced to pay 20 mils more, that is what they want.

AN HON. MEMBER: Now you are really pushed.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, they do not, they are not satisfied with the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) court case.

MR. BARRY: They are not satisfied with the high price of energy which would be paid from Gull Island, which would still be lower than paying for energy from oil. They want to have the consumer pay 20 mils more and, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand what they are thinking of. Why would they do that to the people of our Province, to our energy consumers? Why would they make our people pay 20 mils more? How are they going to be able to justify that when they get into another provincial election?

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) - go to court.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that they cannot justify imposing on the electrical consumer of this Province another 20 mils.

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I could point out the defects in the resolution but Your Honour is pointing out that I have run out of time. One of my colleagues will be presenting an amendment to this very weak resolution, pitifully weak resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I might have a further opportunity to speak on that.

Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member for Eagle River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) with his high rhetoric today. Probably one of the reasons why he figures that if he tries to shout everybody down, and also speak in a very, very loud voice that the issues, the emotional - again a perfect example of what this government has been doing for the past ten years with the people of this Province - it is purely emotion. They are purely imotional issues. And with regard to that, I have said and I will say it again that this government has no long term plan with regard to hydro. When they got in power they were so surprised that they actually did bring down the Smallwood Administration, that they had a piecemeal approach and still maintain it. If we had back in 1972, Mr. Speaker, when this government took over, taken the Quebec Government to court, we may have had our 800 megawatts recalled now. We may have had the Lower Churchill, we may have had the Muskrat Falls. But instead, Mr. Speaker, no, we do not have any long term project so as a result we have seen the expansion at Holyrood. We have seen Hinds Lake. We have seen the Upper Salmon, and now Cat Arm. And for what reason? The minister said that the Opposition wants to make the consumer

MR. HISCOCK: of this Province pay more, 20 mils more. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, this Province is actually now paying more because this government did not have any plan with regard to long term hydro development. LCDC has recommended the construction of Muskrat Falls. It has been shown by engineers in this Province, and in Canada and in the world, that it is probably the best, most simple project to develop, very, very engineering feasible, very, very efficient and a quick job. And if we had that, Mr. Speaker, we would not be decimating and getting rid of our wilderness areas like Upper Salmon area and Cat Arm and Hinds Lake. And this is only going to - Cat Arm is only going to take us to 1985, and I would go as far as to say by the delay that this government has had with regard to the Upper Salmon, the Upper Churchill recall, with regard to the Lower Churchill and with regard to Muskrat Falls, that in five years we still will not have it onstream, Mr. Speaker, from Muskrat Falls or the Lower Churchill. We will have to expand the Holyrood plant, the oil burning plant in Holyrood, Mr. Speaker. And if this is not done, if the Lower Churchill is not brought down by way of Muskrat Falls now, Mr. Speaker, we, the Province, are going to pay dearly.

Back in 1972 it would have cost this Province to develop the Lower Churchill \$1.5 billion, or \$1.2 billion. Now it is up to \$7.5 million. Who has to

MR. HISCOCK: pay more now, Mr. Speaker? The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) was up very, very emotionally with regard to the consumers of this Province. Who has to pay that extra \$6 billion dollars? I am sure, Mr. Speaker, it is not the people in New York or it is not the people in West Germany or it is not the people in Alberta, it is the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker. Ten years ago, after forming the government of this Province, and ten years after, they are after perpetrating the greatest bluff on the people of this Province, the greatest bluff and that is the bluff with regard to energy. And the other bluff they got into because the way the contract was done, and this is rather ironic now, they got in with the idea that the contract was a bad contract and that the Liberals sold the Province down the drain. Now they are taking themselves to court and not only are they taking themselves to court but the original contract with regard to having the re-call rights is now being one of the main test cases of that contract, Mr. Speaker. So here they are criticizing the contract ten years ago and here they are now, will get the re-call rights of 800 megawatts because of the clause in the contract. And we do not even have to take them to court, and this is the amazing thing about it, we do not even have to take ourselves to court; we have the right to re-call that 800 megawatts anytime, all we have to do is give one year notice, not only for that 800 megawatts but anything over and above that. But no, Mr. Speaker, we have not yet done that. It has been an emotional issue, it has been a political issue. The former Premier won an election on it. When he got in the Province was bankrupt, I believe the slogan was then, the Province was bankrupt. And what happened, Mr. Speaker? When they got in, 'tighten your belts; we have to raise taxes because the way the government and the administration under Smallwood left the Province, we have to tighten our belts.' That went on

MR. HISCOCK: for two or three years and then finally there was not one new construction job, not one new industry was brought into the Province, in the next election the former Premier, Mr. Moores, ended up saying we are going to start the Lower Churchill and made two explosions on each side of the Strait, cost this Province \$150 million and after it was finished, Mr. Speaker, closed it down and we are still \$150 million in debt. And if we had that \$150 million, Mr. Speaker, there would be a lot of roads in this Province that would be done, a lot of hospitals, a lot of schools. But no, Mr. Speaker, it was an emotional issue, it was a political issue and the Province is still using the same thing: It is using delaying tactic. And I will tell you again, Mr. Speaker, when we have the next election, I can tell you now what the issues are going to be. They are going to be the offshore, they are going to be the re-call and it is also going to be probably with regard to the fisheries and a few other things. But those are going to be the three main emotional issues. And this government has bluffed our people, the media have taken it for the most part. I thank the media now for one thing that we will at least be getting, now that we are going into the second half of the Premier's term, the media and the people of this Province are now beginning to ask questions. I am very, very pleased by that proposal. Even the Evening Telegram had an editorial with regard to the resignation of the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). I was rather surprised at that but, again, I suppose they have to show their impartiality at times.

But I want to talk with regard to Labrador, that vast house of resources, with regard to uranium, the Northern cod, with regard to hydro, with regard to timber, with regard to iron ore and with regard to people and with regard to wildlife - the largest caribou herd

MR. HISCOCK:

in the world is in Labrador.

We always think about, this government in particular more so than the Liberal administration in the past and that was not always - even though we did open up Churchill Falls and Labrador City and Wabush and Happy Valley.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Labrador was neglected.

MR. HISCOCK:

Labrador has been neglected and this Province now has continued to neglect it and now it is throwing up its hands and saying; Oh, we have a DREE agreement now; we wanted \$100 million, we only got \$47 million.' So everytime I ask you for something else this government is going to say, 'oh, it was in the DREE agreement, we cannot do anything about it.'

So, Mr. Speaker, my question is - we are going to be bringing down the power, whether it is the Muskrat Falls, whether it is 800 megawatts from the Upper Churchill or whether it is the Lower Churchill, we are going to be bringing it to this Province. Labrador, because it is the coast, the original people of Labrador, whether they be native by aborigine or white settlers, they are inhabitants of Labrador. Labrador was awarded, recognized, made an integral part of this Province because of settlement, Mr. Speaker, by way of these people, by way of these Anglo-Saxon,

MR. HISCOCK: European and Newfoundland people who went up from Conception Bay and Notre Dame Bay, Trinity Bay and settled along the coast. And we were awarded or given or recognized that Labrador was part of this Province. And what, Mr. Speaker, have we done? The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) said the other day that Labrador is rather backward; the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) stated that schools are substandard, the Minister of Health (Mr. House) realizes the need for more health clinics. But what does this Province do with regard to electricity? Bring it down to the Island, Mr. Speaker, so we can have industry on the Island and create jobs and maintain a high standard of living.

It has been pointed out that the cost of living is 20 per cent higher on the Labrador Coast, it has also been reported statistically that the cost of living up there is 20 per cent higher and that the wages are 15 to 20 per cent lower, so you have a gap of 40 per cent.

