

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Ottenheimer): Order, please:

I am pleased to welcome to the galleries today a delegation from the Salvage Community Council made up of Mr. Edgar Burden, who is chairman of the council, and two councillors, Mr. David Brown, Mr. Gordon Durrell. I am sure hon. members join me in welcoming these gentlemen to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand on a point of personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in this hon. House I raised a matter of personal privilege when the Deputy Speaker was sitting in the Chair but it was very vague at the time. I did not have the Hansard in front of me. I did not have the transcript of what the minister actually said in his speech. So it was very vague and it was ruled, of course, that I did not have a point of privilege. Then I gave notice later that when I got the transcript of the proceedings of the House that I would possibly raise a point of personal privilege today and that is what I now intend to do Sir.

I want to draw Your Honour's attention to the May 7th. edition of Hansard, tape 1095, EC - 1, and "Mr. Morgan" it says.

MR. SPEAKER: What page?

MR. NEARY: Tape 1095, EC - 1, page 2848.

I will quote the - what is he minister of?

MR. W. ROWE: Forestry.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Lands and Forests I think he is now, page 2848, Mr. Morgan says, "Let me ask the

MR. NEARY: hon. gentleman in the Opposition, one in particular, a certain question, and I will ask it in the form of a question without making an innuendo or charge. Is it true that when the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was seeking the leadership of his party, aspiring to become Premier of the Province, is it true that he promised John C. Doyle if he ever became Premier and the Liberal Party became the government that they would give the mill back to John C. Doyle? Is that the main reason for the bitterness? - "that they would oppose legislation," they would oppose legislation, "to sell, they would oppose government actions to do that? Is that the only reason? Mr. Speaker, if it is, it

Mr. Neary:

portrays very badly on the more intelligent members of the Opposition" and so forth and so on it goes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I take exception to that remark, not because it is a matter of opinion, because it is not a matter of opinion between two hon. gentlemen, Sir, it is an attack on my honesty and my integrity and my character.

MR. W. N. ROWE: And your motives.

MR. NEARY: And my motives, Mr. Speaker. And I am going to quote three sections from Beauchesne that I want to refer Your Honour to shortly.

MR. J. CARTER: Get on with it! Get on with it!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter, Sir, if the hon. gentleman does not like it he can go back to his savoury patch.

I want to draw Your Honour's attention to Beauchesne, Volume I, I am not sure if Your Honour has the same one there that I have, but it is Section 141.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is the old one.

MR. NEARY: It is the old copy of Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, 141. "The rule relating to personal reflections occurring in debate, may be stated thus, namely: that it is doubly disorderly for any member, in speaking, to digress from the question before the House and to attack any other member by means of" - what is that word again?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Opprobrious.

MR. NEARY: -"opprobrious language, applied to his person and character, or to his conduct, either in general, or on some particular occasion, and tending to bring him into ridicule, contempt, or hatred, with his fellow members, or to create ill blood in the House."

Well, I would submit to Your Honour that was one of the reasons why the Minister of Lands and Forestry (Mr. Morgan) raised this particular matter yesterday. It was meant to bring me into ridicule and contempt, and create a little division and hatred amongst

Mr. Neary: my fellow members of the House, making a statement, as he thought in a very clever way, by asking a question. And Your Honour knows full well that you cannot do indirectly what you cannot do directly. You cannot do via the backdoor what you cannot do by the frontdoor, and that is commonly known in Parliamentary circles that you just cannot do these things, and although the hon. gentleman may have thought the question was a clever way to do it, it was still unparliamentary and out of order as Your Honour knows.

