

VOL. 3

NO. 47

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. the member for
Harbour Main - Bell Island.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I rise at this time, Sir, because it was not until today that copies of Hansard were available to me concerning this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. House what I consider to be a very, very serious breach of the privileges of this House. I refer to the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the accusations made yesterday, Mr. Speaker, against my honesty and integrity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I refer to Hansard, Volume 3, No. 46 for Tuesday, May 26th and it is on Tape 1841 in which the hon. member states -

Mr. Neary: I know where it was printed. How does the hon. gentleman think I got a copy of it?" Of course, I am referring to this government pamphlet which the hon. gentleman says was printed at government expense down in Printing Services. He goes on to say:

Mr. Neary: I can tell the hon. gentleman it was not paid for by the hon. gentleman." Some hon. members interject and Mr. Neary goes on: "Mr. Chairman, it was not paid for by the hon. gentleman." Hon. members interject again and say, "Prove it." At this point, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Neary comes back with: "I can prove it. Sure I can. I am making a statement now and I am accusing the hon. gentleman of misusing taxpayers' money to have this brochure printed in Government Services." Hon. gentlemen interject again with "No," and Mr. Neary says, "The hon. gentleman had better be careful."

MR. DOYLE:

"We already know about people who lie in this House."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that these accusations are very, very serious indeed and I further maintain, Mr. Speaker, that when the hon. gentleman said he could prove it, and he says right here, "I can prove it. Sure I can. I am making a statement now and I am

MR. N. DOYLE:

"accusing the hon. gentleman of misusing taxpayers' money to have this brochure printed in Government Services." When he made that statement, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that he could not have had that proof available to him and as a result it is a breach of privilege of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. DOYLE: And I maintain further, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman could not have this proof available to him because I have the proof right here in my hand, which I will table for all hon. members to see, the Jesperson Printing invoice and the receipts and everything else associated with it. But I feel, Mr. Speaker, that a prima facie case of breach of privileges of this House has been established and at this point, Mr. Speaker, I will leave it in your competent hands to make a ruling on it.

MR. NEARY: To the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: As Your Honour knows that is not a point of privilege, it is a matter of a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I thought the matter was adequately taken care of yesterday, Mr. Speaker, but if the hon. gentleman, you know, if it would make him feel any happier - I know Your Honour will rule there is no prima facie case - but if the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) gets his jollies out of this sort of thing, well, then, I withdraw it. I told the hon. gentleman yesterday I accept his word for the statement that

MR. NEARY: He made. But the only explanation I would like from the hon. gentleman, or from the Premier when he gets back, is why these pamphlets have been passed out in the Premier's office to delegations of school children going in the Premier's office and why they are being passed out at the booze stores in this Province?

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of privilege, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, just a few words to the point of privilege. That is not good and sufficient as the hon. member has gotten up and made these statements. There can be no greater breach of privilege than to accuse an hon. member of this House of misusing public funds—as he did¹ of not telling the truth and, Mr. Speaker, appropriating and, as I say, using for his own personal purposes the facilities of the government of this Province. That cannot be, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - that goes right to the root of privileges of the House and the privilege of members if anything ever did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Now the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is wont to think that he can make up the rules in this House and he thinks he can make all these accusations -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - and get up and make statements like he did make. I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that this House dealt with the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, with respect to the point of privilege, I will reserve ruling on it to give it some consideration, I have to review Hansard. I do not know exactly what was said.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: The question, Mr. Speaker, is yesterday in the Question Period it was indicated that the minister had not discussed his letter to the Board and the letter that the Board sent back to him. I would ask the minister has he now discussed this matter with any of his colleagues in Cabinet?

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

MR. DINN: Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly I have had general discussions with my colleagues, both in Cabinet and outside Cabinet, about the items that were tabled in the House and the explanation I made yesterday, certainly I had discussions. Everybody is talking about it apparently.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the people in the labour movement, people on this side of the House, and every person on the Labour Relations Board felt that the minister did something that he should not have done, has he now been given the opinion by other ministers that the ministers agree with the opinion expressed by the Board and that in fact he should not have written the letter? Has he now been given that advice?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the people who I talked to concurred with the actions that I have taken. I have not heard anyone outside of the hon. member for LaPoile (S. Neary) and a few members from the Opposition, and I understand there was a

MR. DINN: press conference this morning
I got that secondhand, I believe, information—that there was an hon. gentleman in the labour movement who disagreed with my actions. Obviously, there are people who disagree but I will continue and I will maintain that whenever something in the public interest is brought to my attention, whether it is done by a union group or a management group, then I will take appropriate action -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. DINN: - I will write letters. I will communicate to the appropriate people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: - if accusations are made by people about boards, then I will have those investigated and find out and reply to any people who communicate with me.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Justice (G. Ottenheimer) who, in reply to a question from my colleague from LaPoile (S. Neary), said, "To my knowledge, I have absolutely no knowledge of anything improper done by the hon. minister with respect to any representations he may have made to the Newfoundland Labour Relations Board or any other board, absolutely. I have total confidence that he has done nothing whatsoever improper in anything." And my side comment was, 'Be careful.' I

MR. L. STIRLING:

would ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) in view of the letters that have now been tabled, the one to the Board and the one from the Board, if he had that information at the time, and now that he does have that information, does he still make the absolute statement that in his opinion the minister done nothing improper?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, obviously I made that answer, that was a couple of days ago. So what the hon. gentleman is really asking me now is you know, in light of matters discussed yesterday am I of the opinion that anything improper was done. I am certainly not setting myself as judge over other people. Obviously it can be argued - the hon. member opposite has argued that he thinks it was improper interference. The hon. minister has made the case that he does not regard it as improper interference, that he was making representation, he was passing along a representation which had been made to him to the board, that he was transmitting a representation. So if hon. members opposite wish to set themselves up as a Solomon and be the judge of - put themselves forward as the great judges, that is obviously their privilege. But it is an area in which different people could honestly hold different opinions. The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) has stated that he did not regard nor was it his intention to interfere in any improper manner with the Newfoundland and Labrador Labour Relations Board and he regarded what he did as a matter of representation, a legitimate representation where he was transmitting a representation made to him. And I am certainly, at least, equally prone to accept the explanation of the hon. minister as I am of hon. gentlemen opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. L. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, that question was asked to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. L. STIRLING:

I can understand the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) who was not knowledgeable or learned or sought any advice, I can understand him blundering into this situation, but now I must ask the Minister of Justice if, in fact, now that this matter now has been brought to his attention, does he think that the Labour Relations Board made the proper response in saying that they viewed with alarm the letter from the - the very fact that the minister wrote a letter? The Minister of Justice, can he tell us whether or not he believes that the Labour Relations Board response was appropriate or inappropriate?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I think in matters like this obviously there are different perspectives. I am not going to say either that the Newfoundland Labour Relations Board was wrong in its reply. From the perspective - things are not always black and white obviously - from the perspective of the hon. minister, it is my judgement that he honestly and reasonably believed that he was doing the appropriate, correct thing by transmitting to the Newfoundland Labour Relations Board -

MR. NEARY: Is this government policy now?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The hon. member will -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I have a question now from the

Leader of the Opposition and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - and it is not my intention to - I usually do not avoid questions. I try to give as honest and forthright an answer as possible. But I cannot do it with constant interruptions.

I certainly accept the position of the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) that in his opinion he was legitimately and correctly acting upon a request made to him to transmit certain concerns to the Newfoundland and Labrador Labour Relations Board.

I can also, from the perspective of the Newfoundland Labour Relations Board, they were collectively, together, as a board, of the opinion that it was improper for the Minister of Labour to transmit this concern, and from their perspective it is quite reasonable and understandable that they would take that position because there are two quite different perspectives there.

MR. NEARY: It never happened before in Newfoundland history.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!
A point of order has been raised by
the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. minister is giving a
response to a question, Mr. Speaker.-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - and all the time through the hon. member
for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is interjecting. Now there are rules
that a member answering a question, or giving a question, is
permitted to be heard in silence. The hon. member is disrupting
the House.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the time
has come for the hon. member for LaPoile to be told in no uncertain
terms to comply with the rules of this House -

MR. NEARY: You do not own the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - or else, Mr. Speaker, there is a
remedy available -

MR. NEARY: You would like to have the power
but you do not own it.

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

MR. MARSHALL: - whereby people who disrupt the
proceedings of the House can be named and put out until they learn
parliamentary behaviour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):
member for LaPoile.

To the point of order, the hon.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker. Your Honour knows full well the traditions of this House. The hon. gentleman would like to own the House. He thinks the government owns the House. The hon. gentleman thinks he owns the House. But this is the people's House and all the hon. gentleman is trying to do is to consume time in the Oral Question Period to protect a minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - who is guilty of interfering in the judicial system of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, I have said on numerous occasions that there are certain interruptions and it is outlined in Beauchesne for all to see and to adhere to. The Chair has a responsibility to try to keep order but members have a responsibility as well to try to adhere to any rulings that the Chair gives in order to keep the House in order.

I must say that insistent interruptions and loud shouting are things that all of us at least should not accept in this House and the Chair will be observing the way that members react

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

to various things that are being said. There are certain things that are allowed to be said, but constant interruptions, loud shouting and so on are things that cannot be tolerated and will not be tolerated to any great extent.

A supplementary. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

A new question, Mr. Speaker, to the President of the Council, who is anxious to get into this. I would ask the President of the Council - I understand the Premier is away. Maybe he can tell us where the Premier is and how long he is going to be gone because this is a very serious matter that has to do with the credibility of the government as far as both employers and labour are concerned. So I would like to ask the President of the Council where the Premier is and when he will return to deal with this very serious problem?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the seriousness of the problem can be measured by the capacity of the mind which asserts that it is a serious problem. Mr. Speaker, there have been -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, there have been -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen want an answer I am prepared to give it but I am not prepared to give it in this particular setting. I mean, if the House is going to operate as a House I will give an answer but if it is going to operate like a bear pit, Mr.

MR. MARSHALL:

Speaker, I will take my seat.

Mr. STIRLING;

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, I really take that as a reflection on the Speaker. I think the Speaker is keeping control of the House and I would repeat the question-

SOME HON.MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING:

-I would repeat the question and ask the President of the Council to stop pouting like a little child and get up and answer the question; where is the Premier and when will he return to deal with this very serious matter of the credibility of his government as it relates to both the employers and the employees in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The Premier, Mr. Speaker, is about very important public business with respect to the development of this Province, the possible development of this Province. I will not say exactly where he is, but I can say, Mr. Speaker, that he is engaged in one of the many struggles that this government has had to engage in over the period of time with respect to such issues as -

SOME HON.MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

- our rightful ownership of resources, our right as Canadians to transmit electrical power, etc., in that particular area. And anyone, Mr. Speaker, observing the way in which the Opposition is asking questions and carrying out the proceedings of the House, whether he is successful or not in his endeavours, will realize that he could not if he were back here no matter what he is doing where he

MR. STIRLING: important, would the acting Premier tell us whether or not he has had discussions with the Premier about this involvement by the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) in what the Board considers interference and what the labour movement considers interference? Would the acting Premier tell us whether or not he has had a discussion with the Premier and was the resignation of the Minister of Labour and Manpower discussed?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is not really worth a reply, but let me say this, Mr. Speaker. We have many discussions with the Premier. Every minister in the Cabinet has discussions with the Premier regularly, daily, as opposed to the way that the governments that the hon. gentlemen were members of were used to.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with reference to this, we have already indicated what our particular view of - and I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) has admirably given the view of the government with respect to this particular matter. But I can, just to allay any doubts, say that it was never in anybody's contemplation except in the small minds of certain people opposite that there would ever be any question whatsoever of the Minister of Labour and Manpower resigning. The Minister of Labour and Manpower will be a member of a Progressive Conservative administration for many years yet to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Terra Nova on a supplementary.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

In reading over the letter which

MR. LUSH: was written to him on, I believe, the 3rd of April from the Vice-President of Newfoundland Light and Power, Mr. Templeton, I see nowhere in that letter where the Vice-President asked the minister to make any representation to the Labour Relations Board. Can the minister specifically point out to hon. members where the Vice-President of Newfoundland Light and Power specifically asked the minister to, one, transmit information, or to make representation - to transmit representation, which was what the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) was saying, which is a difference - to transmit representation or to make representation, either?

MR. FLIGHT: Or to interfere.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that somebody in the Opposition took time to read the letters. Because the letter that I received from Mr. Templeton basically makes inferences with respect to how they were dealt with before the Labour Relations Board. And at the bottom of page one of the letter, it says - "We believe," he says "that special circumstances concerning the service that we supply

MR. DINN:

"to the public should have been of concern to the Board -

MR. FLIGHT: That is right.

MR. DINN: -" and that a hearing should have been held." Now, that to me is -

AN HON. MEMBER: So what?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Now, that to me is an allegation that the Board did something -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. DINN: That to me is an allegation that one side of this application before the Board believe that they were not treated right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: And I had to find out -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: And I had to find out from the Board exactly what had happened.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Menihok.

MR. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, I rarely interrupt any member in this House when he is speaking and a few minutes ago you got up and you made indication that all members of the House should abide by the rules and I think that the hon. gentlemen should have the decency to go by your ruling.

Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Sit down and shut up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To the point of order, I rule there is no point of order, but hon. members are aware of what I said

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): a few moments ago and the Chair will observe.

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to let that stand on the record anywhere, that the Labour Relations Board - there is an allegation, in my opinion, in this letter and I am not going to allow that to stand on the record and therefore, in order to find out how the ruling was made and why it was made, and knowing that the Labour Relations Board has made excellent, excellent rulings in the past, I wrote a letter to the board so that I could get an explanation so that I can reply to this.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: I could not leave this on the record. As a matter of fact, if I got a representation from a union alleging anything, alleging something else, I would do exactly the same thing. I would do exactly the -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: I would do, Mr. Speaker, exactly the same thing. Now if the hon. member for Grand Bank -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must ask the hon. member for Grand Bank (L.Thoms) please to restrain himself. I will not tolerate excessive shouting like that. If members want to pass along comments, that is acceptable but I think we all know what kind of comments are acceptable. But certainly not loud shouting across like that, especially when you have asked a question and you want an answer because it is impossible to

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): get an answer if there is loud shouting like that.

