

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the Speaker's Gallery today, seated in the Speaker's Gallery, I should say, are a delegation from the Conception Bay South Town Council, the newly elected mayor, Aubrey Dawe, accompanied by the Town Manager, Mr. Fred Squires, and the Town Clerk, Maureen Harvey. Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to update the House on the situation regarding Advocate Mines in Baie Verte. As hon. members know, the operation is scheduled to close down on December 31st, of this year. Since the decision to close the operation was made by the Board of Directors on September 9th, government has been pursuing a number of alternatives which might allow the mine to continue past the announced closedown date. Several meetings have been held with the company and others in an attempt to find a solution to the problem which would allow Advocate Mines to continue uninterrupted. In a recent press conference I announced that we had come to the conclusion that the mine managers, Johns-Manville, were determined to see the operation close. Therefore, although we would be continuing our efforts to persuade the company to continue the operation, we would be placing greater emphasis on our efforts to attract a new operator.

Hon. members will also be aware that government commissioned the firm of Watts, Griffis and McOuat to advise us on the current world market conditions

MR. WINDSOR: for asbestos fibre and Advocate's relative positions. The study confirmed that although the present world market is depressed, it is expected that a general improvement will occur and that the Advocate Mine should be competitive under normal conditions.

Yesterday, in Toronto as well, my Deputy Minister attended a meeting of the creditors of Advocate which was convened by the interim receivers, Peat Marwick Limited. At that meeting the creditors of Advocate agreed to the proposal put forward by the receivers, Peat Marwick, which provides for a holding position to be maintained until the end of this year. Under this arrangement the mine will be allowed to continue to operate without fear of closure due to the actions of the creditors. At the end of the year the company will be in the best position to satisfy the claims of the unsecured creditors.

I have previously advised this House that four companies have expressed an interest in assessing the potential for their involvement at Baie Verte. Discussions with the principals and officials of these companies is continuing and we are encouraged by the level of interest shown to date. Indeed, on Friday past my officials and I met in Toronto with Transpacific Asbestos Inc. to discuss their expressed interest in the Advocate operation.

I am very pleased to advise hon. members that we were informed by Transpacific of a proposal which they were proposing to submit to the receivers and which I am informed has now been submitted. While I am not at liberty to disclose the details of the proposal at this point in time, I will say that it is designed to transfer ownership of Advocate to Transpacific Asbestos Inc. and to

November 25, 1981

Tape No. 3721

EL - 3

MR. WINDSOR: avoid the scheduled year-end
closedown of the operation at Baie Verte and to satisfy, if
possible, all secured and unsecured trade creditors.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

The company has been working, Mr. Speaker, for several weeks in acquiring and analyzing the information required to develop the proposal. At the meeting held in Toronto last Friday, we had the opportunity to learn a great deal about the company and the proposal they have presented. Transpacific Asbestos is a Canadian company which presently has a producing asbestos operation in Australia. The operation is similar in size to Baie Verte and has given the company ten very valuable years of experience in the asbestos industry.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it abundantly clear that this proposal is a conditional one and it will depend, for its success, upon a number of factors which include co-operation from the major shareholders of Advocate as well as support of both the federal and provincial governments. Discussions have been ongoing with the federal government and we have reason to believe that funding could be made available in this instance as it has been made in the past in other parts of Canada when major industries have experienced financial difficulties.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I emphasize again that this proposal is far from finalized at this point in time and it will require a great deal of analyzing by all parties involved before we will know whether it is acceptable or not.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we are continuing our discussions with the other companies that have expressed an interest and I am hopeful that additional proposals will be put forward in the near future. Hon. members may rest assured that we will continue our efforts to find a solution to the problems at Baie Verte with the continued advice and support of my colleague, the member

MR. WINDSOR: for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), and the representatives of the local community and the union who have shown a great deal of responsibility and support for our efforts during the past several weeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans has about two minutes.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, speaking for this side I want to assure the minister that we are pleased. We are pleased with anything positive, any positive news we hear coming as a result of the negotiations ongoing to keep the asbestos mines in Baie Verte operating. We are pleased for the people of Baie Verte. We regret, Mr. Speaker, as do the people of Baie Verte, that this crisis that we are facing in Advocate was not identified and was not recognized by the Government of Newfoundland, who had a responsibility to recognize and identify.

There is evidence now, Mr. Speaker, that because of financial commitments to this Province by Advocate mines there were indeed ample warnings, ample reasons for the Government of Newfoundland, for the Department of Mines and Energy, to have recognized what was happening in Baie Verte and to have moved before we got into a crisis situation. But having got into a crisis situation, Mr. Speaker, more will be said, I would think, before the Advocate situation is finished, about the financial aspect that this Province was aware of and did nothing about, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, there is really nothing in the statement. We have known and the people of Baie Verte have known for two or three months there have been negotiations ongoing. The only thing new here is the identification of a company, Transpacific, a company.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: And what is interesting, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: What is interesting, Mr. Speaker, is the minister wants to assure this House that he can vouch for nothing, that it may depend on financial commitments from this Province or from Ottawa, that there is nothing with regards to the proposal. Mr. Speaker, obviously the people of Baie Verte know and the member must know that it is the kind of proposals that Transpacific want are the terms of conditions under which they want to operate that mine will decide whether or not they move in and continue to operate the mine. So we will be looking forward, Mr. Speaker, with bated breath, as do the people at Advocate, for when the Minister of Mines (Mr. Windsor) stands up in this House and tells us that a deal has been consummated with a company who will indeed operate Advocate mines. A very interesting observation that the minister made was that the agreement reached yesterday with the unsecured creditors would guarantee the unsecured creditors, and Advocate guarantees the unsecured creditors -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: - of meeting their commitments.

I do not know how the minister could do that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: I am not sure how the minister could do that.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
Any further statements? Before proceeding to Oral Questions I would like to point out that seated in the gallery this afternoon and visiting with us today is a delegation from Airport Heights and we welcome them today to this sitting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: I will yield to the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Forests, Resources and Lands (Mr. Power). It refers to last years spray programme and the spill near Gander Lake. The minister made a statement on June 26th in which he said that there was an area near spray block 211, namely Sunday Lake, which was the area where the spray had been actually jettisoned. Now we have heard reports from the federal Department of the Environment that say that there is no trace - no trace of the spill could be located. I want to ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, if he was indeed, on a matter of such grave importance to the House, misrepresenting the facts when he not only said the area had been located but that the morning after cleanup was already was in progress?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

November 25, 1981

Tape No. 3723

ah-3

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to our spray programme of last year, which was generally opposed by members opposite and which they continue to find every possible excuse to prevent good forest management in this Province, with regard to our spray programme last year, and with the loss of spray on that given day because of an emergency on board the aircraft, let me assure this hon. House and the Province that everything that was needed to be done was done. Every contingency was taken care of. The plane pilot did exactly what he was suppose to do when in case of emergency

MR. POWER: he has to dump a load of chemical. He went to an area which was a cut over area, an area that was away from populated areas, an area that was away from any large bodies of water. Mr. Speaker, that day we had Canadian Environmental officials, we had provincial Environmental officials, we had all persons visit that given area. We could not find any significant traces of large amounts of chemical in any one area. There were many hundreds of samples taken, Mr. Speaker, from vegetation, soil samples and water samples in the area. There was no significant amount of chemicals found in any of the area, which goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that because we had a good plan in place, because we had taken account if emergencies were to happen, that no significant environmental damage was done by that chemical spill nor could it have been done, Mr. Speaker. And it just goes to show that last year when we undertook to have a very serious management decision in this Province to protect the livelihood of 20,000 people that we had in place along with that decision, Mr. Speaker, an environmental plan, a contingency plan, which took care of all of the possible things that might have happened. I can just say, Mr. Speaker, that we are lucky that we had such a successful spray programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister was and is, Did he misrepresent the facts when he said - in view of those two conflicting reports, did he misrepresent the facts when he said on the 26th that the spill had been located and that the clean up had already begun? Now, if he did not, Mr. Speaker, would he tell

MR. TULK: the House which report he considers to be wrong? Is it the federal Department of Environment or his own statement in this House on the 26th, the morning after?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, again, the members opposite continue to want to oppose the spray programme, which was a sound management decision on behalf of the people of this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. POWER: - a sound management decision which protected the livelihood of 20,000 people, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. POWER: - and it seems that members opposite are more concerned about the possibility of whether you found a certain number of spray samples, whether you found a certain number in the samples that we did, Mr. Speaker. I can guarantee this House and guarantee the people of this Province that there was no significant environmental damage done because of the emergency onboard the aircraft, that the environment was protected, that the people of Newfoundland were protected and, because of a sound management decision by this government, we have protected the livelihood of 20,000 people.

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, again, the question to the minister is which area? Is it the area that he said on June 26th, or is it true that the federal Department of Environment is right, that indeed the area has not been

MR. TULK: located and that no samples of matacil have been found anywhere? Now, would the minister answer the question instead of going off on a tangent about us being opposed to this, that and the other thing?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, the area was identified, the area was inspected by the federal Department of the Environment, by the provincial Department of Environment, there was no significant environmental damage caused by that spray spill, which was what we guaranteed the people of the Province on the morning after the spray spill. There was no significant damage, it was done according to the contingency plans that were in place in case there were emergencies and we have worked very

MR. C. POWER:

closely with the federal Department of the Environment, the provincial Department of the Environment and, in fact, the main problem we had with our spray programme last year was because the operators of the aircraft found it to be more difficult to work in Newfoundland because we had so many rules and regulations laid down.

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. B. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. THOMS:

I will yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) yields to the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

MR. B. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the question is to the minister, the question is is the report of the federal Department of the Environment wrong when they say that there is no evidence of a spill in the area that he says, or is his report of June 26th. right when he says that he did find that area in there, Sunday Lake? Now which report is right?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. C. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, again members of the Opposition are having significant difficulty in examining reports which are done by different agencies, whether provincially or federally. What we did provincially was to isolate the area of the spray spill exactly as given to us by the pilots and by persons who were in the area. What the federal Department of the Environment did was inspect the area for significant environmental damage. They did sampling, as did our provincial Department of the Environment. And the federal Department of

MR. C. POWER: Environment, as did our provincial department, found no significant damage.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. THOMS: You have a supplementary? Go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: - yields for the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) to ask a supplementary.

MR. G. FLIGHT: I thank the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms).

I would want to ask the minister, Mr. Speaker - it is obvious now that the area that the spill took place in was not identified the day the minister came in the House and indicated where it was. It is obvious it was not identified.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FLIGHT: Now I want to ask the minister this: when was the area in which the spill took place identified? Would the minister indicate to the House when his department was successful in identifying the area and started the clean-up of the spilled matalcil in the jettisoned area, not the drippings all the way from here to the airport or from here to Vancouver maybe, the actual dumping of the load itself? When did the minister's department identify the area where that dumping took place and started clean-up operations?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, the area was identified by the pilot immediately after the disaster or emergency took place.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

Nov. 25, 1981

Tape No. 3725 DW - 3

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

MR. L. THOMS: Thank you, very much, Mr.

Speaker. I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

Mr. Speaker, I understand that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. L. THOMS: If the minister sitting alongside the Minister of Fisheries could just keep quiet for a moment, I would like to direct a question to him.

I understand that now, Mr. Speaker, apart from the proposals already submitted to government by the Lake Group and Fishery Products, that another new proposal was submitted by the Lake Group as of yesterday. Now one of the problems with the delay of a decision is this: that if a decision with respect to the Lake Group proposals is not made soon, then there is going to be a dissipation of the work force in Grand Bank. They are going to be going to other parts of the Province obtaining jobs or other parts of the country obtaining jobs. My question to the minister is this: would the minister advise this House and the people of Grand Bank when a decision from government can be expected, and would the minister be able to give some details of the proposals, and whether or not the latest proposals submitted yesterday includes the re-opening of any or all of the fish plants on the South Coast of this Province?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to answer the first part of the question in connection with the proposal and proposals, I thank the hon. gentleman for asking the question because I want to clarify any confusion with regard to proposals and counter-proposals. As indicated some time ago by the Premier, that when the first proposal of merger was rejected with regard to the financing requested of government, there were two proposals then before us, one from the Lakes alone and one in a general way, a very general way from the company Fishery Products. As a result of yesterday, the Lake proposal is off the table now and a new proposal to replace that, so we still have two proposals: One in a general way from Fishery Products which is being pursued at the official level with the company, and this new proposal came in yesterday to both levels of government which is requesting assistance of both levels of government. That is all I can say at this time. I think any details of the proposal or request for assistance should come, and rightly so if they feel they want to do so, from the company concerned. The proposal now as I say, it takes off the earlier proposal from the Lake company, this new proposal involving both levels of government, it is being submitted, as I understand, to at least two ministers in Ottawa and, of course, my colleague, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), and myself have proposals here in Newfoundland.

And in relation to the second part of the question, maybe an important part, as it pertains to the problems in Grand Bank in the hon. gentleman's district, this government will pursue vigorously that proposal in giving it consideration. And it is the aim of my colleague and myself, the two ministers in fact, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to have that proposal to all of the total Cabinet by next Thursday's meeting. That is our objective. In other words, we will pursue it vigorously to get a decision made from this level of government and we are hoping that the federal level will take

MR. MORGAN: the same kind of attitude and consideration and deal with it from their level as well in that way.

MR. THOMS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. THOMS: To ease the uncertainty that is existing in the district of Grand Bank now where you had some 730 employed at that plant on August 27th, we now have 730 unemployed, that is directly; then, of course, there is the spin off effect of that. But to ease the uncertainty in the minds of the people of Grand Bank, could the minister indicate whether or not this latest proposal includes the re-opening of the Grand Bank plant, or any of the other plants for that matter? Does it include the re-opening of the Grand Bank plant? Would the minister give the people of Grand Bank some easing of the uncertainty in this regard?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as I earlier indicated, it would be just unfair to make available details of the agreement -or the proposal rather put forward to government. And it would be also unfair to build up any expectations or hopes in any way in the minds of the workers and people in Grand Bank. And all I can say is the proposal will be dealt with in a very careful way and in a very fast way by the government, along the lines where I indicated that a decision could be made as early as next Thursday, Thursday of next week. But in regards to the detail and what the proposal encompasses, that this cannot be disclosed at this time, and there are very obviously reasons why; it is before two levels of government.

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

MR. THOMS: I would say it is probably more unfair to keep the people of Grand Bank in the suspense in which they are being kept right now, Mr. Minister. But a week or ten days ago the Concerned Citizens Committee of Grand Bank requested a meeting with the minister and with the Premier of this Province and at that time the Premier indicated that he would be meeting with them almost immediately. Now to date no such meeting has been arranged with the Concerned Citizens Committee. Would the minister advise this House on what date and at what locale that meeting will take place, bearing in mind and remembering that the committee would like this meeting to take place prior to any decision being made on a proposal that will be made by Lakes, or Fishery Products, or who have you?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the request for a meeting, I am not sure of the manner it was requested, but I know last evening I talked to members of the Grand Bank Town Council, and in fact the Mayor of the town as well, and I have indicated to the Mayor, Mr. Snook, yesterday evening that we would be keeping him informed as the mayor and the council of Grand Bank. I earlier talked to the committee, the Concerned Citizens Committee of Grand Bank, which is one committee for the Grand Bank town itself, and also the committee for the whole peninsula, both committees. We informed them we would be willing to meet and discuss with them any time.