And Section (2) of Paragraph 140, Sir, "The whole law of Parliament on this subject is admirably summed up and expressed in the following Standing Order of the Lords: "To prevent misunderstanding, and for avoiding offensive speeches, when matters are debating, either in the House, or at committees, it is for Your Honour's sake thought fit, and so ordered, that all personal, sharp, or taxing speeches be forborne; and whoever answereth another man's speech shall apply his answer to the matter without wrong to the person; and as nothing offensive is to be spoken, so nothing is to be ill taken," and so on. It

MR. NEARY: goes on and on. I will not read it all for Your Honour. I am sure Your Honour will look at the section because I believe this particular section applies. Another section that applies, of course, is the Parliamentary Rules as Your Honour is so familiar with that have been used so often in this hon. House. And I refer again to 155 in volume 11 of the old edition of Beauchesne, "Imputation of false or unavowed motives. The misrepresentation of the language of another and the accusation of misrepresentation." Both of these apply, Mr. Speaker. "Charges of uttering a deliberate falsehood," Mr. Speaker, again applies. And, "No member can be allowed to attribute any intention to insult others," Your Honour knows. Neither can you question the honour of a member of this House or can you question his motives. You might be able to question the member's motives outside the House, there are people who do it, but in this hon. House it cannot be done. And then the other most serious part of all, Sir, that could apply, I suppose, if you wanted to stretch your imagination a little bit is that there is an implication here of bribery and corruption. And that, as Your Honour knows, is a most serious and grievous matter. So we have three sections of Beauchesne that apply to the hon. gentleman. I am sure Your Honour will want to take this under advisement before giving a ruling but I believe, Sir, if there was ever a case, a prima facie case for a breach of a member's privilege of this House, Sir, we saw statements made yesterday that would give rise to such a case. I know, Your Honour, my hon. friend the Government House Leader will argue that it is a matter of opinion between two members. It is not, Sir. I am sure my hon. friend will argue, and he always does, that we must maintain and protect the decorum of the House and yet my hon. friend did nothing yesterday to call upon the Chair to protect me against this outburst.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Order, please! I cannot permit the hon. gentleman to go into debate on the matter.

MP. NEARY:

Well anyway, Mr. Speaker,

let me sum up by saying, and I know I do not have to go into any long detail with Your Honour because Your Honour understands the point of privilege that I am making, but the question, what the hon. gentleman thought was a clever way of doing it, of trying to smear me and attack my character and attack me personally and to squirt his venom and to poison the atmosphere, was to do it in the form of a question. And Your Honour knows full well and the members of this House know full well that you cannot do that. It is unparliamentary no matter how you do it. And if Your Honour is prepared to agree that I have a prima facie case, rather than move a motion-and I am prepared to move the motion-but I am quite prepared, Your Honour, to accept an apology, an withdrawal and an apology from the hon. gentleman rather than put the House through the trouble of having a debate on this particular matter. The hon. gentleman was a gentleman

MR. NEARY: in man fashion he would get up and apologize, and I am hoping that Your Honour will agree that I have a prima facie case and that my privileges in this House have been breached.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I shall deal briefly with the point of privilege brought up. I think it is well to draw to the attention of the House what exactly is a point of privilege, because the matter of privilege has been brought up in this House from time to time when, in my view, it is not a point of privilege; and it is very important to distinguish between points of privilege and points of order and no points of anything, really, but particularly with respect to a point of privilege because the point of privilege is of a nature which suspends all operations in the House itself and cannot be brought up unless it comes within the framework of the definition. Now the definition of a point of privilege is in paragraph 16, clearly set forth in Beauchesne's Fifth Edition which reads: "Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by Members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals. Thus, privilege, though part of the law of the land, is to a certain extent an exemption from the ordinary law.

"The distinctive mark of a privilege" - and I draw this to Your Honour's attention - "is its ancillary character. The privileges of Parliament are rights which are 'absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers'. They are enjoyed by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its functions



MR. W. MARSHALL: without unimpeded use of the services of its Members;" So in other words, Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege is a matter which is very grave and it is an action which results in members of the House not being able to carry out their functions.

It goes on to say in paragraph 17, the often quoted matter referring to the privileges that "A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the House power to impose a reparation".

In the previous edition of Beauchesne, the one we had been using before and which in some respects I think is preferable to the present one because the present one reflects the changes that have occurred in the House of Commons in recent years which have not pertained in this particular Legislature - in the Fourth Edition I refer you to paragraph 106, page 97: "Although either House may expound the law of Parliament, and indicate its own privileges, it is agreed that no new privilege can be created." And these privileges are set forth in the

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Fourth Edition of Beauchesne very clearly in which, I submit to Your Honour, you will find none of the characteristics allegedly put forth by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) to fall into any of those categories, so, first of all, there is no point of privilege. If there were any point at all, it might be a point of order, and I think we have to distinguish in the House between privileges and order. But there is no point of order either, Mr. Speaker, because really what is alleged in this particular instance and what was read from page 2848 is nothing more than the opinion, an opinion by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. J. Morgan) as to the source of the opinions that were expounded by the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) when he was giving his speech on that particular bill. And surely there is nothing wrong with any member of this House stating in debate that another member's position he has taken is wrong because he refers to the source of that opinion and that really is all that the hon. member was doing.

