



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 21

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

29 May 1985

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for
Stephenville, a point of order.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to extend an invitation to all hon. members of this hon. House tonight to see the performance of the Bay St. George Community College Glee Club which will be performing at the Hotel Newfoundland at 8:00 p.m. They are quite good, starting to become very well known and I think that any hon. member who can spare the time should come down and enjoy a very good performance and see the efforts that are being done by the community college. They are quite good and I extend an invitation to all members of this House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

That was not a point of order. The hon. member took the opportunity of giving us some information.

MR. MORGAN:
A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am so used to saying 'Mr. Chairman' the last three or four evenings, I called you Mr. Chairman. I apologize for that, Mr. Speaker.

My point of order is in relation to a story in today's Evening Telegram in which the Chairman of a Committee appointed by this House to investigate the matter of a possible breach of privilege of a member of the House, in this case this member, in which the Chairman said, and I quote and I can table the story, "Mr. Carter said there are no further public hearings into the allegations of breach of privilege planned, but that the Committee will be meeting privately with witnesses and anyone else they think necessary, including the Premier."

Now, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this. The Committee had earlier planned to hold public hearings in this whole matter. The whole matter was to be scrutinized through the public process of public hearings. I have appeared on two occasions as a witness in that process, and other witnesses as well. Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that it is quite unfair for the Committee to suddenly now decide to call in witnesses and meet with them privately. If the Premier is going to be called to that Committee as a witness, this witness here wants to cross-examine the Premier, in questioning, in the same way as I did with other witnesses. Mr. Speaker, you earlier ruled that the Committee has a right to make its own decisions, but surely there is a right and a wrong with regard to these decisions when they are made. I am saying now it is quite unfair for that Committee to hold private meetings with

certain witnesses when they have already gone through a process of having public hearings with all the media there.

Mr. Speaker, again I quote the Chairman again for the record. He said, "There are no further public hearings into the allegations of breach of privilege planned but that the Committee will be meeting privately with witnesses and anyone else they think necessary, including the Premier."

MR. BARRY:

Another Star Chamber, is it?

MR. MORGAN:

So, Mr. Speaker, why is it the Premier can sit down in private meetings where I cannot cross-examine him but others can cross-examine me? It is quite unfair, Mr. Speaker. In rising on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to say as well that I give notice of a possible point of privilege. The reason I cannot do it now, at the most opportune time, is because the transcripts of last evening's meetings are unavailable to me, they will not be available until approximately 6:00 P.M. this evening. If I had last evening's transcripts in front of me, there is a strong possibility that I would be rising on a point of privilege and I could use the contents of these transcripts. But right now I give notice there is a possibility that I will be raising a point of privilege at the first opportune time based on the transcript's contents.

Mr. Speaker, my point of order is there has to be a clarification as to the workings of this Committee. Will they or will they not hold all hearings publicly as has been done to date? Or will

they hear certain witnesses privately and certain others, as has been done to date, publicly?

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of order, the Committee that is being referred to is not under any obligation to hold all public meetings or all private meetings. We have already held a number of private meetings where we have determined our procedure and where we have done some preliminary interviews. We will certainly have to hold some more private meetings to discuss the report we must bring before this House, and we will be having some more private meetings with perhaps experts in the field of procedure on privilege, as we see fit. We are under no obligation to hold all public meetings or all private meetings. We will try and give this as public an airing as possible. I do not mind giving that undertaking to this House, but at the same time I do not think we are under any obligation to do as the hon. member suggested. And I think, as you so properly ruled, Mr. Speaker, we are the masters of our own agenda and we intend to do so.

MR. TULK:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Fogo, on a point of order.

MR. TULK:

I must say to the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) that I am surprised as a member of that

Committee as he is that that Committee is suppose to be calling witnesses, and I make the point 'witnesses,' in private, that we will not be hearing all witnesses in public. And I can assure this House and this Committee, and I think I have the assurance of my friend for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), and indeed the assurance of everybody on this side, that the two members who sat on that Committee representing this side of the House will not sit and hear witnesses, particularly witnesses, in private. Sure there may be some private meetings between the Committee as to its decision and so on, what it is going to come out with, but we are not going to sit, nobody on this side is going to sit and hear witnesses in private. Witnesses who give evidence should be heard in public.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. John,s North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Requests for information naturally are done in private. But any fullfledged investigation of a witness quite obviously will be done in public. But this not to preclude us from getting information where we can in private from experts in the field of procedure and perhaps asking a few general questions around to people who may be knowledgeable in this area. I think the Vice-Chairman quite properly takes the words out of my mouth when he expresses his opinion.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker may I speak to that point of order just once more?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

What I understood the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) to raise was his particular reference to the Premier. I believe that was his particular reference, that we may be holding private meetings with the Premier to get information. Well, I have to differ with the Chairman in that regard. If there is, perhaps, a person skilled in parliamentary procedure that could very well be considered, if you wanted to talk about parliamentary procedure or something in regards to this case. I want to assure the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), and indeed this House, that in no way will this side of the House go along with holding private meetings to gain information that could be construed as evidence in this case. In no way will that be, as far as we are concerned. Now the government side can overrule us again if they want to and say, yes, there will be private meetings. But I can assure you that this side of the House will not participate in those meetings that are private when it comes to evidence. That is not the way we believe in doing things.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

To that point of order, I have already ruled that this is not in the hands of the Chair. The

Chairman of the Committee and the Committee are masters of their own procedure. And if a report comes in due course there will be ample opportunity to debate a motion to accept, or otherwise, that report.

The comment made by the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) about a possible delay in getting the Hansard report of last night, I have already given directions that we employ extra staff to expedite these Hansard reports. I will check into that matter and see that we get them at the very earliest opportunity.

Before calling Oral Questions, I would like to welcome a number of distinguished guests: The hon. Mable Deware, Minister of Community Colleges, New Brunswick; and hon. Ernie Isley, Minister of Manpower, Alberta; Dr. Harry Fisher, Director-General, Council of Ministers of Education Canada; and Mr. George Demetra of the Council of Ministers of Education Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
We also have forty senior Grade XI and XII students from Wa-Wa-Nese, Manitoba with their teacher, Ron Vander Busche. And we have sixty students from James Moore Central High School, Carbonear, accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Reid and Mr. Wareham.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
We also have sixteen Grade XI students from Stella Maris School, Trepassey, with their teacher, Ted Winter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, in his -- weekend Convocation address, Dr. Leslie Harris, the president of Memorial University, issued grave warnings that continued restraint on the part of government in relation to the university makes it a virtual certainty that Memorial will not be able to maintain its present level of scholarship. Now, since the level of scholarship is a central reason for a university's existence, I would ask the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) if he has, in the wake of the president's remarks, scheduled any meetings with the president to discuss what appears to be a crisis in the Province's system of higher education?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly the problems at the university are not new ones to me or to anyone in the university administration. Contrary to popular opinion, there has not been a restraint period that particularly affected the university any worse than it has affected other universities in many parts of Canada, and any other post-secondary institutes in many parts of Canada. Certainly the restraint programme as it related to the university is no

worse than the restraint programme that all government departments have gone through, a restraint programme which we thought, to be fiscally responsible, was very necessary.

In the case of the university, they have had fairly substantial increases. Many members, Mr. Speaker, may not know that the university grant this year is \$76 million, up from \$70 million last year. Now that is not a bad increase in a time of reasonable restraint. They have gone from \$70 million to \$76 million this year. And just as a matter of record, I guess when the Conservatives took over the Government of Newfoundland in 1971 the university budget was \$14 million. Since 1971 it has gone from \$14 million to \$76 million. That is a fair increase and shows our interest in the university from its academic scholarship point of view and from making the university programmes accessible to all persons in Newfoundland.

Now, in talking with the president of the university both before and after Convocation about this issue, we are fairly hopeful that in the \$76 million grant given to the university this year will be found enough money to solve very peculiar anomalies that exist at the university as it relates particularly to new instructors, new professors being hired. Because in order to get someone to come to a position now you actually have to pay them more than some of the senior professors who have been there for four, five or even longer periods of years. So we are hoping that in this year's budget the university can accomplish what it has set out and been mandated to do, which is to provide a university education to

all students in Newfoundland who wish and are capable of going to university. And we think, Mr. Speaker, that in times of restraint the university budget has significantly increased in recent years. We hope to continue to increase it and even go beyond the restraint period and give substantial increases to the university. But, again, in this year's budget, considering the budget that we have and considering the restraint period which we are now coming out of, we have given the university a good increase. I look forward, during the next few years, to doing a lot of things for the university to improve scholarship. Mr. Speaker, as an example of the kind of things we are doing at the university this year, which we were not able to fund last year because we were deep in restraint. involves the School of Pharmacy and the School of Nursing. We are going to spend \$2.1 million, beginning with \$1.6 million this year and \$500,000 next year, to make sure that we have students better educated in those particular fields.

MR. TULK:

How long is this going to go on?

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, they ask a question; the question may be simple but the answer is reasonably complex and it relates to many persons in Newfoundland. I am more than glad to give a detailed answer or give, I guess, a less accurate one. The university has requests to government for in excess of \$90 million of capital and we are hoping to be able to accommodate some of those capital requirements over the next few years. At the same time we will continue to give, albeit it may be modest but

we still think significant in times of restraint, increases to the university budget so they can accommodate the things they want to do.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. The business as usual response and attitude of the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) is typical of members opposite. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister will he, in light of the president's comments, recognize that there is a crisis at the university? When you have the president of the university saying that they are unable to fill positions because they cannot pay enough in order to attract qualified people to the positions, when you have young people on the radio, as they were this morning, stating that they could not get courses because there are not enough courses being given at the university, there is a serious problem, Mr. Speaker. The minister has to respond to that. I ask the minister if he would commit to meet with the President of the University immediately to explore what it is that the president is concerned about and what is it that the government can do to assist the university in this period of crisis?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Career Development.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) fully understands government procedures as they relate to dealing with the university. Besides having a minister in

Cabinet now responsible for advanced education, which gives the university more access to a minister directly - something which was criticized on the other side of the House in part - we also have a Cabinet committee, which takes in several of the members of Cabinet, which meets with the university on a very regular basis, both during budgetary preparation and afterwards, and that committee is meeting with the university on an ongoing basis. There is hardly a day goes by, and certainly hardly a week goes by, that I do not spend some time discussing with the president of the university, as I do with the leaders of other educational institutes in this Province, the needs for increased funding for education in this Province. It is not a simple problem that we have in this Province. If we have a crisis in post-secondary education, then the crisis exists in our vocational school system which needs modernization. We could actually spend, today, \$100 million or more in vocational education in Newfoundland, in our colleges and in our vocational school system; we could spend that kind of money and at the same time the university has a request into us for \$90 million and at the same time they have problems when it comes to salaries at the university. Those are not just university problems, they are education problems all over Canada where the educational institutes are not receiving enough money, so they think. The ministers who are in the gallery, and the hon. Flora MacDonald and myself, this morning were at a discussion of the Association of Community Colleges of Canada and the Vocational Association of Canada over at the Arts and Culture Centre. One of

the questions asked there by somebody from out West was how are we going to improve education in Canada unless we can increase the salaries of all persons who are involved in those two given groups, which take in, I think, 800 people at the conference and there are probably 8,000 members in those associations across Canada. The problem of salaries in post-secondary education is a serious one, but again, in our case, in our budget, \$76 million will go to the university this year. In my department, an overall budget of \$138 million for a Province of 560,000 people, we think is a fair commitment to the goals of education in this Province. Sure, we would like to do more and, sure, we are going to do more, but it takes a little bit of time. We will have access to more money over the next few years through our development fund and different sources of revenue that we now have. I guess anybody in this Province who is not fully cognizant of the emphasis that this government is placing on education and training, is not fully aware of what this government has been doing for the last six months.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
That is the sort of complacency that will see the university continue to decline. Perhaps the best thing the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) could do would be to recommend that his department be done away with and the savings passed over to the university if that is the attitude

he is going to take.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I ask once more, will the Minister of Career Development at least commit himself to sitting down with the president of the university to discuss the concerns that the president has expressed at this convocation and to see what the minister can do, rather than standing up and telling this House that everything is alright and everything is going to be okay at the university. That is the same attitude the former Minister of Education took with respect to drop-outs from high school last year. Will the minister meet with the president of the university, and soon?

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

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, I wish we had had these great suggestions to solve the problems in post-secondary education before the budget, because I could have saved the government an awful lot of money. Now all I have to do to solve the problems in post-secondary education in this Province, all the government has to do to retrain all these young Newfoundlanders who want to be trained in areas of modern technology, in areas where there are going to be jobs, is I have to agree to have a meeting with the president of the university, that is going to solve it, and I can abolish the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies,

which will solve the other half of the problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those kinds of simplistic answers are simply not valid in the world of education today.

MR. BARRY:

Will you have consultation with the president of the university?

MR. POWER:

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that I had my calendar here to show you how often since October 2 I have met with people in post-secondary education in this Province, and the person I have met with probably the most is the president of the university.

MR. BARRY:

On Saturday?

MR. POWER:

I was at the convocation on Saturday. I discussed it with him after his comments. I was there on the stage. We have had ongoing discussions. What the president of the university said was not new. He said it to us at our budget meetings, he said it last year in convocation and, for some reason, it did not get the same amount of play, that he did not have enough money to solve the salary anomalies and salary adjustments which he would like to make at university and, because of that, he was afraid that some persons were going to go off to the mainland. That is not just a university problem. In the Newfoundland Medical Association, we have doctors who leave to go to Ontario because they can make more money there. Sure, we do.

Now, how do you solve all those problems? The simple point is that a meeting is not the

solution. The solution is more money. This year we have given the university \$76 million, \$6 million more than last year. We think that is a concrete way to solve this problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question involves a couple of departments and, probably eventually, several, so I would have to direct it to the Premier. The subject has been broached before in the House; however, there is some additional information I would like to have.