Now I do not know if that request is still standing with them, if they will want to meet with us, if it is, I can be in contact with the committee this afternoon and we can arrange a meeting with the senior officials of my department and myself to sit down with them. But again we would not be able to disclose any detail, but we would be willing to discuss the situation with them any time at all, if at all possible this week.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on this matter. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) thought that he could go on radio and television and say that this new thing had come in. Now I understand from the few details that he has given that he is not prepared to tell my colleagues whether or not he is going to let the people in Grand Bank know

November 25, 1981

Tape No. 3727

NM - 3

MR. STIRLING: if this proposal involves opening Grand Bank or not. It is cruel not to let the people know whether the proposal even

MR. STIRLING:

considers it, because if it does not consider it, then they have a statement to make.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker, is that presumably any money - and the question is if there is any money that is going to have to be put up by the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, does not the minister intend to be coming to this House of Assembly for authorization? And I would ask the minister if he would now tell the House of Assembly how much, in what range is the number of dollars that he is talking about which this House of Assembly is going to have to vote to support that latest proposal?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate the hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), when he speaks on the issue of Fisheries usually hurts one of his own colleagues, or confuses the situation to the point that it does hurt one of his own colleagues. The hon. gentleman surely must understand that the Lake Group of companies is a private sector company. The decision they make with regard to what plants they operate and what trawlers they sail etc., is strictly a corporate decision of a company not involved with the Newfoundland Government. These are not our decisions to make. They are our decisions to make if they request assistance from us, financial assistance in particular. I am saying now, and this is all I am going to say today, it is a fact that this new proposal is asking for assistance, is requesting assistance from both levels of government. This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that this company has found itself in some financial difficulty, this year, the year '81, the Lake Group of companies which owns a number

MR. MORGAN: of plants around the Province, including Grand Bank, that the company proposal now put forward, as I say, will be dealt with by both levels of government. It is the first time they have asked two levels of government, the first time they have involved the federal level of government, in seeking some answers and solutions to the problems in the fishing industry in Newfoundland.

Finally, the people involved in that company understand as well that we have not got all the answers and all the solutions to the problems in the fishing industry, and to the problem this one company has in particular.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we tried to pry some information out of the minister in connection with cutbacks in programmes in the Department of Education, what programmes had to be cut in order for the minister to cough up her share of the deficit in current account this year. Now, the minister stonewalled on that and told us there were going to be no cutbacks. Now, will the minister tell us what sources of new revenue the Department of Education is going to implement to try to recover the share, the Department of Education's share of the deficit in current account? What new revenues does the minister have planned?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for another opportunity to reiterate that this year in our Province we are spending a record amount of money on education, that is at every level.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, this present fiscal year there are no new sources of revenue, and the only sources of revenue are those indicated in the Budget Speech which was brought down last Spring. However, when we look forward to next year when we know that the demand for spending at the post-secondary level will be even greater, because the interest in our student population for advance education is greater than ever with the benefit of improved high school programmes, we are saddened with the realization that the federal government is reducing the level of funding specifically for post-secondary education. So that revenue source next year is going to be less, and less the year after.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education is either unaware of what is going on in the minister's department or is attempting to mislead this House.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if it is unparliamentary I withdraw it and save the hon. gentleman the trouble.

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. You are not allowed to accuse anyone of intentionally misleading this House which -

MR. STIRLING: Even if it is true.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
I would like to hear the point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: - within the context of what the hon. member said, he was obviously doing. So he has to withdraw.

MR. NEARY: I withdraw.

MR. MARSHALL: And apologize.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile withdraws.

MR. NEARY: I am not going to waste any time on the nasty -

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

MR. NEARY: - member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

Is the hon. Minister of Education aware that within recent days the Department of Education announced a one hundred per cent increase in the cost to students writing the Grade XI public examinations? The rate last year was one dollar per subject with a maximum of six dollars. Now it has been put up to two dollars with no maximum. Is the hon. minister aware of that new form of child abuse in this Province?

SOME HON MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that question really deserves an answer, but because I am extra considerate I will say that rates for public exams were set in the Budget last year to reflect a variety of circumstances including inflation, and in my judgement they are within reason.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how low can an administration sink when they start to get - when the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - tries to get -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member has a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: - the department's share of the deficit mismanagement out of the hides of the school children.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - by increasing the -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. member should ask his supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

Alright, Mr. Speaker, I would like

to ask the minister how much revenue, how much the minister expects to contribute to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for his mismanagement, for government mismanagement, how much revenue will they get as a result of this child abuse of increasing the dollar up to two dollars with no maximum? How many students will have to pay that and how much revenue does the minister expect to get out of the children of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for

LaPoile's (Mr. Neary) whole line of questioning is based on errors and falsehoods. What I think is important for all hon. members to appreciate is that in a time when the federal government is exercising fiscal restraint for whatever reason, which is imposing a difficult burden on our Province which has responsibility for delivering educational programmes, we, nevertheless, are going the extra mile and making an unprecedented financial commitment to education, recognizing that our young people are our most valuable resource.

The latest available Statistics Canada data indicates that our Province among the ten in Canada is spending more on education as a percentage of earned income of our residents than any other province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT:

I yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

He yields.

Supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I will ask the hon.

minister another question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: How much revenue does the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) expect to get from the children of this Province as a result of doubling the fee for writing their Grade XI Public Examination? Now give us a straight answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, we now have more children finishing high school than we ever did before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MS. VERGE: The drop-out rate is lessening, the retention rate is improving.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. VERGE: And we are pleased, Mr. Speaker, at the realization that more than ever students, certainly as a percentage of the secondary school population, are completing their Grade XI and writing public exams. And the whole matter of administration of public exams is very well handled and we look forward to good results in June.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: I yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: He yields.

Supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Education tell the House how many students will be writing the public examinations next year? Approximately how many students will be writing the Grade XI public examinations and how many of these students will be charged a 100 per cent increase, from one dollar to two dollars without any maximum, to help make up for government

November 25, 1981

Tape No. 3730

SD - 3

MR. NEARY: mismanagement and waste and
extravagance as announced by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)
last week?

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

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, it is expected that most students who are in Grade XI in this school year will be writing public exams in June. There are approximately 146,200 students in kindergarten through Grade XI in our Province in approximately 650 schools, and the administrative arrangements, including the fees for public exams for next June, was arranged and decided last year when the budget was compiled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member yield?

MR. LUSH: I yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Minister of Education confirm for the House now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. the Minister of Education confirm for the House that the fee for Grade XI students writing the public examination this year has gone from one dollar to two dollars - one dollar last year with a maximum of six dollars, up to two dollars this year with no maximum? Would the hon. gentleman confirm or deny that fact?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. gentleman!

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS VERGE: I am, as you would appreciate, not an hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I would not be able to say that it is unparliamentary, though.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the fees for public exams for June and July of 1982 were decided in the Winter and Spring of 1981 in consultation with school boards and it is the judgement of the officials and myself as Minister of Education that those fees are reasonable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have to come back again. Would the hon. the minister confirm or deny whether or not there has been a 100 per cent increase in fees to school children in this Province? - I do not think an administration could stoop any lower than to try to get some of their deficit from the school children of this Province - confirm or deny that the fee has gone from one dollar, last year one dollar, maximum of six dollars per student, up to two dollars, which is 100 per cent increase with no maximum? Would the hon. the minister confirm or deny that?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would have to rule the question out of order. Beauchesne, paragraph 357, subsection 171 (d) says, "A question must not repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused." Therefore, it is the same question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it a point of order?

MR. NEARY: Well, on Your Honour's ruling.

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

MR. NEARY: Is Your Honour saying that the minister has refused to answer the question? I have asked the question three times in three different ways and I have not gotten the answer, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is out of order to ask the Speaker a question with respect to the proceedings of the House. The hon. member, as usual, is abusing the privileges of this House. Your Honour made a ruling and he is the same as any other member. When Your Honour makes a ruling he accepts it without question.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of order, there is no point of order. Standing Orders 31 (f) is quite clear, "The Speaker's rulings related to oral questions are not debatable or subject to appeal".

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Would the hon. minister indicate to the House whether or not the increase is 100 per cent, 150 per cent or 200 per cent? Because, Mr. Speaker, there is no maximum. So a student doing seven subjects -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order, the hon.

President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour, has already made a ruling on that point. The hon. member is again -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: - repeating in substance a question he already asked. He is flagrantly violating Your Honour's ruling, trying to avoid Your Honour's ruling, and the obvious remedy for the hon. member is to be asked to take his seat and recognize another member. And if he will not do that there is another obvious remedy as well.

MP. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we now see this government refusing to give answers, and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) intentionally rising on a point of order that he knows is no point of order, knows that the Speaker has complete control and is just wasting the Question Period, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I would agree that there is a legitimate point of order. I have already read the appropriate reference and I think it is clear enough for anybody to understand. And I repeat it once more, if it means I have to, in order to get members to understand it. The traditional restrictions on questions are those listed in Beauchesne's Fourth Edition at citations seventeen and seven which are as follows: Paragraph 357, 7 (d); "In putting a question a member must confine himself to narrow limits and the purpose of the question is to obtain information, not to supply it in the House. A question, oral or written, must not repeat in substance a question already answered or to which an answer has been refused". I think it is clear the hon. member is repeating in substance the same question and has already given indication that he has asked the question three or four times. So I think that is fairly clear. So that is the ruling.

MR. S. NEARY: It is a completely different question, Mr. Speaker. I did not get a chance -

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member has a completely different question then - he may ask it.

MR. S. NEARY: I did not get a chance to ask my question because 'Mr. Nasty' from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) rose to his feet as usual to try to protect the -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member may save a lot of time if he asked his question because he about twenty-five seconds now to get it out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Okay, then. I will ask the minister if the minister could indicate in what part of the budget this announced increase to the children of this Province to pay this additional fee, to pay 100 per cent or 150 per cent in fees, what part of the budget? Could the hon. minister tell us where we can find that in the budget?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had as his colleague did, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), attended the Estimates committee hearings on the Department of Education -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please! Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions

has expired.

While I am standing, I would like to recognize, seated in the gallery today, representatives from two native groups from around the Province representing the Labrador Inuit Association of Labrador, and representatives of the Indian Federation of Newfoundland. On behalf of all hon. members we welcome you here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to present a petition on behalf of approximately 709 residents of Airport Heights, or 83.4 per cent of the voters who live in the Airport Heights area.

There are about 850 voters in the vicinity of Airport Heights, Mr. Speaker, and out of that 850 only twelve voted in the most recent St. John's City election. Now, give or take two or three people who might have signed the petition after it was put in my hands, Mr. Speaker, there were 709 people signed the petition, or 83.4 per cent.

The people who signed this petition are deadly opposed, are against, Mr. Speaker, becoming -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

- a part of the City of St. John's, and they beseech the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) and this House to reverse or quash a decision that was made by Cabinet, in secret, on the eighth floor of Confederation Building, to reverse this decision.

MR. NEARY: But let me first of all, in presenting the petition, Mr. Speaker, point out that the two MHAs for the Airport Heights area were asked to present this petition in this Hon. House. The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) did have the courtesy to reply to the Committee, but the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) showed callous disregard for the efforts of the Committee and the wishes of the people in his district by his lack of response.

You see, Mr. Speaker, Portugal Cove Road divides the two districts, St. John's East Extern and Mount Scio.

On September 4, 1981, the MHA for St. John's East called Carl Sterrett on VOCM's Open Line to say that the Committee never involved him in the problems of Airport Heights. It is totally inconceivable, Mr. Speaker, that the member for St. John's East could utter such a statement when he did not even bother to reply to phone calls.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is making references to myself which are entirely and absolutely incorrect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: East Extern?

MR. MARSHALL: You said East.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a point of order, The hon. member has taken the opportunity to clarify statements that had been attributed to him.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The member for St. John's East Extern did not have the

MR. NEARY: decency or the courtesy to reply to phone calls or to letters from the committee. Now, Mr. Speaker, anybody who has followed the St. John's boundary controversy over the last several years realizes that partisan politics was the only consideration taken into account when the areas on the perimeter of St. John's were being carved up. The recommendations of the Powell Commission were completely ignored and decisions that make no sense to anyone, except the Premier and his colleagues in Cabinet, were made. For instance, Mr. Speaker, they agreed to leave out Mount Pearl and the other areas, and Wedgewood Park, and put in a corridor of land that goes up bounded on one side by St. John's Airport and bounded on the other side by the Kenmount Road and dead-ends practically at Windsor Lake. There is no room for development, there is no pay tax base in the area, Mr. Speaker, and therefore the people will get no services. Mr. Speaker, residents of Airport Heights have been the victims of unfair and unjust treatment by this government. They have been under the iron heel of this Premier and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook) now long enough. And if democracy, Mr. Speaker, means anything in this Province, then the Premier should have the courage to reverse a decision that he made sometime ago to include Airport Heights in the City of St. John's. And if the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook) thinks for one moment that these people in the gallery and their neighbours are going to give up their struggle, are going to stop their fight for what they consider to be just and knuckle under the iron heel of this government, Mr. Speaker, then they are not in touch with reality or they do not understand what a couple of thousand Newfoundlanders are capable of achieving when they unite for a common purpose.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the prayer of this petition. I regret that the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) did not see fit to bring the petition into this House on behalf of his constituents. I support the prayer of the petition and I ask that it be placed on the table of the House, Mr. Speaker, and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further petitions? The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: I will yield to the minister if she is going to comment on the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, the decision on the St. John's urban regional boundaries was made by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and I so accept the petition and bring it to the attention of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition because it brings out a couple of points.

MR. MORGAN: Surprise! Surprise!

MR. MOORES: There is a comment we need.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, we never need to worry about getting television in this House of Assembly, If we could only get all the residents of the Province to be sitting in the galleries the way that the people are today to see the way that certain ministers in the government conduct the people's business --

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: - they would understand the lack of respect that this government has for people.

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of Fisheries -

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

I have to draw to the attention of visitors in the gallery that they are not permitted to participate in the activities of the House. I bring that to their attention.

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. One of the rules that we follow in this House of Assembly is we are not allowed to do some of the things that you are tempted to do or that your frustrations would cause you to do, and one of the other things is that we cannot say some things about our colleagues in the House that you can say outside. So, Mr. Speaker, in the decorum of the House I am restrained about some of the things that I can say about the attitude of this government, which is one of complete lack of respect for people's rights, complete lack of respect and a government that manipulates. Otherwise how could you have the situation in which the people of East Meadows can have their petition heard, the people in Newtown can, the people in Wedgewood Park can, and then the people in Airport Heights cannot?