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there is nobody over there who can out-shout me or out-speak me. The fact of the matter is that if I got a representation, as I got in this letter, that says certain things about the Board, that somebody felt, whether it is the Labour Standards, the Labour Standards Tribunal, whether it is the Labour Relations Board, I would not let that on the record and I have to get back. And after the Supreme Court deals with this, or after the courts deal with this Certiorari, then I will reply to Mr. Templeton because I cannot allow that to stand. I cannot allow that to stand. -I did not make it public in the first place. Hon. members opposite saw fit to make it public and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: -it would not be here before the House unless hon. members made it public. While it was

MR. J. DINN: before the courts. They had the letters in their possession.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. J. DINN: - while it was before the courts and they brought it up before this House circuitously as it was and they made it public in a -

MR. S. NEARY: You brought it up.

MR. J. DINN: I had to. I had no option but to defend myself. I certainly would not have brought this up before the courts had dealt with it, but I had no option but to defend myself in this House as all hon. members find in this House - the hon. member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) today had to do exactly the same thing - when accusations are made against their operations, the way they operate or conduct business, when accusations are made you have to defend yourself. And I will continue to do that too, Mr. Speaker; I certainly will not allow any hon. member over there - I have a Mifflin report here on my desk how you should not operate, how you should not operate in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, despite that heavy explosion, the minister has not convinced me that the Vice-President asked for him to make representation. But personally, Mr. Speaker, if I were the minister and had received this, I would have transmitted the representation. I would simply have forwarded the letter to the Labour Relations Board saying, 'This was a letter that I had received' which would have been transmitting but not interferring - that is what it would have been.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: So if the minister is saying that the letter he wrote to the Labour Relations Board is not interference, could he indicate to the House what is interference?

MR. G. FLIGHT: What he would have considered interference?

MR. T. LUSH: What he would have considered interference if this letter that he wrote after receiving this letter from the Vice-President, if that letter was not interference, what is interference?

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

MR. J. DINN: It is not normally my job to indicate to the hon. member what is interference, but I will give him an example of what would be considered interference. For example, in 1970/71 on Bell Island hundreds of letters were transmitted to welfare officers on Bell Island saying to do this or do that or process this or process that, hundreds of letters!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DINN: The hon. member asked for an example, Mr. Speaker, and I want to answer the hon. member because I like to answer questions in this House. Hundreds of letters and directives were given to the welfare officers on Bell Island, to a point where the welfare officers thought that their jobs, the security of their jobs was in jeopardy if they did not do what a particular minister indicated that they should do. That to me, these hundreds of letters and this pressure brought to bear by a minister would, in my opinion, be considered interference.

MR. NEARY: I was doing my job, my duty.

MR. J. DINN: And the hon. member, for his edification, the hon. member who brought this up in the first place was the minister of the day at that time. There was a whole book written on him. The hon. member should read a book as to how not to operate. It is called the Mifflin report. I read it many times and I do not operate that way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. J. DINN: And the Labour Relations Board, Mr. Speaker, has no fear from the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) as to the security of the Board or the security of their positions as a result of a representation by me.

MR. T. LUSH: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: So again, Mr. Speaker, a rather convoluted answer to a very serious question and carrying on from there, Mr. Speaker, the minister makes representation on behalf of Light and Power to the Labour Relations Board when they, in fact, did not ask. He sees fit to make representation, and in the last paragraph of that letter to the Labour Relations Board, makes some statements, Mr. Speaker, which had placed him, I am sure, in a most unfavourable light with the labour movement of this Province.

Now I will ask the minister - he answered yesterday that he thought that IBEW was a wonderful union - now I will ask the minister how he can justify that with a statement that says that these people were holding the people of Newfoundland up for ransom? Now if a union is that good, how can the minister justify that kind of a statement to say that the IBEW is a good union, in one case here yesterday, and yet to make this statement in the letter here to the Labour Relations Board that they were holding the people of Newfoundland up for ransom?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may not recall but I think that most members in this House can recall that in 1980, during a strike we had a very serious situation in this Province with respect to, for example, letters I received and telegrams that I received from different districts throughout this Province, representations made by MHAs in this House today as to what I was going to do about certain things, representations made by, for example, the Mayor of Port aux Basques as to what I was going to do with respect to a power outage out there and a serious and emergency situation that existed -

MR. NEARY: How long was the power outage? When was it?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

- that these were the people who were suffering and I received those representations, and here we have another representation made to me with respect to the fact that there were an indication that the company could not operate during those conditions in 1979-80 and with 95 per cent of their employees certified they would not be able to operate at all. And they felt that they should have a hearing and I asked the Labour Relations Board for an explanation.

The last line, Mr. Speaker, of my letter to the board is a very important line. It is not 'do this or else'.

MR. LUSH:

Let us hear it.

MR. DINN:

"I would be pleased to hear your reaction and response to this important question."

MR. NEARY:

What important question?

MR. DINN:

The hon. member does not think it is important?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. HANCOCK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HANCOCK:

Seeing that the minister considers the IBEW a great union yet they held the people of Newfoundland up to ransom, could he indicate on a scale of one to ten how he considers

MR. HANCOCK: the other unions in this Province? I am sure they are anxious to know where they stand with the minister.

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

MR. DINN: The hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) obviously does not understand what goes on in labour relations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: The fact of the matter is that somebody has to suffer during a strike situation.

In the case of 1979 - 1980, I do not believe that the Light and Power suffered a bit. I do believe that the employees did when they went on strike because they did not get salaries, they did not get wages. But the fact of the matter is somebody did suffer very seriously and that somebody, as an example, were all the people between Rose Blanche and Port aux Basques when there was a power outage and so on. These are the things that happen during strikes.

We have the right to strike in Newfoundland. We have it in the public service, we have it in the construction industry, we have it throughout. And I will stand here day in and day out and defend that as a right. Now, the fact of the matter is that has nothing to do with the situation. The situation is that I received a letter. Along with these other things that are in my mind with respect to what happened before, I received a representation that, to me, questioned what a Board was doing that comes under my department. Now, in order to reply to that -

MR. NEARY: You are answering the last question now.

MR. DINN: In order to reply to that, I had

MR. DINN: to get information. Now, the Board did not think that the way I asked for the information was appropriate. That is unfortunate to say the least. And I can understand the Board's reaction. I have no qualms with that. I can understand their reaction.

MR. NEARY: You had no choice but to accept it.

MR. DINN: The fact of the matter is, you know, it was just necessary for them. I mean, I can understand them pointing that out to me, but it was also necessary for them to answer the question to find out how I was going to reply to these things. Because I do not think they should be on the public record. Now, I will do that when the courts and after the courts deal with it. I would not have brought this up in the first place. The hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), knowing that this was before the courts - because it is indicated in one of the letters he tabled - knowing that, made a public issue of it, while they were before the courts. I had to defend myself and I will continue to do that. There is no problem with me defending myself against accusations made by the hon. the member for LaPoile. He should read his own book. No minister on this side operates that way.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is becoming increasingly clear that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) has no conception whatsoever of what natural justice is about in this or any other province.

I have a question I would like to direct to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) in the absence of the Premier.

May 27, 1981

Tape 1862

EC - 3

MR. THOMS:

In view of the fact that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) has interfered with the Board and it is considered that he has done nothing wrong, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) now agrees that he has done nothing wrong, and then looking at the third paragraph of the letter which has been tabled, the expression therein that

MR. THOMS:

the labour union in this particular case was in effect holding the innocent third party, meaning the Newfoundland Light and Power, up to ransom, I would like to ask the President of the Council in view of this, in view of what the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) said, is this or is it not now government policy?

MR. NEARY:

This letter.

MR. THOMS:

This letter. This statement

by your minister.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. President of the

Council has a very short time for an answer, about ten seconds.

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it was

quite a long, long question and I cannot answer -

MR. STIRLING:

By leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do hon. members wish to

agree to give leave?

MR. MARSHALL:

I hesitate, Mr. Speaker.

I will speak by leave of the Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

Yes or no.

You need no more answers than that.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman should

watch his blood pressure, keep his blood pressure down, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I understand

the time has expired. Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I think I

distinctly heard a no.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): This being Private Member's Day, Wednesday, I now call Motion No. 6 which was moved by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight).

Motion No. 6. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the motion calls for an immediate start on the Lower Churchill, specifically the Muskrat Falls hydro electric site. And, Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a more appropriate way to start off these few remarks I intend to make than to quote from an editorial in today's paper and, Mr. Speaker, I quote. "What was the self-styled crowning achievement of the Moores administration" - referring to the Moores administration dealing with the Upper Churchill.

MR. MARSHALL: What paper was that?

MR. FLIGHT: That is the people's paper, the people's paper. But it is significant what was said, Mr. Speaker; what was said is this. "What was the self-styled crowning achievement of the Moores administration may yet become clear to all as one of the great blunders in Newfoundland history." Now, Mr. Speaker, this administration started by the Moores administration in 1972, the handling of

MR. FLIGHT: the Lower Churchill power, it will become, Mr. Speaker, the biggest blunder and be seen by people, is being seen every day, Mr. Speaker, by people as being the biggest blunder in the history of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the history of the Lower Churchill, this administration's approach to development of the Lower Churchill, and Mr. Speaker, before I do let me say that I believe that the people of this Province, there has been no issue ever, political or otherwise, anyone within living memory will ever be able to say that on any one issue that the people of this Province was more confused, lied to more often, cheated more often, fooled more often, and used more often politically than they were on the issue of the development of the Gull Island, Muskrat Falls, the Lower Churchill power site. Never, Mr. Speaker.

Now let us trace, before we get into the substance of it, Mr. Speaker, let us trace the career, let us trace the events of the Lower Churchill development.

Mr. Speaker, in 1974 the Moores Administration, made up of all the people present now, Mr. Speaker, made up of the present President of Council (Mr. Marshall), made up of the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), made up of the present Premier, paid in excess, Mr. Speaker, of \$200 million to BRINCO to buy out BRINCO, to nationalize BRINCO, and of course in nationalizing BRINCO they took over CLFCo. And lest there be any doubt, Mr. Speaker, that CLFCo is a Crown corporation and that there is a Crown corporation today suing Newfoundland; for anyone who wants to check the records, in November of 1976 CFLCo became a Crown corporation, a Crown corporation, Mr. Speaker, that counts as one of its members the Chairman of Hydro-Quebec, its Chairman and Chief Executive Officer is a member of CLFCo, Mr. Speaker. Now that must confuse some people, that the Board of Directors of CFLCo, a company that this Province paid in excess of \$200 million for, that this Province

MR. FLIGHT: stretched their credit on, that bled the people of this Province financially- \$200 million may well have gone to in excess of \$300 million today, Mr. Speaker. That is the price paid in 1974. For what, Mr. Speaker? What did they tell the people of Newfoundland they wanted to buy that - what did they justify that kind of shenanigans with? To make an immediate start on the Lower Churchill, Mr. Speaker, they needed to buy BRINCO, they needed to pay BRINCO in excess of \$200 million to make an immediate start on the Lower Churchill; 1974.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is now 1981 and there has been no immediate start made on the Lower Churchill and there will be no immediate start made on the Lower Churchill, Mr. Speaker, for a long, long time. And the reason there will be no start made on the Lower Churchill, Mr. Speaker, is because of the way that the administration of this Province, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the present government -Mr. Moores in the first instance propped up by the present Premier, propped up by the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry); in 1974, Mr. Speaker, and 1975 the present Minister of Mines and Energy was going around this Province convincing people

MR. FLIGHT:

that we should have a hydro electrical programme in the Province as a stopgap to 1981 when the Lower Churchill power would come onstream, and we were talking about a tunnel. And then the next event, Mr. Speaker, was 1975 when the then Premier of the day and his Minister of Mines and Energy started the tunnel. They blasted, Mr. Speaker, in August of 1975, set off the blast that would start the tunnel to bring the Lower Churchill power into Newfoundland.

MR. HODDER: How many millions did that cost?

MR. FLIGHT: In 1975, Mr. Speaker, a couple of months after the election, the Minister of Mines and Energy of the day, the then Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Crosbie, stood up and said that there would be no more expenditure on the Lower Churchill, that it was being stopped.

And then, Mr. Speaker, here is where we get into the politics of the Lower Churchill. Prior to 1975, there was never any mention, in talking about this Province's ability to develop the Lower Churchill, there was never any mention of the transmission of power. We never heard that one of the problems with the transmission of power was the constitutional rights to wheel power across Quebec. We were told the reason we could not develop the Lower Churchill was because BRINCO owned the Lower Churchill; because BRINCO had the water rights, we had to buy out BRINCO. Never any question, Mr. Speaker, of constitutionality or the right to ship our power across Quebec or ship it anywhere, for that matter.

And then, Mr. Speaker, the politics started to come into play. Recognizing that they did not have the ability, Mr. Speaker, the financial ability, the political will and probably the expertise to develop either of the Lower

MR. FLIGHT: Churchill sites, they had to find a way out. They had to find an excuse, Mr. Speaker, to give to the people of Newfoundland to justify their spending what today may be in excess of \$300 million or \$400 million with the buying out of BRINCO, the giving to BRINCO of \$300 million or \$400 million, Mr. Speaker. They had to justify that because that cost this Province miles and miles of road. It cost them hospital extentions, it cost them schools, it cost, Mr. Speaker, this Province - there is no telling what that expense might have cost this Province. And it served no purpose at all, Mr. Speaker. So, they had to justify that. And then suddenly they raised a spectre of not being allowed to ship our power across Quebec, not allowed, Mr. Speaker, to have a corridor through Quebec.

And they wanted to give the people of Newfoundland the idea that they were talking about a designated power corridor across Quebec, another power line down through Quebec to wheel out the Lower Churchill power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are 1,700 megawatts available on the Lower Churchill, 1,700 megawatts of power. There is presently 450 megawatts of power being generated in this Province by burning oil. So, Mr. Speaker, if we develop the Lower Churchill tomorrow and we brought the power we needed into this Province, the 400 megawatts to close down Holyrood and to stop any dependence on oil, we would then have around 1,200 or 1,300 megawatts to transmit.