It has been clearly established that since the provincial election there have been a number of political patronage appointments by the government -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. KELLAND:

- in specific reference, the defeated Tory candidate in Windsor - Buchans (Mr. McLennon) and the defeated Tory candidate in Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) have been given patronage appointments. The additional information I would like to have is how long were these positions vacant and/or when were they created, what selection process was used to fill them, and were any other candidates actively considered before the political patronage appointments were made to fill those two positions?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of procedures here and, under the Standing Orders of the House, I think one of the conditions under which Oral Questions are asked is that they be urgent and of public importance. I suggest to the hon. member - I know he is a new member, I appreciate that, I understand that - perhaps he does not know all the rules of the House but we are willing to accommodate the hon. member, we are willing to realize he is a new member, but obviously he can put that question on the Order Paper and we will only be too pleased to answer it.

MR. KELLAND:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
I appreciate the procedural lecture, Mr. Speaker, I am new member, but I am probably a lasting member which is perhaps more than we can say for a few of the members opposite in the future. Anyway, the supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, if I can get right to it, is would the Premier confirm then that yet another defeated Tory candidate, the one in St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond), has now also been given a political patronage appointment and is now working for the government and what is the position he has been given?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have already answered the hon. member. As it comes to being long-time members of this House, or whatever, as referred to by the hon. member opposite, I was elected in 1972 in a district that had never been Tory in its history and this is 1985, so perhaps we have some longevity over here that the hon. member is unaware of.

As it relates to his question, I am not saying I will not answer it. If he wants to put it on the Order Paper we will be only too pleased to answer the question for the hon. member.

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

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

MR. KELLAND:
If the Premier for whatever reasons refuses to answer at this stage of the game and in this method, would he inform the House if his government does have a policy of political patronage appointments which would put defeated Tory candidates in fairly high profile positions, and, in effect, would that not have the effect of putting them in a position to actively campaign for the next election at public expense?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
You are worried already!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. gentleman's motivation is that he is getting worried about the next election already. We honestly

have a majority government now and we really do not intend to call an election in the near future. I want to assure the hon. member we feel very comfortable, Mr. Speaker. We have a lot of work to do on behalf of the people of the Province and we will do that and then we will meet the people at an appropriate time. But I would assure the hon. member that he does not have to worry about his seat for the next little while. We are about Her Majesty's business, and, as I indicated to him, we are only too happy to answer his questions. I think his questions are of a nature which should be put on the Order Paper and we will be only too happy to answer the hon. member's questions. No problem. We will answer them in due course. But they are the kind of questions that do not elicit an immediate response, that should be put on the Order Paper and then we will deal with them. I thank the hon. member for his questions. Put them on the Order Paper and I will answer them.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Premier and it has to do with the highway's agreement. I have a copy of a statement he made a little over a year ago when the federal Liberals were in power, and in it he discusses highway matters. One of the comments he makes, after pointing out that the CPA report says that a five-year \$1 billion programme is required to put our highways in shape, is, 'Therefore

the \$470 million five-year programme proposed by the Province is modest and reflects our concerns for the fiscal restraints that are faced by both governments.'

I also recall sometime in February I believe, that John Crosbie, our Cabinet minister, also said that we are looking at \$480 million or \$490 million in terms of this roads agreement. However, during the election we heard, if I am not mistaken, an announcement that there was going to be a \$180 million roads agreement.

The other thing that we also heard during I think the Throne Speech, that that was suppose to be - I am sorry, we heard first that it was a \$180 million agreement which was to be for five years. In the Throne Speech we heard that it was for five years. In the Budget Speech we heard that it was for seven years. Now we have got to the point where I understand that the agreement that has actually been signed - is it a \$108 million agreement?

The question I have, quite frankly because I am getting confused by all the figures and the dissolving numbers, is how much is this roads agreement? How much has been signed? That is my question to the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

MR. DAWE:

I made a ministerial statement last week on that.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) had a statement on that last week. I do not know where the hon. members

are. Apparently they only read the papers, Mr. Speaker, and I would like for them to read Hansard and to take the ministerial statements and read them and absorb them. I do not know where the hon. member gets \$108 million. I mean, nobody on this side of the House has ever said \$108 million. I do not know where the hon. member keeps himself when the House closes and before the House opens, but obviously it is not in areas of valid information for sure.

We have publicly already announced that we will be signing - it has not been signed, we have agreed between the two governments to sign it - an agreement on the Trans-Canada Highway and the Trans-Labrador Highway of \$181 million, \$1-8-1 million. And it will cover a period of about seven years. Every five-year agreement that we have signed to date has run over because of the ways the tenders are called and there is always a clean-up year.

For example, this year in Forestry, the five-year agreement has gone into six years. If you look at the road builders in this Province, it is very difficult to put through any more than a certain number, the tenders will be called, some of the work will be done in one year, and it will lap over into the other year. For example, right now, on the Conception Bay Bypass Road, the pavement is being done this year when it was supposed to be done last year. So you get a flow-through in the cash flow. So the cash flow could go for seven years even though all of the tenders are out in five.

But it is the largest highway's agreement in the history of

Newfoundland and Labrador and it covers the Trans-Canada Highway, the Trans-Labrador Highway, and perhaps it may cover some secondary roads. We are into final negotiations, but we have the final figure of \$181 million. Now we have to begin negotiations on some other secondary roads in the Province as well. This will be primarily a programme of TCH and Trans-Labrador Highway development.

Because we are concerned about the number of jobs in the Province this Summer, and there are a lot of seasonal jobs, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), in consultation with the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge), met with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) in Ottawa, and we got them to agree - and the minister announced it last week, but got very limited coverage in The Evening Telegram on it, hid away on some weird page way over - to pre-tender three projects on the Trans-Canada Highway. These are three that are all designed, ready to go, in order to create jobs early so that we can get the projects done early.

The Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski), and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) are supposed to sign the formal agreement within the next week or so, as soon as schedules can permit. But it is \$181 million. Ninety per cent of the money will be spent on the Trans-Labrador Highway and the Trans-Canada Highway. It is for seven years, I think, in total but most of the tenders will be called and construction will be started within the five year period.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I am glad to get the numbers straight. Probably on a five year basis \$108 million was not too far off. The point that strikes me about that is when the Premier said that this is the largest highways agreement that has ever been signed, and it is a seven year agreement. I tried to divide 7 into \$181 million and I am getting somewhere around \$25 million or \$26 million per year. Am I in that ball park?

MR. TULK:

You are pretty close.

MR. FENWICK:

That is about approximately right. I went and checked back in the bad old times of the Liberal Government and looked back over the last three years when the highways agreements were signed with the Liberal Government. There were two of them, if I recall correctly. One was a three year agreement, if I recall correctly, and there was another, a special recovery project. Is that not correct? I added up those two and divided by the period of time that they are covered by and, lo and behold, I get \$26 million a year on average was spent over the lifetime of those contracts. So what you are telling us is this great contract, this great contract that has been signed, the largest ever, is really, on a year by year basis, no more than the bad old Liberals had spent, and if you take inflation into account it is probably less. Are these numbers

correct?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we have never ever signed in our history an agreement for any period of time - five, six, seven years, or three years - of \$181 million, settled and finalized. Never! Now, as the hon. member says about the amount that will flow through each year, it is highly likely, very probable, that all the tenders will be out in five years but it is just not going to be possible, with our own provincial programmes, to finish in five years. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has told me on a number of occasions in the last week it is going to be almost impossible with the tenders that we have going out this year for the road builders and construction people to be able to respond to the amount of money that we have available to get it underway. And that might be hard for the hon. member to believe but it is true. There is just no way. So now if you want to divide, like the hon. member did, you can divide, but I will tell the hon. member that was not spent, it was flowed over into the next year. This is our problem. The tenders might be called but it flows over into the next year. But we have never signed an agreement with the federal government for anything near \$181 million over seven years. We have never ever signed an agreement of that size.

Now the hon. members opposite might want to criticize it and all the rest of it, but the long and the short of it is we are going to

have enough projects on the go to keep all the construction companies in the road building industry in operation over that period of time and we are going to tax to the limit the amount that they are going to be able to do in any one year.

Our problem is like on the Conception Bay Bypass, which is not paved yet. These are problems that we have. Because these are big projects, remember, these are not small projects, they are all \$1 million projects. They are not \$250,000 or \$500,000 projects. If you add what we are going to try to put out this year in Trans-Canada Highway and Trans-Labrador Highway, plus our own roads programmes - where is our roads programme now?

MR. DAWE:
In total?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
In total, our own provincial.

MR. DAWE:
\$76 million this year.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Everything together is \$76 million. Is that not the largest in our history?

MR. DAWE:
Pretty close to it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It is pretty close to the largest in our history. We are doing as much as we can do. But there are lies, lies, and then there are damn statistics, as the hon. member knows. It depends upon how you want to divide it up. All we can say is we have never signed an agreement with the federal government any time in the past which had a total expenditure of

\$181 million. Now, you can play games all you like, the long and short of it is we are going to be making significant improvements to the Trans-Canada Highway, East, Central and West. We are going to continue the Trans-Labrador Highway and, hopefully, do some secondary roads to with this agreement. Then we are going to sit down and talk to the federal government about other secondary roads programmes in the Province that we want to be financed as well. But it is the largest in our history in any one agreement that we have signed with the federal government.

MR. W. CARTER
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), and it is a follow-up to him of my question last Friday at which time I made reference to press statements coming from the various hospitals to the effect that a number of beds will be closing out for the Summer. In his reply the minister gave as the main reason for these bed closings was to facilitate the vacation season. And he certainly conveyed the impression, Mr. Speaker, that once the holiday season had ended these hospital beds would be reactivated. Mr. Speaker, it has now come to light that certainly in one case, in the Health Sciences Complex, most of the beds that are being closed for the Summer will remain closed from then on. The main reason, of course, is because of budget restraints. Will the minister now, Mr. Speaker, give an undertaking that this is not so?

Making allowances for the number of closings because of the Summer holidays and the fact that people do not elect to have surgery at that time of year, would he now give an undertaking that, once the season is over, September, say, that these beds will be reactivated and that the eight hundred to twelve hundred people who are on the waiting list at any given time, for example, at the Health Sciences, will be given an opportunity to get treatment in a hospital without the beds being closed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

As the hon. member knows, beds are closed for many, many reasons, including the one that the grants to hospitals across this Province have not been increased during the last two years. There was a three-year freeze recommended by the Royal Commission on Health, Hospitals and Nursing Homes that is being followed. Hospitals, like every other department of government, have to follow and manage the monies that are made available at this particular time. I said last week it is not unusual to find that beds are closed for many, many years, and I do not think there is anything exceptionally unusual that they are closed at this particular time. I admit that beds have been closed at the Health Sciences Complex from the middle of June until the end of March in this coming year.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, almost on a daily basis we hear reports of people

waiting to get into the hospitals, people, in some cases, in need of very serious medical attention. In fact, it was only a few days ago I heard of some very serious cases that are being deferred by virtue of the fact that there are no beds available.

Mr. Speaker, we all realize the need, maybe, to cut back, but surely the minister is not trying to say that we should be saving money at the expense of the sick people of this Province. And that is what we are doing if we are going to be closing out thirty beds after September that, Mr. Speaker, will affect about 700 patients. In other words, 700 people will not be entering hospital who would otherwise be able to come in and get treatment.

Mr. Speaker, will the minister reconsider? We hear the hospital administrators begging for more money in order to carry on. Will the minister not impress upon his colleagues the need to make more money available, if that is necessary, to ensure that these beds will not remain closed after September?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

It is the opinion of many that if you throw money at health, keep on putting more and more money in, and that if you provide enough beds, enough physicians, that you are going to improve the health of a nation, but this is not so. There are waiting lists in every hospital all over the world. If there were not waiting lists, there would be no purpose in having a hospital. These things are part of Medicare all over this whole world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

A good point. A good point.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

DR. TWOMEY:

It is also factual that patients are divided into various lists - those that are acute, those that are elective emergencies and those that are on the chronic care waiting list. It is also known that those who are on the waiting list might be on two or three waiting lists of hospitals elsewhere in this Province. This is a well-known fact. Every waiting list is cross-checked when there is a special research programme done. It is also known that many people change their minds over a period of time and decide not to have elective surgery done.

These are the facts. People have to live within their budgets, hospitals have to live within their budgets, governments have to live within their budgets.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

With budget restraints, Mr. Speaker, such now that sick people have to suffer more, with unemployment at its highest peak, with the fishery going down for the third time in many cases, is the Premier now ready to put the minds of the Newfoundland people at rest and say that the danger of

overheating the economy is now past?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, I am glad to be able to answer the hon. member. I do not know if the fishery is going down the drain or not, Mr. Speaker. I do not think it is, but if the hon. member thinks it is it might be because of the foundation that was laid a number of years ago by the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If he thinks it is going down the drain then, obviously, it did not happen overnight and, therefore, he might have to take some responsibility for it. I do not think, myself, unlike the hon. member, that it is going down the drain. I think that we have a real opportunity through Fishery Products International, which is a restructured company now in the offshore fishery and in some of its inshore operations. Would the hon. member like to know, for example, that there have been put now on the Canadian market - unfortunately, it was not in the hon. member's time when he was Minister of Fisheries - two or three brand new products, which are going over so well, from the Burin plant which we insisted stay open, unlike when the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) was in the Cabinet and part of the Government of Canada in Ottawa wanted to close down the Burin plant which has now gone on a double shift because we cannot keep the new product, the first product of its kind in the world, on the tables of the United States.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, on national television a year or so ago the Premier said some plants will have to close. He is now misleading the House in saying that he was the champion. He was the person who put the boots to the fish plants. I and my colleagues managed to save them over his objections and his bungling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Let me just say that the hon. member was an aide outside the door in the hotel where the restructuring agreement was done; he was not allowed in the same room when it was happening.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

At the time, Mr. Kirby and Mr. De Bane came to me after the agreement and asked will we let the hon. member in the same room after the agreement was signed. This is the hon. member now who was trying to say that he was part

of something that went on. All I know, Mr. Speaker, in response to the point of order by the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), is that on the table, in writing, was the clear federal policy by the people he supported in Ottawa to close down the Burin plant.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, it is not true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

What I have been trying to say to the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) is I know it is true, I can prove it is true. Harbour Breton and Gaultois and Ramea and Grand Bank, we saved them. I know it gets on the hon. member's nerves. All I was trying to do was respond to the hon. member for Twillingate's situation as it related to a question on unemployment by saying that there were two shifts on in Burin plant that were putting out brand new product, never seen before in the world, on the tables of Americans today and we cannot keep the market going. We are creating jobs in this Province. Now if the hon. member has a point of order, I would like to know where it is?