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have had some meetings over the years with the people of Airport Heights and they have had a consistent community feeling -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. STIRLING: - a feeling that they lived where they decided to live because they want to be a community, and they do not want to be part of a large metropolitan area that they cannot influence. And they are prepared to pay their share of taxes, Mr. Speaker, but they are not prepared to go into a situation in which they are being treated like some kind of subordinate. One of the things that this government has said is that they cannot have the normal water and sewer services for a five to ten year period. Now if this government will stand up now and make a commitment to the people of Airport Heights, that they will be entitled to the same water and sewer services as the people in the city, and they will have to pay their fair share of taxes as the people do in the city, then I am sure that you would then have people who would take a second look at it. What they are very concerned about is the dictatorial attitude of this government, an attitude that does not care about people, an attitude of a government that is as two-faced as one day standing in here saying, "We cannot trust the native people. We cannot trust them to bargain. We cannot give them their rights under the Constitution."

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please! That is a different matter. The hon. member should confine his remarks to the prayer of the petition.

MR. STIRLING: In dealing with the attitude, Mr. Speaker, that caused the petition to be taken up in the first place is that they would like to get out from under the dictatorial decisions made by this government, I was just using to illustrate that they can be two-faced, they can change their positions, they can do an about-face. If they

MR. STIRLING:

keep up enough pressure they will be able to accomplish what the women of this Province did when they forced this government to give them back their rights, because they had the muscle to do it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING:

And they are not the only ones around. This municipality—because they are a municipality, they are a community—have the right to have their members in this House of Assembly present their views, present their petitions whether they agree with them or not. People have the right to be heard in this Province. And on this side, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House it does not make any difference whether we agree with them, whether we check out, as a member did, check to find out what the political persuasion was as a people and if they were good Conservatives, he would have supported it, but because somebody was suspicious of somebody's politics, he would not bring in the petition. Well, as long as we are in this House of Assembly, for the short time that we are on this side and then for as long as we are on that side, we will always protect the rights of people and make sure that they have a right to be heard regardless of whether you agree with them or not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yesterday there was an agreement I think between both sides of the House and, as I understand it, afterwards between the two House Leaders; the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hodder) came over to talk to us yesterday, and there was an agreement that we would

PREMIER PECKFORD: delay the vote on the motion that was put yesterday by me as it related to Motion 2 on the Order Paper, that we would do a vote on it today and then move on to the next order of business on the Order Paper. So I just point that out to hon. members and I take it that we are now ready to vote on the motion dealing with section 34 of the new accord and the inclusion of sections 34 (1) and 34 (2) in the accord now before the House of Commons. So with the agreement that we had yesterday, I would ask all hon. members to support this resolution.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, As a representative of roughly 80 per cent of the native population in this Province, unless the Premier of this Province takes out the word 'existing'; I will not give unanimous consent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: I will not give unanimous consent

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The procedure in this particular matter is not to allow for debate. The procedure is that there has -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

If hon. members will allow me to continue, I may be able to tell them what I am trying to say.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The procedure is that the Chair simply asks, at this particular point in time whether or not there is unanimous agreement to proceed with the request as put forth by the hon. the Premier which is to put Motion number 2 now without debate. So I simply ask, is there unanimous agreement to proceed?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: No? I hear a no. There is no unanimous consent.

MR. FLIGHT: Clarify it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no clarification or anything else. We now proceed therefore -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, let it be noted for the record that there was an agreement yesterday with the Opposition and with the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hodder).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. STIRLING: The Premier just spoke on it.

MR. SPEAKER: I just said it was not a point of order.

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

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, what my colleague, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has said is that he is prepared to grant leave if we are prepared to discuss the resolution which he brought into this House two days ago, and which we could not get unanimous consent for. And if you are serious about it, then we will bring in that resolution and have the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition already should understand that that is not a point of order because the matter has now been dealt with. The procedure, and the responsibility of the Speaker is when a request is made for unanimous consent to put a motion that would not normally be allowed, such as today on Private Members' Day, is that the Speaker simply rises and asks if there is unanimous consent to proceed. If there is not unanimous consent, well then we move on to the next order of business. I made the request, I asked if there was unanimous consent. I heard a no, so I did not obviously have to proceed. So I now proceed to the next order of business which normally would be called on Private Members' Day, Wednesday, which is the following motion.

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

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

MR. STIRLING: The reason that I raised the point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the Speaker did allow the Premier to make a comment after we -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

For the purpose of clarification only, and that is the way I will consider

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

the comments by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), I did not allow the Premier to say anything. I did not recognize the Premier. The Premier simply stood and made a comment and I stood up and ruled it out of order, There was not point of order.

MR. NEARY:

A point of information, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of information?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, perhaps.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

When Your Honour called the

resolution that was put on the Order Paper today as a result of the resolution being introduced into the House yesterday, this side agreed that Your Honour can call the resolution. We have agreed Your Honour can call it and we will debate it. It is the other side who are saying, no. So if there is any confusion there, Mr. Speaker -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of information.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of information, the

hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr.

Neary) is allowed to stand up on a point of information, so are members on this side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now there was an agreement yesterday

to put this to a vote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I will repeat myself one final time.

I have made the request. Is there unanimous consent to deal with this motion now today - Motion 2?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

I hear there is no.

MR. WARREN: To debate it, yes.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): No. My understanding is that the request -

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member should take his seat when the Speaker is standing.

My understanding is that the request is to put Motion No. 2 today without debate. That is the request. I asked if there was unanimous consent, there is not unanimous consent. That should be clear for anybody to understand. So we now move to Motion No. 3, It being Wednesday, Private Members' Day and I therefore call Motion No. 3 moved by the hon. the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle).

MR. WARREN: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member cannot rise when the Speaker is standing. You can raise a point of privilege when I am finished.

I will read the Motion then the hon. member may raise his point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Motion No. 3, moved by the hon. member for Harbour Main - Bell Island:

WHEREAS our present sources of electricity will not be sufficient to meet our power demands by 1984-85;

AND WHEREAS a Province with such great hydro potential ought not to be dependent on foreign oil supplies for any of its electricity needs;

AND WHEREAS this Province has been frustrated in its efforts to develop its vast hydro resources for the economic and social benefits of its people;

AND WHEREAS development of Gull Island power can give new economic life to the depressed Happy Valley - Goose Bay area;

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

AND WHEREAS it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to ensure Newfoundland's rights to transmit its hydro power to neighbouring provinces in the same way other provinces are permitted to transmit their oil and gas;

AND WHEREAS alternative routes for the transmission and sale of our surplus power will prove more expensive;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the Government of Canada to uphold this Province's right to fair and equal treatment in the transmission of its energy resources.

The hon. member for Harbour Main-Bell Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains on a point of privilege.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, As a member in this hon. House, I would like to rise on a point of privilege that as a representative of 80 per cent of the aboriginal people in this Province, I do have a right in this House to get up and say that I do object against this move.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. members are not helping the situation. Until we hear the member say what he has to say, I will then determine whether there is a point of privilege.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: And, Mr. Speaker, yesterday we gave consent to debate the motion yesterday and we would likewise give consent today to debate the motion.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. WARREN: However, Mr. Speaker, we will not give consent if the Premier is not willing to take out the word 'existing'. And all he is doing in that, Mr. Speaker, is taking away the rights of the native people.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of privilege, the hon.

the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yesterday here in this House - to that point of privilege to which the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was allowed to have his say - yesterday it was agreed by everybody, and as the Speaker has articulated, that this motion would be put today without debate so that all the legislators -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No! No!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- let me finish, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- so that all the legislators in this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- could agree to the native rights being included in the Constitution. And, Mr. Speaker, just by way of some clarification for the member for Torngat Mountains, his House Leader (Mr. Hodder) came over to meet with the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) on the government side yesterday to insist that there be no debate today and we agreed - him representing all the Opposition members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I believe I have heard enough to determine that I can make a ruling on what I have heard right now. Obviously all members, from previous practices, will be clearly aware that this does not constitute a point of privilege but the

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has taken the opportunity to make a statement of his position, and that is not the purpose of a point of privilege. Therefore, I would have to rule, as is the Speaker's responsibility, there is no prima facie case.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did you allow the Premier to speak on it?

MR. SPEAKER: Because the hon. member spoke on it. I allowed one on each side.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege?

MR. STIRLING: Yes, a separate point of privilege brought up by the Premier making comments and accusations about a member of the House who is not here to defend himself. And since we have to give notice of a point of privilege, I give notice now that my colleague will be bringing up this matter when he does return. because what the Premier said is not true.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
All that is necessary is a notice
and that is what I have accepted.

The hon. the member for Harbour Main
- Bell Island, Motion Number Three.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The motion that we have on the floor today, Mr. Speaker, is in my opinion, and I would imagine in the opinion of all members on this side of the House, a very important motion. I would like to read it to the House, Mr. Speaker, to make it absolutely clear

MR. DOYLE: as to what we are dealing with.

"WHEREAS our present sources of electricity will not be sufficient to meet our power demands by 1984 - 1985;
AND WHEREAS a Province with such great hydro potential ought not to be dependent on foreign oil supplies for any of its electricity needs;
AND WHEREAS this Province has been frustrated in its efforts to develop its vast hydro resources for the economic and social benefits of its people;
AND WHEREAS development of Gull Island Power can give new economic life to the depressed Happy Valley - Goose Bay area;
AND WHEREAS it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to ensure Newfoundland's rights to transmit its hydro power through neighbouring provinces in the same way other provinces are permitted to transmit their oil and gas;
AND WHEREAS alternative routes for the transmission and sale of our surplus power will prove to be more expensive;
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the Government of Canada to uphold this Province's right to fair and equal treatment in the transmission of its energy resources."

This is a very, very important motion, Mr. Speaker. And, as the hon. the member for St. John's West, Mr. Crosbie, in the federal House recently stated in speaking to a motion, a similar motion that was put in the House of Commons just recently, we here in the Province of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, are rapidly being faced with what is becoming a national tragedy.

Now, as everyone is aware, Mr. Speaker, the Upper Churchill now produces 5,600 megawatts of electricity. Now this translates into approximately 35 billion kilowatt hours per year, which, as everybody knows, is purchased by Quebec Hydro.

MR. DOYLE: This power is currently sold to the Province of Quebec for three-tenths of one per cent-or one cent, I should say, per kilowatt hour.

Now, if you talk in terms of oil - and I think it is interesting to talk in terms of oil in this day and age, Mr. Speaker - that would translate into approximately \$1.80 a barrel for oil. When that contract was entered into some time ago, it was and it still remains a sixty-five year deal and it gets progressively better -

MR. MORGAN: Gets progressively worse.

MR. DOYLE: - no, gets progressively better for the Province of Quebec.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, yes, right.

MR. DOYLE: So after forty years that power will sell for 2 mils per kilowatt hour. And it is very interesting again to note that that will translate into \$1.50 a barrel for oil by the year 2016. By the year 2016, Mr. Speaker, Quebec will be paying the equivalent of \$1.50 a barrel for oil to the Province of Newfoundland. In other words, Quebec will be buying hydro-electric energy at a price of 2 mils per kilowatt hour.

MR. DOYLE:

In spite of that tremendous deal that they have, in spite of the fact that Quebec continues to make millions and literally billions of dollars off the backs of our Newfoundland people, we still remain frustrated, Mr. Speaker, in our efforts to develop the vast hydro resources that we do have, because Quebec wants a similar deal to the one that has already been drafted on the Upper Churchill.

Now, it might be interesting to speak about the profit for a moment or two, Mr. Speaker. The profit each year to Quebec for 35 billion kilowatt hours of electricity is \$525 million per year - \$525 million.

Now, you might say, Mr. Speaker, that that is a very good basis, I suppose, on which to draft a new deal on the Lower Churchill. In view of the fact that Quebec has gotten such a fantastic deal, has gotten such a great deal out of the Upper Churchill, you might say that might be a very good basis upon which to draft an agreement, now, on the Lower Churchill, an agreement that would probably reflect a little bit better the situation as it exists today with respect to oil and hydro electric power.

Now, when you consider that our present source of electricity will be depleted, I suppose, sometime in the '80's, then you have to consider Quebec's position on this matter to be a national tragedy in terms of where we sit here in Newfoundland.

We are, Mr. Speaker, presently using very, very expensive imported oil in this Province to produce electricity, and that from day to day makes water power even more attractive in our Province. If we could develop the Lower Churchill we would be developing approximately 1700 megawatts of power for the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. DOYLE: Unfortunately, and this is quite unfortunate, we are not a heavily industrialized Province and as a result we cannot use 1700 megawatts of power, Mr. Speaker. So, therefore, we have to go to different markets outside of Newfoundland, outside of Canada, to the United States, possibly, to sell this surplus power. But, but, this is where the Province of Quebec comes in, Mr. Speaker, and they have said: 'You are not going to sell that power unless, first of all, you sell it, again, to the Province of Quebec.' In other words, we are not allowed to transmit our electricity over territory within Canada unless it is sold first to the Province of Quebec.

So in the middle of all this, Mr. Speaker, we have turned our attention to the federal government. We have turned our attention to the federal government and we asked the federal government, if at all possible, to try and afford Newfoundland fair and equal treatment in the transmission of our energy. But, again, the federal government has indicated that this is something that should be solved by the Province of Newfoundland and by the Province of Quebec sitting down together and making a decision between themselves.

Now, that seems to be a position, Mr. Speaker, taken out of sheer politics, taken out of sheer politics. After all, Mr. Speaker, the federal government has exercised its power to allow oil and gas to come from Manitoba, to come from Saskatchewan, to come from Alberta, to come from Ontario into Quebec. No province, no province, Mr. Speaker, can stop them from doing that, that is a constitutional right. No province can stop them from doing it. However, for some strange reason, some strange reason, I guess known only to the federal government, they have not taken a similar stand

MR. DOYLE: on transmission of hydro electric power across other territories so Newfoundland is left to wait again. Newfoundland is left to wait for the courts of Newfoundland, and the Supreme Court of Canada, to

MR. DOYLE:

make our decisions for us and to tell Quebec that what they are doing is morally and is legally wrong in every single way. And that wait, Mr. Speaker, that wait continues to be very, very expensive for the Province of Newfoundland. Since all these negotiations have taken place, a number of things have happened over the years, but I think the most significant thing that we should remember is that to develop the Lower Churchill power now would cost the government of Newfoundland \$4.3 billion. On top of all that, a third oil-fired unit had to be built at Holyrood and I think that was done at a cost of approximately \$75 million. And what did we get out of it? One hundred and fifty megawatts of power; \$75 million for 150 megawatts of power. It had to be produced by oil and it had to be produced by very expensive oil. Then there is the Hinds Lake project which cost \$80 million to the government of Newfoundland, and we produced out of that 75 megawatts of power; \$80 million to produce 75 megawatts of power. And that translates into 25 mils per kilowatt-hour. Next comes the Upper Salmon and that cost us \$155 million. And what did we get out of that? We got 84 megawatts of power. One hundred and fifty five million dollars for 84 megawatts of power. Now the cost of all this to our Crown corporation is 40 mils per kilowatt-hour and that, Mr. Speaker, is twenty times what Quebec is paying for power from the Province of Newfoundland, twenty times what they are paying for Churchill Falls power. Cat Arm, Mr. Speaker - \$300 million for Cat Arm, for 127 megawatts of power, 60 mils a kilowatt-hour, 60 mils per kilowatt-hour and that is twenty times what the province of Quebec is paying the Province of Newfoundland for Upper Churchill power. Now the total cost of all these developments to date, Mr. Speaker, is approximately \$610 million, \$610 million of an unnecessary expenditure, I suppose.