I mean, the President of the Council (W.Marshall) is sitting taking notes, Mr. Speaker, and I would like for him when he stands up to

MR. FLIGHT: when he gets up to answer this question. He spent his political career, Mr. Speaker, the last four or five years, crucifying people on the whole Upper Churchill Falls problem. And he, Mr. Speaker, and most of his colleagues and anyone who knows what they are talking about will agree that the problem - the present Premier, Mr. Speaker - indicate the problem with the Upper Churchill is the time, the sixty-five years in the contract; that the original contract for 2.5 mils was not a bad deal, given the economics of the day, but that the sixty-five years is our problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, maybe the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) will tell us when he stands up if he believes that having 1,000 megawatts of power to move out of Quebec to any market through Quebec, would that justify the capital cost of building a corridor through Quebec? And furthermore, is he prepared, Mr. Speaker - let us assume if we were to agree on a long-term take and pay, let us assume we were prepared to accept a long-term contract - would he be prepared to sign with PASNY in New York or anyone else? Would he be prepared to sign a long-term contract? Would he be prepared to ship the power out of Labrador now the same way as it was shipped out in the Upper Churchill deal? Would he be prepared if - say, if a long-term contract on the total output of the Lower Churchill was required, would he be prepared to sign? That is what the people of this Province are interested in, Mr. Speaker, will we ship out? Are we prepared to develop Gull Island and ship the surplus power out over a designated corridor with no recallable rights, with no recallable rights?

Because, Mr. Speaker, only a fool, only a fool would think about the possibility

MR. FLIGHT: of building a corridor down through Quebec to ship out the Gull Island power, 1,000 megawatts the Premier talks about. With recall rights, Mr. Speaker, we would end up in ten years with a line down through Quebec that probably cost in excess of billions, I think \$1.5 billion was the last figure put on it, with nothing to ship over it.

So, Mr. Speaker, when he stands up why does he not admit to this House that in the past seven or eight years there has been nothing but politics played with the Lower Churchill, nothing but straight, pure politics played with the Lower Churchill. And the general public is starting to see, they are starting to recognize the politics.

We talk about cheap power, Mr. Speaker. LCDC - now let us look at the next event in the Churchill Falls power situation: The government, recognizing that they were not capable of developing the Lower Churchill on their own, set up the LCDC, the Lower Churchill Development Corporation to recommend whether or not - five years after they had spent in excess of \$300 million, five years later they realized they could not develop the Lower Churchill on their own so they went to Ottawa and they had the LCDC, the Lower Churchill Development Corporation set up - 51 per cent Newfoundland, 49 Ottawa.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, that Lower

Churchill Development Corporation made a lot of recommendations. One was that they make an immediate start on the Muskrat power development. There were no problems with transmission, there was no surplus energy. If the court case with Quebec that is ongoing down here now worked out, we would have 800 megawatts recall, we would have 600 megawatts at the Lower Churchill that we could bring into Newfoundland. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that whether the court case worked out or whether there was transmission mattered not. The LCDC, the most qualified people in Canada, recommended to this government that they make an immediate start on the Muskrat Falls power site.

Now, having created the corporation, they refused to take the advise. Instead we are gone with Cat Arm, Mr. Speaker, a \$300 million project, a project that has all sorts of dangers and threats to the environment of this Province, that is only a stopgap measure, that will only produce power for two years anyway. Whether we like it or not, Mr. Speaker, the Muskrat Falls project is a five to six year project. From the commencement of construction until it is completed, until the power is onstream, is six years, Mr. Speaker. We will be short of power in this Province. After Cat Arm is onstream, Mr. Speaker, in 1986 there will be an energy shortage in this Province.

Now, the minister might stand up and tell us where the shortfall is going to come from. That was the reason, by the way, that LCDC recommended Muskrat. The recommendation was that we start Muskrat now and continue on with Gull.

Now, let us talk about the cheap power, Mr. Speaker. LCDC has told the government of this

MR. FLIGHT: Province that Muskrat Falls power would cost 85 mils.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. FLIGHT: Muskrat power, 85 mils delivered to Hydro; Gull Island power, 65 mils; and the Upper Churchill power excess to Newfoundland, 45 mils. Mr. Speaker, the cheapest Labrador power available to this Province, a blended price for Labrador power, 65 mils, Mr. Speaker, 4 mils more expensive than the Cat Arm development and the cheapest we could supply in this Province.

MR. NEARY: If they were doing their homework there would be no need of Cat Arm, no need of it at all.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, we sell Quebec our power for 2.5 mils per kilowatt hour. LCDC suggests, Mr. Speaker, that we find a market that will pay us 30 mils for Gull Island power. But Gull Island power is going to cost us 33 mils to produce. LCDC suggests that if we could find a market for 30 mils - what they are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that we have to market the surplus energy developed at Gull Island for less than it costs us. Now, Mr. Speaker, is there anyone in this Province interested in developing Gull Island or Muskrat to sell at a loss? You know, if the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) were here, Mr. Speaker, he might want to talk about this. LCDC, the experts in this area of Canada, Mr. Speaker, have told us that we may have to market - if we can market - Gull Island power for 30 mils. It will cost us 33 mils to generate. The people of this Province have to make a choice, Mr. Speaker. Are they prepared to market Gull Island power for less than it costs us to produce it? Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of question that the

MR. FLIGHT: the kind of question that the House Leader (Mr. Marshall), when he stands up, is going to have to address himself to. And he is going to have to start going around this Province, Mr. Speaker, it is more and more becoming apparent to everyone in this Province that we have been done in on the Lower Churchill. Mr. Speaker, in 1975 the Lower Churchill had been estimated at \$2.3 billion, that was the total cost including transmission. Today it is four point something billion dollars, twice as much in four years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Lower Churchill may have been at one point -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: - a cheap source of power for this Province, it may have been, but, Mr. Speaker, the way that this government have dealt with the Lower Churchill development from 1971 to this day has denied Newfoundland and very effectively made sure that the Lower Churchill, or the Upper Churchill for that matter, but certainly the Lower Churchill will never be a cheap source of power for this Province. Delivered to Newfoundland Hydro, Mr. Speaker, Lower Churchill power has got to cost us in excess of 65 mils - that is blended price, that is recall from the Upper Churchill, Gull Island and Muskrat, the cheapest and most expensive Labrador power blended have got to average 65 mils, Mr. Speaker, thanks to what this government have done this past ten years. And that is the price delivered to Newfoundland Light and Power, Mr. Speaker. When Newfoundland Light and Power put on their profits, Mr. Speaker, and all the rest of the escalation is added, for Labrador power, period, if we are going to develop the Lower Churchill sites, we will be looking at 100 mil power, Mr. Speaker. Labrador power delivered to this Province will be 100 mil power and it will be 100 mil power, Mr. Speaker, because this administration did not have the political will over this past ten years to develop

MR. FLIGHT: the Lower Churchill. It was sickening - he is not in his seat now and I am sorry he is not, Mr. Speaker - to hear the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) justifying a few days ago the Cat Arm development, and he said what a great economic boom to Newfoundland, 700 jobs for two years. Well you know what the Muskrat would have been five years ago or today? - 5,800 jobs for six years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FLIGHT: How does that compare for a great economic boom? If we are looking at the short term benefits?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to talk about the Lower Churchill in the long term, not prepared to talk about the Lower Churchill for the short term benefit. And, Mr. Speaker, look what has happened to this Province this past ten years. Because this Province would prefer to play politics with the Lower Churchill issue starting in 1971 - and that minister, if there is anyone in this House. Mr. Speaker, more well aware of what I am talking about it is the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). He pulled out of Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, because he did not agree with what was going on financially in that administration and he sat there for five or six years and he watched, Mr. Speaker, the same actors that he is propping up today, the same Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), the Premier when he was the Minister of Mines and Energy. Today, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation in Labrador where it is becoming questionable as to whether or not we have the ability to develop the Lower Churchill, whether or not the Lower Churchill will be feasible. And, Mr. Speaker, all the time, remember this, we have paid an awful price not only in dollars and cents for this government's procrastination on the Lower Churchill,

MR. FLIGHT: but since 1973, Mr. Speaker, we have had to double the capacity of Holyrood oil base, we have had to develop Hinds Lake, we have had to develop the Upper Salmon with the irreparable dangers and damages and wipe-out to the environment, and now, Mr. Speaker, we are wiping out the last piece of real estate of this Province worth retaining. That does not bother the minister that to pay for their desire to play politics with the Labrador power that we have wiped out, that we are doing unbelievable destruction in this Province, Mr. Speaker. That does not bother him at all. But it bothers a lot of people. And, Mr. Speaker, the price that we have paid, the price that this Province has paid and the people of this Province have paid for this government's performance and handling of the Lower Churchill, Mr. Speaker, may well indeed take years, it will take a long time, but surely as sure as the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is sitting there one day -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: - the people of Newfoundland will realize-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. FLIGHT: -the price we paid
because of this administration's handling of the
Lower Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please!
The hon. member's
time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. FLIGHT: No, I have twenty
more minutes. Enough is enough.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the
hon. the member did not want to take the leave because the
hon. gentleman was struggling, I think, not just at the
end but really at the beginning of his statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman
has brought in a resolution, into this House, which is a
Private Member's resolution which he put on the Order
Paper of this House at the opening day of the House. The
operative part of it reads: "The government accept the
recommendation of the Lower Churchill Development
Corporation and make an immediate start on the Muskrat
Falls Project, the short-term benefit being the jobs and
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 think it is
very significant that when the hon. gentleman brought in
a resolution at the time which contained a suggestion -
the energy critic for the Opposition - a suggestion of
what was to be done in the future and what he would
recommend, that he choose to consume 85 per cent, if
not 90 per cent of his time talking about his impression

MR. MARSHALL: of mistakes that had occurred in the past in the acquisition of BRINCO shares and of the premature development of the Lower Churchill site. He did not get in, Mr. Speaker, to the - you will note that he did not get into the main part of the resolution, and I am afraid that the hon. gentleman there opposite is infected, affected and effected by the disease that has long since wormed its way into the Opposition, of talking about things, their impressions of things in the past and that, and not being constructive but, in other words, being destructive.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is an example, too, of the energy critic. In the recitals in this resolution he starts off: "WHEREAS the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador will experience a serious electrical power shortage by the year 1985, that such shortages will increase significantly each year thereafter."

Well, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this government has already taken a very dramatic and positive step to alleviate any possible shortages in the year 1985, as already indicated by the commencement of the Cat Arm project.

MR. HANCOCK: That is not the point (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we are debating the resolution and the recitals and this is incredible for an energy critic. The energy critic of the Opposition said this, lo and behold: "The only on-island source of available electrical energy to offset these shortages is by adding oil-fired generating capacity to the Holyrood Generating Station, thereby subjecting our people and industries to unbearable electrical energy costs."

Now, can you imagine that? The energy critic on the opposite side of the House

MR. MARSHALL: did not even know that Cat Arm existed. I make no wonder he is against it. At the time he brought this in, Mr. Speaker, he thought that the only source of generating power in this Province was the oil-fired Generating Station at Holyrood. He was obviously unaware of the Cat Arm project, he was obviously unaware of Cat Arm. He said the only source of electrical energy was the oil-fired Holyrood Station. Now that is the energy critic, Mr. Speaker, in the Opposition. Can you imagine it?

Now, make no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that in their abject embarrassment the hon. gentlemen put a resolution up like this without thoroughly researching it. They have obviously put it up without researching it. And they get so embarrassed when they see that what they have said is untrue, they get up and do not talk about the resolution.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk about the resolution because it is very interesting. The operative part of the resolution talks about the recommendation of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation. Now, as everyone knows - I say everyone, everyone on this side and most people in Newfoundland; I cannot say for the hon. gentlemen there opposite - the Lower Churchill resource is divided into two main parts, Muskrat Falls and Gull Island. And the hon. gentleman, when he talks about this recommendation, and there was a recommendation made by the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, did not want to tell us why they said the Muskrat Falls project was preferable, what the reason for it was. The Muskrat Falls has around 700 or 800 megawatts, Gull Island has about 1700 megawatts. We cannot use in this Province 1700 megawatts. So in order for the immediate future to develop Gull Island, Mr. Speaker, to make it

May 27, 1981, Tape 1869, Page 4 -- apb

MR. MARSHALL: economically feasible,
we would have to be able, obviously, to use 1700 megawatts.
Even with an aluminium smelter, Mr. Speaker,

MR. W. MARSHALL:

we will still have such excess power from developing Gull Island that it would make it economically infeasible.

So the only way in which Gull Island can be developed, Mr. Speaker, is if we have in the short term, until we need it ourselves, the ability to sell the power outside. Now where do we sell it, Mr. Speaker? Do we sell it to England? No, the hon. gentlemen there opposite may be a little bit surprised to know that we cannot sell it to England. So we will tell them that we cannot sell it to India and we cannot sell it to Australia. The only places where Newfoundland can sell its power are to our sister provinces of Canada or to the United States of America. The Power Authority for the State of New York has already indicated it is willing to buy it. And why then was this recommendation that the Muskrat Falls site be used? It was because it said in the report that they did not see an immediate resolution to the problem of transmitting electrical power generated on this Province outside.

They did not see, Mr. Speaker, but we see a resolution of it and we feel that that resolution should be there. But the reason, of course, when the hon. gentleman there opposite, because this has become such an issue since he brought in this resolution and did not mention it is he would have to get up and he would have to talk us through the reasons why we cannot transmit our electrical power. And the reasons we cannot transmit our electrical power, Mr. Speaker, is because we are prevented from doing so by the Government of Canada, by the Government of Canada which is controlled by the friends of the hon. gentlemen there opposite. And rather than stand up, Mr. Speaker, as true Newfoundlanders and say, 'We have the same rights as all other Canadians to transmit our resources, our electrical power in the same

MR. W. MARSHALL: way as oil and gas, the hon. gentlemen there opposite are too embarrassed to get up because they do not want to stand up and speak out as true Newfoundlanders. Instead they want to side with their political friends in the federal government in Ottawa. Now that is the reason -

MR. T. LUSH: Do not be so silly, boy.
Sit down. Do not be so silly!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. President of the
Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) is not a very vicious man, Mr. Speaker, but I wish there was something in the rules where Your Honour could eradicate the vicious look on his face because it is rather awesome and frightening. It really is something, you know!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. MARSHALL: He makes me virtually quiver in my shoes. But that is why, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, the energy critic, that is why he did not deal -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: -that is why he did not deal with the resolution, Mr. Speaker, and that is why the hon. gentlemen there opposite are choking over there now and interrupting and interjecting. The fact of the matter is it would have been much better if the hon. gentleman had brought in a resolution, something to the effect that this House demands, begs, implores, or whatever wording you wish to use, the federal government to recognize the basic rights of Newfoundlanders as Canadians and permit us immediate access to the transmission of electrical power, Mr. Speaker, we would not only take -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

May 27, 1981

Tape No. 1870

DW - 3

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we would not only take the recommendation of the Lower Churchill to develop the Muskrat Falls, but we would be able to take the recommendation to develop the Lower Churchill including the Gull Island site. And think what that would do for the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) export it to New York.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Listen to the hon. member! 'Export it to New York!' Mr. Speaker 'Export it to New York!' I will tell you what, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): I ask the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) to restrain himself.

Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):
the Council.

The hon. the President of

MR. MARSHALL:
you what we will do.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Methinks they do protest to much, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, look we export it to New York and , you know, that is another point. If we manage , as we will manage the affairs of this Province, we cannot use all that power immediately. I guarantee the hon. gentlemen there opposite when this government enters into an agreement to develop the Lower Churchill and, if it has to export some of the power as it will in the short term, it will have adequate clauses in the contract to be able to reclaim it when the people of Newfoundland need it. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen there opposite might like to know that that aspect of the matter has already been discussed with the Power Authority of the State of New York in our discussions with them, they are aware of it and they are agreeable with it. There will be no longer, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen there opposite need not fear about a sixty-five year contract or what have you. We will look after the interests of the people of this Province.

MR. FLIGHT:

How much is Labrador power going to cost on the Island, 'Bill'?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon.. gentleman called me by my first name. In the parlance I am suppose to be know by the seat which I occupy, and in any event even outside I have not given the hon. gentleman liberty to use my first name.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

That is quite correct.

MR. MARSHALL:

Let us look at the other aspect of the resolution. Now this is the real gist of the resolution. You know, if you talk about the past we will revisit the past. The next part of the resolution says - now this is why, Mr. Speaker, they want the Muskrat Falls developed. They want the Muskrat Falls developed because of - now listen and let us emblazon this - 'the short-term benefit being the jobs and the general boost to the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador.' Now, Mr. Speaker, is that not true Liberal philosophy, the short-term benefit being the jobs. They have not changed, Mr. Speaker, and that explains why -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

- the Upper Churchill was given away for sixty-five years. There were short-term jobs in 1960, Mr. Speaker, and 1970 and now the people of Quebec rather than the people of Newfoundland are enjoying our birthright. We would be a have Province instead of a have-not Province but for the zeal of the hon. gentlemen there opposite to provide short-term jobs so for the short-term they would be rewarded by the public and returned to office. This government, Mr. Speaker, governs in the interest of the people today, tomorrow and in the years to come and is not prepared to give away the birthright of the future for the short-term jobs and the political return of tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

This is a true Liberal resolution if there ever was one. It shows, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal party is the same now as it was before. The member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) is embarrassed. He embraced the party, that particular party, if you can call it a party, he embraced the hon. members there opposite

MR. MARSHALL: thinking that they had changed their spots and he must, Mr. Speaker, be today writhing over the fact that this has gone through caucus - oh, yes, it went through the caucus. And not just the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), it was not just the member for Windsor-Buchans who did not know that Cat Arm existed. These went through their caucus. The caucus did not realize, Mr. Speaker, it existed. Now, I will deal in the few moments available to me, Mr Speaker -in case there is any doubt as to what the government's intention is, I will deal with the spurious remarks made - I wish the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) would stop frowning at me, Mr. Speaker. It is really disconcerting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: He is not getting paid \$25,000 to do it.

MR. MARSHALL: But, Mr. Speaker, just so we will know on the record what the government's position is, I am not surprised that the government could not possibly vote for a resolution which is going to take the development of Muskrat Falls and in effect ignore the rights of this Province to transmit electrical power through our sister Provinces in Canada. Neither, Mr. Speaker, will this government ever embrace a resolution which calls on a development to give away our resources for the purpose merely of short-term jobs. We are a long-term government, the members are short-term, and even in their short-term, Mr. Speaker

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

- they are going backward, they are showing they are going backwards by this resolution, and they are also showing -

MR. STIRLING:

The Opposition (inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

- they are also showing, Mr. Speaker, that they do not know - how can the minister - the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) - that is a Freudian slip, minister - how can the member for Windsor-Buchans possibly, is he going to resign as energy critic of the party, getting up and saying in his resolution that the only available electrical energy source is oil fired generating capacity, when we have come in with this great -

MR. STIRLING:

He will make a great Minister of Mines and Energy, one who knows something about it.

MR. MARSHALL:

- with this great proposal for the development of Cat Arm. So we are not going to vote for it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

There will be no unanimity in the House today.

Now, I would like to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

- I would like to go over, Mr. Speaker, if I can a few other -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

I know the hon. gentleman is very disappointed of his choice of parties and he is smarting under his choice of parties. He wished he had not and he sees -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:

application.

We are considering his

MR. MARSHALL:

Lower Churchill -

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Let me just deal very quickly with his remarks about the Lower Churchill. He did go back into history, as he did, and he ignored his own resolution because he was embarrassed by it, because he did not want to stand as a Newfoundlander, and because he did not want to embarrass his colleagues in Ottawa. But the fact of the matter is he went back in history, and he talked about the Lower Churchill. Well now, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province were supposedly done in by the Lower Churchill. What happened on the start-up of the Lower Churchill is a matter of history. I remember, Mr. Speaker, when it was started up and it was not a matter of -

MR. FLIGHT:

A real bluff.

MR. STIRLING:

so high.

How come the lawyers fees are

MR. MARSHALL:

There you go, you see.

MR. FLIGHT:

The biggest bluff ever -

MR. MARSHALL:

that I -

It is a matter of record, Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

- that I did not agree with it, I thought the start-up was premature and subsequently, as happens from time to time, people I disagree with occasionally have to admit that they were incorrect, so they cancelled it. But what happened? The monies that were spent are unlike those spent on rubber factories and what have you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

What we do, Mr. Speaker, what this administration and what this party does, what the PC Party does, is occasionally in its zeal to develop it does something a little bit prematurely and makes a mistake, it capitalizes on its mistakes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Because all of that money is there today, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman knew it. The money is there in this very Lower Churchill Development Corporation that he refers to.

MR. FLIGHT:

What have we got?

MR. MARSHALL:

It represents, Mr. Speaker, it has been capitalized and it represents the capital of this government in the Lower Churchill Development Corporation.

MR. STIRLING:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

What the President of the Council is giving in the way of information he knows should be corrected to say that it is up to the federal government as to whether or not when all the agreements are put together, whether the federal government will agree to recognize that \$100 million. It right now is a debt of this Province. It still is a debt and if they are not careful in the next two or three days it will continue to be a debt.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, there is obviously no point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

No point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition took the opportunity to -

MR. STIRLING:

To correct him.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

- to clarify -

MR. MARSHALL:

No point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council has about one minute left to conclude his remarks.

MR. MARSHALL:

Just information given by the leader of the agents of the party in Ottawa.

So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows that this has been capitalized in the Lower Churchill Development Corporation. All he has to do is read the -

MR. STIRLING:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman does not understand.

MR. STIRLING:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

That is not, as the minister knows - maybe he does not know, maybe that is the problem. The problem is that it has not yet been capitalized into the assets of the Lower Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair has just ruled that that is not a point of order. The hon. President of the Council has about thirty seconds left to conclude his remarks.

MR. MARSHALL:

All the hon. gentleman has got to do, Mr. Speaker, is read the agreements. On the takeover of the BRINCO assets, Mr. Speaker, they complain about us reclaiming our resources by buying back - Mr. Speaker, we would not have had to do that if they had not been given away by the hon. gentlemen there opposite. Very sadly in this resolution they show a penchant to do the same. So we are voting against it, if there is any doubt in Your Honour's mind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

May 27, 1981

Tape No. 1872

NM - 5

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not envy Your Honour's position sometimes in this hon. House, but I want to congratulate Your Honour on the way in which he handles the various situations that arise in this House.

Mr. Speaker, we just heard a typical St. John's East cocktail speech in this House. Nobody is a true Newfoundlander except a member of the St. John's East cocktail set, according to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman obviously believes in class distinction. The hon. gentleman, because he says that you are not a true Newfoundlander if you do not do this or you do not do that or you do not conform to the hon. gentleman's philosophy or his way of thinking, you are anything but a good Newfoundlander. Mr. Speaker, coming from a member of the St. John's East cocktail set, I would say that we would look at that kind of a statement rather askance. The hon. gentleman is still fighting Confederation. The hon. gentleman was an anti-Confederate and he has not acknowledged the fact that Newfoundland is a part of Canada and he is still fighting Confederation. And the hon. gentleman is living in the past, Mr. Speaker. He continuously lives in the past in this House. Every opportunity - he hates Joey so much that he cannot resist the opportunity to get the knife in and give it a twist whenever the opportunity presents itself. And if the opportunity does not present itself, then he will make his own opportunity to get at Joey. But, Mr. Speaker, let me say this at the outset, that the hon. gentleman who just took his seat and all hon. members on the government side of the House should get down on their hands and knees this very day, get down on their hands and knees and thank Joey Smallwood and the Liberals of this Province for one thing.

May 27, 1981

Tape 1873

EC - 2

MR. HANCOCK:

More than one, brother.

MR. NEARY:

No, but there is this one thing

I am going to mention.

MR. HANCOCK:

Three hundred and thirty-three.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, there are three hundred and thirty-three, but one that came up yesterday in the Supreme Court. Hon. members know that the government are spending \$500,000 and it will probably go to \$1 million - I am told at this moment it is \$500,000 of taxpayers' money that is being spent on legal fees involved in this case before the Supreme Court on the recall of Churchill Falls power; \$500,000 spent on legal fees so far, when all the government had to do, by the way, was to send a letter to the Churchill Falls Corporation and say, 'Mr. Churchill Falls Corporation, we want to recall 800 megawatts of power.' And if the Newfoundland Government could show that they needed that 800 megawatts of power, then Churchill Falls would have no recourse but to deliver that power to Newfoundland Hydro. It is just as simple as that. That is an act of this Legislature.

MR. HANCOCK:

That is right.

MR. NEARY:

That supercedes all the law.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is right.

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, what did the Supreme Court say yesterday? They said the most significant thing that they could have said, that the whole case of this government hinges on a clause in the lease agreement. And what is the clause in the lease agreement? That when Newfoundland needs the power, it can recall the power because it belongs to Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

The government's whole case - this is what the court said yesterday - the government's whole case hinges on one clause. Now, who put that clause

MR. NEARY: in there? Was it the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall)? And incidentally, I might say that the Tories in the House at that time voted for it - it was a unanimous vote of the House - the Tories voted for the development of the Upper Churchill. To a man, every member of this House voted, including the Tories. So the hon. gentleman is condemning his predecessors in this House every time he talks about the agreement. But, Mr. Speaker, let us not get sidetracked. It is a very, very important point that the Supreme Court when it hands down its decision - I will make a prediction now -

MR. NEARY:

their decision will be based on the clause that was put in the agreement by the Liberals when they were in power in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That is the only hope the Province has of winning its case. It is the only hope and the truth will win out in the end when they hand down their decision in the Supreme Court. And that needs to be said over and over again. It needs to be repeated over and over and over again so that it will sink into the thick skulls of hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me repeat it. Let me repeat. In the case now before the Supreme Court, when the government -

MR. STIRLING: And the whole basis of their attack is to take back the water rights.

MR. NEARY: That is right. The whole case hinges, so we are told by the courts, hinges on a clause in the lease agreement, Mr. Speaker, and that clause clearly states that Newfoundland owns the power, the power has not been given away. It belongs to Newfoundland, that we can have every kilowatt of power from the Upper Churchill by merely writing a letter to Churchill Falls Corporation, under a statute of this Province, under a law of this House, a law passed in this House, send a letter to Churchill Falls Corporation and ask to have the power delivered to Newfoundland Hydro. It is just as simple as that.

The legislation of this Province supercedes everything else, agreements and anything else that you want to talk about. And so, Mr. Speaker, I hope that when the Supreme Court hands down its decision based on that clause that was put in there by a Liberal Government that we will not hear the member from St. John's East (W.Marshall) or the Premier of this Province rant and rave and say, oh, another

MR. NEARY: victory. It will be the same kind of a victory as they had in Bellevue, that is the kind of a victory it will be. There will be no victory, Mr. Speaker. It is a sheer waste of taxpayers' money, it is a bonanza for the lawyers and if the government had not made the colossal blunder that it made back in 1974 we would not be in the dilemma that we are in in this Province as far as the recall of power is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, as near as I can ascertain, that gigantic blunder, which will probably turn out to be the biggest blunder in Newfoundland's history, the nationalization of the Churchill Falls Corporation, as far as I can estimate at the moment has cost the taxpayer of this Province so far over \$300 million. Now, how do I get these figures, Mr. Speaker, how do I arrive at these figures? Well, based on the information given me in an answer to a question that I put on the Order Paper to the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry), the government had to borrow \$165 million to purchase the shares of Churchill Falls Corporation and another \$30 million had to be put up for the water rights, the repeal of the water rights, that is \$195 million back in 1974.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you take an average of 10 per cent interest on \$195 - \$165 borrowed from the bank and another \$30 million to pay for the water rights - \$195 million; if you use an average of 10 per cent interest a year - and I see my hon. friend has a pencil there; do some rough calculation and the hon. gentleman will see - let us use round figures, \$200 million is what it cost, the initial cost of taking over the Churchill Falls Corporation. Ten per cent at average interest, which is low, very conservative with a small 'c' that would be \$20 million a year for seven years is \$140 million. So, you add that on the \$200

May 27, 1981

Tape No. 1874

EL - 3

MR. NEARY: million and that is \$340 million
it has cost so far. Approximately \$340 million it has cost
the taxpayers of this Province for that colossal blunder that
will go down as the biggest blunder in Newfoundland's history,
the nationalization

MR. NEARY: of the Churchill Falls Corporation. And as my hon. colleague so well put it when he was speaking, the reason given this House, Mr. Speaker, the reason that we were given in this House, and you talk about a House being misled, and members being misled, the reason given in this House, and Your Honour was not here, but I was here -

MR. TULK: They should be ashamed to come back again should they not?