Does this government have any long-term projects to take the people on the coast off diesel and hook them up to the vast hydro projects of the Upper Churchill and Muskrat Falls or the Lower Churchill? No, Mr. Speaker, none whatsoever. And the people of Labrador, how are they supposed to feel about that? They suffered, they went through great hardships, and I have spoken of this in the House. Before Grenfell came, there was a person who ended up having her legs frostbitten; her father put her on chopping block, chopped off the two feet because there was no doctor. Another person had to saw off his own leg, And these were the people who clung to that rock, Mr. Speaker, along the coast. And how have we been treating them? I think the answer speaks for itself. The editorials of the papers speak for it,

MR. HISCOCK: Whether it is Mr. Rompkey - Mr. Rompkey, I would like to point out to the member, will do more for Labrador to keep Labrador as an integral part of this Province than all of this government put together. I would like to point out, where the minister points out from time to time, that DREE agreements, within the year we have seen over \$50 million for C-CORE at the University \$50 million for the railway, we have seen - when the fisheries component is signed in June, \$47 million for Coastal Labrador DREE agreement, we saw \$30 million for modernization. So I think Mr. Rompkey is doing his fair share. But it is not good enough, Mr. Speaker, to have this Province say that Ottawa must do everything.

And with regard to LCDC, with regard to the Lower Churchill and Muskrat Falls, the federal government has recognized and will guarantee the financing of the Lower Churchill. And with regard to the Trans-Labrador Highway and various other projects, Mr. Speaker, we will have it. But this government should not continue to go in the direction of completely ignoring the local needs of Labrador. We cannot

MR. E. HISCOCK: always say that we need the power for the Island: The coast of Labrador is much as an integral part of this Province: If it is not then it should be told so.

All the fish, Mr. Speaker, the Northern cod caught all along the Labrador coast and the North Shore of Quebec, all of it, Mr. Speaker, is taken to the Island, dried and processed and sent to markets in the community of Brigus, in the community of Harbour Grace, in the community of Port Union and Catalina. And not one job, processing job is on the Labrador coast. If we get a grid from the Lower Churchill, even if it is a parallel grid running along to the coast and then let it go on into the submarine cable, even if that is done, Mr. Speaker, we can have a plant on the Labrador coast to process the saltfish that is caught in the local area and shipped on to market. Because, Mr. Speaker, there is an outlet for shipping until late January or early February and that is plenty of time to have this fish dried and shipped to markets.

But with regard to a statement that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) said, he stated that the Liberals could not negotiate only at a minimum price. The Minister of Mines and Energy realizes and knows that whatever the market price is going, that is what the price will be paid by industry. Industry will pay the market price not one cent under, not one cent over, but the market price.

MR. BARRY: Not one cent under?

MR. E. HISCOCK: No, Mr. Speaker, they will not pay under it because both governments, any government, whether it is a NDP, whether it is a Conservative or whether it is a Liberal, will make sure that we will get the market price. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it does

MR. E. HISCOCK: not matter who is in there,
who is in there, Mr. Speaker, what company -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. E. HISCOCK: -because the Minister of Mines
and Energy (Mr. Barry) knows it is not the Minister of Mines
and Energy who negotiates the contract. It is not the Minister
of Mines and Energy who negotiates the contract, but the officials.
And I would go as far as to say that if this -

MR. L. BARRY: Are you going to let your
officials run your government when you get in, are you?

MR. E. HISCOCK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would go as
far as to say Mr. Young has been running the Minister of Mines
and Energy ever since he has been in there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. HISCOCK: One time he is being advised on
one thing, another time he is being advised on another thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. E. HISCOCK: And because of that complica-
tion, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves now in a

MR. HISCOCK: unique position of taking our own selves to court, that is the type of advice the officials are being given.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if this government changed tomorrow - and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) knows this - if we changed governments tomorrow, basically the contract and the officials negotiating would be the same. And the Minister of Mines and Energy also knows that when the original contract was drawn up on the Upper Churchill, it was the best financial experts in Newfoundland, in Canada and in the world who advised the government and BRINCO on that, Mr. Speaker. But the Minister of Mines and Energy would like to say that the Premier did not read it or whatever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

It is very difficult for the Chair to hear what is going on. Some degree of flexibility is allowed on each side but I think we are getting a little bit out of hand. I would ask everybody to restrain themselves.

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, it is a very, very important Resolution and I am a little bit surprised that the Minister of Mines and Energy is going to bring in an amendment. Anything that is good in this Province, whether it is by the Opposition or whether it is by the news media, if it is good for the Province it is good for the Province and it is about time for us to stop playing politics with certain issues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: And we have stopped them with

MR. HISCOCK: regard to the offshore. We asked for joint management and development. We will stop on these other things and we have put certain things above it. But no, Mr. Speaker, we do not have this from the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the Minister of Mines of Energy (Mr. Barry) and from the Premier. They continue to play it because they know that if they do get serious and let the people know what is sorry on then the people will see through the ten year bluff and everything will start crumbling around them and the people will realize that they have been fooled.

MR. CALLAN: Ten year bluffer.

MR. HISCOCK: The expression is 'You can fool the people some of the time -

MR. BENNETT: 'but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.'

MR. CALLAN: That is right.

MR. HISCOCK: And I would say, Mr. Speaker, as our leader said, the embarrassing thing about this is the government is trying to fool itself and I think they are even beginning to believe it.

But with regard to 'give it away' - the Minister of Mines and Energy was saying, you know, 'Give it away.' I wonder why, with regard to his university days when he was in the Liberal Party, did he feel then the great spirit of liberalism gave everything away? Is there any liberalism in him now to want to see free milk in our schools, to see a dental programme expanded? Is there any liberalism in him now, Mr. Speaker, or when he changed to his Tory blue did he throw all those things out through the door?

Mr. Speaker, I would go as far as to say that this Resolution is a good Resolution. I regret that the Minister of Mines and Energy is going

MR. HISCOCK: to put an amendment to it. But even if he is going to put an amendment to it, the people of Labrador are looking at this government particularly. They have had to wait now with the shelving of the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls because of Cat Arm. The people on the Coast are extremely upset because of the high rate of electricity, the highest in Canada. As the rate goes up with diesel, the more you consume the more you have to pay, whereas in the Province, Mr. Speaker, the more you consume through Hydro rates the cheaper it is.

Labrador and the Province are looking at this government for fairness and I only ask one thing with regard to the Upper Churchill, in concluding - and I have said it before, Mr. Speaker - that this is an emotional issue, Mr. Speaker, with regard to Labrador. The government has used it as an emotional issue and a political issue to get re-elected. That is fair and fine if they want to do it again. But they should also be very, very aware - and I am sincere when I say this - that they should also be very, very aware of the feelings of Labrador. I would ask the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) to put himself in their situation - they have lived on the Coast all their lives with their families and to see all the power going out - how they feel, Mr. Speaker.

I hope that this government in fairness will start the construction of a transmission line through Labrador so we can get some jobs and that we will also have a uniform price for diesel electricity all across the Province, Mr. Speaker. And if the government do this they will do a lot, just by that equalization they will do a lot to wipe out the feeling of alienation

MR. E. HISCOCK: that Coastal Labrador and Labrador generally is having. I am a little bit surprised, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) - Mud Lake, only eight miles away from the transmission line is not even hooked up. So I hope that the government will address some of these things.