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the Premier, if what the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) just said is not correct, perhaps the Premier would

indicate to us what he is prepared to do for the people of Gaultois because he has not been prepared to meet with them and tell them that he is going to do something that will see them getting more than five weeks work a year. What is the Premier prepared to do for the people of Gaultois, since he mentioned them?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I have heard enough on the point of order. There is obviously a difference of opinion between hon. members, there is no point of order.

The time for Question Period has expired.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, the Premier is now misrepresenting the case before us. He knows that while I was present to see that the interests of the South Coast were properly addressed, the gentleman from Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) was hiding, the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) was hiding and the Premier was on the phone keeping the Minister of Fisheries of the day (Mr. Morgan) in St. John's. He would not even let him come to Toronto. Is that not correct?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Yes, yes. Right on.

MR. SIMMS:
You are misleading the House. That is my point of privilege.

Make him withdraw or fling him out so he can go back to his office and do some work for a change.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of privilege, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
There is no point of privilege there. The hon. member is completely unnerved now because he knows that he supported a government in Ottawa which wanted to close down Ramea, Gaultois, Harbour Breton, Grand Bank and Burin and I can prove it, Mr. Speaker. There is no point of privilege. I am not interfering with the privileges of this House or of the hon. member. I know the hon. member feels bad about it. He was grating to try to get into power in Ottawa. He got in there for ten days, thought he was the big hero for Newfoundland and then suddenly got flung out. That is not my fault. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. member supported a party and a government which wanted to close down, holus-bolus, almost all the South Coast and that is the problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order please!

MR. SIMMS:
What a barefaced liar!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Withdraw! Withdraw!

MR. BARRY:
To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

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

To that point of privilege, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
The Premier had his chance when he stood up, Mr. Speaker. He gave no indication that he was prepared to do anything for the people of Gaultois and I think that that in itself proves who is right and who is wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
The Premier is not prepared to fight for the people of Gaultois, he was not prepared to meet with them during the election he is not prepared to do anything with them now. The former Minister of Fisheries, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) was nodding his head, yes, the Premier would not permit him to go to the Toronto meeting for the conclusion of the FPI deal and the Premier, perhaps, while he is at it might indicate why it was that -

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

Is the hon. member speaking to the point of privilege?

MR. BARRY:
Yes, I am speaking to the matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, just as was the Premier speaking to the matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Fine.

MR. BARRY:
I would like to ask the Premier if he would indicate why it was, on two if not three different occasions, he had to undermine the former Minister of Fisheries, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), in his attempt to get a deal?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is obviously no prima facie case of breach of privilege.

MR. BARRY:
I see. We do not get a chance to (inaudible) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:
- let them go on as long as they want.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
We will be like the Liberals, close them all down.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Do something for Gaultois and then tell us how you are going to (inaudible). Do something for Gaultois.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It is open for six months, otherwise it would be zero, if the Liberals had their way.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please.
The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. BARRY:
(Inaudible) thousand dollars a year. What a fraud.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, the hon., excited and immature Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has made certain responses to Your Honour's ruling, 'we are not getting a chance to air our views.'

AN HON. MEMBER:
That is right.

MR. MARSHALL:
Now, I would just refer, Mr. Speaker, to the points that were taken up in yesterday's Hansard by the hon. gentleman -

MR. BARRY:
Yes, do that.

MR. MARSHALL:
- about interfering with people speaking, and about getting up on spurious points of order. But that is not the point. The point of the matter is that regardless of the heat of debate, and regardless of what occurs in this particular House, Your Honour's ruling is Your Honour's ruling and statements such as those made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition - there was another one made a few moments ago by the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) -

AN HON. MEMBER:
He called him a liar.

MR. MARSHALL:
- these types of statements, Mr. Speaker, in the House, and particularly those the Leader of the Opposition made with respect to questioning Your Honour's ruling, goes to the very essence of this House itself, to the very essence of the order in this House, to the very essence of the institution. The hon. gentleman made a statement when Your Honour gave your ruling to the effect that 'our rights are not being observed.' Because Your Honour made that ruling, he made it to Your Honour -

MR. SIMMONS:
And he is right. He is right.

MR. MARSHALL:
The hon. gentleman says, 'He is right.'

MR. SIMMONS:
He is right.

MR. MARSHALL:
So I can now include the hon. gentleman for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) in the point of privilege, and I would ask both gentlemen to please withdraw the remarks and their dispersions on Your Honour.

MR. BARRY:
To the point of order.

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

MR. BARRY:
What did you stand up on? What did the member stand up on?

MR. SPEAKER:
It is a point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Was it a point of order?

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of sanctimony.

MR. BARRY:

A point of sanctimony, was it?

MR. SPEAKER:

It was a point of order. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

First of all I would like to mention to the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) there is no such thing as a 'dispersion'. All right? There might be an 'aspersion', if that is the term that the member for St. John's East is attempting to refer to.

Mr. Speaker, we found it necessary to point out yesterday, and I just found it necessary to point out again today, and we understand the newness of Your Honour in the position and the difficulty that Your Honour has at times in controlling members on both sides of this House, but we are not, with respect to Your Honour, going to sit in an Assembly where members are not given the same opportunity on both sides of the House, and we are going to make this clear. Now, Your Honour has the confidence of this side of the House, and Your Honour will continue to have the confidence of this side of the House if we are treated fairly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

But when we see, and we are sure it is only inadvertent at this stage - we believe it is inadvertent - but when we see that

we are not being given equal time, when we see that we are being cut off from speaking on points of privilege when members opposite are permitted to go on at length, then, with respect to Your Honour, we will find it necessary to point that out if it continues. That is the only point that is being made, and we may as well get started. We are in for a long three or fours years, at the Premier's discretion, and we may as well get this started right. We are going to insist upon being treated fairly and having equal time, and being treated the same way as members opposite are treated.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Just further to that -

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of order. He has already spoken, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker recognized him. Sit down!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sit down! Sit down!

MR. DAWE:

When did you take the Chair? Sit down!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It goes to different sides.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will say, first of all -

MR. SIMMONS:

How come he is recognized?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) got up and was recognized by the Chair, and the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage got up later and called the attention of the Chair to that.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to reply in the refrain of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) except to say that the Leader of the Opposition, in his transition to the other side, has graduated from the schoolboy debater to the schoolboy lecturer. Because what he is purporting to do, Mr. Speaker, is lecture Your Honour as to the rules of this House. Your Honour has done an admirable job in enforcing the rules of this House in your brief tenure, and Your Honour cannot, in the Chair, carry on and conduct the affairs of this House without the support of all members, without all members complying and not questioning your rulings.

Now, if the hon. and also equally emotional member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is going to continue the same type of action that he became renowned for in the House of Commons in Ottawa, this is going to be a sorry House, indeed. You cannot, Mr. Speaker, control the mouths, unfortunately, of all members, but what we can do, and what we will do, Mr. Speaker, is enforce the rules of this House.

I would ask both hon. gentleman, first of all, on a point of privilege, to withdraw their remarks, indicate to the Chair that they cast no aspersions, dispersions or insults to Your Honour, and that they are going to learn to keep a civil tongue in their heads for the rest of this Assembly.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage to the point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Is it order or privilege? He stood on order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the point of sanctimony, or whatever -

MR. SPEAKER:

There is a point of order before the House.

MR. BARRY:

There is point of order before the House. I see.

MR. SIMMONS:

- was raised by the gentleman for St. John's East. I watched the proceedings for the past few weeks, including the past ten minutes, and so as to avoid casting aspersions, I will just observe what I saw. I saw the Premier going on ad nauseam and the Speaker sitting complacently in his Chair; I saw my colleague trying to make a point in about one-quarter of the time and suddenly there was an urgency to cut him off. Now, Mr. Speaker, you be the judge.

I am prepared to take the admonitions contained in the

lecture from the gentleman for St. John's East, but I say to Your Honour that you would not be having half the difficulty if you had a Government House Leader who was more determined to make this House work than he is determined to create chaos. Because the more chaos he creates, Mr. Speaker, the fewer questions we can get in, the fewer points we can make in debate. He knows that. He is not a stunned man. He is not a stupid man. He is a vindictive man. And that is the real problem, Mr. Speaker, in this House, the vindictiveness of the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

Now, I give you, Sir, my firm assurance I respect the Chair, I respect the position of Speaker, I will come to respect the occupant of that Chair as it is demonstrated that the occupant deserves that respect as Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame! Shame!

MR. SIMMONS:
In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I will operate on the assumption, however awkward at times, that the Chair is being fair, until I have ample proof otherwise. And I tell Mr. Speaker I am getting there quickly, I am getting that proof pretty quickly. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, has my assurance -

MR. DAWE:
No wonder your colleagues are growing pale.

MR. BUTT:
Sit down, you are making your leader squirm.

MR. DINN:
What an embarrassment.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, you have my full assurance that I will abide by the rules of this House, but, Mr. Speaker, you have my equal assurance that if the rules continue to be perverted I will not abide by them.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!
We are speaking to a point of order, now.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I listened with interest and said nothing while the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage was speaking. If the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage means what he says, the people who are still in this gallery, who were there when the hon. member sat down a few minutes ago, if the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage is serious in what he said to the point of privilege on violating the rules of this House, the hon. member sat in his place and, if not everybody here sitting then most of the hon. members heard him call me a liar from his chair.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
A barefaced liar.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
A barefaced liar.

Now, if the hon. member says that he is willing to uphold the rules of this House, then he will stand in his place and not get up on a technicality saying, 'I was sitting rather than standing when

I said it'. For the decorum of this House, I never said anything derogatory to the hon. member -

MR. BARRY:

No, not much.!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- only in the policy of plant close downs. I did not deal with the personalty of the hon. member-

MR. BARRY:

No?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, he did not.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- but the hon. for Fortune - Hermitage called me a liar and he knows under the rules of the House that that is not proper. Therefore, if the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage is serious about what he just said about abiding by the rules of the House, ensuring that no more point of privilege or points of order come up, then the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage will stand in his place and say that he has violated the rules of this House and that he will withdraw his comment that I am a liar.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, before concluding that point of privilege. I have been in this House for a few years, Mr. Speaker, but right now it is a toss-up in terms of sanctimoniousness between the

Premier and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

I sat here this afternoon and I listened to the Premier of this Province describe a person, then a member of the Parliament of this country as 'a mere aide, not permitted to get inside a door where a meeting was being held'. Downgrading, Mr. Speaker, ridiculing a Member of Parliament of this country. I heard the Premier then go on and talk about the member for Fortune - Hermitage only having been in the Cabinet of the Parliament of Canadaa for ten days. I did not see much in the way of relevance with respect to that point in terms of the debate that was raging at that point in time. Now, if the Premier is going to carry on with this degree of sanctimoniousness, let him point the finger at himself, and let him raise the level of his own debate before he starts pointing fingers over at this side of the House.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I did not break any rule of this House, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage did, and that is the difference. And the hon. Leader of the Opposition can split hairs all he likes, he can talk about it all he likes, there is a rule in this hon. House which says that one hon. member will not call another hon. member a liar. The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage when he sat down, and we all know it, we all heard it, did say that and that is against the rules of the House.

There are rules and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition does not make them. They are rules that are in the Standing Orders and that are in Beauchesne and, therefore, one of those rules has been broken. And I say if the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is serious about elevating the decorum of this House, then he should acknowledge that he has broken that rule and withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I would like to comment on it. I will reserve judgement on that. I would like to read through Hansard, and I may have some comment to make on the proceedings of yesterday and today. I did not hear any hon. member say anything about a lie, but I will review Hansard and I may have further comments to make when I have that done.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I do not think we ought to leave it hanging there, and to assist Your Honour in ruling, for the record -

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this on a point of order?

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has invited me to do something, Mr.

Speaker says he heard no such utterance. I made an utterance and I will tell the House in a second what it was. I learned a long time ago that if somebody says white is balck when it is white, then he is telling an untruth. And the Premier's statement of the fisehries restructuring was a complete misrepresentation. He was on national television saying, 'plants should close.' I take no umbrage to being there as an aide. An aide is one who is helpful and I believe I was helpful in keeping the plants in Ramea and other communities open despite the bungling of the Premier and his propensity to get on national television rather than to get to the problem at hand.

So yes, Mr. Speaker, I admit to him that I did use the term 'barefaced liar'. I guess it relected what I was feeling at the time, because he was so badly misrepresenting the situation. I recognize, at the same time, that you have to be coy in this House and say things a little more indirectly. I am not such an expert at that as the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and the gentleman for Green Bay (Premier Peckford) are, I am more direct and I said what was on my mind. It is still on my mind, but if it is not parliamentary to say it, of course I would withdraw it without any equivocation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier, to the point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I accept what the member for Fortune - Hermitage has said in the sense that he is withdrawing it. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members here over the whole question of the restructuring agreement. The question of whether I said plants must close, or whether the hon. member was an aide, or whether I was this or I was that, or he was something else, or what he said in some other context, and what I said in some other context is totally irrelevant, it is just a question of the rules of this House. There are certain rules and one of those rules is the one that now the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) acknowledges.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, and tell the people of Gaultois how it is just a matter of rules, too.

MR. SPEAKER:

Today is Private Members' Day.