MR. NEARY: Who should be hanging their heads in shame, Mr. Speaker? Who should be hanging their heads in shame? The reason we were given was because they had to have the water rights back in order to develop the Lower Churchill, back in 1974. And then before the '75 election, just to put the icing on the cake, just to show you how sincere they were, just to show you how far advanced in their plans they were, just to show you all the markets they had for the power, BOOM! on both sides of the Strait of Belle Isle, another \$210 million.

MR. TULK: \$210 million?

MR. NEARY: \$210 million, not \$100 million. I am adding the interest on to that too now, by the way. \$100 million which had to be borrowed, \$10 million a year interest on that, that is \$550 million added to the indirect debt of this Province. That is only a 10 per cent interest rate I am using. A half billion dollars, \$500 million, added to the public debt of this Province. Why, how the taxpayers ever tolerate it, I will never know. Obviously they do not know the facts, the facts have not filtered out to them.

MR. TULK: And that was done with the financial genius of Crosbie.

MR. NEARY: Well, Bully Boy was one of the culprits, but a couple of the culprits are

MR. NEARY: still over there.
\$550 million down the tube, down the drain, wasted, Mr. Speaker. And, now, when they had an opportunity to develop the Lower Churchill, back in 1972 and 1973, it would have cost about \$1.5 billion. No, not \$1.5 billion, it would have cost \$1 billion to develop the Lower Churchill. The plans were in place, the development was ready to go ahead, all they needed to do was call public tenders. That was nine years ago. Hon. members surely must know that nine years ago the development of the Lower Churchill was in place and ready to go ahead for less than \$1 billion. Now what is the cost of developing the Lower Churchill?

MR. HISCOCK: About \$4.5 billion.

MR. NEARY: How much?

MR. HISCOCK: About \$4.5 billion.

MR. NEARY: \$4.5 billion.

MR. HANCOCK: Not counting the
\$500 million that it cost.

MR. NEARY: Add that on to the
\$550 million and what have you got?

MR. HANCOCK: \$4.5 billion.

MR. NEARY: No, I cannot be
hypocritical about it, they have not spent the \$4.5 billion
but that is what it would cost. And if they do go ahead
with the development, they have added a further burden to
taxpayers of this Province of \$3.5 billion, wasted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I
am not going to get into high financing, but these are
the facts of the situation. These are the facts. And if
there is anybody who should hang his head in shame in this
House - at least Mr. Smallwood got a development going.
At least he got it going, whether it be good, bad or
indifferent. But this crowd cannot point to one industry

MR. NEARY: that they have started in this Province since they took over ten years ago, not one industry. And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that pretty soon the oil better start flowing or Messrs Premier and Company are going to be in serious trouble.

I forecast the other day that pretty soon, at the rate she is going in this Province, with the high cost of living, with record unemployment, with a housing shortage, with the vandalism and crime increasing in this Province, with the cost of living and the taxes in this Province, there will be rioting in the streets. It is worse now - we are passing right now through a recession in this Province that would make the dirty thirties look like small potatoes. Never before have I seen and heard so much discontent in Newfoundland and so many people looking

MR. S. NEARY: for jobs and so many people frustrated.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province felt, ten years ago, when this government took over, they felt that the Lower Churchill was going to be developed and that there would be a reduction in electricity rates in this Province - their hopes and expectations were built up - and that there would be employment resulting from the development of the Lower Churchill. But no, it has not happened. The people have been let down. And this very day while we are debating this wonderful resolution brought in by my colleague, by the way, the Premier is down in New York trying to negotiate markets, markets for the surplus power from the Lower Churchill. Negotiating markets! I thought 'Joey' was the only one who did that. The only difference now is they say, 'Well, we will not make the same mistakes that 'Joey' made. They have not got a contract yet. There is no hope of their ever getting a contract with their attitude, nobody will touch them with a barge pole, no bond houses or no industrialists will touch them with a barge pole, Mr. Speaker.

And so I would say if anybody in this House should hang their heads in shame, it should be the hon. crowd who sit opposite. It is amazing, you know, how they can jump over the mistakes of the last ten years. They jump over all the corruption and the mistakes of the last ten years to get back at 'Joey'. And that is not going to help the situation, Mr. Speaker. That is not going to put bread on the tables of people in this Province, that is not going to solve the unemployment problem. 'Joey' is gone, he is out of politics and that defence is very weak. It is not going to work. It does not wash with the people of this Province anymore. The people want action. They want

MR. S. NEARY: performance. They want to know what the track record of this government is since they took over. Are you going to develop the Lower Churchill? When are you going to develop it? How much is it going to cost? What benefits will Newfoundland get? What time is the oil going to start flowing? That is what they want to know. They are fed up with all the talk about oil and gas, they want to know when will the oil start flowing? And if it is not flowing pretty soon, Mr. Speaker, you are going to see an awful lot of trouble ahead, an awful lot of trouble ahead for this administration. You are going to see riots in the streets before this is all over.

So I am glad to have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to have a few words on this resolution. I support the resolution. If the government votes against it, I do not know but we should do the same thing that the government is doing themselves. We had another resolution in this House last week or the week before last, and it boiled down to a political decision, a decision taken along partisan political lines and the vote was taken. And now the government are buying ads in newspapers, a new low in this Province, buying ads in newspapers to say the Liberals voted this way and the Tories voted this way. And they have the resolution manipulated to try to serve some political purpose for the administration. I am surprised the hon. member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) tolerates that kinds of politics.

So, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I can say is that, having listened to the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), I hope he was not stating government policy. I hope earlier today, when he was defending the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) who interfered with the judicial process in this Province, I hope he was not stating government policy. I would be very disappointed, the people will be awfully discouraged and disillusioned if the hon. gentle-

MR. S. NEARY: man was stating government policy. What the government should be doing, instead of trying to criticize poor old 'Joey', who is trying to write an encyclopedia on the history of Newfoundland, what the government should be doing, Mr. Speaker, under this resolution, is telling this House and telling the people of Newfoundland what their plans are to develop the Lower Churchill. That is what they should be doing. They should be taking a positive, constructive approach to this, not play politics with it, as they have been doing for the last ten years, and tell us what their plans are, tell us what they are going to do. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, they have no plans, they have not done anything and they cannot point a finger to one new industry or one new project that they have started in this Province in the last ten years.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, there is no

MR. HODDER: quorum in the House. It is my understanding that government is charged with the responsibility of keeping a quorum in the House and for much of the speech here there were only three members in the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): We will have a quorum call. But I think when the House Leader for the Opposition (Mr. Hodder) rose there were fourteen but we do not have fourteen now, We have a quorum call.

I will ask the Clerk to please count the members.

There is a quorum present.

The hon. Minister of Finance

DR. COLLINS: I think we have just seen a most incredible thing, Mr. Speaker. Today is Wednesday. You know, the rules of this House say that for four of the five sitting days there shall be government measures, that is essentially what the rules say. On the fifth day, which happens to be Wednesday, that will be for the Opposition, that will be their day to bring forward concerns of theirs. Essentially it is Private Members' Day and at least that gives the opportunity for the Opposition to call the order of the day. And in actual fact that is what happened today, the Opposition called the order today. It is an Opposition resolution. And what do we find, Mr. Speaker? We find that they aim to close up the House. Now, is that a responsible attitude for the Opposition to take? The very day when they can bring forward something that they say they have on their minds, they have great concern about, at the slightest opportunity they want to close up the House and prevent the people's House from operating. I think it is incredible, I think it is absolutely astounding that this is the approach that the Opposition should take. I am not surprised, Mr. Speaker, because I think we have a very ineffectual Opposition at

DR. COLLINS: the present time, I think the leadership of the Opposition is very, very strange. I have only been in this House, say, five or six years, I think, but I have seen a number of Leaders of the Opposition and I can say, from my certain knowledge, that the leadership of the Opposition at the present time is the strangest leadership of the Opposition I have ever seen. It does not have the vigor that was there when the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) was in place, it does not have, shall we say, the intellectual capacity as when the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) was in place -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Barid): A point of order, the House Leader for the Opposition.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's Centre - is it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: South.

MR. HODDER: South. You hardly know which district he is from because he is so insignificant in the House, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, his comments are not relevant to the bill which we are debating. He has not mentioned the Lower Churchill or the resolution since he started speaking. I might point out, as well, Mr. Speaker, that it is the duty of the House and the House Whip on the government side of the House to keep a quorum here. And any member may direct the Speaker's attention to the fact that there is not a quorum. When only three members of the government side, the governing Party of this Province, are sitting in this House on a Bill which is as important as this one, you know, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the government should hang their heads in shame. But, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the member is not being relevant.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker,

May 27, 1981

Tape No. 1877

SD - 3

MR. SPEAKER(Baird):

To the point of order, the hon. the
President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The member is obviously being
relevant, he was talking about the lack of any death in the
Opposition. And it is been shown - it is all very relevant,
because the hon. member is going to

MR. MARSHALL:

get on to the fact that there is a resolution before this House right now by the Opposition, and the energy critic, which does not even acknowledge the fact that Cat Arm exists, let alone discuss whether it should be developed. So they are very relevant when he is talking about the lack of quality, Mr. Speaker, in the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To the point of order. There is no point of order. I think the opportunity was taken to - remarks made by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). While some degree of flexibility is allowed, I would now ask the hon. the minister to get on with the subject at hand.

DR. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As you say, there was no point of order. I was merely pointing out that we are supposed to be debating today a very important resolution and the Opposition, through the type of leadership it has, was trying to scuttle that opportunity for the House to do that. It was trying to close up the House so that we could not debate this very important resolution, and I was making that point. And that is very relevant to this resolution.

Just to finish off the remarks I was going to say, we also had a Leader of the Opposition here, who took a very responsible view - I am talking about the former member for Bellevue, the hon. Don Jamieson. His image was implanted on the Opposition and I think it was a very good image, but I am afraid the Opposition now has sadly fallen down from that.

I hope that the Opposition will not get into the habit of trying to undermine important business in this House as they tried to do today when they tried to close up the House just as

DR. COLLINS: the debate on this resolution was going forward.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a very important subject. I think the wording of the Resolution leaves a great deal to be desired. It is very sloppily written. It has not clearly been thought through, obviously. It says here that 'Newfoundland and Labrador will experience a serious electrical power shortage by the year 1985.' I am not certain where that information came from. The information that I have is that there is no real danger of a serious shortage until 1986. And I have read quite a number of relevant documents to this effect, that we can survive until 1986 with proper management, and that is what this administration continually gives.

My hon. colleague, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), has also pointed out that in the second WHEREAS paragraph, the person who brought in this resolution apparently was unaware that there is, in actual fact, another site for development of hydro-electric power on this Island. So that is a rather sloppily-worded section.

The next one there says that

Muskkrat Falls -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: - will give a stable, long-term supply -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair has to hear what is going on, and I am sure all hon. members would like to hear what is going on. Whilst we allow some discussion back and forth across the House, the Chair is having

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): difficulty, so I would ask
for order, please.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker -

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: I am glad that the Speaker brought
it to the attention of the House. We are having problems
hearing him too. I wonder could you ask him to speak up
or turn up his microphone because he has sort of been
mumbling through his beard and muttering and, I mean,
they are such pearls of wisdom that I would like to hear
it as well, Mr. Speaker. So could you ask him to straighten
up and speak up.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon.
the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: I could hear myself perfectly
well over here, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: My volume, Mr. Speaker, is no
match for the Leader of the Opposition. It has often come
to my mind, with his great volume, his loud laugh - it
often comes to mind that old saying, 'The loud laugh
bespeaks the vacant mind'. So I would just like to throw
that pearl of wisdom out. But, Mr. Speaker, to the point
of order, I would suggest that if hon. members opposite
wish to hear what I have to say, if my volume is a little
low, if they maintain a modicum of silence, perhaps that
will help.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, there
is no point of order. However, all members of the House
have the right to be heard in silence and evidently -

May 27, 1981

Tape 1878

EC - 4

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Order, please!

Evidently, we are having some difficulty in hearing the speakers. I would ask everybody to adhere to the House ruling.

DR. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I am glad that you made that very forceful remark there. I do not know if the hon. members opposite are aware of the fact that when the Speaker stands, when the Speaker is speaking, no one is supposed to talk, make noise or, indeed, laugh. The hon. members opposite, apparently -

MR. MARSHALL: Jackasses.

DR. COLLINS: - are not aware of that fundamental rule of parliamentary procedure.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order. The hon. gentleman just made a statement and now he is running out of the House, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: I am on a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are not in your seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who talks about the decorum of this House, who is so sanctimonious and pure, the image he tries to portray in this House, just made an unparliamentary statement by referring to the Opposition as jackasses. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has no choice but to withdraw that statement. It is unparliamentary. It is unbecoming of the dignity and decorum of this House and the hon. gentleman should have the courage and be man enough, if he is a man and not a mouse, to withdraw that unparliamentary remark.

DR. COLLINS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I think Beauchesne outlines the particular nouns which are unparliamentary and, as far as I recall, that particular noun is not in that group. Now, I think a jackass is an animal. I think it is a very noble animal. I think it is a compliment to the Opposition to be compared to a noble animal like a jackass.

MR. MARSHALL: As a matter of fact, it elevates them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To that point of order, I am sorry I did not, because of the noise that I have previously spoken about, hear what was going on and I reserve judgement until I check Hansard.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we have had quite a number of interruptions since I started to speak, and I think that underlines the first point I was making, that is, that the Opposition have no interest in this particular resolution. Now, this resolution deals with one of the primary industries and one of the resources of this Province that is going to shape our future. And I think the Opposition, in a number of ways, is showing that they either have no interest in it or no concept of the importance of this particular resource. The fact that they tried to close the House, the fact that they are interrupting and preventing debate from going forward, the fact that the only cogent comment that the Leader of the Opposition seems to be able to make in terms of this resolution, because I do not think he has spoken yet, is a rather braying noise. I think that all these points show that the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition, generally, have really no concept of the importance of hydro electric power as a natural resource in this Province.