So in concluding, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) will not say that the Liberals give everything down the drain. I would ask the Minister of Mines and Energy now what is he going to give Labrador to replace taking all its resources to the Island?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to say a few words on this particular motion. I can agree with some of the statements that have been made by gentlemen on the other side that it is indeed, in the main, a very important resolution. There is no doubt about that. The resolution deals with a topic, with a concept, with an issue that is very important to the future of this Province and has been important to this Province for the past number of years.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution itself, sad to say, is very poorly constructed in many regards.

MR. NEARY: We would expect you to say that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I had the same thing said to me only two weeks ago, so I suppose what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I can certainly find problems with some of the things or some of the assumptions that have been written in this resolution. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to shout and scream to try to be heard over hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not think I interrupted a person all day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

The people might not agree with what I am saying but I certainly have a right to say it. And my understanding of the rules is I have a right to say it in silence. I do not expect everybody to agree with everything I say but, like I said, I do not believe I interrupted a soul all day, I do not believe I shouted at a person all day, so I would ask for the same courtesy if the hon. gentlemen opposite do not mind. Now if they want to shout, Mr. Speaker, I can shout as well as anybody.

But what I am about to say,

Sir, is that find there are some very poorly put and very poorly placed assumptions in this particular resolution. I want to go through it, first of all, and look at how I believe the resolution is improperly put together, based on improper assumptions and things that are not really, as of June 3rd., 1981, fact. And I want to point those out.

Now the first 'WHEREAS':

"WHEREAS the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador will experience a serious electrical shortage by the year 1985 and that such shortages will increase significantly thereafter". That is based on improper assumptions. There never was the problem of serious shortages. We have always talked about shortages. We have always thought that unless new generating potential came onstream there would be shortages by 1985. But we have never - I do not think anybody has ever said that there would be serious shortages. So there is a difference, a very important dif-

MR. RIDEOUT: it is just wrong, it is a wrong assumption, it is a fallacy and it should not allow it to stand without being contradicted.

But what I am saying as far as this 'Whereas' goes, the Whereas is based on an improper assumption, that there is an Island site that can be developed, and there is and there will be and there is one announced and it will be developed. So, therefore, the assumption that is built into this second 'Whereas' is misleading, Mr. Speaker. It is not correct, it is not right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: The third Whereas in this particular motion, 'Whereas the development of the Muskrat Falls power site would for the foreseeable future provide Newfoundland and Labrador with a stable long-term supply of relatively low cost electricity' is a fair statement except with one regard, it would be relatively low cost electrical energy as compared to oil. It is not really low cost electrical energy to develop but that is, I suppose, an argument of semantics, and it is not really important. The basic assumption, the basic premise in the resolution is fine, and I have no trouble agreeing with it, but it must be pointed out and it should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that it is relatively inexpensive when compared to energy generated by oil fired generation.

So it is not really fair to say that it is relatively low cost in itself, because it is not, and that is a wrong assumption.

The next Whereas: "Whereas in June, 1980 the Lower Churchill Development Corporation recommended to the government that an immediate start be

MR. RIDEOUT: on the development of the Muskrat Falls power site, assuring government in its report and recommendation that the project is economically and technically feasible; that there is no dependence on the exportation of surplus power; and that an intertie with the Island part of the Province is feasible by a sub-sea cable crossing."

Now that in itself neither, Mr. Speaker, is a bad assumption. There is no doubt, I mean anybody who can read and has read the report of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation knows that that was a recommendation that was made by that particular group. But it also must be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that in the report made by the Lower Churchill Development Corporation it drew some very significant conclusion about the development of the Gull Island site. It did not talk about the development of Muskrat Falls site only, it drew some very significant conclusions and made some very significant statements about the technical feasibility, about the economic feasibility and really about the desirability of developing the Gull Island site itself. It made some very interesting comments and drew some very interesting conclusions.

So it is unfair, Mr. Speaker, it is unfair to say, it is untrue to say that the only conclusion that the LCDC Report came to was that we had no other choice but to develop the Muskrat site. That is not what they said. It is a recommendation they made, but it is not the only thing that they said, and anybody who reads the report, Mr. Speaker, will have to agree that that is not the only thing that they said.

Then we come to the 'Therefore Be It Resolved' part of the resolution, and, Mr. Speaker, that is filled with a lot of things. "Therefore Be It Resolved

MR. RIDEOUT: that Government accept the recommendations of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation and make an immediate start on the Muskrat Falls project, the short-term benefit being the jobs and the general boost to the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador, and the long-term benefit being a stable, relatively low-cost source of electrical power for this Province." Now I have already dealt with the relatively low-cost portion in remarks that I made about a Whereas above that one.

But again, Mr. Speaker, the Therefore Be It Resolved is mischievous really in that it does not point out, it makes no reference whatsoever to what the LCDC report contributes a lot of their time and a lot of their pages in talking about, and that is the desirability, the technological ability and the feasibility of going ahead with the Gull Island project provided a few things can be put in place that they mention in their well put together report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to propose an amendment to this resolution. And my understanding of an amendment -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: It is not going to be very long. The Leader of the Opposition need not worry.

My understanding of the purpose of an amendment, an amendment can be made that would make a resolution more broadly acceptable. And I have pointed out a number of wrong assumptions that are contained in the preamble of this resolution as it stands on the Order Paper today. I pointed out a number of erroneous assumptions that are contained in the Therefore Be It Resolved section of the resolution as it stands.

June 3, 1981

Tape 2121

PK - 4

MR. RIDEOUT: The Minister of Mines and Energy
(Mr. Barry) in a very able and eloquent speech today pointed
out a number of more serious, erroneous

MR. T. RIDEOUT: assumptions that are contained in the speeches made on the resolution to date and indeed in the resolution itself.

So I understand that it is in order to move an amendment that would make the resolution more acceptable without totally negating, of course, the concept of the resolution which deals with the development of the Muskrat Falls site. In fact, the resolution that I had on the Order Paper only a couple of weeks ago was amended in the same fashion. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by my colleague for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett), to amend the motion by deleting all the words after 'Whereas' and adding the following, "WHEREAS the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador will experience an electrical energy shortage by the year 1987 and such shortages will increase significantly each year thereafter," And that is basically the 'Whereas' of the hon. gentleman with a few corrections made to take in account the Cat Arm site - "AND WHEREAS the development of the Muskrat Falls power site and the Gull Island power site would, for the foreseeable future, provide Newfoundland and Labrador with a stable, long-term supply of relatively low cost electrical energy". Again basically what the hon. gentleman was saying in his resolution. "AND WHEREAS in June, 1980 the Lower Churchill Development Corporation recommended to the government that an immediate start be made on the development of the Muskrat Falls power site assuring government in its report and recommendation that the project is economically and technically feasible and that there is no dependence on the exportation of surplus power and that an inter-tie with the Island part of the Province is feasible by a sub-sea cable crossing". Again basically I do not believe hardly a difference in a tittle or a jottle of anything that the hon. gentleman had in his resolution.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: And then I add, "BUT WHEREAS the Lower Churchill Development Corporation also concluded that the Gull Island power project was also technically and economically feasible provided that surplus power could be sold Westward; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government accept the conclusions of the Lower Churchill Power Corporation and urge the Government of Canada to provide the necessary financial guarantees and to amend the National Energy Board Act to give that Board authority to set the terms and conditions upon which Newfoundland can both wheel electricity over the existing Quebec transmission grid and/or construct a new transmission line if necessary as established by the Board through the Province of Quebec, So that, Mr. Speaker, to permit an immediate start on the Gull Island power project as well as the Muskrat Falls project."

Mr. Speaker, that is the amendment and I put it forward for Your Honour's consideration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: I have a point of order to the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. G. FLIGHT: I do not really need to read the amendment. I listened to the hon. member intently and I understand what the resolution is saying, Mr. Speaker.