MR. BENNETT: Does the hon. gentleman have figures on (inaudible) Lake?

MR. DOYLE: On what?

MR. BENNETT: (Inaudible).

MR. DOYLE: Six hundred and ten million dollars, Mr. Speaker, of an unnecessary expenditure if we had been able to go ahead with the Gull Island power project. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the people in Newfoundland are again being held up to ransom by a greedy and unfair province, I suppose, the greedy and unfair province of Quebec. And those are the cold, hard facts, Mr. Speaker, and I know that all hon. members - it will be unanimous, I believe - I know all hon. members are going to support me on this resolution because it has for its basis at least the fact that Newfoundland is not getting fair treatment from Quebec. It has as its basis fair and equal and equitable treatment for the province of Newfoundland, so I do not imagine you have any other choice but to support this motion.

As a matter of fact it is interesting also to point out in speaking about the inequities in this power contract that last week Mr. Mulroney pointed out in the province of Quebec to Quebecers the one-sidedness of this deal and he called upon Quebec then to more or less reopen negotiations to have the power contract renegotiated to more adequately reflect the situation as it is today in the Province of Newfoundland. But I do not think we need to hold our breath, Mr. Speaker, waiting for the province of Quebec to come to our aid in that way. It is a very sad state of affairs, Your Honour, when you consider that the renewable resources which offer the highest potential for the Province of Newfoundland

November 25, 1981

Tape No. 3740

ah-3

MR. DOYLE: and which can overcome the great disparities between Newfoundland and the rest of Canada, we are just not allowed to take advantage of it. I think it was all said, Mr. Speaker, in this little booklet that was a submission to the Senate Committee on National Finance by the hon. Dr. John F. Collins.

MR. DOYLE:

I would like to read just a wee paragraph from that. It pretty well sums up the situation that we are in with respect to Gull Island power.

"The Economic Council of Canada," on page sixteen, "The Economic Council of Canada in its recently released report on the Newfoundland economy measures the value of Churchill Falls power transferred to Quebec at approximately \$800 million, as determined by Hydro Quebec's average selling price for electricity of 23 mils in 1980. Now this sum is \$700 million more than is actually received and implies the transfer of economic rent from Newfoundland to Quebec of approximately \$1200 per Newfoundlander, \$1200 per Newfoundlander.

"A more equitable allocation of the benefits of this vast resource to this Province could obviously do much toward relieving the economic and fiscal disparities which exist between this Province and the rest of Canada.

"There are two other hydro electric sites on the Lower Churchill river which are under-developed, one is the Gull Island 1700 megawatts, the other at Muskrat Falls 600 megawatts. The Lower Churchill Development Corporation, a joint federal/provincial organization, has thoroughly investigated both projects and concluded that Gull Island can be produced at significantly lower unit cost than power from Muskrat Falls, but that there must be a market for surplus Gull power. Newfoundland has a customer for Gull power but feasibility of export sales depends upon an export route and access to the Quebec system. The Province has therefore proposed that the National Energy Board Act be amended to enable the board to regulate inter-provincial and international transmission of electric power. The Province firmly believes that federal constitutional jurisdiction exists

MR. DOYLE: and is seeking a firm commitment from the federal government to take expeditious legislative action."

So, Mr. Speaker, what I have been trying to say in the last ten or fifteen minutes has been said by Dr. Collins in this submission to the Senate of Canada in approximately two paragraphs.

The development at Gull Island, Mr. Speaker, is clearly in the national interest and it should be started as soon as possible. I guess it would be wishful thinking, I suppose, to venture a thought on what such a development could do for the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area. Gull Island energy would replace 19 million barrels of imported oil annually, 19 million barrels of imported oil. And it would create an awful lot of employment for this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would call upon all hon. members to support this resolution because, as I said before, it has for its basis fair and equal and equitable treatment for the Province of Newfoundland. Now there have been many, many grandiose schemes over the last few years to try and retrieve some of this revenue that Newfoundland is losing annually. There have been many, many grandiose schemes by many, many people to try and retrieve some of that revenue, but I think the one of more recent date is last November when the Minister of National Revenue, Mr. Rompkey, and the Leader of the Opposition made a joint press release stating that Newfoundland had the power to impose a tax on power coming from Newfoundland into Quebec.

AN HON. MEMBER: I was going to use that. You do not use that.

MR. DOYLE: Oh! Well anyway, I cannot resist it. Newfoundland had the power to impose the tax upon CFLCo. who would in turn impose it on Quebec to retrieve some of this lost revenue.

But of course we see in the Constitution itself that that approach cannot be used. On the section Taxation of Resources, it says, "In each Province the Legislature may make laws in relation to the raising of money by any mode or system of taxation in respect of sites and facilities in the Province for the generation of electrical energy and the production therefrom, whether or not such production is exported in whole or in part from the Province. But such laws may not authorize or provide for taxation that differentiates between production exported to another part of Canada, and production not exported from the Province." In other words, any tax that is levied upon Churchill Falls power on the Province of Quebec would in turn have to be levied on our own consumers here in this Province. So that effectively puts that one to bed.

On top of all that, the contract is so written that government is not permitted any way to apply any royalties or taxes or levies on that contract. So this shows,

MR. N. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Rompkey really did not know what he was talking about there. And the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) did not know either and is similarly ignorant in this regard.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would call upon all members of the Legislature to support this resolution because, as I said before, it has for its basis fair and equitable treatment for the Province of Newfoundland with respect to Gull Island power.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have just heard twenty minutes of criticism of the Government of Quebec. The member's debate was not relevant to the resolution as he has presented it, It is very easy, Mr. Speaker, for us to support any criticism of Quebec but the member, in standing up for this past twenty minutes, spoke to a resolution calling on the federal government's assistance to develop our power and spent twenty minutes criticizing the Province of Quebec.

Now, I would ask the member: would he have criticized the Premier of Quebec a year ago when his leader, the Premier of Newfoundland, was in Ottawa telling the people of Canada, 'That I would prefer Levesque's version of Canada than that of Trudeau's?'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Was that a way to get the co-operation of Quebec in developing Labrador power, Mr. Speaker? The Premier should have been listening to the speech. The member has not blamed Ottawa for Newfound-

MR. G. FLIGHT: land's inability to develop the Lower Churchill, the member, Mr. Speaker, has blamed Quebec, right where the blame should lie.

Now, Mr. Speaker, things have a way of turning around. A year ago the Premier of Newfoundland was telling the people of all Canada that notwithstanding the kind of treatment that Newfoundland has received from Levesque or the Government of Quebec with regards to our hydro resources, notwithstanding that he prefers -

MR. MOORES: Levesque's.

MR. G. FLIGHT: - Levesque's version of Canada as opposed to the Prime Minister's.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the possibility of co-operation from the Premier of Quebec. Who was the only premier, Mr. Speaker, who refused to signed the accord? Who walked out, Mr. Speaker? Who accused the Premier of Newfoundland of putting a knife in his back, Mr. Speaker? Was that Mr. Levesque?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FLIGHT: Would the Premier of Newfoundland expect now, Mr. Speaker, to have Mr. Levesque say, 'Yes, now we will re-negotiate the Upper Churchill contract.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, those remarks had to be said. We know what has happened! We know what this Province's and this administration's ability to negotiate is. We know the position the Premier took on the offshore, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. FLIGHT: We know, Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. G. FLIGHT: We know, Mr. Speaker, that for two years he hoodwinked the people of this Province. We know, Mr. Speaker, for two years that he told the people of this Province and the federal government and Quebec and whoever else wanted to listen, that there would be no solution to the offshore until we had the ownership. The ownership of that offshore had to be vested in Newfoundland. That was the condition, no other condition, no negotiated settlement, no joint agreements, nothing! That is the only way it can be. 'It can be no other way, Ladies and Gentlemen of Newfoundland!' It can be no other way!

We went through the spectacle, Mr. Speaker, in this House of Assembly of watching an hon. member stand up in his place and say, 'I will cross the House, Mr. Speaker, on the principle that I will not accept any solution to our offshore that does not include ownership. Nothing less than ownership!' And the man in an hour of great principal walked across. I wonder how he feels now, Mr. Speaker, or how do the rest of the members feel when the Premier stands up and says, 'We are now going to Ottawa to negotiate an agreement based on the offer and the theory made by Mr. Trudeau a year ago'?

After two years of watching this Province go down the drain, after two years of bigotted political rhetoric designed for nothing else only to -

MR. MOORES: Deceive the people.

MR. G. FLIGHT: - deceive the people to get what political mileage might have been it, we have watched the Premier saying, 'Now we will negotiate! Now we will negotiate

MR. FLIGHT: revenue sharing, joint management. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us make that relative, let us make the Premier's position on the offshore relative to the Premier's position on Churchill Falls power. As a member, you know, Mr. Speaker, as a member of government, he has access to Newfoundland Hydro. He can call - I mean, I call Newfoundland Hydro if I want information. The member can certainly call Newfoundland Hydro. He does not know what he is talking about. Cat Arm, Mr. Speaker - he says that we were running out of power in 1984. Cat Arm will take us to 1988. That is four years, Mr. Speaker, four years before Newfoundland runs out of power based on local development.

MR. MORGAN: Cat Arm is not enough.

MR. FLIGHT: Cat Arm will take us to 1988.
Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has proven so often he knows nothing about fisheries, he should not get into an energy debate because he will prove he knows a lot less, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) over your head.

MR. LUSH: At least he has a head.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

I think there is a little unnecessary noise. It is very difficult for everybody to hear.

MR. MOORES: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: The minister is unnecessary.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, it is a documented fact. Newfoundland Hydro will confirm it, the former Minister of Mines and Energy, if he were still the Minister of Mines and Energy, would confirm it, the real Minister of Mines and Energy would confirm it, that hydro developments, Upper Salmon and Cat Arm will take us to 1988.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution says 1984. Could the member not have called Newfoundland Hydro? A four year mistake does not bother him because a lot of the other figures that he quoted, Mr. Speaker, are just as far off as the four years.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is 1988

we are talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) or what?

MR. LUSH: No, that is only you.

MR. FLIGHT: Let me ask the member what he wants from Ottawa, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, you are his (inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: He ignores deliberately -

MR. PATTERSON: (Inaudible) electricity across Quebec.

MR. FLIGHT: He deliberately ignores, Mr.

Speaker, the fact that the Prime Minister of this country -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: He deliberately ignores the fact Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister of Canada, about six or seven months ago, indicated that he would bring legislation before the House of Commons and change the regulations of the

MR. FLIGHT: National Energy Board that would declare a designated corridor through Quebec.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that commitment is made in the same sense that the Prime Minister made a commitment that he would treat our offshore resource the same as on land. Now, the commitment will be taken up one of these days.

But, you know, Mr. Speaker, the last thing that that Premier, that Minister of Mines and Energy or the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, who knows anything about this wants, is legislation declaring a designated corridor through Quebec. It is the biggest bluff ever perpetrated on the people of Newfoundland because the minister knows, the Premier knows and anyone who knows anything about electricity knows that there will never be a designated corridor through Quebec. The last thing the Government of Newfoundland wants, Mr. Speaker, the last thing they want is a designated corridor.

What they are trying to do and this is where their ability to negotiate comes into question, Mr. Speaker - what they are hoping - why do you not come out and tell the people the truth? What they are hoping, that by having that legislation on the books this will force Quebec's hand and possibly negotiate our using the present Quebec hydro lines to wheel the power out. Now that is where it is, Mr. Speaker, that is where it is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite are trying to indicate somehow or other that the federal government should force Quebec to use the Quebec hydro lines to wheel our power out,

MR. FLIGHT: when, Mr. Speaker, everyone in Newfoundland who knows anything about mines and energy knows that of the 2,300 megawatts that are available to us in Lower Churchill, 800 are required, 800 megawatts are required to justify a transmission line into this Province. So what do we have? We have 1,500 megawatts of surplus power to export. Now, would the hon. member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) agree that economically a power line, a designated corridor to wheel 1,500 megawatts of power out of Quebec, would never be justified by that sale? Never, ever be justified?

And, Mr. Speaker, remember the patriotic bunch on the other side, you see, what they are telling the people, also, is there will be no more long-term contracts, no more long-term contracts. So what they are telling us is that PASNY in New York state or somebody is going to buy - we will only have 1,500 megawatts from the Lower Churchill to ship out.

MR. FLIGHT: What they are telling us is that they would expect, after we have built a designated corridor, a consumer, the State of New York, to buy 1500 megawatts and give us recall rights, that the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) could go out and identify an aluminum smelter for Goose Bay or elsewhere, and we could pull off that designated corridor the 5400 megawatts that are required to run that plant.

Now, does any member here believe that we could ever get a contract with the State of New York or anyone else to sell them 1500 megawatts of power under those conditions?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) is 540, not 5400.

AN HON. MEMBER: He does not know the difference.

MR. FLIGHT: 540. Well, I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker. I stand corrected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us cut away the bluff here, the nonsense and the bluff. The only way that ever a kilowatt of power will flow from the Lower Churchill across Quebec will be through the present Quebec hydro lines. The only way that ever the production of Gull Island will flow across Quebec to a market in the United States or elsewhere will be by the present hydro lines owned by Quebec Hydro. Whether you like it or whether you lump it, the facts are the facts, it will never go out over a designated corridor. This crowd do not want a designated corridor, they know a designated corridor is not feasible. And the only way it will go out, if we cannot convince Quebec to agree to a deal, to a negotiated agreement whereby we can ship the surplus power from Gull Island out over the present Quebec hydro lines - we will never ship a kilowatt of power out of Quebec. Now,

MR. FLIGHT: that is a fact of life.

And the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), who has a very great stake in what happens with the Lower Churchill, knows that is a fact. He knows that is a fact, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. BARRY: That is right, give it all away.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the figures. The member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle), Mr. Speaker started throwing around figures here, and in his resolution he says: "AND WHEREAS development of Gull Island power can give economic life to the depressed Happy Valley - Goose Bay area". How much economic life, Mr. Speaker? What could Happy Valley - Goose Bay expect to get from the development of Gull Island? I will tell you what it would expect to get, it would stand to get \$240 million pumped into their economy over the construction life of that project - \$240 million, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) this: In 1975 the estimated cost of developing Gull Island was \$2.7 billion - \$2.7 billion. In 1982 dollars, the cost to develop Gull Island will be in excess of \$6 billion. In six years the cost of Gull Island -

MR. DOYLE: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: The member should check his figures. Those are 1980 dollars he is talking about. Those are the dollars that were recommended when Muskrat was recommended for development. That was the figure, \$4.2 billion, in June of 1980. The member should wake up. This is November 1981. For sure the project will not start until June of 1982, which is two years, and the cost

MR. FLIGHT: of Gull Island - the procrastination of this Government, Mr. Speaker, their inability to develop the Gull Island has seen the cost, the capital cost of that project go from \$2.4 billion to in excess of \$6 billion in six years.