DR. COLLINS: To get back to the points that I was making, Mr. Speaker, the third paragraph - it speaks of 'stable, long-term supply of relatively low-cost electrical energy'. Now, that is an incredible statement, Mr. Speaker. And it was presumably written by the energy critic opposite. Muskrat Falls is not going to give us relatively low-cost electrical energy. That is an incredible misconception of the development, the hydro-development that is going to go on in Labrador.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

DR. COLLINS: Relatively low cost of what? Relatively low cost to Bay d'Espoir? Relatively low cost to Gull Island? Relatively low cost to the Upper Churchill? Relatively low cost to the power that is being generated at Holyrood? The Muskrat Falls power will be more expensive than all those sources I have just mentioned, so that there seems to be a tremendous lack of knowledge, or lack of any sort of insight into hydro electric generation by members opposite.

It is very difficult to speak to this resolution, it is so poorly written, it shows such abysmal ignorance of the whole subject. And to go on to the last thing there, Mr. Speaker: And resolve that the Lower Churchill Development Corporation - 'and make an immediate start on the Muskrat Falls project', make an immediate start on the Muskrat Falls project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if members opposite -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

May 27, 1981

Tape No. 1879

EL - 4

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

I will ask the member for LaPoile
(S. Neary) to restrain himself.

DR. COLLINS: I do not know if, Mr. Speaker -
he does not bother me, the member for LaPoile does not bother
me, few of them do, actually. I do not know if members
opposite ever read the book, BRINCO, which outlined the
development of the Upper Churchill.

DR. COLLINS: The Upper Churchill did not have the federal government standing in the way of its development. The Upper Churchill did not have the financial costs that are presently in place with interest rates and inflation that we see now, did not have these in place at the time.

They did not have the same difficulties with marketing that we have at the present time. Despite all of that, Mr. Speaker, it took from 1962 to 1967, I believe, perhaps late 1966 or early 1967, approximately five years to get that project in place, to get the technical side of it worked out, to get the financial packet put together, to get the details of the marketing done. And now to talk of making an immediate start on Muskrat Falls is an incredibly abysmally ignorant view of how these things are done. It is laughable to think that this can happen. They give the impression that all you have to do is go and take a pickaxe, run up to Labrador and start building a dam up there and away you go. I mean it is a most naïve, it is a most juvenile attitude and opinion to take about the development of a major hydro electric resource.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other things that are not written in here that show how abysmally behind the times, shall we say, our friends opposite are in regard to this whole thing. It is not written in here, but implied in here.

When the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) spoke, when he opened the debate on this resolution, he seemed to indicate that there was no place for a federal guarantee in this. Mr. Speaker, LCDC cannot operate, LCDC cannot develop Muskrat Falls without a federal guarantee. It requires a federal guarantee to put a financial package together. It is impossible otherwise to do it.

DR. COLLINS: Now, Mr. Speaker, why should that be so? The reason for it is that the Province itself does not have the financial capability of putting together a financial packet to develop this on its own. Now, that comes as a surprise -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: That comes as a surprise to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling). A smile spreads over his face. It is the first time he has ever heard of it. Now, Mr. Speaker, the most casual student of politics and development in this Province knows that that has been so for years, everyone knows that. That has been so for years. The Province on its own cannot finance the Muskrat Falls development, it needs federal guarantees behind it. That is common knowledge. It is nothing new. I mean, the Leader of the Opposition, obviously the thought just occurred to him, but I can assure him that that is common knowledge, that everyone has known it for years and years and years.

Now, why is a federal guarantee needed? The reason why a federal guarantee is needed is the output from Muskrat Falls will only satisfy the needs of the Island, and the relatively small amount that also would be required in Labrador. There is no surplus for export, so there is no customer who is going to come along and help to finance this. It has to be done either by the Province itself, and the Province has not got the financial strength to do it, or as a Province of Canada it has every right to look to the federal government for assistance in development matters like this. It will require to have a federal guarantee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing firmly in place to suggest that the federal government is willing, despite the fact that this will be of such great benefit to the people of this Province, despite the fact that

May 28, 1981

Tape 1880

PK - 3

DR. COLLINS: this is one of the most studied sources for electrical energy this Province has, despite all of that, the federal government has not come forward and put firmly in place its intention, its undertaking to

DR. J. COLLINS:

give a federal guarantee over this. Now that, Mr. Speaker -

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

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, it appears that the government has decided to develop a policy of giving the most incorrect information. And the information is that there is a Board of Directors controlled by the Province of Newfoundland. And having the Government of Canada, that Board of Directors - now, the Board of Directors here may not report back to the Government -

DR. J. COLLINS: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) has clearly not pointed out in any way that I am in disorder in regard to my actions in this House. He has not pointed that out at all. What he is doing is he is interfering with my privileges in this House, that is, my privilege of being recognized by the Speaker and entering into debate. Now he is getting up on a point that he calls a point of order, which is not a point of order. He has not made any point of order after seven or eight sentences there, and the whole line of those sentences do not point to any point of order. He is interfering with my privileges and I would ask that he be reprimanded and be informed that standing to speak, claiming it to be a point of order and not making a point of order, is an interference with the privileges of an hon. member.

MR. L. STIRLING: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To the point of privilege, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. STIRLING: To the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and that is what we are dealing with, the point of privilege, for him to get up and to interrupt when I had not finished my point of order is, in itself, an abuse of the privileges of this House because he knows a point of privilege is very serious matter. It has been referred to by the Speaker many times, that a point of privilege ought rarely to be introduced in the House. And all of the references, Mr. Speaker, that you are quite well aware of - a minister who abuses the privileges of this House, because he knows a point of privilege takes precedence over everything else, gave him the opportunity to get up because he did not have the patience to wait until I had finished my point of order'.

Mr. Speaker, that is clearly the most flagrant abuse of the rules of privilege of the House and he should not be allowed to get away with it,

MR. HODDER: And he a former Deputy Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege, let me say that I was about to call the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) to order because it is certainly not proper to get up on spurious points of order. And the hon. Leader of the Opposition was not making an accurate point of order and, therefore, he was indeed interrupting the hon. minister. You know, I do not think we should, as hon. members in this House, continue to do that. The hon. Minister of Finance has about one minute to conclude his remarks.

DR. J. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Just to get this correct. I have absolutely no objection to the Speaker ruling on my question of order. But it was the minister who got into it on a point of privilege and I do not believe the Speaker has ruled on whether that was a point of privilege. I have no objection to the Speaker calling me to order, but I could not anticipate that the Speaker was going to call me to order because I had not finished the point of order. So I would like a clarification, Mr. Speaker, I have not heard your ruling on the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, there is no point of privilege. As was pointed out earlier, and privilege is a very serious matter and it is not very frequent that it would come to the floor of the House. But the whole matter of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Stirling) point of order interrupting the hon. minister, you know, I dealt with it in the best way I could under the circumstances.

Now the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has about thirty seconds to conclude his remarks.

DR. J. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, to finish off then, we need a federal guarantee if Muskrat is to go ahead. If hon. members opposite can use their influence to have Mr. Lalonde, who has not - as a matter of fact, to my knowledge, he has leaned in the opposite direction. He has leaned in the opposite direction to giving a guarantee to the Province for the development of Muskrat Falls. If our friends opposite

DR. COLLINS: can entice Mr. Lalonde to take a positive view, I think that there is some value to this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please! The hon. minister's time has expired.

The hon. member for

Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely amazing how hon. members on the other side can wiggle their way out of difficult problems and difficult situations. They have two approaches, Mr. Speaker. When the Opposition sort of corner them they have two approaches. One is to blame Ottawa for anything they cannot do, for any lack of action, any lack of positive activity on their part it is because of Ottawa. And secondly, their other approach is to condemn the Opposition as having no concept of the matter, no understanding of it at all. Mr. Speaker, to hear them talk you would think that each one of us should be in special opportunity classes. You know, it is something! It is absolutely fantastic! You would not know but one had to pass an IQ test to get on the other side. And as I have said before they have got so many over there whose IQs and neck size are the same. There are three or four of them over there in the Cabinet whose IQ size and neck size are equivalent. They have the same numbers.

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) the hon. member.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. - and the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) fits that admirably, fits it admirably, Mr. Speaker, to hear the way that he was trying to get himself out of the trouble that he had gotten himself into with Labour in the last four or five months.

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, again was it not amusing to hear the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) get up and talk about the wording of this resolution? Quite obviously the minister did not look ahead and see what the wording was of resolutions on the other side. Because they are so inane, they are so stupid, a kindergarten student would throw them away. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the President of Treasury Board failed to tell us what a good resolution should be. He failed to tell us. He just went on and sort of said it is a poorly worded resolution. And how many times have I heard members on the other side say, 'Now, the wording is not important. The wording is not important, it is what the resolution is trying to say'. Because I have been one hon. member who has been condemning members on both sides for the sloppy resolutions. I do not like sloppy resolutions. I like resolutions to be the way that a resolution should be. And the member for St. John's North, (Mr. Carter) now walking out, knows again that he submitted some of the most stupid resolutions ever put forward in this House -

MR. HANCOCK: You should see the one on the Order Paper. Look at this one.

MR. LUSH: - and one a couple of years ago, which, if it was enacted upon, we would have the best curriculum in all of Canada. It was to encourage all members of the government to read the books in the Newfoundland curriculum with the view, of course, of getting more Newfoundland material in. And I found out, in questioning, in the last couple of months with respect to Grade XII, that the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) not only has not read, she has not got a clue about what is going in the curriculum, not a clue about what is going in. And here was the member for St. John's

MR. LUSH: North (Dr. Carter) putting this great resolution for all members of government to read the curriculum.

MR. HANCOCK: Just read the latest one he has got in there.

MR. LUSH: Oh, yes. Well, I am going to get on to these now. I am going to bring out some intelligent resolutions, some good resolutions. But let me say a resolution must be specific, number one. It must get to the point. It must ask for positive and specific action. The verbs must be positive and specific, positive action. Let me see, let us look at the positive action by the resolutions presented by the government. Just look and then you will know by the resolutions. The resolutions will reflect the type of government that we are getting.

Let us look at the first one which, again, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) wanted us to bring in, this resolution. How could he bring it in? We cannot get a chance to bring in a resolution, anything that has got to do with Ottawa, because we know that members on the other side are going to get in there. Well, the resolution that the member for St. John's East wanted my hon. friend and colleague from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) to bring in was being brought in by the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle). Well let us look at it. The important part of course is the 'BE IT RESOLVED', I think, the 'BE IT RESOLVED'. It says: 'THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the government'. Now what kind of action is that, to urge? There is one kind of urge I know and I could do it every time the hon. member for St. John's East gets up. I could do it every time. Urge, what is that? Is that not a great resolution? 'That this House urge the

MR. LUSH:

let us look at number eleven by the member -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. LUSH: - well, I do not like to be
(inaudible) by Mr. Speaker himself.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: I would like to add -

AN HON. MEMBER: I did not say anything (inaudible).

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

MR. LUSH: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to ask the hon. member if he would refer to the motion put forward by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). The hon. member is straying over the Order Paper and making references to other resolutions and not the one that is on the floor for debate. So I would ask the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) if he would confine his remarks to that resolution.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, but what I was attempting to do was to show what a good resolution that the member from Windsor-Buchans had here. This is what I was attempting to do because the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: - has said it was a poorly worded resolution. Granted it was going to take a little bit of time, Mr. Speaker, but what I was doing was demonstrating what a good resolution this was, and I had to take a few examples to demonstrate that. So we go to resolution number eleven, and what is the action word again? What is the specific word? "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House go on record as urging again - urging again" - 'urging', Mr. Speaker. They love this word 'urging' - go on record. They have a new word there now. Now, we are going to

MR. LUSH: number thirteen, the one presented by the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett).

MR. YOUNG: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order raised by the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) prepared speeches.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker - no, look.

My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that you cannot deal with a resolution that has been dealt with or is coming up in the future. And the hon. member is quoting from resolutions for the future and I feel that he is out of order.

MR. LUSH: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. YOUNG: That is common sense. That is common sense.

MR. LUSH: - I am (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have difficulty hearing the hon. member for Terra Nova to the point of order.

MR. LUSH: I state again, Mr. Speaker, that I am not dealing with the resolution, I am simply demonstrating, by using the wording of other resolutions, what a good resolution we are now debating here today.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, to the point of order, I think I have heard enough on the point of order to make a ruling. Just before this point of order was raised, I asked the hon. member for Terra Nova if he would confine his remarks to the resolution before the floor. It is certainly not the Chair's intention to stifle debate, but when I offer direction to an hon. member who is speaking I expect him to adhere to the ruling of the Chair. Therefore, I would ask the hon. member for Terra Nova once again if he would confine his remarks, as broad as

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): they are, to this resolution put forward by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) on the power - energy.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, again I was trying to illustrate what an excellent resolution the member from Windsor-Buchans presented, and I was saying that a resolution must be specific in the action and be emphatic in the action that it is advocating and words like 'going on record' and 'urging' - and, Mr. Speaker, without going into it now, hon. members, I know, are interested in the resolutions, we are going through them and now you will see that the only two words, the only two phrases known by members on the other side are 'go on record' and 'urging', 'go on record' and 'urging'. I will not read them any more, Mr. Speaker, I will take your advice and take your ruling, but hon. members are reading them and now you will know where the good resolutions come from.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what does this Resolution say, the one that the hon. member from St. John's thought was a poor resolution but, Mr. Speaker, what does it say? Let me come to it. It says, "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government accept" - accept, no urging, Mr. Speaker, no urging, no pussyfooting around, no getting out, no wiggling of things, "that the government accept the recommendations of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation and to make -"

MR. STIRLING: A start.

MR. LUSH: What kind of a start? When? Now, an immediate start, Mr. Speaker, "an immediate start on the Muskrat Falls project, the short-term benefit being the jobs and 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." That is the resolution, Mr. Speaker, that meets

MR. LUSH:

every characteristic of what a good resolution should be, specific, Mr. Speaker, concise, and precise. A good resolution, no doubt left in the minds of people as to what the intended action should be, that the government accepts the recommendations. As I have said, no urging, no going on record, no encouraging, but that the government accept the recommendations, action! It is calling for action, immediate action, specific action here and now.

Well, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK:

Specific.

MR. LUSH:

Specific action, exactly.