And as the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) pointed out a couple of weeks ago when there was a resolution passed that the amendment cannot change the resolution. And I submit, Sir, having submitted the resolution -

MR. BARRY: Cannot change a resolution?

MR. FLIGHT: I am going to find out on this thing. My resolution is very clear, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

It would be helpful if the hon. member had some references.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

No, I am going to -

MR. SPEAKER:

You are just going to present this?

MR. G. FLIGHT:

My resolution is very clear.

I make no apologies that it does not talk about the Lower Churchill, the Upper Churchill, it does not talk about Gull Island, it does not talk about sending power out of the Province. It says that we make an immediate start on Muskrat. And, Mr. Speaker, any resolution that takes away from that thought, from that theory, is not in my opinion acceptable. Because my resolution, Mr. Speaker, is very definite. It talks about the development of the Muskrat and any resolution that talks about anything separate than the development of the Muskrat takes away from the original resolution.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council to the point of order.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. gentlemen there opposite just get up as a matter of course, but the fact of the matter is if something is out of order it has to be out of order - not because the hon. member or for that matter myself says it - but because it comes within rules. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will just quote you very quickly from Beauchesne, the fourth edition of Beauchesnes, 'The object of amendment may be to affect such an alteration in a question as will obtain the support of those who without such alteration must vote against it, or abstain from

MR. MARSHALL: voting thereon or to present to the House an alternative proposition either wholly or partially opposed to the original question. This may be affected by moving to omit all the words of the question after the first word 'that' and to substitute in their place other words of a different import. In that case the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment but includes the motives of the amendment and of the motion' etc.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that the hon. member is talking on the same subject. He is bringing in an amendment. The hon. gentleman's main motion is with respect to Muskrat Falls. The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay's (Mr. Rideout) motion merely just modifies it and makes it more acceptable, deals with the same subject matter - deals with the Lower Churchill, deals with Gull Island, deals more fully with the situation. The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay is able to put in a motion that makes it more acceptable because in fact the hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay understands the situation as the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) did not when he proposed it originally.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: I think that all the references are acceptable to this side of the House. The question is, Does it really deal with the substance of this motion? The purpose of the amendment, we accept, is to make it more acceptable. Mr. Speaker, what has happened here is that if you vote for this motion you negate the motion put by my colleague because it changes the inference.

MR. STIRLING: My colleague has put a motion that requires us to accept the recommendation and make a start on Muskrat Falls. This BE IT RESOLVED - all the WHEREASES let us forget. When you deal with the BE IT RESOLVED in the amendment, 'that the government accept the conclusions of the Lower Churchill Power Corporation' but the action that it asks for, 'urges the Government of Canada to provide the necessary financial guarantees and to amend the National Energy Board Act to give that Board authority to set the terms and conditions upon which Newfoundland can both wheel electricity over the existing hydro grid and/or construct a new transmission line -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - if necessary as established by the Board through the Province of Quebec so as to permit an immediate start on the Gull Island power project as well as the Muskrat Falls project.'

Mr. Speaker, it introduces an entirely different concept and that is the concept of a debate on what a recommendation should be to the National Energy Board and a debate on the Gull Island site, whereas this is a very specific resolution that deals with accepting the recommendation of the Board - not the findings, no argument with the findings - and recommends that we take immediate action. This action gets into an area that is totally unrelated and has to do with recommendations to the National Energy Board and a transmission line. These things are not covered at all in the resolution and it does not deal with the main purpose of the resolution which is to get action on the Muskrat Falls site.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear one final submission on the point of order from the other side. I think that would be fair.

MR. MARSHALL: To the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that all the text to that resolution does is pertain to the original motion itself. It does not negate it, it makes it more acceptable. The only reason why the hon. gentlemen are getting upset is because they might possibly, if Your Honour rules it in order, have to vote on a resolution which will embarrass them before their federal buddies up in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member wishes to make a submission?

MR. HODDER: I just want to refer -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: I am sure Your Honour would not want a motion to be incorrectly amended in the House, but Section 437 in Beauchesne says, "An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved." And also, "An amendment may not raise a new question which can only be considered as a distinct motion". Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Can the hon. member give me that quote again, the reference?

MR. HODDER: If I can find it again, Mr. Speaker - 437, Mr. Speaker.

So I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this particular amendment has changed in that it was brought two wholly new elements into the motion, namely, the Energy Board of Canada and the Gull Island site.

June 3, 1981

Tape 2123

EC - 4

MR. HODDER:

So I would submit, Mr. Speaker,
that the motion is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): I thank hon. members for their submissions. The question clearly is for the Chair to consider whether or not the resolution or the amendment negates the original intent of the resolution and that is what the Chair will decide. I will take a few moments to do it if hon. members will allow me, a recess for a few moments

RECESS:

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

With respect to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay, I would like to quote the following authorities for hon. members, to direct their attention to those authorities. And I will say at the outset this is again one of those matters that presents a question of degree, and a difficult question of degree for the Chair to determine. In any event I want to quote at the outset Standing Order 36 of our own House rules which states: "A motion may be amended: (a) by leaving out certain words; (b) by leaving out certain words in order to insert other words; (c) by inserting or adding other words". And this amendment obviously falls into category (b).

Secondly, Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, page 153, paragraph 425 says: "The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original question which must, however, be relevant to the subject of the question." It appears to me that the purpose of this amendment coincides with references in Beauchesne, that the object is to affect such alterations in the motion that could obtain the support of those who would not support it in its original form. So it appears to me within the general principle and purpose of the amendment as referred to specifically by

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Beauchesne in paragraph 425.

And finally I want to quote Sir Erskine May, Parliamentary Practices, Ninteenth Edition, page 387 and I quote: "The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original question. The latter purpose may be affected by moving to omit all or most of the words of that question after the first word and to substitute in their place other words of a different import. In that case the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment but includes the purpose of both the amendment and the motion, both matters being under consideration of the House as an alternative proposition". This amendment in my opinion merely adds an extra dimension to the resolution and I do not consider that it negates the original resolution.

Thus having considered it, I rule that the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay's (Mr. Rideout) amendment is in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: However, at the same time I would have to advise the hon. member that his twenty minutes had expired because of the debate on the point of order that was raised subsequently. His time had expired at five, the House recessed at five. So his twenty minutes have expired.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you very much, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand a copy of the amendment was given to the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight).

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) just brought in an amendment to a very valuable resolution. And I wish to go on record from the beginning that I will be supporting this amendment, Mr. Speaker. However, I do have some concerns with this government's lack of initiative in having the Muskrat Falls project started.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) Speaker's ruling. He thinks the Speaker made the wrong ruling.

MR. WARREN: I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: He cannot believe his ears.

MR. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, I know -

MR. HODDER: Come on over, 'Tom', boy.

MR. WARREN: - that members on the government side -

MR. NEARY: Come on over, 'Tom'.

MR. TULK: Too bad you did not do it when you were here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the members on the opposite side of this House do show signs of shock across their faces. I can see there are very few smiles and they are all shocked, they are all shocked, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not blame the hon. members for being shocked because it had to take a Liberal, a turncoat Liberal to bring in such a resolution, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, that man stood up for a principle. And with that, Mr. Speaker, therefore we have to support this resolution because we

MR. G. WARREN: want to make sure, we want to make sure that this government gets off their butts as fast as they can and get the Muskrat Falls and the Lower Churchill going as soon as possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will throw the challenge back into the member's court this time to make sure that he can convince his pig-headed Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. G. WARREN: I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker.