MR. MARSHALL:

If I may, Sir, before we proceed -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is related to Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker. The hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) has drawn to my attention, which I do not think there was any real need to have done so, but to ease his mind I think we will do it with the consent of the House. He has on the Order Paper Motion No. 7, which is to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Conveyancing Act". Now, when it is called, which will be after two or three other resolutions, normally there

would be first reading. But, as I interpret the Private Members' rules, there would be first reading and, immediately, second reading. But in order to allay any doubts that he has, Mr. Speaker, I move, with the consent of the House, that we read for a first time the motion of the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), "An Act To Amend The Conveyancing Act", on the understanding that it will appear in its same place in Private Members' motions as second reading rather than first reading, if that is agreeable to the House.

MR. BARRY:

That is going to come up next week, you mean?

MR. MARSHALL:

No. When it comes up, it will come up in second reading so it can be debated. So we could have first reading of that bill now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

On a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I think I understand what the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is saying but I am not sure everybody else does, so, to avoid any confusion -

MR. BARRY:

It comes in as number seven.

MR. TULK:

- it comes in in the order in which it is placed on the Order Paper? If that is what the Government House Leader is saying, there will be no problem.

MR. MARSHALL:

Today it is Order Number 7 and it will still be in its same place next week but it will be second reading in the name of the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick).

MR. TULK:

No problem.

Motion, the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Conveyancing Act," carried. (Bill No. 100).

On motion, Bill No. 100 read a first time, ordered read a second time as per the appointed time on the Order Paper.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

This is Private Members' Day and we are debating the amendment. The debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for Menihek. He has fifteen minutes left.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, before I start, I perhaps would commiserate a bit with you in terms of trying to keep what has obviously become somewhat of an unruly House in order. The only consolation I can give you is that I think, about twelve or thirteen years ago, the Premier and the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) were both on the same staff of the same high school in Springdale, I understand.

MR. SIMMONS:

And we enjoyed each other's company then too!

MR. FENWICK:

I was just wondering who performed the role of the Speaker at that time, or did they actually get to fighting on the floor at the same time?

MR. SIMMONS:

He was a marvellous fellow before he took Marshall's advice.

MR. FENWICK:

It could be.

The other observation I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that during that disruption or the argument back and forth, a member in the gallery had a baby in her arms and it started crying, which I think is an understandable reaction to what we were doing here. But I would suggest to that member in the gallery that perhaps she should bring the baby back in and maybe, even if the baby cries, it will elevate the level of debate in the House at the same time.

MR. SIMMONS:

Especially right now.

MR. FENWICK:

Getting back to the matter at hand, we are discussing today the Private Members' resolution, slightly amended, which is essentially a question of the Churchill Falls power contract, the whole question of development of Churchill Falls, the whole question of developing electrical resources in Labrador and in Northern Quebec. And, rather than specifically go on either of those resolutions or the amendments to them, I would like to discuss it in more general terms, which I think is basically what we have been doing anyway.

I would like to back up and start

with the simple question: Who is to blame for the situation we are in right now? To summarize a bit, the situation seems to be right now, that we have a power contract that lasts for another forty or fifty years, or even longer when it is reviewed. We ended up selling Churchill Power for two and one-half whatever it is, mils, I believe, and as we go along, we will continue to lose millions and millions of dollars a year in comparison to the cost of generating that electricity through the means of oil and so on and so forth. The question we have is, Who is to blame?

We have, it seems to me, two opposing schools of thought on that. The first is that which is espoused by the Premier and by the Conservative Party, the government; and not to simplify the argument any more than is due, but essentially, the Premier's argument is that the fault for this particular legislation, the Churchill Falls contract, lies with former Premier Smallwood and with the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador, who were in power at the time that these particular transactions occurred. I think that it has even sunk into our common mythology that that is the way we accept the argument or, at least, some people do. I remember one of my students at the community college. In talking with him, I asked him: "Think of a theoretical situation. What would have happened to Newfoundland if it had entered Confederation in 1869 at the first opportunity, rather than waiting until 1949?" And his comment to me, which I thought was quite instructive, was that we probably would have lost all the resources we have. And, while I think he is absolutely

incorrect about his assumption, I think it does bring out a commonly held belief by a lot of people in our Province that they look on Confederation as a result of things like the Churchill Falls contract and something less than the advantageous thing that should have been done back in 1949. I think that is really unfortunate. Because if you talk to people who lived in our country, now our Province, prior to Confederation, they will tell you that the benefits that have accrued from Confederation have been vastly more than those things which we have lost. Quite frankly, I think it is inappropriate to blame Confederation for the particular contract we have, yet, that is the impression that is going forth in our Province and that is the impression that is held by a large number of people. That is extremely unfortunate.

The question remains: Do we blame former Premier Smallwood and the Liberal Party for that particular piece of legislation and for the contract that came out of it?

While I do not want to defend everything that Mr. Smallwood did while he was Premier of the Province, he did, for a large part of the time, have what he called a 'develop or perish' philosophy. There are a number of things that he did that I would hold him accountable for, and a number of mistakes were made, but I would suggest that they were made in an effort to develop the Province and I think that we cannot really exclude the Progressive Conservative Government of today from having made mistakes, as well. As a matter of fact, I think if we look over the Strait of Belle Isle, we will see a number of holes going underneath,

or part-way underneath the Strait, which I think could be held up as a major mistake of that particular government, as well.

It is fair to say that the Liberal government of the day did make a mistake. It made mistakes in many other areas, including some of its small-scale or secondary industry development projects, as well.

I decided when I was preparing for this speech that I would look back on the debates in Hansard at the time the legislation that enabled the particular contract to be signed, were debated. And you have to go back quite a way in time in order to find it. The actual contract itself was signed in 1969. That was the one between CFLCo and Hydro Quebec. The legislation itself was passed something like seven or eight years earlier in 1961.

The legislation, of course, turned out to be essentially a blank cheque to CFLCo. What it did was give them basically all these enormous resources in Labrador. And it gave them the option of developing them whichever way they saw fit. And when this legislation was debated in 1961 the question that I had that I wanted to answer myself, because in 1961 I cannot recall, I think, I was seventeen years of age at the time, and I certainly was not interested in Churchill Falls power. But the question I wanted to ask is, was this legislation put forward by the Liberal Government at the time in a manner in which the Progressive Conservative Opposition said, no, listen do not go forward with that. You are likely to sell us down the river for the rest of our lives, etc. etc.

The fact of the matter is, in looking up the Hansard debates very few, if any, objections were raised for that particular legislation back in 1961. A gentleman by the name of Greene was Leader of the Opposition at the time, and that is quite a ways back. He did point out that it did give a lot of power to the Hamilton Falls Power Company. But his main concerns were those of employment in Labrador for Newfoundlanders and the retail sales tax exemption that was given to the Hamilton Falls Corporation at the time. He knew, as he pointed out in his comments, that the control of Labrador was passing from the Legislature, but he allowed it to. He did not object to it because he felt that was the proper way for it to be developed.

In other words, the Leader of the Official Opposition at the time did not point out that there was a major problem with this particular piece of legislation, and he never pointed it out in time for the government to be cognizant of it as well.

The point is at that time that nobody, absolutely nobody in the Province seemed to foresee the kind of situation that would arrive after this particular piece of legislation was signed. The question I had to ask myself is, why? And when you come down to it, it is because nobody could predict that in 1973 there would be Arab oil embargo, and nobody could predict in 1973 that the price of electricity that was generated by oil would rise sharply in price.

In other words, circumstances well beyond the foreseeable knowledge of Mr. Smallwood in 1961, Mr.

Greene as Leader of the Opposition or any of the members of the Legislatures made the legislation of 1961 and the contact that was enabled by it looked extremely bad in retrospect. But it was an event that occurred twelve years later that made the thing look that bad. The question I have is why does the Premier and why does everybody else continue to blame Mr. Smallwood for that particular piece of legislation when nobody including the Official Opposition was in a position to say that that was the wrong thing to do? As a matter of fact, they were all quite laudatory in saying that it was the best thing that had been done in a long time.

The other question is if we cannot blame Mr. Smallwood, can we blame the Liberal Opposition of today? And I went and checked because I wanted to make sure that the fifteen Liberal members here today were not personally responsible. And I found out, not very surprizingly, that none of the fifteen members of the Liberal Opposition were in the House in 1961 to either vote for it or against it. As a matter of fact when checking a little further I have discovered that the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) was still in diapers at the time the 1961 legislation was passed. And as a matter of fact, the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), if I understand correctly was not even born at the time that legislation was passed. And the question I have is, how can you possibly blame people who are either (1) in diapers, or (2) not born, for a piece of legislation that nobody who was then alive at the time, accurately pointed out was something that would cause problems later on.

So for my very quick examination of Hansard and the record, I would argue that Smallwood is not responsible for it. I mean, he is not the blame for it. It was events way beyond his control. I think that we should start accepting that and stop blaming the gentleman.

At the same time I do not think that the Liberal Party of today should take any blame whatsoever for the power contract of 1969 or the legislation of 1961 because, quite frankly, they are not the same people either. And it is unfair to start blaming people for things that they had absolutely no control over. Then who do you blame?

Then the question arise we may take the other major school of thought on this particular issue, and that is put forth primarily by the Liberal Party of the day, and that is that the fault for what is going on let rests solely with the Provincial Government of today with the Premier and the with the administration that is currently in power. And quite frankly the temptation is there to berate them as well. I am very reluctant when I see people going to courts again and again and again to continue on with that kind of an approach, because, in my opinion, you were much better off to negotiate. But the fact is, that was the decision made by the government of the day back in 1979, 1980, and 1981. And I find it difficult to find any extreme fault with them over that particular decision.

Now that the courts have failed, however, I think it is time that we look at other avenues and other opportunities for developing that particular resource. Because as the House knows there are

tremendous resources in Labrador and in Northern Quebec. Reports I have seen indicate that only 40 per cent of the electrical energy in Labrador and the Northern Quebec part of the Ungava Peninsula have been developed at this time. That there are three major kinds of development still available, one, is Gull Island, and the other is Muskrat Falls both within the area of Labrador, and the other is the Five Rivers that are flowing from Labrador into the Province of Quebec. If developed, these electrical sources will produce one and a half times as much electricity as the Upper Churchill now does produce.

And what is needed, obviously, is an overall agreement with Quebec that is much to their advantage in order to develop these resources. As a matter of fact, if an overall agreement were signed, were worked out, we would be in a position, I would argue, to get back a considerable amount of the benefits that were lost in the Upper Churchill deal. They would bring us 150 per cent more power onstream than we currently have from Labrador. They will at the same time give us thousands of construction jobs and I think that that is not an insignificant consideration, considering our 25 per cent unemployment rate. And they will allow us to repatriate the power as we need it, not in decades times as it may be called for under other development schemes. And that is one of the things that I would like to put forward at this time.

One of the things that we tended to do in the past when we developed electrical energy is to look for a buyer for the whole thing in perpetuity and I think if

anything has been learned from the Churchill Falls Power contract it is that that is an inadvisable way to develop it. It seems to me much more intelligent, if we could develop the power potential up there, to sell it to current users for a period of time, perhaps ten or fifteen or twenty years, and on a graduating basis repatriate the power as our own power requirements increase. To do this I think we must rule out any attempt to use the idea of putting a power corridor through the Province of Quebec. I know that we do have a constitutional and a legal right to do that, but I think if we look at the fact it will cost in excess of \$9 billion to put a power corridor through Quebec that it does not make much sense to do that if we are ever going to get any major benefits from the hydro resources that are left, which means that we must find some way of taking the power from Labrador and Quebec, moving it down to the markets that currently exist in, most likely, New York State and other New England States, and as we need the power back, repatriate it as we can. And I cannot see how that can possibly be done without the co-operation of Hydro Quebec and without an overall master strategy to develop the power in that particular area. The reason that I mention it at this time is because I think that is the only way we can go. I have heard from the minister responsible and from the Premier over the past number of months that there are indications that negotiations may be starting in that way.

The reason that I want to make the kind of speech that I have made here today, which is essentially that I believe it is not the fault of Smallwood and the Liberals we

are in the fix we are in, and it is not ultimately the fault of the Premier and the present administration we are in. Mistakes were made by in the sixties by Mr. Smallwood and the Liberals and the House of Assembly back then. Mistakes have been made in the seventies by the present administration in terms of choosing the court route rather than negotiation and mistakes have continued to be made in the eighties. And quite frankly I think we are all to blame for the fact that we do not have that developed at this point. I am willing to accept it. If every other party in the House is willing to accept it, maybe we can, just maybe, get the kind of co-operative environment going here where the provincial government of the day can go and negotiate the best possible deal they can, try to correct as many of the past mistakes, because, quite frankly, I can live with the blame that I accept today for the contract as it is, but what I cannot live with is sitting here and doing nothing for the next decade because we continue to play party politics with this issue.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the President of the Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, hearing the hon. gentleman makes it seem so simplistic but, of course, it is easy to propose simplistic solutions when one is out of power with no opportunity or hope of getting into power.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address this resolution that is before the House in the name of the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and the amendment that was proposed by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight). The resolution, just briefly, says, "That this House go on record as encouraging the Governments of Canada, Newfoundland and Quebec to seek a resolution to outstanding issue with regards to developed and undeveloped hydro electric resources in Labrador and Northern Quebec." And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that that resolution is as appropriate as the amendment proposed by the member for Windsor-Buchans in the present context is both inappropriate and inapt to bring before the Legislature at this particular time at this particular stage with this climate that we are in at this present time.