Now, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) was criticizing on the basis that they were getting jobs in the short-term, and indicating, of course, that that was Liberal philosophy, the short-term, and they only worked in the long-term. Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder how long do they think they have. They have been in power, they have the reins of government in this Province for about eight years and what have they done in eight years?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Nine years.

MR. LUSH:

Nine years? Nothing. Absolutely nothing. So that certainly demonstrates their long-term plans.

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible).

MR. LUSH:

And, of course, if the hon. member for St. John's East has any influence on the activities of this government, certainly one can understand why it is that they have not been doing anything, because the member for St. John's East spent such time looking over his shoulder, looking back at what past Liberal administrations have done, that he has got no concept of what could happen in the future.

MR. MOORES:

That is right, especially today.

MR. LUSH:

None at all, Mr. Speaker, none at all.

Now, of course, I think it was the

MR. LUSH: great Sir Winston Churchill who said that looking back over one's shoulder now and again was a good thing. Well it is a good thing so that, hopefully, we will learn from it so that we can plan good projects for the future. But the member for St. John's East, Mr. Speaker, is preoccupied with backward gazing, preoccupied with backward gazing and that is the problem with the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), Mr. Speaker,

And it typifies the kind of government that we have been having today, a government that is doing nothing, that is doing nothing with respect to unemployment in this Province, either in the short-term or in the long-term.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to our hydro needs, again the member for St. John's East indicated that my friend and colleague, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) who put forward this resolution, indicated that he knew nothing about the hydro needs of the Province because he did not mention the Cat Arm project. He did not mention that. Now, Mr. Speaker, I saw nothing in that to really indicate that the member knew nothing of the Cat Arm project. I am sure he knows more about the Cat Arm and every other arm that is on that Cat Arm, more about Cat Arm than the member for St. John's East knows about Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, again what an insidious attack for the President of the Council to take. What a low level of debate to get into in this most sophisticated and this most magnanimous resolution that is asking for the government to attack the hydro electricity problems of

MR. LUSH: this Province , and by so doing, to give our people some badly needed employment, and lastly, having the effect of stabilizing the cost of electricity to the consumers in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what more could one say in a resolution? What more could one say in a resolution? Three marvelous outcomes of this particular resolution? Now, a lot more outcomes from that, Mr. Speaker, than urging, than urging.

MR. LUSH: That is what we have to do in the remaining Wednesdays from now on on Private Members' Day, is to get ready to 'urge', 'urge' every Wednesday, 'urge' whenever the government brings up a resolution.

MR. CARTER: Your time is up sit down. Your time is up.

MR. LUSH: Well.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is another reason for urging, it hurts.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, I saw nothing in that to indicate - I suppose if the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) had known or had some way of knowing that the hon. member knew about Cat Arm, maybe he would have supported this resolution, if he knew about Cat Arm. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted I would just like to go to resolution no. 9 and just to prove a point again, I see nothing in that one, I see nothing in that resolution that indicates that the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) knows anything about Cat Arm. I see nothing in that resolution to indicate that he knows anything about Cat Arm.

Well, Mr. Speaker, whether we

May 27, 1981

Tape No. 1885

RA - 1

MR. T. LUSH: know anything about Cat Arm or not, anybody who knows anything about the hydro electricity demands in this Province, knows very well that by the year 1984 and 1985 this Province is going to be tremendously short with respect to meeting its hydro needs if there are no other sites developed. And, Mr. Speaker, the LCDC have come out and strongly recommended that the Muskrat Falls be started immediately, be started immediately, The government, of course, prefers the Gull Island project but, of course, all of us would like to see the Gull Island project developed and, I suppose, what the hon. member from Windsor -Buchans (Mr. Flight) did was to incorporate both things and say let us make a beginning on the Lower Churchill, let us make a beginning on the Lower Churchill. But, no, we cannot do that either. We cannot do that, Mr. Speaker, because, again, we go back to the favorite tactic by this government that if we are not doing something, if there is no action it is for two reasons; one related to the constitution or it is related to intra-provincial relations, of course, which have to do with transmitting our power through Quebec, so we cannot do anything. Now, the Muskrat, of course, is not for transmitting power through Quebec, we want the Muskrat to come the other way, we want it to come to the Island. So, Mr. Speaker, again, showing how they try to weasle their way out of things by blaming it on the constitution and by blaming it on intra-provincial relations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated before, this government is constipated with the constitution. It is constipated with the constitution but I would tell you that it is not going to wash any more, the people of this

MR. T. LUSH: Province are beginning to see through it and they are wondering, you know, if there is anything this government can do? Is there anything this government should do or should we do away with having a provincial government at all, because they cannot do anything? Everything they try to do, everything, everything they try to do, Ottawa has got to decide it for them or anything they cannot do, it is because of Ottawa.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible) the Constitution.

MR. LUSH: Well, it is the constitution, Mr. Speaker, they are constipated with the constitution. But, as I say, it is not going to wash because the people of this Province are beginning to learn the style of this government, they are beginning to learn what they are trying to do and I think they have exhausted the political mileage they can get on this constitution. They have certainly exhausted that, Mr. Speaker, and there is nothing else left for them. Now it is time for them to act, now it is time for them to act. The people of this Province want action, Mr. Speaker, and here is a resolution in which they could have demonstrated action, but no, Mr. Speaker, they cannot do it. And this has nothing to do with transmission rights, nothing at all, it has nothing to do with transmitting hydro electricity, this is calling for the development of the Muskrat. But, Mr. Speaker, let us see what will happen, let us see what will happen now, Mr. Speaker, when we come to next week's resolution because it looks like the government would support this.

The hon. member from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) said he would support this resolution if, of course, there was another attachment to it, if there was another appendix to it, if there was another resolution, that is, that we support it and 'urge', I guess - we got that word 'urged' - we got in 'urge' the government to -

MR. LUSH : convince the federal government to allow hydro electricity to be transmitted across provinces, If we could only say in a resolution, Mr. Speaker, that we would 'urge' the federal government, that we would 'urge' the federal government to accept that Principal, then they would accept it. Well, Mr. Speaker, again this is just another diversionary tactic by this government. They have become excellent at diversionary tactics. Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they have used up all of their diversionary tactics. The people of Newfoundland are now beginning to see through them, they are beginning to see through them. And so , Mr. Speaker, I will clue up by summarizing that this, Mr. Speaker, is one of the best resolutions that I have ever seen presented before this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: One of the best resolutions that have ever been presented.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: It is advocating specific action,

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, advocating that this government accept the recommendations of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation. And, secondly, make an immediate start on the Muskrat Falls thus achieving other purposes (1) creating jobs in the short-term for the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker and; (2) the long-term benefit being stabilizing electricity costs, the electrical costs for the people of this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is very specific. It is a marvellous resolution and for these and other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I whole-heartedly support this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak in this debate but the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) always gets me to rise to the occasion, all the time. The hon. member is falling into the old trap that other hon. members in the Opposition have fallen into. He got up today and talked about the resolution that is before the House and what a great resolution it was. And how he insulted other hon. members for resolutions they had on the Order Paper. The poor hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) was down in his seat sitting and listening to the hon. member and being insulted. And the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) laughing at the remarks of the hon. member for Terra Nova, while he was smirking and laughing and joking about resolutions put forward by the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde who in resolution sixteen says, 'I urge the government to ensure that the Department of Education do certain things'. He 'urges' - a lot of members in this House use certain verbs to illustrate what they want in resolutions.

MR. J. DINN: And the hon. member got up today and fell into the old trap, Mr. Speaker. We have a resolution before the House today that is basically, almost totally incorrect and wrong. It cannot be supported. The hon. member got up and instead of addressing himself to this resolution which talks about electrical power and generation and so on, something that you could at least talk about, the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) got up and insulted the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) who had a particular word, a particular verb in -

AN HON. MEMBER: And Grand Bank, too.

MR. J. DINN: And the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms). The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde got up and had to leave the House because he was insulted by the hon. member for Terra Nova. And I caution the hon. member, because he is falling into the old trap of going around attacking people and insulting people and so on, like the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) falling into the same, old, tired trap, the trap, by the way, Mr. Speaker, that has cost the Opposition of this Province credibility over the past where we lost two or three, now, Opposition Leaders because of the tactics that they used in this House of Assembly, wasting the time of the House on foolishness, insults, insulting other hon. members in this House. And, Mr. Speaker, I decry, I protest that kind of foolishness in this House. And I think the hon. member for Terra Nova should know better. He should know better. He is becoming one of the better speakers in this House. He is up in the class almost, Mr. Speaker, of the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), whom I have a lot of respect for as a parliamentarian and a debater in this House. The hon. member for Terra Nova

MR. J. DINN: never read this resolution or the preambles to it or he would have seen the folly of the resolution. 'WHEREAS the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador will experience serious electrical shortages by the year 1985'. They will not because we will have Cat Arm, Mr. Speaker, they will not experience - it is wrong, totally incorrect. Just not correct, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DINN: 'AND WHEREAS the only on-island source'-

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) with Cat Arm over there?

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) clearly outlined to the hon. members opposite and they still get up. There are none so deaf as those who will not hear. The hon. member for St. John's East stood up in this House today and pointed out to the Opposition the folly, the incorrectness of this resolution and its preambles. And the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) is wilting now, getting out of the House, wilting under the pressure.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is gone out to 'urge'.

MR. J. DINN: The hon. member for Terra Nova is gone out to 'urge'. The hon. member for Terra Nova will have to contend with the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) and the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) who, in their resolutions, are also 'urging' Mr. Speaker, certain actions to be taken.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us get to the resolution.

MR. DINN: This resolution put before the House was thought out by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) and approved by the caucus of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: All agreed.

MR. DINN: And all agreed. And the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), there he is, hoof in mouth again, hoof in mouth again. All agreed to this resolution and all of its preambles.

MR. STIRLING: Nothing (inaudible) preambled.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition will get an opportunity to speak if he takes an opportunity to speak. The hon. Leader of the Opposition sits in his seat and shoots his little wisecracks across the House instead of getting up in his turn and speaking in the House. Mr. Speaker, he will have his opportunity like other hon. members.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get to the resolution and what is before the House today. And I am not going to be dragged into lowering myself to getting back and forth with these little snide comments by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. And I say that, Mr. Speaker, I always call members opposite by the name of the seat they represent or the party they represent or - always correct. And I am always in order, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe I have ever been called to order in this House for doing something, abusing the rules of this House.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. members now, including the Leader of the Opposition, to stop abusing the rules of the House by interjecting and get up in his turn like the statesman that he should be, get up in his turn and speak in this debate and let us see how he supports the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans

MR. DINN: (Mr. Flight). I caution him not to get up, to speak on this resolution when he gets up, and not to get up and insult other hon. members in the House, including hon. members on his own side. Do not fall into the trap like you are falling into lately. Do not get there like the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), you know, insulting people. Get up, give your remarks, give your arguments for why you support this resolution. Show the intensity of your belief in this resolution. And let us see what you really believe, what you really think. I mean, do you go along with the fact that: 'AND 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 electrical energy!?'

MR. FLIGHT: Do you go along with that?

MR. DINN: Is that what you go along with?

MR. FLIGHT: Do you believe that?

MR. DINN: Do you believe that the only generating source on the Island of Newfoundland is Holyrood? Is that what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) believes? I mean, is that what he is actually going to get up here today on and throw out his pearls of wisdom about how Holyrood, oil-fired Holyrood, is the only place that we can generate electricity on this Island? He does not believe that Cat Arm should go ahead. The hon. leader is on record, does not believe Cat Arm should go ahead.

MR. STIRLING: It is already gone ahead.

MR. DINN: Does not believe in it, does not believe in all of this. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way we operate. The fact of the matter is, Cat Arm will go ahead.

MR. FLIGHT: What else? So what comes after Cat Arm?

MR. DINN: Cat Arm will go ahead, Mr. Speaker. And the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) will find out what will come after Cat Arm in due course. Mr. Speaker, he will find out in due course and we will have another election, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans, at that point in time, may be squirming to save his nomination, Mr. Speaker. What will come next? Yes, we had Hinds Lake on the Island. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans is against Hinds Lake.

MR. FLIGHT: What kind of a face have you got?

MR. DINN: Was not against Hinds Lake was he? Oh, he was not against Hinds Lake. A few jobs for Windsor people, he was not against Hinds Lake. It had nothing to do with environment that he was not against it, but he was not against Hinds Lake at the particular time. No, I would not expect the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans to be against Hinds Lake. But Cat Arm, that might not quite affect the member for Windsor-Buchans.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans is not the Minister of Energy, fortunately. He is the energy critic. He will always be that if he continues on the same tack, putting resolutions, foolish resolutions before this House, foolish preambles, not well thought out argumentation when he does get up. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans, who is against Cat Arm, was not against Hinds Lake because of the few jobs. That is what he talked about you see, Mr. Speaker. That is the whole philosophy of the Liberal Party, 'Let us develop Upper Churchill, give it all to Quebec but we will get a few jobs in the meantime. That is what we will do. And let us start a linerboard mill.' Because what will we do out in Stephenville? 'We will get a few jobs in the interim.' It does not matter if it goes bottom up. It does not matter if it cannot work. It does not matter if it could not work as a linerboard mill.

MR. FLIGHT:

It is working now.

MR. DINN: It is working now because you know why. You know why it is working now. It is working now because it is a newsprint mill -

MR. FLIGHT: Because it will work (inaudible).