Now, does anyone care in this House, Mr. Speaker, to guess, if we get the same kind of procrastination for the next six years, what the capital cost of Gull Island will be?

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) up and give it away.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) give it away, I will guarantee you that.

MR. FLIGHT: They have not given it away, Mr. Speaker. The only monument in Newfoundland to the ability of this administration to develop hydro power is the two holes on either side of the Strait, Mr. Speaker, That is their monument to their ability to develop the Lower Churchill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, the members talk so big. You talk about propaganda and you talk about trying to blindfold the devil in the dark; it is true, Mr. Speaker, that Quebec

MR. FLIGHT:

buys Upper Churchill power for 2.5 mils. Now, would the hon. the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) want to tell me what it would cost if we suddenly owned - if the Water Reversion Act were declared, if it were proclaimed and we owned the whole 5,200 megawatts of power - what it would cost to deliver one kilowatt hour of that power to Newfoundland? Would the hon. member tell me that? I mean, he is very knowing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: 2.5 mils? That is the message that he would like to get out. The message he would want to get across to the people of Newfoundland is that Churchill Falls power is cheap power, 2.5 mils. Well, I will tell you what it is. Churchill Falls power delivered to Newfoundland today is more expensive than anything being generated on this Island. It would cost the average consumer in this Province 55 mils. Why did the member not in his debate - why was he not fair-minded? Why does he not tell the people of Newfoundland what it will cost them for energy developed from the Upper Churchill to Newfoundland? Why does he not tell them that the energy we are producing in this Province today at a blended rate - the cheapest, Bay d'Espoir, the most expensive, Holyrood - only costs this Province, to generate, 30 mils? Why does he not tell them that? - that the kinds of rates they have seen, the increases they have seen in their power bills these past five years is based on 30 mil power? And then why does he not tell them what is going to happen to them when we bring the Upper Churchill power into this Province, what is going to happen to their domestic hydro bills, when we know to deliver now, in 1980 - we have a full year's inflation to take care of and a full year's difference in the interest rates to take care of - and in 1980 the cost to deliver

MR. FLIGHT: Churchill Falls power to this Province was 55 mils? Why did not the member in his speech, if he wants the facts to come out, tell the people of this Province what delivering Churchill Falls power to Newfoundland will cost?

Does anyone want to hazard a guess as to the size of an increase that Newfoundland Hydro will be going to PUB for when we have delivered the Churchill Falls power to Newfoundland? Maybe the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) might want to hazard a guess as to the percentage rate of increase that Hydro will be wanting after they have delivered Upper Churchill power at 55 mils cost to the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, we are all looking forward to the Water Reversion Act being proclaimed, and then, Mr. Speaker, we can use it. We will then own 5,200 megawatts of power. And, Mr. Speaker, we can use a maximum into the mid-1990s of 800 megawatts.

Will the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) when he rises in the debate now, Mr. Speaker, tell the people of this House of Assembly, tell the people of this Province, when we proclaim the Water Reversion Act what we will be doing with the surplus 4,400 megawatts of power that we will then own in Churchill Falls? Will the member tell what we will be doing with it, how we will get rid of that power? What is he proposing? With the Water Reversion Act proclaimed, we own the power site, we own 5,200 megawatts of power. We need and can utilize 800 megawatts. Going into the 1990s what will we be doing with the in excess of 4,200 megawatts of power that will be left in the power plant at Churchill Falls?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: What will we be doing with it, Mr. Speaker? In the negotiations that are going on,

MR. FLIGHT: will the relationship between Quebec and Newfoundland be conducive to having Mr. Levesque agree, 'Well, since you own it you can now continue to ship it out over our lines'? Will that be conducive?

Mr. Speaker, the best advice that this government can get on the Lower Churchill is to stop hoodwinking the people; start telling the truth about the power in Lower Churchill; tell the people that because of the way that the government of this Province have handled the Labrador power, the capital cost has gone from \$2.7 billion to in excess of \$6 billion; start telling the people of Newfoundland that this Province is in the

MR. FLIGHT: same position today with regard to the Lower Churchill as we found ourselves in with regard to the Upper Churchill; start telling the people of this Province that the Lower Churchill will flow to the sea forever unless this government can find the ability to negotiate with the Province of Quebec. Why do we not start telling the people that so we will all understand the Labrador power situation?

So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the support or the non-support of the resolution, I have to this point in my life, as most members in this House to this point in life, supported anything that was in the better interest of this Province. We have had difficulty, Mr. Speaker, and, you know, the proof is in the pudding, we have had difficulty with the political hypocrisy that this government was using with regard to the offshore. We have had a great deal of difficulty -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Is the hon. member winding up? His time is just about up.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

We have had a great deal of difficulty in accepting the political tripe and nonsense that the Province has been subjected to by this administration for the past ten years on Churchill Falls. The truth is starting to come out, Mr. Speaker. And I will tell you another truth, you will hear less and less in the next couple of months, in the next year, about the Lower Churchill. This administration will not want to talk about the Lower Churchill. Remember I said that, Mr. Speaker. Less and less we will hear about the Lower Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, the monument to the ability of this Province to develop Labrador power, is the two holes blasted in the Strait, the in excess of \$2 million they gave to BRINCO, they spent on BRINCO for nothing, their inability, Mr. Speaker, to negotiate with the federal government, their inability, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the Quebec

MR. FLIGHT: government. And, Mr. Speaker, if we have to wait for the Lower Churchill to be developed and Newfoundland to benefit from the power in the Lower Churchill, the people of this Province will have to wait - and ten years is proof - the people of this Province will have to wait until this government is changed. They have taken these past ten years to prove they are incapable of dealing with the power on the Gull Island, Muskrat sites, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in supporting the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I think we have heard again, reconfirmed for us here in 1981, the position of the Liberal Party in this Province that has been the philosophy, that has been extant within the Liberal Party since 1965 and, indeed, prior to 1965. It is the hon. members opposite, led by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) who, in private life - and if you meet him behind the curtain and you meet him outside the hon. member is a very knowledgeable and a sensible human being. But you stand him up here in the House of Assembly and he parrots the kind of Liberal diatribe and the defeatist attitude that has pervaded the Liberal Party in this Province since 1965. Prior to 1965 the then Premier was a visionary and to some extent he did a number of good things, but he started his decline in 1965. Now hon. members opposite have been on his coattails ever since. Now, unfortunately, his coattails have been disappearing downhill and hon. members opposite are following him. And the member for Windsor - Buchans epitomizes that defeatist attitude. He said, 'We cannot do it. You cannot do it'. Those are the same people, Mr. Speaker - and I am sure the Premier when he deals with the offshore negotiations, and when that matter is finally resolved in our favour, when we get the kind of deal on the offshore that we know we deserve and that is constitutionally ours, legally ours, when that

MR. STAGG: finally culminates we will be able to point to many examples of speeches, rhetoric by hon. members opposite, particularly the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) who stands smirking in the corridor now as I castigate him. We will be able to throw these words back at them, how they predicted defeat, Hon. members opposite are the great defeatist, they are defeatist, not only are they defeated politically, Mr. Speaker, but they are defeated, they are defeated and defeatist. They said it could not be done.

MR. FLIGHT: We have ten years proof.

MR. STAGG: The hon. gentlemen opposite are living examples of the philosophy,

MR. F. STAGG: it cannot be done, so why not be suppine? Why not be the lapdogs of Ottawa? Why not give in to Rene Levesque? Rene Levesque -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) the last ten year.

MR. F. STAGG: The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Hollett) hands me a document. It says, 'Angry Levesque Drops Hydro Sabotage Hint'. In other words, if we are successful in getting the federal government to do what they should do, and that is make a power corridor through Quebec, either a new corridor or access to the existing lines, if we are successful in doing that, then Mr. Levesque says that they will sabotage it. Well, there is a place for saboteurs, there is a place for anarchists and terrorists. There is a place them. The place for them is in jail. The place for them is behind bars. The place for them is not in this great country of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have to deal with in this Province is we have to be able to look for our legal rights within this country. And there were those hon. gentlemen opposite who said that the Premier was the most un-Canadian of Canadians last year - remember? - when he was speaking out and giving this Province's position on the constitution, as he has done on the Upper Churchill contract and he has done on our position on the Lower Churchill prospects and as he has done on the offshore. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been falling all over themselves in the hope, in the hope, their vain hope that he will fail. Hon. gentlemen opposite want us to fail. They want the government to fail as far as the offshore is concerned. They want failure. They have a vested interest in failure!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. STAGG: They have a vested interest in failure, Only by the failures of this government can that group, can the Liberal Party ever hope to slither back into power. It is only by the failure of this government. I must tell hon. gentlemen that there have been no failures to date. The greatest success story politically in this country in the past two years -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): Order, please!

Evidently some members enjoy the little bit of extra noise in the House, but it is very difficult when you are in the Chair to hear what is going on.

MR. F. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The greatest success story in Canada in the past two years has been the constitutional agreement. And who brought it about? Who was the architect of that agreement? Who was it? It was our Premier. It was our Premier dealing with several other premiers. It was our man. But hon. gentlemen opposite, like MacLean's Magazine and like some others who would deny that this Province or anyone representing this Province could have anything to contribute to Confederation, hon. gentlemen would decry and say, 'Foul, failure'. That is what the hon. gentlemen would like to see. So they would prefer that Newfoundland had failed on the constitution. They would prefer that Newfoundland fails on the offshore. They do not want control or ownership of the offshore. All hon. gentlemen want is power. They want the perks of power. They want to be ministers. They want to be Speaker, Mr. Speaker. They want these things that they will never get, Mr. Speaker! The Liberal Party may be re-elected in this Province at some time, but it will not be re-elected as long as they have the -

November 25, 1981

Tape No. 3747

DW - 3

MR. CALLAN:

We do not have a quorum.

Mr. Speaker, a quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Order, please!

We have a quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):
the House.

We have a quorum.

The hon. member for Steph-
enville.

MR. STAGG: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on many occasions when you are making debating points, hon. gentlemen will attempt to interrupt your train of thought. Now, this is Private Members' Day. We are having a debate here on the Lower Churchill and the future of the Lower Churchill as it pertains to Newfoundland. There are, I believe, eighteen members of the Opposition. Their ranks, as I say, keep declining - you never know from one month to the other how many of them there are over there. They keep resigning and whatever. I think there are eighteen of them now. There is one in the House at the present time, Mr. Speaker. There is one in the House at the present time. There are approximately twenty members on this side of the House. So that is some indication of what the Opposition feels about a matter which is of vital importance to this Province, and it is with despair, with a certain amount of despair that I look opposite. If I were only interested in the political ramifications of this, Mr. Speaker, I would say that it would be duly noted that the Opposition have no interest, have no interest in winning the battle of Churchill Falls.

As a matter of fact, the Opposition have a vested interest, in their minds at least, a vested interest in losing. They want to lose. The Opposition wants to lose the battle for Churchill Falls. They lost the first battle with Churchill Falls. Our government is now attempting to regroup and recoup the losses, the \$500, \$600, \$700 million a year that is a direct result of an

MR. STAGG: imperfectly worded, a traitorous document that was executed in 1965 so that someone could have a grand imperial concept, as it was. Mr. Churchill called it a grand imperial concept, and that is all that was needed. Because hon. gentlemen opposite are able to be led around by the nose by anyone, and they have been led around by the nose by half a dozen in the past ten years. They have been led into Opposition and that is where they are going to stay.

The Opposition wants us to fail on this. They want us to fail on fisheries, Mr. Speaker. They want us to fail on fisheries. They do not want this government or the people of Newfoundland to have any jurisdiction or control or say in the fisheries, no, because as soon as that happens, or relatively soon after that happens and the people of this Province have a say in the fisheries, because only through election to this House - the only way that people in this Province can control their natural resources is by electing members of the Provincial Government, that is the government that the people of this Province can throw in and throw out, elect and defeat. We have infinitesimal control over the House of Commons, seven members out of a 284 seat House. That is why the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Premier and all of us on this side have stood up for years, and we will continue to stand up, for control and jurisdiction, or some say in control and jurisdiction, over the fisheries. And that is why we on this side want to win that battle.

November 25, 1981

Tape No. 3748

FL - 3

MR. STAGG:

It is a question of philosophy, Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of this group of people, which go by the tag of the Progressive Conservative Party. Some of us are to the left of centre, some of us are to the right of centre, some of us are in the centre,

MR. STAGG: but we have one common thread throughout, that we will not emulate, we will not approximate, we will not be in any way similar to the hon. gentlemen opposite who are still taking their cues and casting the kudos, kudos.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: - at the former Premier, Premier Smallwood.

MR. CALLAN: - an opportunist.

MR. STAGG: Opportunist? The hon. gentleman calls me an opportunist.

MR. CALLAN: And reformed Liberal.

MR. TULK: You sound like a (inaudible)

MR. STAGG: Well, I did try to get rid of Mr. Smallwood in 1969, I must admit, when I supported Mr. Crosbie, as did the Premier support Mr. Crosbie in 1969, as did a whole lot of people support Mr. Crosbie in 1969. Now, speaking of Mr. Crosbie: On October 30th, 1981, he made a speech in the House of Commons that was circulated to some members on our side. I do not know if the hon. members opposite got it or not. He probably did not send it to them, because they would not be interested in hearing what Newfoundland's position was. But for anybody who is interested in this particular situation, anybody who is interested in it, I refer them to October 30, 1981, Common's Debates, page 12371 where the hon. John Crosbie deals with, in detail, the situation with regard to Upper Churchill and Lower Churchill and the necessity of having wheeling rights through Labrador.

MR. FLIGHT: He was the right one to deal with it.

MR. STAGG: Yes, and he would have dealt with it too. He would have dealt with it too.

MR. FLIGHT: He was the right one to deal with it.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I am an advocate of the Anglo-Saxon route, the so-called Anglo-Saxon route which is rather - it is an ethnic way of speaking about it, but I am a believer that if we did get a firm sale for the electricity in New York or wherever, and we were able to come down the West coast of Newfoundland and go across the Cabot Strait, or go from Cape St. George-

MR. FLIGHT: With 1000 megawatts of power.

MR. DINN: Five thousand two hundred.

AN HON. MEMBER: One thousand five hundred.

MR. STAGG: -to go across the Cabot Strait or across from Cape St. George to Prince Edward Island, or however it has to go - I do not think that route has been properly explored.

MR. PATTERSON: Maybe we could send it over by EPA.

MR. FLIGHT: (inaudible) waste on 1500 megawatts.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or Air Canada.