It says in very imperative terms that, "Hon. gentlemen," and it is new found to the hon. gentlemen to all of a sudden want to get out like holy terrors in negotiations and go against the federal government, but laying that aside, "that the House immediately call upon the Prime Minister to live up to his commitment, introduce legislation to give wheeling rights to Newfoundland and Labrador and indeed all provinces."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the administration presently in Ottawa has showed very clearly in recent times that it is prepared to deal fairly, equitably, reasonably and in a Canadian way with the government and the people of this Province. And they did so with the recent agreement that was put together and that was concluded with the Atlantic Accord, where despite the fact that we had - I

do not like to say lost the court case because one of these days in the academia when, you know, twenty or twenty-five years time when I retire, and very shortly when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) goes back to academia, perhaps we can have a debate upon the correctness of that decision. I have always had great difficulty with that particular decision because of the fact that we brought that resource with us into the Canadian Confederation. But all that aside now, it is academic and that decision is very academic because, despite the fact that the court case was "lost," the net result of that agreement is that we got exactly what we wanted from that court case. We sought in that court case ownership and it defies my imagination how anyone can possibly conclude that we did not get ownership when we get the same rights to collect revenues as if it were located on land. So in other words we get the same ownership rights with respect to revenues, Mr. Speaker, as if it were located on land.

So we got that in a very direct way from negotiations over a two or three year period, the history of which is well known to the people of this Province. And the fact of the matter is we got it when the present administration in Ottawa came to power and the present administration, after coming to power, has shown that it is willing to deal with this Province in a fair and reasonable way.

So I think that we should approach the matter of the Upper Churchill and the Lower Churchill in this particular manner and this vein and I think, therefore, that the amendment by the member for Windsor-Buchans is inapt,

inappropriate at the present time.

MR. BARRY:
Why?

MR. MARSHALL:
Because of the reasons I have given out. The hon. gentleman was out drinking coffee and that. I am not going to repeat. We have an administration in Ottawa that is prepared to deal with us fairly. We have a Prime Minister of Canada who, for the first time, has indicated an interest in attempting to unravel this particular problem. He has indicated in a publication which he put out, *Where I Stand*, he indicated it at the Tory Leadership Convention, he has indicated it since he has been elected in the House of Commons and the type of resolution and amendment put forth by the member for Windsor-Buchans in that context is very, very inappropriate because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. Leader of the Opposition likes it or not, we sought and we gained our rights with respect to the offshore in a negotiating manner and, hopefully, we will be able to again, even though the problem is much more difficult with respect to the hydro matter because what we are doing there is unravelling a problem of our own creation, rather than commencing something new.

So that is why I say it is inappropriate. The approach of the Opposition is not the approach we are taking. We would hardly take the approach of the Opposition on the matter of negotiation and their relationship with Ottawa anyway, because their particular approach, had been last year and up to then, really in a

sense, Mr. Speaker, dismally betraying the interests of the people of this Province where they were prepared to see the resources of the offshore given away and they were pressing us to do what we could because Halifax and Nova Scotia were progressing and we were not. We had to sign an agreement right away. Already, today, it was rather amusing to hear, talking with a businessman in Halifax, that they are very much concerned up there in Halifax as to the business and the spinoffs that are coming down here with the respect to the Atlantic Accord. We are hardly going to take advice from the hon. gentlemen there opposite as to how to unravel these bilateral problems, and that is what we will proceed to do. So we are certainly not going to take, Mr. Speaker, the advice of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry).

Now, I want to deal in the few moments I have with certain statements made in this debate and in other debates by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to hydro matters. It was yesterday in a debate and in the debate last week. He had the consummate gall, Mr. Speaker, to refer to certain actions that had been taken and condemned, Mr. Speaker, condemned myself for having supported them. He conveniently forgets, Mr. Speaker, that he was the author of those and I certainly did not support those measures. I actually opposed them, and I am going to go into those now, because, quite frankly, I think someone in the position of Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), I think the press and the public should really test what he says today with what he says yesterday because there certainly has to be some virtue in consistency.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

Call in the members.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

A quorum is present.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I was advising the House, for the benefit of the absent members, that we are hardly going to take the advice of the Opposition with respect to the way in which to negotiate agreements and to deal with Ottawa. Most specifically, I was on to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Barry) with respect to certain statements.

Now, that particular resolution that was brought in, I just was to digress for a moment, was brought in by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), and I want to point out that although he is the energy critic, this is the first question, the first statement he has made since this House has been open with respect to matters of energy. He has not asked a question on the Atlantic Accord, there have been no questions asked on it.

MR. FLIGHT:

Will the hon. member yield for a second?

MR. MARSHALL:

No, I will not yield. He has not asked a question on hydro matters with respect to the rates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I will permit a question during Question Period tomorrow. No, I am not going to yield.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is the Leader of the Opposition's resolution and not the member, I would suggest, for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) because the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is the one who asks all the questions and tells the other members.

I noticed very curiously the other day the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) got up to ask a question about fisheries, and the critic on fisheries then thought he had to elucidate by asking a supplementary and then the former Minister of Fisheries in this administration got up. Now, it seems to me that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is really controlling and telling everybody what they may do or who may say anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. MARSHALL:

Here, for instance is the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), who is probably the most respected teacher in educational sphere in this House itself, and who is the critic on education? It is the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). So all things have to go through the Leader of the Opposition. But I want to, Mr. Speaker, because I only have a few moments available -

MR. TULK:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo on a point of order.

MR. TULK:

I know it is debate can be very wideranging in this House, but there is such a thing as relevance to what is being discussed and I fail to see any relevance in what the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is getting on with. There does not seem to be anything to what he is saying, it is absolute nonsense, it makes no sense at all, so I wonder if the Speaker could listen to him very closely. I know Your Honour he is able to put you to sleep, but I wonder if you could listen to him very closely and try and keep him on the debating points that we are on, keep him relevant. He is a very important figure in this Province and it is very important that we keep him relevant. We do not want him wandering off.

MR. FLIGHT:

He is relevant only in St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the interruptions, I may not have time to make the points I want to make, but I will have time to continue them after the mover of the non-confidence motion in the Budget Speech debate. I will proceed a little bit on that anyway.

I was talking about the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Marshall) and the Leader of the Opposition's position yesterday. I noticed when he talked about his proposals

with respect to the energy matters in this Province and his particular solutions, which is to look at Mr. Bourassa's statements, which were not very direct statements at all and really tell us nothing differently and urge us to do things that he was not able to do himself. I do recall, because I want to set the record straight, and this is rather important, that the Leader of the Opposition referred to the takeover of BRINCO and he scored, particularly myself, he referred to me on the takeover of BRINCO, and the start up of the Lower Churchill. He forgot, Mr. Speaker, as to who was the Minister of Mines and Energy when both the BRINCO take over in 1974 was effected and when the start up of the Lower Churchill occurred. He conveniently forgot, because he forgets for the sake of his own personal ambition, these things are out of a person's mind, driven out very easily, but he kept quite when I reminded him yesterday, very pointedly, about where the source of the real opposition was to that. And the source of the real opposition with respect to the takeover of BRINCO was yours truly, Mr. Speaker, because I asked the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy when he brought it in as to why it was necessary to take over BRINCO. That was the first question. The next question came, the response that came from the Leader of the Opposition was, it is necessary to get the ancillary rights that BRINCO has because BRINCO not only had the right to develop the Upper Churchill, it had the Lower Churchill rights as well. So I said to him, 'Leo, you do not need to do that, boy, why take over the Upper Churchill when you can just expropriate the rights of the Lower Churchill.' And he said, 'Oh, you cannot do

that because you cannot expropriate the rights of a Crown corporation.' I thought that rather peculiar, but at the time he was a colleague so you take statements like that. I did not think a learned person like himself would make such a statement but, obviously, he was very, very wrong with respect to it. You cannot expropriate land of a Crown corporation if, for instance, it is Canadian National or Air Canada, the shares are owned by the federal government, because you would be expropriating, really, the property of the federal government, but it is an entirely different thing to say you cannot expropriate the property of a federally incorporated corporation, otherwise, anyone could avoid the expropriation of any property simply by incorporating a federal company. So he was wrong there.

Then I said, 'Why take the shares, Leo? Why in the name of God do we have to take the shares?' He said, 'We have to take the shares because of the streams of the Upper Churchill can be diverted to change the Lower Churchill.' I said, 'We can make legislation to prevent that.' He said, 'No.' Now the net result of all that was he was wrong. He brought the bill into this House. Now there were a few mistakes made by the previous administration and they paled to insignificance when it comes to the one before it but that was a mistake and one that I had spoken out on. The hon. member even forgot it yesterday. It was a mistake -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Did you support the bill?

MR. MARSHALL:

No, look at the record.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You were absent, were you?

MR. MARSHALL:

I will get to that, about the bill, in moment because he even forgot that, you see.

So, what happened, Mr. Speaker, was \$160 million was paid out altogether. Thirty million dollars was attributable to the rights other than the shares, the Upper Churchill itself, and the other \$130 million was referable to the Upper Churchill. So we paid out \$130 million under the aegis of that hon. gentleman, under his advice, that we did not need. That is the first thing. That is part of his type of remedy for it.

The second thing, in 1975 he came into the House with this - and all you have got to do is look at the record in Hansard in 1974 and it was in The Evening Telegram in 1975 as well as in Hansard where anyone can see - the then Minister of Mines and Energy decided with all of this that he was going to come in and start up the Lower Churchill and borrowed and spent \$200 million without two essential prerequisites; Number one, he did not have a corridor assured to sell the power and he did not have financing arranged. Mr. Speaker, the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) wants to know, and he asked me, 'Did I speak?' I was down at the time, deep in the backbenches, but proudly a Tory just the same, right down to the end as far as the gentleman then could put me and, yes, if you look at the record in 1975, you will see that the successor to the Minister of Energy got up in the House and spoke against it, gave the reasons

why, which I just gave a few moments ago, and voted against it and stood up in Division against it as well. So that was well known. These here are two aspects now that the hon. -

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) I feel is playing with what really happened here, Sir. He is attributing the acts of a Tory Cabinet to one individual in that Cabinet and, Sir, I think that is totally incorrect. I think that if he is going to cast aspersions with regards to something that he disagreed with at the time, number one, he should point out who was responsible, the whole Cabinet was responsible, and, number two, if he felt it was such a strong matter of principle at the time maybe he should have been more adamant in his Opposition.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

That is a nice attempt to try to take your leader out of the heat, but it is not really going to work, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact I did speak out very, very clearly on it. My point is this, that certainly a Cabinet is responsible. I thought it was a mistake at the time and I stood up and I said it was a mistake. Even

if I did not, Mr. Speaker, which I did, the point of the matter is that the hon. gentleman who then sat in that chair was the initiator of that. That, Mr. Speaker, was his proposal. That was the type of proposal that he had in order to resolve this situation with respect to the Upper Churchill.

Now, I am running out of time, but I am going to get in tomorrow, or the earliest opportunity possible to this business, which is very humorous to the hon. Leader of Opposition (Mr. Barry) talking about we had to accept the Atlantic Accord, because we had referred it to court. It is a matter to pride to us that we referred it, and what we negotiated after that case. But let us ask the further question, as I will ask tomorrow, what about the Revision Act? Now I do not disassociate myself with the Reversion Act, and I disagree with what the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) who says that it was a mistake. It was an attempt by this Province, and by everybody - it went through unanimously in this House at the time - to try to unravel that contract. And I do not say, and I say here, I do not agree, I specifically disagree with that decision, but unfortunately it is the highest court in the land, but I do not agree with the premise that a sovereign Legislature has not got the right to repeal its own legislation. But that has been designed and we have to respect it.

But I want to talk tomorrow or the next day about the way in which that particular resolution was handled or that measure was handled by the hon. gentleman. I hope the public will see just what kind of a erratic a person, who is

attempting to tell us what to do with respect to energy matters, is now in charge of the Opposition. Because we will talk about that and we will talk about that reference to the court that the hon. gentleman made. He scores us for referring to the court. He put the Reversion case in court, mind you, I do not disagree with putting it in court. But the hon. gentleman is trying to weasel out of it now. But I will carry on tomorrow. The hon. gentlemen would not believe the type of erratic behaviour of the hon. gentleman when he was minister, this same gentleman now who has got all of the answers. People can go across the House if they want to, and they come over here on points of principle, and the hon. gentlemen over here are as consistent on this side of the House as they were over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
But I will say this, I will say that the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) is consistent. I regard the member for Twillingate as being over there unfortunately from the point of view of mistake because of bruise feelings or what have you. At least he is consistent in what he says.

But the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) on this very vital point is completely and absolutely, Mr. Speaker, erratic in his behaviour. First of all, let us look at these two measures he took and he enticed the government to take at the time when those were his solutions, Mr. Speaker, the takeover of BRINCO and the aborted start up of the Upper Churchill.

Now tomorrow or the next time I get a chance in the debate I will talk about his even more astounding and erratic behaviour in connection with his reference to the Reversion Act to the court. And I am giving him fair warning now so he can bone up on it, his erratic behaviour at the same time of opposing it by the backdoor.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that and realizing that I am running out of time, I would, by leave, like to go on until about five o'clock in the afternoon and put it all out, because I think it is necessary to bring it out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave! By leave!

MR. MARSHALL:
This Province cannot afford those kinds of statements. The statements made by people in responsible positions.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the resolution that has been put down by the gentleman for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). To commend him for the thought, it is a thought that is not a new one to him, as a matter of fact, I remember a number of years ago, it might have been around 1975, 1976, he and I and the then gentleman for Eagle River, Mr. Strachan, went to Goose Bay and we three held a press conference, as he

will recall, in which we expressed some concerns on the subject of this motion.

MR. HODDER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
No, but you not only now are reminded, but I am sure you will remember at the time the initiative that we were taking was an appropriate one and in subsequent time, I think, the government came to take the same kind of initiative. The gentleman for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has always had his heart in the right place, sometimes his head makes him do some strange things for which we forgive him.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution -

MR. TOBIN:
(Inaudible.)

MR. SIMMONS:
Again you see there is the difference in the gentleman for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and the gentleman for Port au Port. The gentleman for Port au Port, and I can be partisan about this and say it is because he was over here, but I just think it was because of his good breeding, wherever he was. The gentleman for Port au Port can disagree with you and still smile. The gentleman for Burin-Placentia West somehow takes all of this very personally, and for that I feel very sorry for him.