To get that Premier off his fat butt and get some action on the Muskrat Falls and the Lower Churchill. Now, Mr. Speaker if he is so smart -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. G. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the member is so sincere in bringing in this amendment, I hope that the rest of this government will be as sincere in getting this project on the go as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, in the Committee on Industrial Development, the hon. Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), I asked him a question. I asked the minister a question and the question was if Muskrat Falls -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. member for Tornat Mountains.

MR. E. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, when are we going to hear the member for Tornat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) would just close that thing that he has between his nose and his chin, then I would probably continue.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), in response to a question I had posed to him in committee, I had asked him, if the Muskrat Falls project would go ahead, how much power would there be coming out of this project; he said there would not be enough power from the Muskrat Falls for Labrador if there was an aluminum smelting plant established in Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is that the reason why the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) is saying on one hand there is going to be an aluminum smelting plant in Labrador, and the Minister of Development is saying, 'We do not know where it is going to be? And it is just because, Mr. Speaker, this government cannot see its way clear to act immediately upon opening up either the Muskrat Falls or the Lower Churchill?

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope today that this has been a great lesson learned by the members on the government side. At least now we are going to see - the headlines tomorrow are going to read - I can almost picture the headlines tomorrow - it is going to read, 'Immediate Start on the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat, both of them.' There is going to be an immediate start because a government member has brought in an amendment to the resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in February 1979, the Minister of Mines and Energy at the time, who is now the Premier of this Province - and by the way, I was a civil servant then being paid by the government of this Province.

MR. G. WARREN: Here is what - I want to read this. This is dated February 20th., 1979, 'Mines and Energy Minister, Brian Peckford' - and I will read it quoting from the paper 'says if he is elected P.C. Leader and Premier of the Province, he will use every effort to have a royal commission to look in to the Upper Churchill power contracts.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Mr. Speaker, that was on February 19th., 1979.

MR. L. STIRLING: His first broken promise.

MR. G. WARREN: That was his first broken promise and he had not even consented to have a royal commission set up to look into the Upper Churchill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is - why, I wonder, Mr. Speaker? am going to relate some more news, maybe it just might have some bearing. I do not know whether it is or not. In the years when the hon.

MR. WARREN: 'Mr. Chips', the hon. John Crosbie, was Minister of Finance in the Newfoundland Government and at the same time the Premier of the day now was the Minister of Mines and Energy - Mr. Speaker, I might shock some people, if I say, if I repeat this too loud. I do not know, it is only a rumour but I have to repeat it, Mr. Speaker. Now at this time when the Finance Minister of the Province was the hon. John Crosbie and the Minister of Mines and Energy was the hon. the Premier who is the Premier today, now I understand - I do not know if it is true or not, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is true or not; maybe some members on the other side could advise me. I was hoping that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) was in his seat, because I understand that the chief legal advisor for Mr. Crosbie - now I do not know if this is rumour or not - but the chief legal advisor for Mr. Crosbie was a professor of law at Dalhousie University -

MR. HOLLETT: Who is that?

MR. WARREN: - was a professor at Dalhousie University, was the chief legal advisor on the Upper Churchill when the government bought out BRINCO. Now, I do not know, and I understand he was a professor at Dalhousie University, and maybe the guy was a native of Placentia Bay, I do not know, but there is a rumour. Now, did this have any bearing, I wonder, when this came out in the light, when this all came under light, I wonder, I am just wondering now if that had any bearing at all on why the so-called - the guy that was running for the Premier of the day all of a sudden stopped everything? This was about - he was going to have a royal commission into the Upper Churchill, but all of a sudden it stopped since the government bought out BRINCO. Now I do not know if this had any connection at all and why the Minister of Mines and Energy today is so touchy and so hot on everything concerning the

MR. WARREN: Upper Churchill and the Lower Churchill and everything else. I am just wondering why the minister is so tight and it leads one to wonder, it leads one to wonder what the minister was doing studying law in Dalhousie University, Mr. Speaker. So, I am concerned if the minister when he was a member of this government back in the early 1970's could afford to spend \$150 million in blowing two holes, one on each side of the Straits, and he was still concerned on making sure that the power comes to Newfoundland, and all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, now we see, when they want to start the Muskrat Falls, we are not concerned about the Upper Churchill, we are not concerned about all the people who are leaving Labrador, Mr. Speaker, we are not concerned that the population of Happy Valley-Goose Bay has decreased in the past five years over 55 per cent, we are not concerned about that, Mr. Speaker. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what this government should do is stop the bickering, stop the confrontation with Ottawa, and get on with the task that the Minister of Manpower and Labour (Mr. Dinn) has been elected by 4,800 votes to do. If the members have been elected to do a job, why not get on the work and do a job.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) 4,800.

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible) 4,800 was it?

MR. HICKEY: (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I could tell the hon. member from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) that the people in my district do not agree with him either when he calls them stark raving mad.

MR. HICKEY: No, I (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: They are not too concerned about you either, Sir, and the way you look at these people as savages.

MR. HICKEY: I did not suggest that (inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

So I would suggest, also, Mr. Minister, that if your department was doing its proper work, you would not have to make these kind of comments about the native people of this Province. I am surprised, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

- I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that when you get the Chamber of Commerce and the town council and all the other people in Happy Valley-Goose Bay asking this government to follow the recommendations of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, that the government does not pay any attention to it. They come up with some excuses that 'We have not got the money', but just look at all the monies that have been wasted, look at all the monies that have been wasted in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

Now, who are the Lower Churchill Development Corporation? Who are they?

MR. WARREN:

I understand there is -

MR. TULK:

Cousin Vic.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, cousin Vic; that is our first one, the guy who pulls the strings, who tells the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) what to do, what bathroom to go to, when to go, in nighttime and everything else. That is who runs the Churchill Falls Development Corporation.

MR. HANCOCK:

Is that the only one?

MR. WARREN:

He is almost like the guy in the Grade IV Literature with 500 hats, you know, take a hat off and there is another hat on. That is the kind of a guy he is, he carries a hat for every occasion.

Now, who else is on there?

By the way, there are provincial appointees, Wallace Reid, David Mercer, David Vardy, Angus Bruneau, and David Moores. Now, those are provincial appointees. Those are the people who are concerned about the day-to-day operation of this Province. Now, they are concerned that we get hydro onstream as fast as possible.

There are also five federal appointees, Sidney Robbinoff, Alexander MacIntosh, Harvey McGee, Digby Hunt, and Harold Marshall.

MR. BARRY:

Who is the first guy?

MR. WARREN:

The first guy is Sidney Robbinoff.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, he is from Outer Cove.

MR. WARREN:

He is from Outer Cove?

Maybe he is from Outer Cove, Mr. Speaker. However, these are federal appointees and we have five federal and six provincial. That is the majority on the Board, Mr. Speaker. People are concerned. And what did they say, Mr. Speaker? I have to read it again because some hon. members on the opposite side of the House have not read this report. I am going to read the recommendations again, Mr. Speaker,

MR. WARREN: to make sure that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), if he cannot read, can listen probably.

"The Board of Directors of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation recommends to the shareholders that the corporation proceed with the 618 megawatt hydro-electric development at Muskrat Falls on the Churchill River." Now, Mr. Speaker, they recommended this.

MR. STIRLING: After spending \$15 million.

MR. WARREN: After spending \$15 million on it, they recommended this to the government. And what did the government do? Another \$15 million down the drain, another \$15 million gone down in the two holes that the Minister of Mines and Energy bored down in the Labrador Straits in 1972. This is what this government has done, Mr. Speaker, for the past nine years since the P.C. administration has been in power, and all we have seen, Mr. Speaker, is lack of power and two big simultaneous booms or bangs, one on each side of the Straits way back in the early 1970s.