MR. STAGG: I am not sure that that cannot be done. I would be a firm believer in it, that we would always have it passing through friendly territory. At least our own territory is friendly territory. But I would also say this, Mr. Speaker, it is inevitable that that power in Labrador will be developed. But I will also say this, I think it is also most important that that power be developed for the people of Labrador. Now I am a person who lives on the Island and I have a vested interest in an industrial center on the West Coast, the Stephenville area, a great industrial center, but I believe that Labrador power must first be developed for Labrador. And who is to say that the power, when it is developed, that we could not have the iron ore of Labrador smelted in Labrador? Who is to say that cannot happen? It is inevitable. There is an inevitability about that as well, that the power and the

MR. STAGG: iron ore will go together. There is an inevitability about it.

The Lower Churchill was discussed in this House in 1972, in the Fall of 1972, when CFLCo was owned by BRINCO -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: That is right, it was owned by BRINCO. And hon. gentlemen opposite, neither one of them are in their places today, but there were two leading lights in that Opposition, the then Leader of the Opposition and a man who later became Leader of the Opposition briefly, and their philosophy was, 'Let us get the Lower Churchill started, we need the jobs, we have tremendous unemployment in this Province, we need the jobs.' That is what their philosophy was and that is what they have stated in this House in debate.

MR. CALLAN: What is your philosophy, drive them all to Alberta?

MR. STAGG: The philosophy of this government is that we cannot trade off short-term jobs for the long-term benefit of this Province. And John Crosbie, who was Minister of Finance at the time, said the Churchill River will flow into the Atlantic forever before we make a deal that approximates the Upper Churchill deal.

MR. FLIGHT: That is what Newfoundland is doing.

MR. STAGG: Yes, it is still flowing into the Atlantic and I say more power to us for having done that. More power. Because it is power for ourselves, maybe during our lifetimes, but that river and that

MR. STAGG: peninsula will be generating water for a long time, Mr. Speaker. It will be generating water for a long time. And we are mere pin pricks in history.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: That is right. We occupy a very small part of history. This group here will be - we will have our ten or fifteen years in power, then the people who follow us will have their ten or fifteen years. And I want it to be said we will be replaced by people of a similar persuasion, the faces will change, the party will remain the same. I want it to be said about my legacy that when the time comes for -

MR. NEARY: What legacy?

MR. STAGG: The legacy of me as a politician, the legacy of this group here as political leaders in this Province, that we did not give it away and we will hold on to it. We will hold on to it because it is something that is vital to our future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: I commend the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) and the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) - the two members for the Labrador Coast I cannot commend them, but I do commend my two colleagues for their unceasing and untiring efforts as far as the Churchill project is concerned, and the member for Menihek in his efforts to make sure that the Lower Churchill when developed is to have economic significance for his area. I certainly commend him in that and, as a member of the House of Assembly from the Island part of the Province, I want to go on the record as saying that.

Mr. Speaker, we are going through an exercise here today that has been gone through many times before. I guess in every session of the House we deal with the Churchill Falls situation, and what it serves

MR. STAGG: to do each time is it serves to point out that even though we may look alike, even though there may be very great similarities between us on some matters, there is a very distinct difference between the government, the Progressive Conservative Party in this Province and the Liberal Party in this Province. Because the Liberal Party is a group of defeatists and they are the party that would not be able -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: - that would not be able to look after this responsibility if it were ever handed to them.

I commend the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) for bringing in this resolution. It is a good resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: His speech was full of detail and the arguments were irrefutable. The member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) dealt with it in the way that the Liberals traditionally deal with it, did not deal with the subject but lamely said at the end that he supports it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I support it and I support it for the reasons given by myself and by the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to this debate on this resolution and say that we are, of course, going to support the resolution for:
'BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the Government of Canada to uphold this Province's right to fair and equal treatment in the transmission of its energy resources.'

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the first time that that resolution was passed it was passed at a national convention of the Liberal Party of Canada, in which this Province took that resolution, or a very similar resolution, and presented the case to all of the people in Canada as represented by the Liberals there, over 2,000 strong. And, Mr. Speaker, that resolution was passed. That resolution was the beginning of why the Prime Minister brought in and agreed years ago, two years ago, a whole year before the Energy Minister and the Premier admitted that they had been assured by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Energy that he would bring into the House of Commons a resolution that would give Newfoundland a power corridor across Quebec. That was started by a Liberal resolution approved by the Liberal Party of Canada and then agreed to by the Prime Minister and the federal Energy Minister. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is no problem approving this resolution.

I think the closing remarks of my friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) are so true, they are so true, because he finally

MR. STIRLING:

admits there is a difference in approach of that party, a PC approach, and a Liberal policy. That is what he is absolutely correct on. And people in Newfoundland and Labrador are beginning to see what it means. You know, the old-timers knew what it meant when they said 'Tory times are hard times'. But this new crowd has got a new slogan, 'Tory times are tough times. Hang tough'.

MR. TULK: Oh, yes. (Inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: The member who said he is proud on behalf of his colleagues to say, 'Let it run to the sea. Boys, we did not give her away'.

MR. THOMS: What a consolation that is to people who do not have any food on their tables.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the people who are out in Alberta, the people who have gone from all over this Province, people from the Premier's own district, people from Robert's Arm itself, over sixty families given up in frustration and disgust and waiting -

MR. THOMS: Despair.

MR. STIRLING: - Mr. Speaker, for something to happen. Surely this government that had so much promise, the government that was finally going to say, 'Boys, in Newfoundland we are coming into our own. We do not need

MR. TULK: Stepping forward.

MR. STIRLING: - any more help from Ottawa' -
The first Throne Speech, do you remember it? 'We have come of age in Newfoundland'.

MR. TULK: Yes.

MR. STIRLING: 'We are stepping forward for the way we want to grow'. Well, a lot of these young people -

MR. TULK: (Inaudible) grow old faster.

MR. STIRLING: - a lot of these people found out the way that they wanted to grow was not the way of the PC Party. What they have had to do -

MR. PATTERSON: (Inaudible) stepped forward with Peckford.

MR. STIRLING: What they have had to do -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Call an election now and see how many will step forward.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order! Order!

MR. STIRLING: That is the way that they found out, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. STIRLING: The way they had to grow -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: - is that 25,000 people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. STIRLING: - went to Alberta, went to Toronto because they could not get a job in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. FLIGHT: You are serving your last term.
(Inaudible) your last term.

MR. STIRLING: They are disillusioned, disgusted, apathetic. Now, Mr. Speaker, do you know the worst part of it all? The worst part of it all is it does not only reflect on the fantasy land and the schizophrenic attitude of the Premier of this Province, it reflects on every member on that side. And I wish it was only on the members on that side, but it reflects on all of us in politics, Mr. Speaker. It reflects on all of us because people are beginning to feel that nobody can do anything for them, that there is no promise, there is no future, because the government has oil on the brain

MR. STIRLING: that the total concept was for oil, and only oil and ignore everything else.

Mr. Speaker, why have we not heard of the Lower Churchill for the last six month?

MR. FLIGHT: We will not hear of it again either.

MR. STIRLING: Why is it we have not heard anything?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: Because every ounce of public relations has been sucked out of that issue. Because, Mr. Speaker, the greatest disappointment that this crowd got was when the Prime Minister said, 'You can have a power corridor across Quebec'. Because as my colleague for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) said what you know you want, and what we all are going to have to have in Newfoundland and Labrador is either an agreement with Quebec, Because this is not Northern Ireland, although maybe that is the way that the people on the other side want to operate -

MR. PATTERSON: Tell us about the tax Rompkey said we could have and you endorsed (inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: And that has not changed.

MR. FLIGHT: Tell us about the jobs -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us about it.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you about that.

MR. FLIGHT: Tell us about Argentina.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I will tell you about that because -

MR. TULK: No more Argentina.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker -

MR. FLIGHT: Tell us about Argentina.

MR. STIRLING: - I will be glad to tell them about that. Because this government got elected, as the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is so proud to state, and the other anti-Confederates who are there in the front benches -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: - they got together for one thing, which was to get rid of Joe Smallwood. And, Mr. Speaker, they did that. Let us give them full credit. They got rid of Joe Smallwood, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATTERSON: (Inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: And once they had done that, Mr. Speaker, they did not know what else they were there for. And that is why in 1973-1974 you saw the last version of this crowd, the last version of this crowd explode a couple of holes on each side of the Strait.

MR. PATTERSON: (Inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: And the present President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) had to quit the Cabinet, would have nothing to do with them, because of

MR. STIRLING: the colossal mistakes that they have made on the Lower Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, what are they waiting for? The federal government has put up \$200 million in equity, last year, to get started. There is in force a corporation which we all should be proud of, the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, 51 per cent owned in Newfoundland, 49 per cent Ottawa. The federal government has agreed to put up all of the money that is needed, they have agreed to allow their credit to be used to raise the money. Newfoundland has the lousiest credit in all of the Dominion, but you do not have to use Newfoundland's credit, the credit of Canada will be used to finance the Lower Churchill. So the federal government did what they were supposed to do, they put up the equity, they bailed Newfoundland out of the \$100 million wasted, then they agreed to finance Newfoundland. Now, what did Newfoundland have to do? What did this 'great step forward' group of born again Tories - they cannot stand the word 'Tory', they like to be called P.C.s. The only Tory is now leaving, he has to go back to his law practice, he has to check in. The half Minister of Energy and half President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and the part-time lawyer has to go back to check on how many cheques came in today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you real proud of yourself now?

MR. TULK: Why should he not be? It is the truth.

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

MR. STIRLING: Let us go back to see what it was that was the government's responsibility. Because, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation here in which we are discussing an energy bill and the part-time Minister of Energy does not have the decency to sit in this House of Assembly and listen to the debate, because, Mr. Speaker, he is a part-time lawyer, a mouthpiece.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, what is happening to this government? They at one time had an Energy Minister and an Energy policy. They have abandoned the Lower Churchill completely. No wonder they tried to get another resolution in here today, because they were embarrassed to have to debate this resolution, Mr. Speaker. What is missing? The federal government has put in the equity. The federal government has guaranteed to put up the guarantees for all the financing, guarantee all the bonds. So what is missing, Mr. Speaker? What is missing in the Lower Churchill? Why is it not going ahead? You come back to provincial responsibility. How many markets have they lined up? How many companies, Mr. Speaker, are lined up to put some business into Labrador? How many businesses are waiting to develop? How many companies do they have lined up? How many have they reported to in this House to say, 'Look, we have a hundred companies lined up' - ten? Ten companies? One, Mr. Speaker? Do they have one?

The member for Naskaupi

(Mr. Goudie) knows what the feeling is in Naskaupi, about all the promises that have been made to Naskaupi over the years, about all the industry that was going ahead, and now he is going to see it taken away from Naskaupi again and put in another part of the Province. The member for Naskaupi knows that it is a foregone conclusion the Naskaupi people and the people in Labrador are not going to get an aluminum smelting plant if it comes to Newfoundland. No, Mr. Speaker, they have been taken, they have been used, they have been conned - promises and promises and promises and great expectations. But the fact of the matter is,

MR. STIRLING: they have not done their homework. They have not gone out and brought any industry. I will give credit to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). At least he travels around looking for something. But the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) who is responsible for bringing some industry to the Province, bringing it to Labrador - when did they last talk to a series of companies, Mr. Speaker? How many markets have they created? Mr. Speaker, there are no markets, nothing done by the provincial government to create some markets in either Labrador or the Province of Newfoundland or on the Island portion of the Province. Nothing done, Mr. Speaker. That is what we are waiting for, waiting for some markets.

Now, what were some of the other alternatives? What about the alternative that they talked about, and they had a broker

MR. STIRLING: retained, about looking at the Atlantic route. Why have we not heard anything about the Atlantic route over the last little while? The people in New York will buy power. The people in the rest of Canada need power. If they had done their homework there would be industry in Newfoundland and Labrador looking for power. But, Mr. Speaker, none of that has happened. But they are happy, Mr. Speaker, they did not give anything away. They have not given anything away. There is nothing given away Mr. Speaker, not a thing. The water is still flowing, they have not given it away. They have not given away a stick of wood. They have not given away an ounce of mineral. No, sir, they have not given away anything, Mr. Speaker. They are living off the welfare of Ottawa. They are glad to take \$400 million in equalization payments, but they are not, Mr. Speaker, doing anything to generate any industry, generate any business.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at what they should be doing in the meantime if they cannot develop any markets, Mr. Speaker, let us suppose that they do not have that ability; The Premier's total work experience was as a welfare officer and a teacher who used to have to call the principal to come down and settle down the class. And he gets like that every once in a while.

MR. TULK: It just goes to show you.

MR. STIRLING: Show me somebody over there who has had any experience, Mr. Speaker, bringing in any business. Mr. Speaker, show me some experience, I am trying to give them some credit, show me somebody with any experience in bringing in any business to the Province, any business with marketing.

So, let us assume that they have no expertise in attracting business; they have no expertise in attracting markets, let us accept that. Now, what could they be doing in the meantime, while they are waiting for us

MR. STIRLING: to get the markets for them, or they are waiting for the federal government, or they are waiting for some markets to show up and get them to do something? Now, Mr. Speaker, why did they not start the five year construction programme? We suggested it, I think it was in December last year, Mr. Speaker. In December last year we made some suggestions to them about how they could get the transmission line started under the Channel, and how we could create 2,000 jobs at its height in the construction season, 2,000 jobs across Labrador and in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, they would not have to be covering up the fact that they do not know where the \$16 million is coming from, if they created a few jobs. They just have not created any jobs. They have just shown no initiative.

But, Mr. Speaker, they have not given anything away. They have not given anything away. Mr. Speaker, we agree with the resolution. We have to agree with the resolution, because if we were in power, Mr. Speaker - let your imagine run for a few minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Call an election. Call an election.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order!

MR. THOMS: Call an election. Call an election.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the first thing that would have happened in dealing with Labrador is that we would have faced up to two or three questions. First of all, in dealing with Quebec, Quebec is holding the trump card and you would have to arrange to have an examination of the total of the energy problems in Labrador and in Quebec. Now, what is it that they want? They want to develop land that runs into the St. Lawrence, headwaters in Newfoundland. We would have had a joint development going with them, Mr. Speaker. We would have had business and industry attracted

November 25, 1981

Tape No. 3753

IB-3

MR. STIRLING:

to Labrador.' We would have had an agreement with the federal government and we would have had the transmission started, Mr. Speaker. We would have had 2,000 Newfoundlanders working today, 2,000 working on the Lower Churchill development alone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: We would have a five year programme going, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: \$240 million injected into Goose Bay.

MR. STIRLING: We would have had people coming into this Province, seeing the great enthusiasm, the great excitement. We would have had what the Premier has now come around to. You see the Premier is the only person in this Province who can sound so convincing. I have to sit and listen to him and say, Boy I am convinced, I am convinced. Just like I was the other day when he said with the native group, the other day with the native group, "We cannot do anything. We cannot give anything away. We have to have a year of consultation because it is financially going to ruin Newfoundland. So, therefore, I am against putting it in the constitution". The next morning, "My position has always been that it should be in the constitution". He does not even have the good grace to turn around and acknowledge that he is going in the opposite direction. He says, "Oh no, I was going this way all the time".