Mr. Speaker, I would much rather talk about the gentleman for Port au Port. He is one of my favourite subjects. And he has put down another motion here which-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

The gentleman for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is being talked about by every other teacher in the Province, I do not see why I should get in on the act.

MR. WARREN:

We will talk about you.

MR. SIMMONS:

I had forgotten last night for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that he crossed the floor because I was in an exchange over supper with a couple of teachers and they were going after the gentleman for Torngat Mountains so viciously-

MR. TULK:

You still believed he was on your side of the House.

MR. SIMMONS:

In his absence I found myself defending him -

MR. WARREN:

Oh, good!

MR. SIMMONS:

- and saying here is what Garfield really meant. I said, I do not agree with what he said, but at least I will defend like Voltaire to the death his right to say it.

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, yes, he reminds me. He and I have fought some battles on the same side and will again.

But now, Mr. Speaker, I want to come back again to the gentleman for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), because you see on this resolution, not only was his heart in the right place, but his head was in the right place too. His heart told him 'this

unconscionable thing called Churchill Falls cannot go on. I have to do something about it. I have to take this thing in hand.' His head told him, 'Now that I am on the Tory side of the House, how can I ingratiate myself?' And he has found the way. I did not realize until about ten minutes ago that this was the motivation, because I had assumed that this was not only a private motion, but I assumed that it would not have much chance of support from the government until the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) spoke and indicated to us that he would be supporting the motion without the amendment. I found that strange, because I recalled May, 1984, when the government, the Premier, in particular, wired a telegram to the then Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau; and I want to say to the gentleman from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) that that telegram - and he should get it and read it, the telegram of May 7 from the Prime Minister of Canada - that telegram does not mince any words at all. It says in very direct terms to the government of this country, 'Do what has to be done.' 'Every day,' the Premier says, 'the current situation remains unrectified, over \$2 million is being appropriated by Quebec.' The urgency then was measured in days - that was May, 1984, over a year ago. And the telegram, as hon. members will recall, was publicized, as everything was in those days. The telegram was very strident and it made the point very forcefully that it was important that the Government of Canada should step in with legislation and achieve wheeling rights to allow the movement of electricity across Quebec.

It is worth contrasting, Mr.

Speaker, the wording of that telegram a year ago with the wording of the resolution of the gentleman from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). Because, if you contrast those two documents, you will find that there is a very decided shift of pace, a very decided change of pace. The urgency that was there a year ago where, on a daily basis, we were losing \$2 million, that urgency is all gone now. Are we still losing \$2 million a day? I understood we were. I have not heard about any change in the contract. Yet, somehow, the urgency is gone. So what does the resolution say? In effect, and I will paraphrase it very, very roughly, though I hope, correctly. I will read the resolution first. It says: "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this Honourable House go on record as encouraging the Governments of Canada, Newfoundland and Labrador and Quebec to seek a resolution to outstanding issues".

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this were a new problem that arose this morning, I suppose the appropriate way to go about it would be to seek a resolution. The fact is that this has been festering, it has been stagnated for many, many years. The Government of Quebec is firm in its opposition to changing one dot of that contract. It said so publicly on many occasions, and yet, we have this milk and honey resolution which would have us do some more seeking. Now, I ask, Mr. Speaker, where is the urgency of last May contained in the Premier's telegram? It says, in part: 'In view of the unconscionable situation', etc., he says, 'we would appeal to you to now take steps', not sit down and talk with Quebec or sit down and talk with Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Now, now!

MR. SIMMONS:

This is the telegram to Prime Minister Trudeau, as I said in the absence of the gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins). 'We would appeal to you to now take steps to amend the National Energy Board Act to bring the Upper Churchill contract under federal purview and to give the federal government the power', etc., etc., etc.

DR. COLLINS:

You would have to throw a rock at him to get him to pay attention.

MR. SIMMONS:

Here we go again, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins) is sitting too close to the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and the nastiness is rubbing off! When he came into this Chamber some years ago, he had the makings of a real gentleman, but now he has to cast aspersions on Prime Minister Trudeau, a man who served the country very well, served the world well and now, here he is, in his absence, casting aspersions. It goes on all the time, throw out any name when they are prepared to attack it. You know, that is the gentleman from St. John's South, he casts aspersions. The gentleman from St. John's East casts dispersions.

MR. BARRY:

What is the surrogate leader saying over there?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

It is all right. If I were my friend from Mount Scio (Mr.

Barry), I would leave alone the gentleman from Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) because he is about to have some other problems and he will be much more silent than he is right now when we raise certain other matters in this House in the next few days.

MR. WINDSOR:

Are there some insinuations there that I should know about?

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Speaker, just giving notice.

MR. WINDSOR:

Do you have any facts to bring out here?

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, we have facts. Mr. Speaker, I just sent him a gentle little signal and if he talks himself into a corner, I am prepared to have some fun with him. But I would rather, right now, talk about resolutions, and wonder why, after a year, the urgency of 1984 is no longer there. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, we know why. We know why. It is the same reason that was implicit in the revelation yesterday, or in the budget last Thursday, that Cape Breton gets special tax treatment and we get nothing here - the same reason. Because the word is out in Ottawa, you can take the Tories in Newfoundland for granted. They are not going to rock any boats. It is all 'Please, Mr. Mulroney, would you mind if we asked you to do this for us down here in Newfoundland?' Not the fight that used to be there, where they were supposed to have been fighting for Newfoundlanders first, now, they are out protecting their political hides. Now, they are prepared to compromise anything, including the people of Newfoundland, to stay in

bed with the federal Tories. And so, the strident terms, the urgent terms to do away with this unconscionable contract are gone. No more of those strident terms now, just gentle little pansy rhetoric about seeking a resolution. And, not only that, Mr. Speaker, in the good old days when we had federal/provincial relations conducted aboveboard for all to see, we called a spade a spade and if the Prime Minister of Canada made a commitment it was called a commitment.

Now what do we have in one of the WHEREASES? It says, 'WHEREAS Prime Minister of Canada' - Mr. Mulroney - 'has expressed an interest' - well I would say he expressed an interest, he did more than that. During the election he was fulsome, to use his own word of last night, in his commitment that he, when he became Prime Minister, was going to do something to get the parties together. He made a direct commitment, just like the commitment he made to keep indexation of pensions for older people, just like the commitment he made to keep full indexation of family allowances, just like all the other commitments he made. You saw the television reporter last night from Ottawa, not a partisan Liberal or an NDPer making accusation, say that Mr. Mulroney, in this process, has already broken a couple of commitments he made to the people during the election.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) with his heart in the right place and his head in the right place has been conned by his new political friends. What they are not telling him is that the new government in Ottawa has no

intention of keeping its commitment to referee this one, no intention of acting whatsoever. He need not take my word for it, he should just do some basic political arithmetic. He should just realize that Mr. Mulroney's political stool has two legs, one in the West and the other in Quebec and he is going to do nothing that knocks those political legs out from under him. The political arithmetic is this, there are seventy-five seats in Quebec, eighty-five in Ontario and there are seven in this particular Province. There is in Quebec the chance of getting an administration which will be a little more favourable to the federal system, whether Tory or Liberal. On the Newfoundland side, there is an administration here in office in this building which is an absolute embarrassment to the federal Tories.

I was in Ottawa a few days ago and if you could hear some of the private comments that are being made about this administration down here, not by Liberals, by Tories. This administration is regarded as almost a Banana Republic administration. It is taken for granted, it is considered a lightweight. You ask is Mr. Mulroney going to rush out and get involved in this issue right here. They know, Mr. Speaker, he is not going to and that is why this pansy, gentle, milk and honey wording from the member for Port au Port. Mr. Speaker, I said the wording was pansy and milk and honey, I said the member was genuine, heart in the right place, head in the right place, makes wrong decisions, but the head is still in the right place.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

No, the gentleman from Petites does not have much of a problem understanding, he has a problem making the right conclusions from his understanding. He does not know what to do once he understands and he sometimes does the wrong thing, but again he is human.

Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago we listened to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and if I ever heard a bit of convoluted logic, here he was in the same sentence saying, 'Now I am a supporter of this Tory regime which has brought Utopia to Newfoundland, but I want to tell you at the same time, folks, that we got some bad advice from the erratic Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and we acted on that advice.' Does he not raise this question? If he is right in saying that the advice they got on starting up the tunnel, and if he is right on the advice they got on taking over the Churchill Falls, the question for him then is, is it possible that they have also been sucked into some other erratic advice? Are they also taking erratic advice on Cat Arm? Is that why, under his jurisdiction, he just about doubled the cost of Cat Arm? Is he admitting that they are vulnerable to all kinds of erratic advice? Are the people of Newfoundland being told today that this administration, that we have been told is the answer to all our problems, gets locked into erratic advice, not once, but at least twice by his own admission? Where is the guarantee it is only twice? Maybe everything they do is based on erratic advice. If you would look at the employment

rate in this Province you would have to come to that conclusion. How else can you explain, Mr. Speaker, that while the unemployment rates are going down all over this country they are still climbing here? How can you explain that we have an unemployment rate essentially twice what the other Maritime Provinces despite the fact that the former Liberal government pumped money into here in terms of ocean industries, pumped money into here in terms of fisheries restructuring, pumped money into here in terms of the inshore fishery, pumped all kinds of money into the Convention Center, which the Tories here would not sign until after the election on the assumption that the Tories in Ottawa would win and they might get the credit but the thing was all salted away months before the election? We were up here in the room and the Premier would not sign the document. The Convention Center was locked away last March, Mr. Speaker, they know that. As a matter of fact again you do not have to take my word for it, just read the tourism agreement and there is a clause in the tourism agreement which acknowledges that there will be a convention centre funded jointly by the federal and provincial governments, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a federal government at the time -

AN HON. MEMBER:

We do not need it anymore.

MR. SIMMONS:

Okay. My cousin beckons.

MR. TULK:

No, do not bother.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, no, this is important, this is family, now stay out of it. This is family. My cousin asked me and I replied.

MR. TULK:

Oh, are you related to him? Deny it. Deny it if you are.

MR. SIMMS:

If the premier would not put me in cabinet I would.

MR. SIMMONS:

The relevance is very easy to understand especially for a person of the brilliance of the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms). Landslide Len they call him out there and irrelevance is this, you see here is a government that despite the largess of a benevolent Federal Liberal Government, has not been able to bring down unemployment and I am asking why? But the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) gave us the reason. He has admitted in this Chamber today that the Cabinet has been the victim of erratic advice on at least two occasions and so my question is, if on two occasions -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What cabinet?

MR. SIMMONS:

The Provincial Cabinet here, the gentleman from St. John's East - the gentleman from Torngat (Mr. Warren) should not be distracted by me because I cannot do anything for him over here, he should pay attention to the gentleman from St. John's East, he just might give him some little thing.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from St. John's East has admitted today that the Cabinet has been taking and acting on erratic advice, that was his charge. He said it at

least twice, and so the question is, is he also getting some erratic advice from other sources? Is that why the forestry in this Province is in such a mess? Is that why? Is that why the offshore continues to be an unfulfilled dream, and will for some time to come? Is that why the Marystown Shipyard would have closed long since except for Federal Liberal dollars to keep it open? Is that why Gaultois has been closed six months a year? Is that why the Premier last week kept a delegation from Gaultois cooling its heels here for two days although he had told them, in faith, before the election he would meet them and then during the election asked for time and would they come to St. John's soon after the election? They had been trying for two months to get a meeting and he kept them cooling their heels and sent them away last week without ever meeting them. Is that because of erratic advice?

MR. MARSHALL:

All the erratic advice (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, that is a convenient ploy. We know in this House, I watched the Premier this afternoon, I used to know him years ago and he was such a pleasant fellow, but he has been sitting next to the gentleman from St. John's East and the bile is rubbing off I am sad to say, the bile is rubbing off. He is getting some very terrible advice from the puppeteers over there, the real Tories. There are three or four Tories from St. John's South (Dr. Collins), Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer), and St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the three Tories, and St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), he is

getting very terrible advice from the puppeteers over there and he is not himself. As a matter of fact, I have resolved this afternoon, I have gone outside and had a talk to myself, and I resolved to go easy on him because he is under pressure. He is torn between what he really is, a very pleasant decent man, and the advice he is getting from the puppeteers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this motion we cannot support. My cousin wants relevance. This motion we cannot support and I invite him to support us in the amendment that we have brought in because the amendment brought in by the gentleman from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) reflects with integrity what the Premier said on May 7, 1984 to the then Prime Minister, it puts the urgency back into this matter, Mr. Speaker. It says we are losing \$2 million a day, let us not allow it to go on by having little fireside chats and seeking solutions and that kind of thing, "Let us get on with the job," the member for Windsor-Buchans says, let us get on with it.

Now I invite the gentleman from St. John's East -

MR. TOBIN:

Who is the older cousin?

MR. SIMMONS:

I will tell you about that some other day. Right now I want to make an urgent point to get this Churchill Falls thing resolved sooner than the resolution by the gentleman from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) would have it resolved. I am inviting all members to recognize the integrity of the amendment to the resolution, to put the urgency back into this, to

get on with the job, not to pansy along with the Prime Minister of Canada and let him weasel out of the commitments he made before the election, but to ask him now to put his money where his mouth is. During the election it was convenient for him, the now Prime Minister, to say that he would get involved in this process and he would help it along, where is he now, Mr. Speaker, eight months later? He is up in Ottawa breaking all his commitments about taxes and indexation and jobs that he made during the election. Well let us hold him to one commitment at least, the commitment in the name of ordinary common decency, the commitment to help us here in Newfoundland get a fair deal in Churchill once and for all.

MR. MITCHELL:

What were the Liberals in Ottawa doing for fourteen years?

MR. SIMMONS:

I am going to wait and listen to the gentleman from LaPoile, if there is a man whose brilliance I respect, and whose wife's cooking I like, it is the gentleman from LaPoile.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the amendment and I would urge members to support us in putting some integrity, some urgency back into this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Thank you! Thank you!