I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, how concerned is this government towards Labrador? We want to get the power. I will tell you what they want to do - 'We want to get the Lower Churchill going so that we can get our power down to the States. That is our concern, to get the Lower Churchill going and get our power down to the States, and to heck with Labrador and to heck with Newfoundland.' Mr. Speaker, the first people that this government should be concerned about is the people in Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland Telephone Company have it in their system that where there are telephones where it is impossible to make direct dialling because of the system they have in place, that the customer

MR. WARREN: is charged only the direct dialling rate, so therefore he is not charged going through the operator as you would here in St. John's and so on. They are only charged the direct dialling rate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why cannot the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) direct Newfoundland Hydro to use the same formula? Where there are no hydro rates and where people are depending upon diesel generated electricity, why not use the same rates for those people as you have with the hydro rates? Mr. Speaker, that is not a bad request at all. If Newfoundland Telephone can do it under similar circumstances with their customers where there is no direct dialling and are charging the direct dialling rate, why cannot Newfoundland Hydro do the same thing with their customers where there is no hydro electricity but they have to depend on diesel generated power?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if we look at the resolution that was presented by my hon. friend, the hon. member for Buchans (Mr. Flight), it shows a sincere concern for the people of Newfoundland. It really shows a sincere concern for the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if the members and if the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) is as much concerned about his amendment to the resolution as the member for Buchans was who brought in the resolution, then I would venture to say that tomorrow when the House resumes at three o'clock there is going to be an important debate on the start-up of the Upper Churchill and the Muskrat Falls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling that is what is going to be brought into this House tomorrow at three o'clock by the Premier or by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), that we will immediately start on a debate and a debate, you know, within probably a day or two days and we will start right away on the start-up of the Lower Churchill. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the member wants to get his name in the paper of trying to say - which backfired, by the way, and now we are finally to see another boo-boo on behalf of the government of this Province, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's West has about ten minutes.

MR. BARRETT: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I must say it is indeed a pleasure to be able to stand up and

MR. BARRETT: support an amendment as presented by my colleague, the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout). It is obvious that it has taken a great deal of -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRETT: Not (inaudible) - too much effort to put into an amendment the proper method of development of this huge resource that we have accessible to us in Newfoundland and Labrador. The misguided people across seem to just go - they deal in half way measures - they seem to read reports down to a certain page and then they get all hung up on interpretation and they do not go too far or anything else. And that is exemplified by the resolution that was brought in by the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), who I assume to be the Liberal critic on energy. But I say assume because it has not been indicated here in the House this afternoon that he has a great deal of support for that position from his own side.

This particular amendment, Mr. Speaker, obviously delves directly into the heart of the energy philosophy of this particular government. And that is to develop the most economical resource to bring hydro power, a renewable resource, into the homes of Newfoundlanders at the least possible cost. In order to do that it must be developed from the Gull Island project additional to the Muskrat. The Gull Island project yields the least cost to the consumer. The problem, of course, is that it produces far more power than we have need of. In order to do this, of course, we must get some consensus and some concern expressed across this country that the people in this Province are being deprived of the resource because we are not treated in equal fashion.

MR. HANCOCK: Baloney! Baloney!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. BARRETT: It is impossible for this Province to transmit the hydro resource from this Province through the Province of Quebec, to recognize and determine the users of that power supply -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRETT: - without having to sell the power to another province and let them obtain the entire financial benefit from that. We are unable to get the freewheeling rights through the Province of Quebec in order to sell that power outside which we cannot use ourselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. BARRETT: What we have seen here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is that traditional Liberal flip-flop in action this afternoon. We have seen a resolution brought in by the energy critic for that party—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRETT: - having been amended by a member on this side, the amendment getting support from his own party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRETT: They have got the 'fools rush in' policy over there, they have the fools trying to determine policy which does not exist.

MR. STIRLING: Very disappointing.

MR. BARRETT: It is going to be quite interesting at twenty minutes to six to hear how the energy critic for the Liberal party is going to stand up now and support the resolution which he has now brought in and his colleagues are now turning their backs on.

MR. STIRLING: Do not sound so (inaudible).

MR. BARRETT: He did not have the ability to be able to formulate a resolution that encompassed all of the attributes of the amendment that has been brought in by my colleague for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, they show across that they have no confidence whatsoever in their colleague, the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) -

MR. STIRLING: A bunch of phonies.

MR. BARRETT: - absolutely none whatsoever. They do not even support the principle. The entire debate of the member for Windsor-Buchans was why Muskrat Falls should go ahead and Gull Island should not. Everything he spoke of

MR. BARRETT: was predicated on the basis that Gull Island should not go. Now he has all of his colleagues around him jumping on the bandwagon because what was now being presented on this side is the rational, realistic, proper approach to this whole problem, they are all getting on the bandwagon, leaving him in the lurch, I should not wonder but he has somebody out now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRETT: - he should go for the leadership or something, but his place is not as the energy critic for the members opposite, because obviously they are not prepared, they are absolutely -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. BARRETT: - not prepared to support him.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRETT: This gentleman obviously has been left without any support whatsoever. It is going to be without any support whatsoever.

MR. STIRLING: What bunkum!

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, the content of the message in this resolution, in the amendment to this resolution obviously will get now the whole support of all members of this House with the exception of the energy critic of the Liberal Party.

AN HON. MEMBER: Now he is not the only one (inaudible).

MR. BARRETT: Now he is probably the only one who is going to vote against this because his leader now

MR. BARRETT: and his cohorts have said, look we have got something going over here, this is probably something that we - it is almost like a motherhood issue, how can we now walk away from the amendment that has been so ably put by the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout).

MR. STIRLING: Easy.

MR. BARRETT: This resolution -

MR. FLIGHT: You do not have a full
(inaudible).

MR. BARRETT: This resolution - I have no problem. I have no problem. I do not even need to make it.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRETT: I do not even need to make it.

MR. STIRLING: Not unless somebody (Inaudible).

MR. BARRETT: I do not need to make it at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not be mad, boy!

MR. BARRETT: It has been obvious from the beginning that the resolution that you put up is obviously not in keeping with the idea of your colleagues.

MR. STIRLING: You better sit down or they will know you are not Cabinet material.

MR. BARRETT: It is entirely without foundation.

MR. STIRLING: 'Rideout' is trying to suck you in, boy.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. HODDER: 'Rideout' wants in the Cabinet too.

MR. BARRETT: - this amendment -

MR. STAGG: The Leader of the Opposition is no parliamentarian.

MR. BARRETT: - states that not only should an immediate start be made on the development of the Muskrat Falls power site, which we certainly have no objection to see

MR. BARRETT: happen, but also we must "recognize the benefit to this Province by concluding that the development of the Gull Island project is also technically and economically feasible provided that the surplus power is allowed to be sold Westward."

"The government therefore should accept the conclusions of the Lower Churchill Power Corporation and urge this Government of Canada to provide the necessary financial guarantees and to amend the National Energy Board Act to give that Board authority to set the terms and conditions upon which Newfoundland can both wheel electricity over the existing Quebec transmission grid and/or construct a new transmission line, if necessary, as established by the Board through the Province of Quebec so as to permit an immediate

MR. BARRETT: start on the Gull Island project as well as the Muskrat Falls project.⁴ Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt at all but that the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is in a very, very difficult position now. He has now to get up and try to mend the fences over there, this flip-flop attitude, this 'fools rush in' policy of the provincial Liberals, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there is just no way and I wholeheartedly support the amendment to the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: It being twenty to six, I have to put the amendment.