MR. DINN: - and it will work and it is well thought out. And that is the difference I am trying to point out to the hon. member.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: I am trying to point that out to the hon. member the difference. The ill-conceived, rapidly thought out plans of the former administration, you know, the administration of a party which -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: - the hon. member supports, the quick thought out, shove it in - you know, for a few jobs in the interim. It was the same way with Come By Chance, Mr. Speaker. These resolutions that the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) brought in today are silly, silly resolutions, silly.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans will have more time to reply to speakers on -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. DINN: - both sides of the House next week, and here he is, look, sitting in his seat - look at him, Mr. Speaker - squirting his poison across. He cannot speak in debate, he cannot even speak intelligibly, he cannot even speak intelligently and he puts this foolish resolution in here today, 'No other source of power on the Island but oil-fired at Holyrood'. Well, there we go, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of thought that went into the hon. member's resolution. Incorrect it is, simply incorrect. It is just not factual. The hon. member is against Cat Arm because there is a possibility that people from Windsor-Buchans -

MR. DINN: The fortunate thing, as I say, Mr. Speaker, is that he will never be the Minister of Mines and Energy in this Province with that kind of foolishness going on. He has got to change his ways, he has got to change his ways, Mr. Speaker. He has got to think about things. He has got to put reasonable resolutions before this House. He has got to have the people of Newfoundland judge, not because it is Windsor-Buchans that Hinds Lake should go ahead, not because it is Windsor-Buchans that Hinds Lake should go ahead - and Cat Arm is not near Windsor-Buchans you have to start thinking for the whole Province. And that is when the people of Newfoundland will start recognizing you as reasonable, ordinary people of Newfoundland who want to do something for the whole Province, not for, you know, your picayune, parochial, you know, individual little proposals. Do not put, do not put - ram through Come By Chance - 'Come in, Mr. Shaheen, and let us have an oil refinery out in Come By Chance, and do not worry about it, we will guarantee you all the money'. Is there any reason why anybody would not come in here if they are guaranteed everything under the sun plus interim financing, \$50 million or so or \$5 million or \$10 million to put in your pocket while you are walking around? Sure anybody would develop under those foolish circumstances. We have to stop that in Newfoundland. We have wasted it over the past years, and that has to stop and the people of Newfoundland will elect us forever if the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) continues to bring in this foolishness. So he has got to think about it. The next time he brings in a resolution, I will be watching, because I will jump up again -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: - I will jump up again and I will shove his resolution right down his throat, verbally, in this House. I will shove it right down his throat, Mr. Speaker, because you cannot bring in resolutions like this into this House and have the people of this Province -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) letters you write?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. DINN: - and have the people of this Province -

MR. FLIGHT: Do you think about the letters you write?

MR. DINN: - give the hon. member any credibility. And we cannot have hon. members in this House, Mr. Speaker, get up and insult members on this side and members on his own side when he gets up to speak. The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) should not fall into that foolish little trap. Do not just go along with the sheep. Be a man, be an individual! Stand up and think about what you are doing, think about what you doing. Do not insult your colleagues because they happen to have a verb in there that says 'urge' - 'we urge' the government to do something'. There is nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. There is absolutely nothing wrong with that kind of thing, it is the content of the resolution -

MR. FLIGHT: Did you think about that letter?

MR. DINN: - the preamble as to what thoughts you were -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: - probably trying to express, what you are trying to put across to the people, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: What thought did you put into that letter?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: And if you are trying to put across to the people of this Province that the only source of electrical energy on the Island of Newfoundland today is Holyrood, oil-fired electricity, if that is the only source,

MR. DINN: if that is what the energy critic for the Liberal party today is putting out as factual information, the people of Newfoundland will laugh at him, and I am concerned about that. I am concerned about anybody laughing at any MHA in this House because it lowers the stature of an MHA in this Province, and it should not be done. It should not be done, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HISCOCK: What are we going to do (inaudible) in 1985, go on Holyrood again?

MR. DINN: The hon. member should think. The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) will have a chance to speak in this debate and

MR. DINN: I will be listening very attentively as I was to the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), and the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), and he did not hear me, Mr. Speaker, interject across the House, because that is against the rules of the House and I know he is a young, new, MHA in this House, but he should know the difference by now, he should not follow the lead of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), although he is close to him, he sits close to him in the seat. He should not follow the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) shooting his little remarks across the House, get up in man fashion, man style and say your piece on your resolutions, say what you believe in. Do you believe that the only source of energy on the Island of Newfoundland is oil-fired at Holyrood?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Is that the only source? Do you believe in it? And if you do believe in it get up and say it. And hon. members here and hon. members opposite, who have some sense of what is going on in this Province, will refute it, but present your arguments the way you should present your arguments in debate, stand up man fashion.

The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) got up and talked about specific things in the resolutions. He talked about this resolution and other resolutions. He should have gone a little bit further, he should have done a little bit of research before he got up in this House and insulted the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde, and the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) and other hon. members in this House who had the same words in their resolutions.

MR. CARTER: Shame!

MR. DINN: I think it is a disgrace and a shame that this House should lower itself to that kind of thing. And the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) is not normally like

MR. DINN: that, I think, he is falling into that foolish little trap -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: - it is a foolish little trap that has been set.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he said the government is doing nothing about unemployment. That is another little hoof-in-mouth disease that the hon. member has acquired over the past year or so. He got into the unemployment and employment debate with me before, and he has lost each time. He said, 'We showed how Statistics Canada came out with their unemployment and employment figures.'

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: And how we had 9,500 jobs last year, a rate of 9,500 jobs this year over last year. And, Mr. Speaker, he gets up in this House, and he got up last year - of course, hon. members went outside of the House after and they really felt sorry for the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) - he got up in this House last year and he said, 'But are they new jobs?' Now, can you imagine the thought that went into that. 'Are they new jobs!', Mr. Speaker? He talks about employment, 'Are they new jobs'? Well, they were not there the year before and they are there now. 'Are they new jobs?' 'Relatively new', I said. And I went soft, actually I was soft on the hon. member, I could really have gone at him. But the fact of the matter is, I feel sorry sometimes for the hon. member for Terra Nova, I feel sorry -

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: - for the hon. member for Terra Nova when he gets up and puts his foot in his mouth. As a matter of fact, he so often puts his foot in his mouth that he cannot get one out before he gets the other one in, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:

The hon. member gets up in the House and generally, because he does not take the time - I think - if the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) really took the time to think out resolutions and to get up and make a speech, I think he would be one of the best debaters in this House. I think he would be one of the best speakers in this House. He certainly has the talent. He certainly has the background. He certainly has the capability. But, Mr. Speaker, he just does not take the time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:

I mean, surely the hon. member, if he had thought it out, if he had looked at, if he had researched a little bit for this resolution, he would not get up and use his time to insult his colleagues. I mean, surely that is not what the purpose of this resolution is. This resolution talks about energy. It is incorrect in many ways, there is no way that it can be supported. I mean, you cannot support incorrect, wrong, foolish information.

MR. LUSH:

It is like no. 9 by now.

MR. DINN:

You cannot support that kind of foolishness in this House because the people of Newfoundland would lower - I mean, the credibility of the members of the House would go down and, therefore, we cannot logically and reasonably and sensibly support this kind of foolishness. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) maybe would like to, before next week comes along, before he speaks last in the debate, maybe he will come in and he will change some of the preamble so it does not look so foolish in the public eye. And change certain things in the resolution itself -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:

- so that, Mr. Speaker, we will not be looked upon by the public of this Province as just writing things off without any research, just so that you can get up in

MR. DINN: the House and speak. The hon. members -

MR. LUSH: As a matter of fact, you do not
need a preamble anyway.

MR. DINN: That is right. You do not need a
preamble, but you should not put in foolishness. I mean, this
is serious stuff. You should not put in foolishness before
the resolution.

MR. DINN: The preamble is there to add weight to, the preamble is there to convey information, the preamble is there to assist the resolution. And certainly the preamble - the resolution (a) is no good - but the preamble to it makes it a farce, Mr. Speaker. It shows lack of knowledge. It shows lack of research. It shows lack of caring about what hon. members speak about in this House. It shows lack of caring. And when that happens, Mr. Speaker, the stature of the people who speak in this House goes down because the people of Newfoundland read these things, hear what is going on in the House of Assembly and find out and they say - well, Mr. Speaker, they just lose, the people in this House who bring in resolutions like this, lose credibility themselves and it definitely adversely affects the stature that the members of this House should have.

So, Mr. Speaker, I was not intending to speak on this debate. I think the resolution, the preambles to the resolution, are basically incorrect and cannot be supported, Mr. Speaker. It could be supported with a lot of revision, but, Mr. Speaker, it cannot be supported the way it is. And if the hon. member revises it by next week, if he wants a little assistance I am sure the Table will provide him with a little assistance in drafting a better resolution, Mr. Speaker, and we will think about it. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER A point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was sitting here listening to the minister's speech and it occurred to me that sometime in the future, historians and whatnot will be listening to - going back over Hansards and reading the speeches and I would not want the minister's speech

MR. HODDER: to stand in Hansard as it was. And we will give him leave, Mr. Speaker, if he wants to get up for a moment and say that he really did not mean anything he said.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!
That is not a point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what the Premier is going to say or the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is going to say when they return to find in Hansard the comments made by the representatives from the other side of the House. They are up saying that they are not in favour of the resolution. And the resolution says, 'Let us proceed with Muskrat Falls'. Now, where did we get that information, Mr. Speaker? One of the problems that this government seems to have is in understanding that when they own something, when they control it, normally the owners and the controllers give some direction to the people who are the Board of Directors.

Now, we have a peculiar situation in court right now where the Board of Directors of Hydro are presenting a case on behalf of Newfoundland. The same Chairman of the Board is opposing that on behalf of CFLCo. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have another curious situation in which this corporation, the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, has the same chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Young.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Young who is Chairman of Hydro, Chairman of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation. Mr. Speaker, the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) were very proud of the fact that we

MR. STIRLING: control that corporation.
The Lower Churchill Development Corporation is controlled by Newfoundland, 51 per cent ownership, 49 per cent owned by Ottawa. And the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) - and I was applauding him, giving him credit and he got upset because I chuckled a couple of times when he made a kind of a comment. And now he comes along and makes the admission that the only way that we can develop the Lower Churchill is with the support of Ottawa, with the support of the federal government. Mr. Speaker, all that we are doing -

DR. COLLINS: Muskrat Falls, I said.

MR. STIRLING: The Lower Churchill.

DR. COLLINS: I said Muskrat Falls.

MR. STIRLING: Well, okay, all right.

Muskrat Falls, let us be specific, Muskrat Falls is part of the Lower Churchill Development. There are two Lower Churchill developments, Gull Island and Muskrat Falls. Now, Mr. Speaker, the question is, does this government have any control over what is going on with

MR. STIRLING: any of the things that they own? They want more and more ownership. Now, it is obvious from the court case that they have no control at the present time over Hydro and CFLCo but the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, Mr. Speaker, has recommended - they have recommended the resolution that we have introduced. In the spirit, Mr. Speaker, of attempting to show the rest of Canada that we are very determined to develop our resources, we brought in a resolution that could not possibly have any, any exception taken to it from the other side, Mr. Speaker, because we have brought in the recommendation made by the Lower Churchill Development Corporation. That is their recommendation. They have 51 per cent control. Now, presumably, in this case, the Lower Churchill Development Corporation directors came to the Newfoundland Government and said, "What position will we take on this, Newfoundland Government, you are our owners?" They went to Ottawa, the Ottawa directors, and said to Ottawa, "What position do you want us to take before we commit ourselves as a Board of Directors?" Ottawa committed itself and I had thought, up until today, that Newfoundland had committed itself because, otherwise, your Board of Directors would not pass on a recommendation unless they had checked it with their owners. Now we have control. Everybody in Newfoundland and Labrador who has been listening to the government talk about, "Boy, if we only had control". Now this is something we have control over. This is our Board of Directors, 51 per cent control. There is no way that the Federal Government can outvote Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe they recognize that on the other side, that Newfoundland controls the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, 51 per cent. There is never a time, any time, any meeting, annual, monthly,

MR. STIRLING: weekly, any proposition, there is no time that the Federal Government can outvote the Newfoundland directors, providing the Newfoundland directors are given some instruction. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people who spoke on the other side against this resolution are speaking against the recommendation made by our controlling directors. So, does that mean, Mr. Speaker, that this was an independent view taken by the Lower Churchill Development Corporation directors? Vic Young, was he speaking on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador?

DR. COLLINS: Will the hon. member permit a question?

MR. STIRLING: If the Speaker says that it does not come out of my time, I will be -

MR. MORGAN: He has a good one.
It is a good one.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt); It does come out of your time.

MR. STIRLING: It does come out of the time?

MR. SPEAKER: It would come out of the hon. member's time.

MR. STIRLING: Well, I cannot, you see, I only have twenty minutes. I allowed the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to speak and have his time but if he would -

MR. FLIGHT: By leave.

MR. LUSH: By leave or if time does not count.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: By leave? If the Speaker will agree that it does not come out of my time.

MR. LUSH: Well, if the House agrees.

MR. SPEAKER: All hon. members have twenty minutes in debate except the hon. member in introducing (inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: Okay, I cannot waste any more time, Mr. Speaker, I have to carry on with the points.

MR. STIRLING: You see, Mr. Speaker, the Board of Directors of CFLCo, the Board of Directors of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, the Board of Directors of Newfoundland Hydro are all headed by the same Chairman. Now, in the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, Mr. Speaker, there is no confusion, there is absolutely no confusion. The government controls Lower Churchill Development Corporation. They brought in in June of last year, Mr. Speaker - this is a very important recommendation made by, presumably, the Province of Newfoundland and the Federal Government through their common Board of Directors, because there is no way anything can get past, through LCDC unless the Newfoundland Government says yes because they control the vote. They recommended that they proceed with the Muskrat Falls development, that is their recommendation, the same recommendation as in this -

DR. COLLINS: That is understandably so.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, there will be a time, and I would gladly urge the Minister of Finance to get involved in the debate and he knows that he did not make these points at the time, but the recommendation by the Board of Directors is that they proceed with the Muskrat Falls development. That is the recommendation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question is why, since July, 1980, has this government not moved at all on the recommendation of their own Board of Directors? And that is to proceed with the Muskrat Falls. It is an excellent resolution. It was a real coup that my colleague, the Opposition spokesman, could bring in a resolution presenting the government's view and have the government get up

MR. STIRLING:

and speak against it, actually speak against their own resolution, their own direction given to the Board of Directors of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if they realize it. The interjection from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) indicates that he does not realize that he controls Lower Churchill Development Corporation. Mr. Speaker, there is another very serious omission.

DR. COLLINS:

(Inaudible).

MR. STIRLING:

I hear what the Minister of Finance is saying, but I would hope that it gets recorded in Hansard because he says that he does not give them any direction. Well, what is the point of controlling a corporation if you give no direction to the Board of Directors, if you, the owners, give no direction? What is the point of controlling it? What is the point of controlling anything?

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT):

Is it agreed to call it six o'clock.

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I mean, if the hon. member does not want to speak his two minutes that is fine.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time being six o'clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 p.m.