Mr. Speaker, we just heard an admonition from the other side, or perhaps a comment from the other

side, that this government may have responded to erratic advice. And I do not think we can say that the advice that we get in government is always bang on, it is always totally valid. You know, we do get variable advice. I do not think anyone can quarrel with that, and I do not think we are unique in that respect. I would say that any government occasionally gets advice that later it wished it did not get, or indeed any corporation or group or any individual is in the same boat. So I do not think there is any real thing about that.

As a matter of fact, in Newfoundland we are used to getting erratic advice. We had erratic advice in this Province for twenty-two years -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

- right from 1949 up to 1972 we were inundated with erratic advice in this Province. It came all the way through government. It did not only come from the advisors to government, and there were many of those who, I think, we would prefer to forget rather than remember. But it also came from within government itself. We had a very erratic Premier for those couple of years. So this poor Province and the poor people in this Province have been subjected to so much erratic advice, certainly during those two years, if there were a few small periods of erratic advice in later years it was just a pimple on the back of a hog type of thing.

Now that is not to say that the erratic advice that was given in the administration previously, prior to this previous one, that

that can be ignored. We have to recognize that it was there. And as the -

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I could believe this if I heard this coming out of the mouth of the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). I would not even believe that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) would make such a statement, the Government House Leader. Surely, surely, there are better things, and surely the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) has enough respect for a former Premier of this Province, who is now, I think, some eighty-four years of age and very sick, than to get up here and cast some kind of aspersion on the former Premier of this Province. You would expect that only from the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). Surely he has not sunk that low. And surely he will stand in this House and apologize for what must be a slip of the mind and the tongue. Surely, he will.

MR. SIMMONS:

The gall! The gall!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

That again is just an example of what has been going on the other side, that they rise on points of order which clearly are not points

of order. They are trying to get into the debate. The debate hurts them, so they rise on spurious points of order time and time again. Clearly, it is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying this poor Province was subject to so much erratic advice for twenty-two years or more at the hands of the party to which the members opposite give their allegiance, including the member who just rose on a spurious point of order. They have difficulty in understanding that we can accept that there has occasionally been erratic advice given, even during PC administrations. In comparison, the periods of time where miniscule compared to the record of the twenty-two years from 1949 onwards. But they were there. And the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) from this side pointed out a few examples of erratic advice given to this government, and if we do not learn from our history, we will learn nothing. And the reason why he was pointing him out, of course, is to show to the members opposite that they are now being led by that person who was the author of those brief periods of erratic advice given to the previous PC Administration.

I think that he has done a service to the members opposite. He has pointed out to them the folly of their ways. I am sure he did it hoping that they will reform, but, I think, that is expecting a bit

-much. But he is sort of a kind hearted gentleman, he tries to do what he can for anyone he sees around him, and that is the reason why the attack he took. But that is not what I particularly want to get into.

Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to get into it in terms of rising to speak on this amendment. First of all, just to question why the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) brought in this motion in the first place. Because I do not think it is any secret that most private members' motions do not really either get accepted by this hon. House or, if they do, do they give rise to any great changes in government policy, or in public affairs generally. So on that basis you would just wonder why the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) would bother to bring in a motion, such as he brought in, with that record, in mind, of what happens to private member's motion.

Now I think he is to be complimented for having brought it in. Because even with that record, it is a very important function of this House to consider such motions. If we do not consider such motions as this, if we do not recall the big issues faced in this Province and re-examine them time and time again and look at them anew and bring them back to people's minds, they will be forgotten or they will be looked upon in circumstances that are no longer valid.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) fell into a trap. He thought that this motion should be looked upon as though it was being presented in another era. He thought that this

motion was one being presented in the Trudeau era and, therefore, it should be worded a certain way. Now, obviously, we are not in the Trudeau era, thank goodness. This Province, I suppose, went through a period of its history of greater hardship during the Trudeau era than it every went through before, and I am even thinking back to the days of failure of the fisheries and days of terrible poverty in this Province, days of economic collapse, days of great natural disasters in this Province and so on and so forth. I am even saying in comparison to those terrible days, the Trudeau era for this Province was a total, utter, absolute, complete and almost indescribable disaster.

I think that when history is written about the treatment that this Province received at the hands of the Trudeau administration, if you can call it that, in actual fact, one-man rule - a narrow-minded, self-centered, arrogant, one-man rule - when history compares what happened to this Province during that era it will throw up its hands of us. It will say, 'How on earth did this Province survive during those days of abuse and neglect and deceit and deception?'

MR. SIMMS:

Hear, hear.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, we have now lost or left that era thank goodness. So we have to look at the big issues facing this Province now in the light of present day circumstances. That is what the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage misunderstood. He thought that still for us to have any hope of getting our concerns heard in certain areas where they

have to be heard that we have to use the same tactics that we used in the previous era.

In the previous era to try to make any impact at all we had to take a most aggressive stances. We had to mount campaigns. We had to do all sorts of extraordinary things to the extent - there is no secret about it - that many people in Canada said to themselves, 'Why is Newfoundland being so pesty? Why is it being so persistent. Why is it being like a cracky? Why is it being like that?' And, of course, the reason why was that in Canada we have always been looked upon as a rather small, distant, rather poor Province. We have always been looked at like that and we will for some time to come most likely. But in the Trudeau era we were looked upon as beneath consideration, beneath contempt almost. So the only way we could get any impact at all in the corridors of power in Ottawa was to take those particular tactics I mentioned.

Now, times change - this is what the party opposite does not understand. And if you do not change with times, if you are not adaptable, if you do not evolve, you are obviously going to fade away and you will be of no use to anyone. Times have changed so we have changed with them. We know now that we have got the era of a new administration in Ottawa. We do not necessarily have the era of the Canadian people throughout the land, we still have to work at that, but, at least, we have the ear of the administration, the wheeler of power in Ottawa. Having gotten that ear we can now gauge our approach and mount a different strategy, undertake different tactics in trying to get the positions that we wish to put

in place. That is exactly what the resolution did.

Now, look at the amendments that are brought in. The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) was to go to the Prime Minister of Canada, whose ear we have, who has told us that he is going to work on our behalf, who is attuned to our cause, he is going to go to him and say, 'Now, you made a commitment, deliver on it.' That is a very good way of approaching someone who is attuned in that way. He is also going to go to him and say, 'We insist that you do such-and-such a thing.' You know, we know that you are co-operating with us. We know that you understand our problem. We know that we can point to things you have already done for us, and, of course, the large thing is already done and that is the Atlantic Accord. We know that but nevertheless, ever recognizing that, we are still going to say that we insist you do what we say. Now that is great.

The other message the hon. member claims he was putting out was he is trying to get some sort of positive reaction from the Province of Quebec. Now the way he is going to do that he is try to get it from the Government of Quebec but at the same time he is going to set up meetings with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bourassa). Now that is very likely to be productive, I am sure.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, he is going to ask the Prime Minister of Canada immediately - the word is in here - to introduce such-and-such legislation. This is not to sit down, decide the best way of doing things to try to get a co-operative way of resolving this horrendous problem

before us. This resolution says, 'Immediately you have to introduce legislation,' no thought, no consideration, no private discussion with anyone, no trying to achieve mutuality in the approach to overcoming the problem. So clearly the reason for the amendment was not to help resolve this problem, it was not to assist in getting the rightful concerns resolved. As my hon. colleague just said, it was an attempt to worsen the problem.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Counterproductive.

DR. COLLINS:
He said it was counterproductive. He said that it was designed to be counterproductive. Now that, of course, is a very frivolous way of dealing with a problem or with a concern of ours which is only second, if it is second - let me not put it in that term - let me say that the three major economic concerns for the Province are the fishery, the offshore and hydro development. There are other concerns, there is the forestry, tourism, any number of other ones. But the three that loom largest and are of most importance to our economic destiny are those three. To treat one of them in this frivolous way, to attempt to change or slew a motion that was put forward in all seriousness and with all good intent, to attempt to turn it around so as to gain a little bit of partisan pizzazz out of it and, indeed, to actually turn off the people on the other side of the table that we are trying to help us resolve the problem. That is very frivolous, it is very cynical and it is hardly worthy of the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans to treat a matter in that way, a matter of such concern to this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Fourteen years of frivolity, 26 per cent unemployment, 41 per cent among young people. Tell us about that?

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, if we can get a reasonable deal on the Upper Churchill, it will turn the economy of this Province around almost more than any other single measure. It is capable of giving us immediate revenues. I mean, it could from one day to the next because the revenues are already earned but they are being pocketed by someone else. So it is just a case of diverting the revenues. So it could be that those revenues could flow within twenty-four hours. That is one effect.

The other effect would be it would open up an area of this Province which has always been regarded by Newfoundlanders and Labradorians as, in a way, their mother lode, their hope for the future. The mainland part of this Province, in many respects, is the future that the people in this Province have to look to. It is a huge area, it is a relatively untapped area. It is an area that has already shown its potential in many respects. So if we can achieve this resolution of this problem not only can we get immediate revenues, and everyone knows we certainly can do with those, but it will also be the beginning of a very, very serious start to the development of a part of this Province to which we have always looked in the past and, I am sure, we will always look to for many years to come.

Now, not only that, Mr. Speaker, if we can resolve this I think another very important benefit would flow from it and it would

overcome an irritant between ourselves and Quebec.

In many respects the people of this Province and the people of Quebec are brothers under the skin perhaps more so than the people in other provinces. We are slightly different from the bulk of Canadians. They have a culture which is their own, shall we say. We are their largest neighbours, they are our only land massed neighbours actually. We have neighbours in Nova Scotia but they are across a sea whereas there are neighbours in land continuity in Labrador. But we are natural allies, the people in Quebec and the people in Newfoundland are natural allies but they have been put apart by such things as the controversy over the Upper Churchill, and it is a great shame that should be so. But one of the benefits that could flow from this is that the natural help that we can give to each other would have great benefits, both for this Province, and I suggest, I am confident enough to suggest, that there improved association with us would have benefits for them also. So this is a very serious motion put forward. The amendment is a very frivolous one. I think every member of the House might suggest, even members opposite can vote against that with a clear conscience, but I think that we should vote with enthusiasm for the main motion. I complement the hon. member for bringing it in and I certainly will add my vote to the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I can clearly say that the last speaker was a clear demonstration of the fact that hon. members are prisoners of their own mediocrity. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, was praising up this motion. I can tell the hon. gentleman that if he went to a school in Newfoundland and saw that as a resolution, saw this present resolution sort of made analogist to some programme in the school, he would ask that the schools be closed. If he saw a reading resolution, a resolution in reading something to the effect that we will encourage our students to read, Mr. Speaker, you would close the school down would you not? Now the hon. gentleman mentioned the necessity for change, he talked about the Trudeau era and how it was now necessary to change.

Well, there is one thing that has been consistent, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House. Whenever we drafted resolutions we have made sure, Mr. Speaker, that there is direction to them. We have made sure that there is meaning to them. We have made sure that they are specific. We have made sure that they are not vague, they are not hazy, they are not foggy, Mr. Speaker. We have made sure that resolutions, as resolutions should be, are given direction, that they are given meaning, that they are given specific approaches, that they are given specific details as a resolution should be, Mr. Speaker. We do not care who is in Ottawa, whether it is federal Liberals, whether it is federal Tories, whether it is federal NDPs, we are going to see that our resolutions, Mr. Speaker, have direction, that they have emphasis. And this is what this resolution was all about, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman in speaking is making threatening gestures to the government side of the House. The hon. gentleman should be called to order with respect to this. We are trying to maintain a certain amount of decor and he is waving his fist furiously at this side.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order there is no point of order.

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I was clearly waving at the legs of the table and there was no member being pointed at, it was clearly the legs of the table of the House, Mr. Speaker. I made sure of that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have done with this resolution is that we have sharpened the resolution, we have fine tuned it, we have refined it, so that it gives, Mr. Speaker, a clear direction so that it gives emphasis, so that we know what it is that we expect out of this resolution. We have given approaches, we have given techniques to the resolution, and members opposite obviously do not want any specific techniques, they do not want to be given any approaches. They would much prefer, as an objective, as a resolution in their school, that we will encourage our students to read. We will urge them to read,

Mr. Speaker. What a great direction for a reading programme in a school, to urge them to read as opposed to teaching them work attack skills, teaching them syllabication, teaching how to make critical analysis of reading. That is what we have done. We have given this resolution some direction. We have asked that in a spirit of co-operation we negotiate with all levels of government, that we negotiate with the federal government, that we negotiate with the provincial government of Quebec, that we negotiate with what looks like the future government of Quebec. We have asked that there be no stone unturned. Hon. members find that disagreeable, they do not think we should do that, they do not think we should get the federal government on our side, they do not believe that we should insist that the federal government take action in this. They believe that we should encourage them, that we should urge them, Mr. Speaker. I feel like urging, I feel like urging let me tell you in the true sense of the word.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why are hon. members afraid? What are they afraid of in this resolution? They are afraid to give it direction are they not? They are afraid to make it specific. They are afraid to have some direct approach, afraid to approach the federal government. We were not afraid, Mr. Speaker, to make such resolutions when the federal Liberal government was there. We did the same thing with our resolutions then and we will do the same thing now. We want to give this resolution some directions, yes certainly we should negotiate with the Government of Quebec, certainly we

should negotiate, Mr. Speaker, with the Leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Bourassa). Why not?