On motion, amendment carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans has the right now to close the debate.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I do not mind the applause, but the shouting.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, if ever the people of this Province needed proof positive that that government for eight years have been playing politics with the Churchill power, we have just had it in the speech from the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the disappointment that was shared by that hon. gentleman was -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear! .

MR. FLIGHT: - not only evident, Mr. Speaker,

MR. FLIGHT: in the tone of the speech that the member made that he should forever be ashamed of, but it was also evident in the faces of the hon. members opposite, the disappointment, Mr. Speaker, that would come as a result of our voting for an amendment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to this point in time and in the debate last week, I had one motivation and I have had one motivation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: One motivation and one motivation only, and that is to get the Lower Churchill, be it Muskrat, Gull or whatever going in the better interests of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: That is the only motivation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in that amendment that—anything that the hon. member for White Bay (Mr. Rideout) recommends in his amendment was possible for the government to have implemented this past eight years. Where have they been? Where have they been?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a very key thought in that amendment. It says that 'in view of the fact that we will experience no energy shortages until 1987. And the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, based on every report given to this government that we will face, with Cat Arm, we will face energy shortages in this Province in 1986. But let us assume that the member is right, that we are not going to face energy shortages. What he is telling the people of Newfoundland is that from now to 1987 there will be no aluminum plants, no expansion of present industry, and our present natural consumption, the logical growth and consumption of the established firms, businesses, industry on this Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

So the people of Newfoundland from an energy point of view can look to no expansion of the present industry, they can look to no increase in consumption by industry in this Province today. The domestic users will not be able to, according to his amendment - 1987, he says, there will be no shortage of power in this Province which means that we are going to stagnate industrially between now and 1987. Now that is a great message to send out to the people of this Province. And the lie is put to it by LCDC anyway because LCDC tells us that there will indeed be a shortage in this Province in 1986 and 1987.

So what is the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) doing going around talking about aluminum smelters that he wants to put into Labrador between now and 1987 in order to justify the Lower Churchill development? "There will be no", the member said, "there will be no shortages experienced".

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to support any amendment, the purpose being to get the Lower Churchill operation started. Now, Mr. Speaker, here is what has happened - and the member for Baie Verte-White Bay better pay attention to this - here is what has happened.

MR. FLIGHT: The Government of Newfoundland, with the co-operation of Ottawa, appointed the most qualified professional people they could find in Canada to the LCDC, the Lower Churchill Development Corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: And with \$15 million to use, their mandate was to do a feasibility study on the Lower Churchill. That is what got them out of having to shut it down in the first place, Mr. Speaker, after the BRINCO takeover. We will talk about that in a minute. But their mandate was to recommend to the Government of Newfoundland the most feasible and most economic source of power in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, LCDC could not care less what the Premier thought, they could not care less what the Minister of Mines and Energy thought or the government thought; they had no concerns about what the Opposition thought or the government thought. Their job was to make the recommendation that was in the better interests of the people of Newfoundland.

Now, they recognized that it would be better to start the Gull Island project. They recognized that and said so in the report, but they recognized something else, something very crucial; they recognized the inability of this government to negotiate to get transportation rights, to get surplus rights, wheeling rights out of this Province with Quebec. They recognized the inability of this Province to sit down with the federal government and get an agreement whereby we could export our power. They recognized that they had ministers going around calling the Prime Minister of Canada a turkey. The present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) wants to negotiate

MR. FLIGHT: with Ottawa, wants Ottawa to use its influence in order to get our power out of Quebec, wants Ottawa to use its influence insofar as an offshore agreement is concerned. And that very minister talks about Mr. Rompkey. He talks about a statement he made one day in B.C. That very Minister of Energy (Mr. Barry) goes to B.C. and stands up and says, 'Stop giving credit to Mr. Trudeau. Stop saying what a good job he is doing,' going around and saying, 'That turkey, Trudeau, look what he is doing to this country!' And then we expect some co-operation on the Lower Churchill or anything else? Quote from the Minister of Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: So, Mr. Speaker, LCDC, in their wisdom, recommended an immediate start on the Lower Churchill in June of 1980.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) provincial government.

MR. FLIGHT: To the provincial government.
Now, let me read - and nobody can question this, Mr. Speaker. The court case that was going on down in this courthouse today in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, should put forever the lie to the kind of arguments that were made by the Minister of Mines and Energy today and have been made for the past eight years. Those transcripts are devastating, Mr. Speaker. And if every Newfoundlander who can understand what has been said in those transcripts and the evidence being given by the top people in this Province who advise the government - their advice is not listened to, but they advise the government - if those transcripts are available to every house, they will say, 'How we have been used! How we have been fooled! How we have been hoodwinked!' like I said.

MR. FLIGHT:

Now, let us see what

Mr. Wallace Reid, Chairman of LCDC, says about their recommendation. Mr. Wallace Reid told the court that LCDC Board of Directors had decided that development of Muskrat Falls was economically feasible and should be started before Gull Island. That is what the Chairman of LCDC told the judge. That is what he said in sworn evidence in court, that the other proposed Lower Churchill site should be started before Gull Island. 'No final decision has been taken.'

But listen to this. This, in my mind, is the damning evidence, the damning testimony. Mr. Reid said, 'The recommendation of the board of trustees went before the shareholders in June, 1980 but they have not yet - May 28th - but they have not yet received a reply.' The government of this Province have not yet indicated to LCDC whether they accept their report or whether they do not accept the report.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason I want to see Muskrat started - and the minister said it it is not the cheapest - LCDC in its report says that Muskrat is the cheapest on-Island source of electricity available in this Province, and that includes Cat Arm and Hinds Lake and the Upper Salmon. Any energy we have to develop has to be developed on the Island, Mr. Speaker.

LCDC told the people of Newfoundland that Muskrat power was cheaper than anything that could be produced on this Island. Is that clear enough for the minister? It is cheaper, it was cheaper,

MR. FLIGHT:

it was cheaper in 1972, it was cheaper in 1975 and it is cheaper in 1980 than any power that can be produced on this Island. Now, is Muskrat power cheaper than Cat Arm? Is it cheaper than Upper Salmon? Is it cheaper than Hinds? Is it cheaper than the 150 megawatt extension to Holyrood? That is what that recommendation was based on, some of it, Mr. Speaker. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, let me read, if we are concerned about the consumers in this Province, if the minister is concerned about what putting off, what refusing to start the Muskrat is doing to the people of this Province, here is what the Vice Chairman, the Vice-President of Newfoundland Hydro has got to say about the Muskrat development. 'Newfoundland Hydro's Vice President in charge of Corporate Planning, David Mercer, told the court that from now until 1986 retail electricity costs will increase annually by 10 per cent and assuming the start up of Muskrat Falls project will increase only 5 per cent' -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Assuming the start up.

MR. FLIGHT:

- assuming the start up. So, what this Province is doing, Mr. Speaker, and what this energy policy has done for us since 1972 is to guarantee that the people of this Province will be subject to a 10 per cent increase in electrical costs every year. They could have guaranteed they would have been subject to less than half of that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Is that right?

MR. FLIGHT:

That is right, and I will tell you something else that is right. These costs are based on the cost to develop Muskrat today. The cost to develop Muskrat three years ago was almost 50 per cent less than it is today. Mr. Speaker, this government and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), as eloquent as he is, and the

MR. FLIGHT: way he can twist -

MR. NEARY: Nasty as he is.