The same thing on offshore, Mr. Speaker. Nothing was going to be done unless we got ownership. 'Boy, we are some proud, we said it and we got ownership. It does not make any difference about the courts. Do not bother with the courts. Ownership!' Two years later what does he do, Mr. Speaker? He comes back Mr. Speaker, at the end of two years and says, "Boy, they finally came around to our way. Boy, I can do it. They came around to our way. Ownership is set aside. Yes, we have ownership set aside!" Mr. Speaker, ownership is set aside, a great embarrassment to a man who crossed the floor on a question of principle. Ownership is now set aside and we are back to the Liberal position which was the Liberal position put forward by the member before he crossed the floor, which was 100 per cent revenue and shared jurisdiction - back to the Liberal position.

MR. STIRLING: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is all it was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order!

MR. STIRLING: Now, what about what has happened in those two years? What has happened in those two years, Mr. Speaker? Nothing has happened in those two years. They did not give anything away. They certainly did not give anything away. The companies are going down hill, people are laid off. Nothing given away, Mr. Speaker, but nothing happening. Two years in which people realized that this government are playing at the game. It is like a high school act in which somebody said, Would you like to be Premier. And he said, Yes, I am, boy, I am some brave, I am some big, some tough. Do not give anything away. And now at the end of the period says, Oh yeah, well, I mean, I was in favour of that all along anyway. Oh, yeah, on the natives, yeah, I was in favour of that. And to the women, Oh, we took the women's rights out but I was in favour of it and got them back in. Mr. Speaker, it is getting to be a sick joke.

AN HON. MEMBER: A future Prime Minister.

MR. STIRLING: A future Prime Minister!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I hope he does run to become future Prime Minister. Because, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland and Labrador cannot last another five minutes with him as Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Does somebody want to - do you want to go back and forth or what?

MR. FLIGHT: The member for Naskaupi.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if nobody has the energy -

MR. FLIGHT: What a cop-out! (Inaudible) he cannot.

MR. NEARY: As long as I get recognized.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): The hon. member for LaPoile yields to the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just accused by the gentleman for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) that I did not want to speak in the debate. I was discussing Labrador and some possible industries for there with my colleague, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) while he was throwing these little darts across the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: I just want to say a couple of words, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. GOUDIE: And I was also trying to be courteous to the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and let him have a chance at it as well.

MR. NEARY: Well, I was just returned the compliment, I yielded to my hon. friend.

MR. GOUDIE: I thank the member for LaPoile. Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak for a couple of minutes and add my support to the resolution put forward by the gentleman for Harbour Main- Bell Island (Mr. Doyle). I agree with one statement that the member for Windsor-Buchans made in his remarks when he spoke earlier this afternoon, and that is that I, probably more than any other member in the House of Assembly, stand to gain or lose more with the development or non-development of the hydro

MR. GOUDIE: resources of Labrador, because the Churchill River, as we all know, dissects my district from one end to the other.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) suggested that the people of Naskaupi district would not see the aluminum - he did not agree with the aluminum smelter going in Labrador was what he suggested just a few minutes ago.

MR. STIRLING: You know that that decision has already been made.

MR. AYLWARD: He does not want it in Labrador he said.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. gentleman is getting his information but that decision, as far as the provincial government is concerned, is not made. Perhaps his colleagues in Ottawa have made that decision.

MR. GOUDIE:

I do not know. He is nodding his head, The Liberal Government in Ottawa has decided that the aluminum smelter is not going in Labrador, is that what the gentleman is saying?

MR. STIRLING: No, I am saying you know already that it is just a smokescreen and that they decided where it is going to go and your provincial colleagues, they (inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: The decision, Mr. Speaker, has not been made. As a matter of fact, there will be some discussion on this very topic by the principals involved, or who hopefully will become involved somewhere down the road -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) your area?

MR. GOUDIE: -Within the next four or five days. In this Province they will have the opportunity to have a look at a number of areas in Newfoundland and Labrador for possible development of an aluminum smelter.

When you talk about developments, Mr. Speaker, and philosophies of developments - I had the dubious pleasure a few years ago, in the late 1960s, as a matter of fact, when I was a broadcaster with CBC - and I say 'dubious' because I did not really want to be where I was that particular night, when the Premier of the day, Mr. Smallwood, came to Labrador to try to convince us that he was right when he made the decision, which he announced on Christmas Day, that Labrador would not get a woods industry - would not get a woods industry, and never did get a woods industry. The philosophy of the Liberal Party of that day - and I assume it is the same now, I have not heard anything different in debate - was to extract the resources of Labrador, Mr. Speaker, and put them on the Island some place else or put them down in Quebec, let her go! Do not develop Labrador for Labradorians!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE: Do not develop Labrador for the benefit of Labradorians, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE: That is the philosophy of that hon. gentleman across there, and that is the gentleman who wants to become Premier some day? Yes! Over my dead body and the dead bodies of people in Labrador, Mr. Speaker, that is how he will become Premier!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. GOUDIE: He certainly will not become Premier with that kind of an attitude towards development in Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. GOUDIE: The philosophy, Mr. Speaker, of this government on this side of the House today is that when the hydro resources of Labrador are developed, Mr. Speaker, they will be developed for the benefit of the Province, but specifically for the benefit of residents of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: That is the kind of philosophy that I can support and that is the kind of philosophy that I am supporting today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE: What are the possibilities, Mr. Speaker, for development in Labrador as it relates to hydro? Hydro is the key around which the whole economic development of Labrador is going to evolve.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. GOUDIE: These gentlemen should just retain their cool for another four or five months, Mr. Speaker, and see what developments will occur -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: - just see how it is going to go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: You cannot remember, can you?

MR. GOUDIE: Oh, of course. All we heard today, Mr. Speaker, in the debate, was a complete defeatist attitude over there -

MR. AYLWARD: Right on!

MR. GOUDIE: - from the moment that the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) - and he is not here now, got up and would not agree with this resolution going through today until the last speaker just sat down - a complete defeatist attitude by the party opposite this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: We have no faith in you, that is why.

MR. GOUDIE: No faith in me? Well, there is certainly no faith in this Province for the party opposite, certainly not in terms of forming a government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: But just as an example, Mr. Speaker, of some of the possible developments that could take place -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE: Speaking of taking districts, I hear that there has been a Liberal poll conducted in

MR. GOUDIE: Naskaupi district recently.

One of the names put forth as a possible candidate against me is the hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HOUSE: The Leader of the Opposition? Well he has to run somewhere, he cannot win his own district.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must ask the hon. gentleman to restrain himself.

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE: I have also heard a number of gentlemen opposite suggest over the last couple of years, well, since 1979, that I will not be around anymore after the next election is over. That is possible, I guess. The same suggestion was made, Mr. Speaker, in 1979 during the campaign, when the infamous Mr. Jamieson came over here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. GOUDIE: Some gentlemen opposite refer to me as 'landslide Goudie'. I won the election after the judicial recount by thirty-three votes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: Let me remind hon. gentlemen for perhaps their sakes as well as mine, that the evening after the judicial recount had taken place, I encountered a gentleman down here in the Avalon Mall who walked up to me - I had not seen him before and have not seen him since - and he said, 'You are the guy who just won today by thirty-three votes.' I said, 'Yes, it was close, not very much of a lead.' He said, 'Listen, my son, you

November 25, 1981

Tape No. 3755

EC - 5

MR. GOUDIE: walk into the White House and
the sign on Jimmy Carter's door does not say, Jimmy Carter,
President by 10,000 votes, it says, Jimmy Carter, President.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: That was then.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE: If the hon. gentleman for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) wishes to come to Naskaupi district and go for it, fine, come on, we will have a lot of fun and see how it turns out.

MR. HOUSE: He is going to have to go somewhere.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) the Premier goes to Bellevue. Will the hon. Premier go to Bellevue?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I was getting up to support my colleague, the gentleman for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle), commending him for bringing forth this resolution.

MR. STIRLING: Ten year record.

MR. GOUDIE: And talk about - ten year record? I have not been around ten years, I cannot give any record for that. But I will say -

MR. STIRLING: But you expect me to answer for (inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: If the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, wants to ask me for a ten year record, I have been around as the minister for the last three years -

MR. FLIGHT: Ask the Premier.

MR. GOUDIE: - we do have the best hog programme in the country, for instance, in this department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: We do have the best rural development mechanism in Canada as far as we are aware.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: If the hon. gentleman wants to come down to my office, Mr. Speaker, I can show him copies of letters where people from various parts of the world, not the country, the world have used our models of rural development in this Province as an example.

MR. AYLWARD: Right on! Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Tell us about Northern Affairs.

MR. GOUDIE: Northern Affairs? We are administering -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) your record Labrador.

MR. GOUDIE: - we are administering, Mr. Speaker, in Northern Development -

MR. HISCOCK: Forty million dollars.

MR. GOUDIE: - a forty-three million agreement -

MR. HISCOCK: - with the federal government.

MR. GOUDIE: Not 90/10, no, 70/30; 60/40 depending on which ratio you want to use, and we, this time, were successful in negotiating an agreement with Ottawa, after a year and a half of badgering, where finally we have two agreements in place, one for Conne River, one for Labrador. And the benefits to this Province escalate by a half a million dollars a year, which I think augers well for the monetary input at least, to the well-being of the aboriginal peoples of this Province.

MR. STIRLING: By the federal government.

MR. GOUDIE: Federal and Provincial. Federal and Provincial.

MR. AYLWARD: Check the records, will you.

MR. GOUDIE: Seventy/thirty; sixty/forty; what is the ratio?

MR. FLIGHT: Give them a mention.

MR. GOUDIE: Give them a mention. Good Heaven's
I commend the federal government for their contribution -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: - to the native peoples agreement
and to the agricultural agreement, I have done it publicly
and I will do it here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOUSE: What do you think federal governments
are for, boy?

MR. GOUDIE: That is not true... Not true, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOUSE: What do you think federal governments are for?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE: We recognize the contributions that
the federal government makes, it is too bad they do not live up
to their responsibility and contribute a little more which they
should do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: Either that or
give us the rights to our resources and we will become self-
efficient, one or the other.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. GOUDIE: The hon. gentlemen opposite,
Mr. Speaker, want to sign away the resources, as they did
Churchill Falls. If you want to talk about dealings in
Newfoundland with Quebec, take your own example of the 1960s
and the development that put them -

MR. STIRLING: Now who is going back?

MR. GOUDIE: - up there in Churchill Falls
and sold away their rights for sixty-five years. Changed the
name of the river without consulting the people of Labrador
to any extent whatsoever, just arbitrarily changed the name,
no problem, go on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. GOUDIE:

These Indians and Inuit up in Labrador they are not worth thinking about. That is the attitude of the Liberal Party of this Province, Mr. Speaker. Not worth considering, the Indian or the Inuit people of this Province. That is just the attitude they have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. GOUDIE:

In any event, I am getting a little bit off the track here, I guess.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE:

We can talk about possibilities for developments as it relates to aluminum smelting. Iron ore smelting; I was run out of Labrador City fifteen years ago on the rails, when I worked with CBC, for suggesting, daring to suggest, in that town, to the company that they should try some smelting in this Province and not ship it out of here.

MR. MORGAN:

Hear, hear! That is the boy, 'Joe'.

MR. STIRLING:

What have they done in the last ten years?

MR. GOUDIE:

But hopefully the attitude of that company and Wabush Mines and the rest of them have changed. And I can see, Mr. Speaker, where Labrador, the central area of Labrador, in particular, can become the centre for a great number of industries in this Province, based on the hydro resources of Labrador and of this Province.

The attitude that I have been familiar with for the last three years, being a member of this government, is that is the direction we want to take, to develop the resources, the hydro resources particularly, of Labrador for the benefit of Labradorians and for the benefit of the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right.

MR. GOUDIE: That is the kind of position I can support. That is the kind of position I support when I talk to this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Butt):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I am rather amused, Mr. Speaker, at the crowing, at the boasting that is coming from the other side about all the things that they have done in Newfoundland in the last ten years. Now, apparently most members on the opposite side are using the resolution introduced by the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle), as a springboard to crow about all the things that they have done and all the things that the other crowd have given away. Now, Mr. Speaker, that argument is beginning to wear very thin in this Province, very thin indeed. The people are beginning to ask - not only beginning, they are asking and have been for some time - "When are you going to stop ridiculing Joey Smallwood, when are you going to give up? The man is out of politics, he is writing an encyclopedia on Newfoundland, when are you going to leave the poor man alone and let him live in peace. And when are you going to do something yourselves?"

MR. G. FLIGHT:

That is the question.

MR. NEARY:

People are asking this government to point to one single major accomplishment in ten years of Toryism in this Province. That is what people are asking, Mr. Speaker. The Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls, they have given up on that altogether. People have abandoned hope. And every day you hear more and more repeated -

MR. MORGAN:

The media will not carry it.

MR. NEARY:

Well, maybe they will not, but I will say it for the sake of record.

MR. MORGAN:

There are not many of the opposition here, as well.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, people have abandoned hope as far as the development of the Lower Churchill is concerned. They have given up on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: They have no faith in this administration and they now realize that if Muskrat Falls, the Lower Churchill, is going to be developed and the concept of transmitting power to the Island of Newfoundland and selling the surplus power on the mainland or down in the United States, that that will be done when we get a Liberal Government back in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: It will never be done.

MR. MARSHALL: It will never be done.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let us look at the track record of this hon. crowd who are boasting and crowing about all the great things that they have done. And they get up once in a while, especially the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), who will talk about rubber factories and boot and shoe factories. Well, now let us take a look at their record and see what they have done in ten years. Well, Mr. Speaker, the very first thing that they did when they took over the government of this Province was they shut down the steel mill in at the Octagon. That was the start of it. You talk about Tory times being hard times, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN: Hard as steel.

MR. S. NEARY: They have a rural development programme in this Province that the minister just told us is the best in the world. I would not want to see the worst, Mr. speaker. It has a track record of a sixty per cent failure, sixty per cent failure.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, that is not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true. Less than thirty per cent of the loans and grants that are gotten from that depart-

November 25, 1981

Tape No. 3757

RA - 4

MR. S. NEARY:

their record?

MR. TULK:

Throw down the (inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

Is your Honour aware of what
the record is?

MR. HISCOCK:

The Crosbie empire is gone.

MR. S. NEARY:

Well, the Crosbie empire was
the latest example, tragic, unfortunate for so many
thousand employees of the Crosbie Group of companies.
I feel sorry for these people,

MR. NEARY: I regret that this has happened very much. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about the Crosbie Group of companies because they are not producers. They provide service industries. Just listen to the list. This is only a partial list, Mr. Speaker, a partial list now of the crowd who just told us about all their accomplishments. This is a partial list of industries that have closed down in the last ten years: The Grand Bank fish plant -

AN HON. MEMBER: The rubber plant.