We leave no stone unturned and certainly we should be looking for wheeling rights. Have the hon. crowd given that up now, Mr. Speaker, as an objective in terms of renegotiating Labrador resources, that we should not now have wheeling rights? We have suggested that, Mr. Speaker. I thought that that was an aim of this government, that was an objective, that is what they wanted, that they were looking for wheeling rights. So why did they find that so offensive in this particular resolution? Are they afraid that they are going to make progress, Mr. Speaker? Are they afraid of progress? So, Mr. Speaker, all hon. members should agree with the resolution, it is giving clear-cut direction, it is giving approaches, it is giving techniques and, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition when speaking to this resolution gave clearly three methods by which we should resolve the Upper Churchill, the Lower Churchill and three methods for attacking the whole development of the hydro resources of Labrador. So, Mr. Speaker, we have been clear in what we want in this resolution, we have not left it hazy, we have not left it foggy, we have not left it up in the air, we have specified what it is that we think we want in this resolution and the ways and the means by which we should achieve this objective. So, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that it is not political enough for hon. gentleman opposite. Mr. Speaker, we have removed the politics completely from this resolution, we have stated ways and means, we have given hon.

gentlemen some specific suggestions as to how we believe that they should go about negotiating the hydro resources of Labrador. We have talked about the joint development of all of the hydro resources in Labrador in conjunction, Mr. Speaker, with an amended contract. We have given some clear suggestions but obviously the gentlemen opposite do not want that, they want to keep this resolution vague, they want to keep it without direction, they want to keep it in its wishy-washy state, Mr. Speaker, they want no direction.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

It is now 5:40 p.m. and the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has the right to close debate.

MR. LUSH:

By leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave is granted.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

The question is what valid reasons, what substantive reasons, what substantial reasons can members opposite come up with for not supporting this amended resolution? Do they not agree with the fact that the federal government should become involved now? Do they not agree that they must negotiate with the provincial Government of Quebec? Do they see

anything wrong with negotiating with the official Opposition in Quebec? They are the crowd that started this negotiating with the Opposition. They negotiated with the federal Tories when they were in Opposition so they cannot, Mr. Speaker, see anything wrong with that. Do they not agree with getting wheeling rights, Mr. Speaker, so that we can wheel electricity through the Province of Quebec or wheel electricity over any Province? Does the hon. gentleman find that a disagreeable point?

Now, Mr. Speaker, unless he can come up with substantive and substantial reasons as to why he should not agree with all of these points then the hon. member, as all of his hon. colleagues, must be forced to agree with this amended resolution. An amended resolution, Mr. Speaker, that is far superior to the present resolution, a resolution that gives no direction, a resolution that is aimless, a resolution that will get us nowhere. How are we to know, Mr. Speaker, when all hon. members here are fulfilling the aims and the objectives of this resolution? How do we know when hon. members are encouraging or not encouraging or urging or not urging all the levels of government that the hon. member got in this resolution? I want to hear him tell us what his techniques are, what his suggestions are regarding the techniques and the approaches that we must adopt in this House to encourage and to urge the federal government and the provincial government, Mr. Speaker, to carry on with this resolution. I want to hear the hon. member address these issues, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

I may have been here and misheard something, is the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) not-

AN HON. MEMBER:

We gave leave.

MR. MARSHALL:

Did the House give him leave?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Leave was granted.

MR. MARSHALL:

I did not hear them do it and I suppose it is just a matter of judging which is the lesser pain.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member had leave, I presume leave has been withdrawn?

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) was obviously busy with something else when leave was given, and we appreciate that -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Does the hon. member have leave to continue?

MR. TULK:

That is my point. Yes. I have not heard anybody withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, that is my point of order. Nobody has withdrawn it,

have they?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Yes.

MR. TULK:
Who? I have not heard the statement. Did you hear anybody, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, on this side we really do not care, it does not matter whether that hon. member or that hon. member or any one of them speaks and bores us to death. We could not care less.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Leave has been withdrawn.

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, leave -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, if I may clear the whole matter up, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
I was just about clueing up. I was not about to take advantage of the leave that was given me. In another two or three minutes I was just going to bring about my concluding statements.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, if that was not a point of order I will rise on a point of order myself.

The hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) by right and by standing rules has twenty minutes to conclude debate. Now he has given up five minutes of his time to the hon. member, his most eloquent speech was interesting for two minutes and then everything else after that became repetitious. The members on this side then withdrew leave. Now the whole point of the matter is there has to be a vote on the amendment first before the member concludes the debate on the motion and that is going to take up another few minutes. Mr. Speaker, that is very unfair to the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and that is the only reason we withdrew leave, not because we were not interested in what he was saying, because we were.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
I think it was the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) who rose on a point of order saying that he had to speak at twenty minutes to six and the member for Grand Falls, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) is right, that unless leave is given the member automatically rises. But the member for Port au Port gave leave and everybody over

there, and I did not hear anybody stand on the other side of the House and take that leave away. As a matter of fact, I have not yet heard anybody. Has Your Honour?

MR. FLIGHT:

Is there anything in the Standing Orders that gives him the right to take it away?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I have heard at least half the members on the opposite side withdrawing leave.

MR. TULK:

You heard that? I accept your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! It is usual to vote on the amendment and the main motion at the end, so I will recognize the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I should point out to members opposite that last week when I introduced the motion, at the end of the twenty minutes I asked members opposite if I could have leave to conclude my remarks. Members opposite gave me leave to conclude my remarks and I took about thirty to forty seconds to conclude the remarks. When the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) asked for leave today, I returned the favour and said very clearly two minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You said five minutes.

MR. HODDER:

No, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are hearing a lot of sound and fury from the party opposite about an amendment in the resolution which to me

means very little. Mr. Speaker, the only change of substance in the resolution which they say is making the resolution tougher and more to the point, is a whereas talking about the Leader of the Liberal Party who is not in power in Quebec, and to pay attention to his book.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

There is another whereas which has to deal with -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I did pay attention and I do not believe that I was shouting and cat calling across the House when the hon. member for Bonavista North was speaking.

Mr. Speaker, the other whereas has to do with the wheeling rights across the Province of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, in the last set of negotiations where this Province sat down with the Province of Quebec, that was one of the first things that this Province had asked for. This is a well-known fact in the Province, and in this House. It has been stated in this House that the Province of Newfoundland said that the wheeling cost should be at the price of transmitting power. And, Mr. Speaker, that was brought forward very clearly here when I introduced the resolution and I see no reason why it should have

been in the amendment.

Hon. members made quite a big to-do about the Premier's telegram to the former Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind hon. members that for some fourteen years, while Mr. Trudeau was in power, this Province tried to negotiate and at the end of that time, negotiations after negotiations and numerous requests with the then Prime Minister of Canada, a strongly worded telegram went to the Prime Minister. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have quite a different situation here. We have an initiative from the present Prime Minister of Canada where he has said that he is interested in sitting down and negotiating between the Province of Quebec and the Province of Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Speaker, the cosmetics which the Opposition have put in this resolution is merely to have an amendment, in my estimation. They say that we should insist. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that the way the Opposition would like the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to negotiate? The Prime Minister of Canada makes a statement that he will sit down with the two provinces concerned, and now we have an all-party resolution flung back in his face saying we insist. I would point out to hon. members that times change.

MR. FUREY:

What are you afraid of?

MR. HODDER:

What are we afraid of? I would think, Mr. Speaker, that we would probably -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) should go up and count the majority by which he was elected and perhaps worry about what might happen in the very near future to him, whether he will be here or not.

One of the members opposite called it a milk and honey resolution. Mr. Speaker, members had to know that this was an offer from the Prime Minister of Canada. It was not a request, it was an offer by the Prime Minister of Canada. I heard one of the members when they spoke today, or last day, count out the seats, that the Prime Minister of Canada only represented Quebec, Ontario and Western Canada, as if to say that Eastern Canada was out in the dark, but perhaps hon. members should reflect on the fact, as well, and it is something to reflect on, that Mr. Mulroney's own federal district is a very high unemployment district and it is a district that will benefit greatly from the development of the Upper Churchill rivers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, it will benefit from any developments that go on with the Upper Churchill rivers. And, let hon. members not forget that it is in Mr. Mulroney's personal interest to sit down and negotiate a contract which will see power -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, for a

party that signed a contract for ninety-nine years with no reopeners, which now nets the province about \$9 million a year, they seem to be making an awful lot of noise and fury and fuss, when a government which has been saddled with the power contract since 1971 and which has been trying to negotiate the Upper Churchill contract since 1971, should come under such - we cannot call it opposition, because there has been no opposition to it. In this whole debate there has not been one serious point put forward by the Opposition as to how we should go about this. They made fun of the Reversion Act which, as I remember, was voted on unanimously in this House. I sat on that side of the House when the Reversion Act was brought into this House, and it was unanimous. Members on both sides of the House stood to support it and there were no dissenters. There were no dissenters and nobody voted against it but, yet, members have taken this occasion to get up and criticize the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

Yes, the government has had a hard time trying to negotiate this contract because, as hon. members know, a contract is a contract. And I also find it very funny, Mr. Speaker, that a party of which some of the members were probably elected because of high electricity rates in this Province, was the party that negotiated the high electricity rates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, a resolution such as this should be taken seriously by all members. I do not know what hon. members opposite had in their soup for lunch, but it seems that they are very rowdy today and they seem more intent on heckling and shouting and that sort of thing.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are that we have used up all available hydroelectric power in this Province except for the Lloyds River diversion. The fact is that the electrical rate in this Province is climbing by 5 per cent per year and, in 1984, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that we have exceeded 5 billion kilowatt hours of electricity. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that this government has tried to negotiate and it is a fact, as well, that the Prime Minister of Canada, for the first time that a Prime Minister of Canada has done this, after fourteen or fifteen years, a Prime Minister of Canada has offered this Province to sit down and to try to use his influence to negotiate a contract between Quebec and Newfoundland. And what hon. members can see to criticize in that -

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible).

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, when the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) last spoke, I wondered if he were supporting Quebec or Newfoundland, I could not tell. Mr. Speaker, from the substance of his speech I would think an uninformed observer, who might be sitting in

the Galleries of this House, would have thought that he was actually a member from the Quebec Legislature rather than a member of the Newfoundland Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, to summarize, since there is only a minute left, we are, at the present time, looking, staring - and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was correct when he said that we now have to start developing. Whatever we are going to do must be done soon. Because the lead time on any project, even the smaller projects which would be carried on in this Province, the lead time is such to develop anything else, and anything left, except for the Lloyd's River diversion, which I, for one, and this government - and I have been assured of that - do not want to see because of environmental reasons, and which the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) made a career of in politics - he made his name, cut his teeth on the Lloyd's River Diversion - but he was right, I will give him that, but there are some other projects in the Province but they are not cheap substitutes. So whatever happens now has to happen in Labrador.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I might end by saying it is an unfortunate situation in which the Province finds itself. We may throw innuendo back and forth across the House about who signed the contract, but that is history. It is a problem we must face and I believe that the resolution as placed on the Order Paper is the correct one. I believe that if we do negotiate with Quebec, and we should take every opportunity that we have, and if the Prime Minister of Canada has graciously offered to intercede and to mediate, then I think, Mr. Speaker, that we

return our resolution in kind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave! By leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No! No!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Is the House ready for the question?

On motion, amendment to the resolution defeated.

MR. FLIGHT:
Division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:
Division on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:
Division.

MR. TULK:
On the amendment. On the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:
Call in the members.

MR. MARSHALL:
I believe the House agrees, Mr. Speaker, that we will not wait the three minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:
Is it agreed that we will not wait the three minutes?

HON. MEMBERS:
Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:
Those in favour of the amendment please rise:

Mr. Flight, Mr. Tulk, the hon. Mr.

Simmons, Mr. Lush, Mr. W. Carter,
Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Baker, Mr.
Furey, Mr. Kelland, Mr. Decker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against the amendment please
rise:

The hon. the Minister of Justice
(Ms Verge), the hon. the Minister
of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr.
Simms), the hon. the Minister of
Health (Dr. Twomey), the hon. the
Minister of Fisheries (Mr.
Rideout), the hon. the Minister of
Mines and Housing (Mr. Dinn), the
hon. the Minister of Consumer
Affairs and Communications (Mr.
Russell), the hon. the President
of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the
hon. the Minister of
Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr.
Ottenheimer), the hon. the
Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins),
the hon. the Minister of Public
Works and Services (Mr. Young),
The hon. the Minister of Culture,
Recreation and Youth (Mr.
Matthews), the hon. the Minister
of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), the
hon. the Minister of Education
(Mr. Hearn), the hon. the Minister
of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), the
hon. the Minister of Rural,
Agricultural and Northern
Development (Mr. R. Aylward), the
hon. the Minister of Social
Services (Mr. Brett), Mr. Baird,
Mr. Greening, Mr. Reid, Mr. J.
Carter, Mr. Tobin, the hon. the
Minister of the Environment (Mr.
Butt), Mr. Peach, Mr. Hodder, Mr.
Mitchell, Mr. Woodford.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There are ten for and twenty-six
against. I declare the amendment
lost.

Those in favour of the motion
'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Those against the motion 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

Carried.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the president of the
Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Before the House adjourns I would
like to let the House know about
the Committee meetings: To night
the Government Services Committee
will be reviewing the Estimates of
the Department of Public Works and
Services at 7:30 p.m. in the
Colonial Building.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

No problem with that, Sir.

MR. MARSHALL:

The Social Services Committee will
meet at 7:30 p.m., here in the
House, to review the Estimates of
the Department of Social Services.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Do we have two on at the same time?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

In different places.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Very often we have had two on at a time.

Order, please!

The House stands adjourned until 3:00 p.m. tomorrow.

MR. TULK:

No, we did not.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, we have. And we are going to continue to have two on at a time. And if we want to, we will have three on.

Tomorrow morning the Resource Committee -

MR. FLIGHT:

There is Old Arrogance again.

MR. MARSHALL:

Although the policy is two, if we wish to, we are the government, we will have three.

MR. TULK:

I knew it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

He did not realize that.

MR. MARSHALL:

- will be meeting at 9:30 a.m. to review Resource Policy Estimates of the Department of Mines and the Department of Housing.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Hear, hear! Excellent! Good Speech!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to advise the Opposition that tomorrow the order of business will be the consideration of the Estimates in Committee of the Whole and, of course, we will begin with Consolidated Fund Services. So I will save myself a call from the hon. the member for Fogo tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):