MR. FLIGHT: - and nasty as he is - he can twist things - have succeeded in fooling the people of Newfoundland and Labrador until now on their approach to the Lower Churchill. But, Mr. Speaker, slowly but surely it is coming out. Slowly but surely the politics that have been played with the Lower Churchill is coming out, Mr. Speaker. It is sickening, Mr. Speaker, stomach turning, to hear the M.P., Mr. Crosbie, on radio today talking about the terrible thing that the Government of Canada did to buy Petro-Canada. It is stomach turning when one realizes that he was the person that engineered and browbeat and forced the ministry, all of them, to buy out BRINCO. The minister tried to justify today, Mr. Speaker, the purchasing of BRINCO. That fact is, Mr. Speaker - and he raised another issue that might be worth raising, too. He suggested that maybe somebody made some money off the Petrofina deal.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) said it.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, I have never said it, I have never said it. I have never had reason to say it, but I could say maybe we should look to see if anybody made any money off the BRINCO deal. Maybe we should do that. Maybe after we saw what came out against that administration -

MR. BARRY: It was alleged at the time.

MR. FLIGHT: Maybe, Mr. Speaker, when we look at what that administration was capable of, what we found out that that administration was capable of through the Public Accounts and the Mahoney Inquiry, maybe we should have asked them. Maybe it is not too late to ask if there was any money made on the BRINCO deal, Mr. Speaker. Be that as it may, people in glass houses should not throw stones, and it ill behooves John Crosbie, Mr. Speaker, it ill behooves him to

MR. FLIGHT: be in Ottawa today telling us what a terrible deal buying out Petrofina is -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: - and, Mr. Speaker, it ill behooves him -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: - and the minister gets up -

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

MR. FLIGHT: The minister gets up, Mr. Speaker, the minister gets up and tries to justify the buying out of - the money we paid. Mr. Speaker, we paid over \$200 million. The minister can weasel all he wants. We paid over \$200 million. Mr. Speaker, we are paying in excess of \$20 million a year interest on the money we borrowed. Every cent of profit that CFILCo makes that would have, under the old agreement, accrued to the Province, now accrues to interest on that loan. We do not get a cent out of the Upper Churchill development, Mr. Speaker. We could have, we could have done exactly what they did in 1972; when we could afford to do it, we could have bought BRINCO. We could have nationalized BRINCO. We could have done it when we could have afforded it. We did not have to saddle this Province with in excess of

MR. FLIGHT: \$200 million at \$20 million,
\$30 million a year.

MR. BARRY: \$200 million! When?

MR. FLIGHT: Yesterday, tomorrow, this
Province's legislature when it was ready. And I will
tell the minister something else -

MR. BARRY: Do you think it should be
done?

MR. FLIGHT: No, no, no, not when it was
done. No, no, I can definitely tell the minister -

MR. BARRY: You want BRINCO to have our water rights?

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

MR. BARRY: I will take it when it is ready.
This is the bluff coming out.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) they would still have it.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt
him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
It might be better if the
hon. member addressed his remarks towards me and it might
not provoke such attacks as the hon. minister just gave
to the hon. member.

MR. FLIGHT: Hansard will show, Mr. Speaker,
that I addressed you practically every two minutes of the
debate. I am talking to you, I am not looking at you. I
am sorry about that.

Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: It is okay.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, the BRINCO
takeover: This government, most of the players in
place, saddled the people of Newfoundland with a \$200
million expenditure in excess of \$20 million a year interest

MR. FLIGHT: for the past eight years and we have nothing in this world to show for it today, Mr. Speaker. It did not enhance our chance to develop the Lower Churchill. Had it enhanced our chances to develop the Lower Churchill it might have been worth it. In 1972 the present Minister of Energy (Mr. Barry) and the Premier said, "We have to buy out BRINCO so we can make an immediate start on the Lower Churchill on our terms". Nine years later, Mr. Speaker, no start on the Lower Churchill. And I will tell you something else I found out: Having sunk \$200 million into that takeover, they found out that there was a clause in the power contract that even though they own BRINCO they still could not develop the Lower Churchill. There was a clause in that contract, Mr. Speaker. And maybe, Mr. Speaker, I do not know at what time my learned colleague, the constitutional expert and lawyer and now the Minister of Mines and Energy found out that there was a clause in that contract that even though they owned it, even though they had spent in excess of \$200 million, a clause that stopped them from developing the Lower Churchill, either site on the Lower Churchill. And before they could -

MR. BARRY: Do not be so foolish!

MR. FLIGHT: - and before LCDC -

MR. BARRY: Do not be so foolish.

MR. FLIGHT: Why did the minister not read the LCDC? Now, Mr. Speaker, LCDC - they talk about the terrible deal on the Lower Churchill -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: You are only showing your ignorance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: Is it ignorance to call the Prime Minister a turkey? How about the Barry theorem and the turkey theorem? The Prime Minister of Canada is a turkey. People

MR. FLIGHT: should go around telling -
tell Trudeau, the turkey.

MR. BARRY: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A point of order has been
raised by the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Before the scurrilous remarks
go any further, are carried any further in the press -

AN HON. MEMBER: Spurious?

MR. BARRY: Scurrilous, I said - I have never
called the Prime Minister of this country a turkey. He
may have other epithets attached to him from time to time.
I have never called the Prime Minister of Canada a turkey.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

There is no point of order. It
is obviously an opportunity the minister has taken to
clarify remarks that had been attributed to him.

The hon. member for Windsor-
Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the
matter is, and it is becoming more and more obvious, Mr.
Speaker, that the acquisition of BRINCO did nothing to
enhance our ability to develop the Lower Churchill. We
spent \$200 million,

MR. FLIGHT: the biggest blunder, financial blunder ever in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: The biggest financial blunder ever undertaken in this Province. The people of Newfoundland will suffer forever and ever and ever, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Forever and a day.

MR. FLIGHT: We have spent about \$160 million interest now on the loan -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. FLIGHT: - and it is going up all of the time, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: We are no closer to the development of the Lower Churchill than we ever were.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: My resolution, Mr. Speaker, called for the immediate start on the Muskrat Falls for no other reason that I want to assure the people of this Province the benefit of the cheapest possible source of energy available. The member, Mr. Speaker, was on the media in Central Newfoundland a few days ago justifying Cat Arm, and if the hour was long enough I would want to talk about that, but he was justifying it on the basis that it was a great economic boom, a great development boom.

AN HON. MEMBER: Seven hundred jobs for two years.

MR. FLIGHT: Seven hundred jobs for two years. Muskrat, Mr. Speaker, if you want to talk in the short-term,

MR. FLIGHT: 6000 jobs for five to six years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, again -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Time.

MR. FLIGHT: Let me wind this up, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Let me wind this up, Mr. Speaker, by saying that, as we have done, we have supported the amendment, we will now support the amended resolution, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: We have one motivation and one motivation only, that is to see that the Lower Churchill is developed as quickly as possible for the benefit of the people in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear !

MR. FLIGHT: We see evidence , Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has thirty seconds.

MR. FLIGHT: - that in the past eight years the people of Newfoundland have been denied the rights that were afforded to them by the development of the Lower Churchill. We see evidence that they have been fooled, hookwinked, bluffed, played politics with. Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution urges the government to get on with the development of the Lower Churchill. We are not recommending it, the professionals in the Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: - are recommending it, the people responsible for providing energy in this Province are recommending it. Mr. Speaker, I urge the minister to accept the recommendation of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation and make an immediate start on Muskrat Falls, and stop playing politics with the Labrador power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

June 3, 1981

Tape 2134

PK - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

On motion, resolution as
amended, carried.

On motion, resolution as

It now being six o'clock,
this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at three
o'clock.