MR. NEARY: We will talk about the rubber plant - the Grand Bank fish plant, Gaultois fish plant, Rambler Mines is on the blocks, Advocate Mines has two more months, Gullbridge Mine in the Premier's own district of Springdale, gone.

MR. THOMS: I hear that the Premier is in trouble in Springdale, by the way.

MR. NEARY: When did it go?

PREMIER PECKFORD: It went in the Spring of 1972.

MR. NEARY: In the Spring of 1972, The Premier confirms, in the Spring of 1972, under a Tory regime.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Inaudible) 1971.

MR. NEARY: Gullbridge Mine went in the Spring of 1972 under a Tory regime.

AN HON. MEMBER: The steel plant.

MR. NEARY: I mentioned the steel plant down at the Octagon. Come By Chance oil refinery which the Premier promised to open in ninety days.

AN HON. MEMBER: You did not mention Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Well, I could mention Bell Island.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, do (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes, I will, Mr. Speaker. The

MR. NEARY: government now have an opportunity to do something for Bell Island. And after all their criticism -

MR. DOYLE: What did you do?

MR. NEARY: You ask what I did. I did an awful lot. I did a lot more than this crowd have done in ten years that they have been in office.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You closed the mine down.

MR. NEARY: Is that so?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Shocking fellow.

MR. NEARY: In ten years, since they have been in office, they have completely ignored Bell Island. Mr. Speaker, in ten years they have had an opportunity to do all the things for Bell Island that they criticized us for not doing. Now, why have they not done it? Why have they not done it?

Come By Chance oil refinery, which the Premier promised to open in ninety days, is gone. Newfoundland Forest Products, gone down the drain; Hawkes Bay Lumber Company, closed down; Bay d'Espoir Lumber Company, closed down; Rayo Forest Enterprises, Gambo, closed down; Stephenville Kipper Plant, down; Canadian Cushion Craft at the Octagon - that is a beaut - closed down; Pyramid Mobile Homes down in Argenticia, shut down tight; Maritime Bedding in Stephenville, down; R.K.O. Industries, Stephenville, locked the door; Fishermen's Trading Union Company, shut down; Labrador Linerboard logging operations in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, closed down; Bayshore Foods in Stephenville, financed partly out of taxpayer money, shut down. And I have to stop here, Mr. Speaker, I have to stop and get back to when they talk about the rubber plant. Bayshore Foods in Stephenville, what were they making? Snowballs - partly financed out of taxpayer money. And then they have the face to get up and talk about rubber factories. At

MR. NEARY: least people had to wear shoes or rubbers. LaBatts Brewery, Stephenville, gone; Domac Enterprises, shut down; St. Lawrence mines, gone; Newfoundland Fiberply, locked the doors. Newfoundland Hardwoods will be the next on the list. The brick plant out near Clarenville is on the verge of shutting down.

Mr. Speaker, would you consider this to be the record of a builder or a wrecker? Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition - that is only a partial list, by the way, I am sure that I have missed numerous industries. We should have a little contest here, Mr. Speaker. I could start up in that corner where the hon. member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) or Humber East is sitting -

MR. BAIRD: Now, now!

MR. BAIRD: Humber West.

MR. GOUDIE: - Humber West (Mr. Baird) is sitting and I could ask him how many industries in his area that he knows about have shut down since the Tories took over in this Province, how many have shut down that I have not listed on my list.

MR. BAIRD: Neither one.

MR. NEARY: Neither one. What about the one down near Lark Harbour that was financed by the taxpayers of this Province? Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation put up the money, gave the money to Mr. Dunphy to start a fish plant down in Bay of Islands. That is not listed here. What happened to that?

I am sure the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), if we were to have a little contest right now, could stand up and say, But, Mr. Member, you missed this industry in Stephenville, you missed that industry. This one closed down. Howie Meeker closed down his bedding plant, financed out of taxpayers' money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) if he wanted to, could stand up and tell us about the little operation that was financed by taxpayers down at Pleasantville that shut down, a little manufacturing industry that shut down. If we had a contest, Mr. Speaker, if we went up and down that side and this side of the House, I am sure we would come up with a list the length of your arm of industries that have been shut down in this Province in the last ten years under a Tory regime.

If I were the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) I would be worried about my

MR. NEARY: savory patch, the way they are shutting down industries in this Province, Mr. Speaker. I would not be sleeping over there if I were the hon. gentleman. And as I indicated, Mr. Speaker, millions piled upon millions of dollars that could have been used in this Province to bolster our economy, have been thrown away on ill-conceived ideas and harebrained schemes out of money that this government has used for the purposes of pork barrelling, money that came from the Government of Canada. The fact of the matter is, Sir, that the Rural Development Authority that the hon. gentleman spoke about has a bad, bad track record indeed. It has a 60 per cent failure.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the only reason I stood to speak on this resolution in the first place was because my colleague, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) was out doing an interview. He was scheduled to speak and when I looked he was not in his seat so I had to fill in for a few minutes.

MR. FLIGHT: Tell them what a great speech I gave them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans, our Energy spokesman, wants me to tell the House what a magnificent speech he gave when he was responding to the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I agree with him, Mr. Speaker. If there is one member of this House whose speaking has improved in recent times, it is the member for Windsor - Buchans. He is becoming an outstanding orator.

November 25, 1981

Tape 3759

EC - 3

MR. NEARY: He is rapidly becoming one of the best speakers that I have seen in this House in the last twenty years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And I have seen a good many of them.

MR. NEARY: I have seen the hon. W. J. Browne in action, Jim Greene, Dr. Noel Murphy, Lady J. Spencer, W. J. Keough, former Premier Smallwood, I have seen them all - and I have to say that my hon. colleague, the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), is one of the best that I have heard in recent times. I do not know if he is taking a Dale Carnegie course or not. I would be very surprised if he is not.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, he is not.

MR. NEARY: He is not? I will take the Minister of Justice's (Mr. Ottenheimer) word for it, because obviously he knows.

But, Mr. Speaker, I thought I would mention these few industries that have shut down in this Province, just to illustrate to the House and to the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, what they have to look forward to.

MR. THOMS: Gone, gone, gone!

MR. NEARY: People have abandoned hope, people have given up, people do not believe that the Lower Churchill will be developed, people do not believe that this government can negotiate with the Government of Canada -

MR. FLIGHT: Or anyone else.

MR. NEARY: - or the government of Quebec to get a corridor across the province of Quebec to transmit surplus power to the mainland or down to the United States. They have lost confidence, they have lost faith, Mr. Speaker, and you cannot blame them - after you look at the track record of this administration. All we ever hear from the Premier of this province is gloom and doom.

MR. THOMS: He has got no control over anything.

MR. NEARY: He has no control over anything, not even some of his members.

MR. FLIGHT: He is not giving anything away.

MR. NEARY: There is a little more Mr. Speaker, to running this Province than working on a timetable and then calling a meeting in the auditorium and having a lecture by the principal. There is more to running a province than doing that sort of thing. And the Premier may be a well-meaning fellow, but he just has not got what it takes to develop this Province. He is always, always -

MR. FLIGHT: Three years of nothing.

MR. NEARY: I do not know if the hon. gentleman is paranoid, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if he is paranoid or not. I will not accuse him of being paranoid, but somehow or other he is always looking over his shoulder, -

MR. THOMS: He certainly (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: - and ranting and raving and making silly, foolish statements, non-sensical statements about somebody giving something away. That is his only defence for not doing anything, that is his defence for not developing the Lower Churchill, that is his defence for not negotiating with Quebec, that is his defence for not settling the offshore. We are not going to be like somebody says, we are not going to give everything away -

AN HON. MEMBER: No, that is right.

MR. FLIGHT: Nothing to give away after ten years. Nothing to give away to anyone.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, after ten years that-

MR. STIRLING: Of anguish and heart.

MR. NEARY: - That defence, and after ten years of Toryism, after creating record unemployment in this province, practically shutting down the fishing industry, after wrecking the economy of Newfoundland, that argument is beginning to wear a little bit thin, Mr. Speaker. It is not going to wash anymore, it is not going to fly. People are not buying it. And it is about time that the Premier

MR. NEARY: of this Province gave up
blaspheming and ridiculing Joey Smallwood. Let the man
rest in peace.

MR. DINN: He is not dead yet. He is not dead yet.

MR. NEARY: He is gone.

MR. DINN: He is not.

MR. NEARY: Forget about him.

MR. THOMS: The member for St. John's North
(Mr. Carter) will not be satisfied until he is gone, we
all know that.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Forget about Mr. Smallwood and do
something themselves -

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member has one minute.

MR. NEARY: I am glad of that, Mr. Speaker,
I am not in full flight today - do something themselves.
They have a bad, bad track record in this province, dismal
record. It is getting worse.

MR. S. NEARY: I would forecast that next year, under this government, if we think times are bad now, next year it is going to get worse. There is no indication from the government - all we ever hear from them is gloom and doom- there is no indication that there are better days ahead. And there is no harm to say, Mr. Speaker, no harm to repeat the old saying in this Province, that Tory times are hard times.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I thought I would like to have a few words to say in this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Call an election. Call an election.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I thought I would like to have a few words to say on this resolution and, as some hon. members have already said, the topic has been debated many, many times in the past. And though we have opposite the group of people who want to preach doom and gloom and do not want to lay a good foundation for our future I am sure it is not shared by the Newfoundlanders and Labradorians at large nor by the majority of members on this side of the House. Neither will it ever be, Mr. Speaker. These debates on matters of resource development clearly indicate to anybody who is in the confines or in the precincts of the House, the difference between the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and the Progressive Conservative Party of Newfoundland. The Liberal Party of Newfoundland is a short-term, giveaway party and the Progressive Conservative Party is a long-term, resource management party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is just go and do and get the glory today for today and tomorrow, and forget about the future.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, it is very interesting that I am following -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that I am following the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) because as I listened this afternoon, while I was in the precincts of the House, it brought back memories to me, echoes of the past, echoes of members of the opposition in 1976 and 1977 when they were indicating that the then Minister of Mines and Energy was on a collision course as it related to the development of our oil and gas resources. The Minister of Mines and Energy of the day was on a collision course, so much so, Mr. Speaker, that the member for LaPoile on May 31st 1977 could say in this hon. House, "The Minister of Mines and Energy has frightened the oil companies away with his policy."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, if ever there should be a statement that would haunt the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and that would haunt the member for LaPoile, let that one haunt him.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
Order, please! The hon. member for LaPoile should restrain himself.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It was six or seven months after that prophetic statement by the member for LaPoile that every single oil company signed a deal with the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) give it away

PREMIER PECKFORD: And we did not have to give it away, Mr. Speaker. Here they are again now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order!

PREMIER PECKFORD: When times get a bit tough on resource management, when times get a bit tough, here are the ones who scurry away and look for short-term solutions, Mr. Speaker. But let us get one thing clear now and let it be clear to every member on the opposition, that while there might be economic depression in this Province right now due to a whole bunch of factors -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and though the Liberal Party and the Liberal Opposition might be getting scared, there is one group of people in this Province that will not get scared, like we were not scared in '77. Because of their vulnerability now, we will not sell it away or give it away because the Liberal Party wants to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And they can reiterate that we are driving investment away, Mr. Speaker, all they like, but let the member for LaPoile(Mr. Neary) eat his words in 1981 that he said in 1977.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Let him eat his words.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: (inaudible)

PREMIER PECKFORD: And, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - it will not be too long before they will be eating other words -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - that they are making now, it will not be too long. So let them go ahead and make these weird statements that they want to. I was very interested

November 25, 1981

Tape No. 3761

RA - 4

PREMIER PECKFORD: to listen to the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) talk about the industries that closed down in Newfoundland in the last five or six years. I was very interested to hear it, Mr. Speaker, because it also showed a psychology that the Liberal Party has, that somehow every single industry in the

PREMIER PECKFORD: private sector that runs into trouble must be subsidized by the taxpayers of Newfoundland, so that you subsidize every single industry that is going to close down because it is non-viable, wherewith you will create a circumstance if you subsidize enough industries - which is the Liberal policy - that you will drag the whole Province down.

Now, I would rather see one industry go than the whole Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is number one.

So let us not get hoodwinked on a Socialist philosophy now being advocated by the populist member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), that suddenly because there are a whole bunch of private sector industries in trouble that the government of any society or of any jurisdiction has suddenly to move in and prop up non-viable industries, to prop up a Labrador linerboard industry, to prop up other such industries which have been nooses around our necks so we could not get on with doing basic resource management in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is number one.

And number two - Mr. Speaker, the audacity of the member for LaPoile or any Liberal on the opposite side, to talk about closing down industries! Look at the litany of industries in the 1950s and 1960s that were closed down that were dragged into this Province from Europe, that the member for LaPoile has to answer for some day in the political history of this Province; burning their boats and bringing in industries which are alien to this Province, only to have them close down again and cost us millions and millions of dollars. It is also very interesting that of all the industries the member

PREMIER PECKFORD: for LaPoile (Mr. Neary)

mentioned, one Tory achievement outshines them all and overshadows them all, and that is the change on the power contract at Long Harbour -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - that pays for every single one of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Over \$150 million will come into the hands of Newfoundland taxpayers because we changed the power contract at Long Harbour - \$150 million!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: A fantastic achievement which overshadows all the other private sector industries!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that I have touched a sensitive nerve on the opposite side of the House. It is quite obvious that the members opposite cannot keep quiet while they hear the truth, because the truth hurts. But the truth is going to be told, Mr. Speaker, that Liberal resource management in this Province from 1949 to 1971 was a disaster, an absolute and total disaster.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And then, Mr. Speaker, they have the audacity to talk about resource management, when they signed mineral concessions on the Island of Newfoundland which we have had to change, mineral concessions in Labrador which we have had to change, forestry concessions

PREMIER PECKFORD: both on the Island and in Labrador which we have had to change so that we could get back our birthright and our heritage. This is the party that talks about industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: This is the party that talks about resource development, Mr. Speaker. They should be ashamed of themselves and they should be trying to divorce themselves from their miserable industrial past -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and take a new path to the future. They should not be trying to justify twenty years of industrial disaster from 1949 to 1971. Why go back in the past? Why does the Liberal Party continue to go back to try to justify disasters that everybody in Newfoundland knows were disasters? Why do they not look ahead to the future now, Mr. Speaker, and start talking about what they are going to do in the future? Are they going to approach hydro development in Labrador like we are? Are they going to approach offshore resources like we are? Are they going to approach fisheries like we are? No, Mr. Speaker, they want to stay in the past.

MR. L. THOMS: No, we are not. No, we are not. No, we are not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is getting time to adjourn the debate.

Obviously, the truth hurts, and next Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, if I adjourn the debate, I will tell some more truths that will hurt even more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

November 25, 1981

Tape 3762

EC - 4

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please! Order, please!

The debate has been adjourned.

Order, please! Order, please!

The debate has been adjourned

by the hon. the Premier.

It being six o'clock this House

stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, Nov. 26, 1981

at 3:00 p.m.