The hon. gentleman opposite disagrees with this interpretation of it, which is certainly his prerogative, so you do come down to a situation really of a matter of opinion as between two hon. gentlemen. Exactly what the true situation is is a matter of each one to assess. One can read over the speech of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) and one can draw their own conclusions as to whether or not and how much the hon. member, and for that matter the other side of the House, is or is not influenced by Mr. J.C. Doyle or any other person. So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is patently evident, in this particular case, that there is no point of order, there is no point at all. To so rule would, I think, curtail debate in this House. I mean, all the hon. member was doing from what was quoted was really giving an expression, as I say, of opinion as to the source. It was his opinion and

MR. W. MARSHALL:

that is, I think, perfectly permissible.

And again in conclusion, coming back to the first point I made, I think it is necessary for members of the House, I would respectfully submit, to distinguish carefully between points of privilege and points of order because points of privilege suspend the operation of the rules of the House and should not be able to be used to be able to gain the floor of the House without the capacity of anybody interrupting because a point of privilege is the highest and most serious and gravest point, no new ones can be created, and certainly the one that the hon. gentleman has put forth before this House does not come within the definition.

MR. SPEAKER: (Otteneimer)

I will give my decision on this

matter quite soon, I will take it under reservation and we will give the decision when I have reached it.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): Hon. minister.

MR. C. POWER: In response to a question from the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) yesterday concerning the aviation exhibit at Gander International Airport, the Gander aviation exhibit is owned and maintained by the historic resources division of my department. The space which it occupied at Gander International Airport was provided to us free of charge by the Ministry of Transport. This was, of course, when there was one terminal at Gander which was used for both domestic and foreign passengers. Since they have renovated the Gander Airport, I suppose they have sort of taken our exhibit and put it in entirely into the foreign market section or the foreign passenger section so that now it is just about totally inaccessible to all domestic travel. There were some officials of my department in Gander on Thursday and Friday to check with the Ministry of Transport people to see exactly what their intentions were, whether they were going to provide alternate space or whether their intention was to leave it there primarily for the foreign visitors so to speak. I have instructed my officials to get back to Gander today to discuss with the Ministry of Transport officials, to tell them that our opinion is that we want that exhibit, which was primarily built not so much as just an aviation exhibit but also an exhibit to the input of the people of Gander in our aviation history, that exhibit was put there for the people primarily of Newfoundland and even more exclusively, I suppose, for the people in the Gander area. We are telling the Ministry of Transport people today that we want space made available in some other part of the airport that is totally accessible to domestic travel, otherwise we will be moving the exhibit to some other location within the town of Gander.

MR. NEARY: We will still have access to it.

MR. C. POWER: Yes, definitely.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): Hon. Minister.

MR. T.A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Education, I wish to table the answer to a question asked first by the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). I cannot find the date but the question is in connection with school construction and the cost thereof. It was received by my office on April 17th, but I think it was a later date than in the orders.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development (Mr. Maynard)? My question is, Sir, it refers to the agreement which has been entered into between the government and Abitibi Paper Company presently under debate, but I am not referring to the debate, Mr. Speaker, I am just referring to an element of the agreement. Is it the intention of the hon. minister to table in this hon. House essential ingredients of that agreement, essential parts of that agreement which are referred to as being part of that agreement which have not yet been tabled in this hon. House, namely, the areas of the agreement referred to as LLL-1; LLL-2; and LLL-3 and which are spelled out as the financial statements of Labrador linerboard which are a formal part of the agreement, an essential part; the legal actions which may be pending against Labrador linerboard; the inventory of the equipment which is presently at Labrador linerboard which is a part of the agreement which is being taken over by Abitibi Paper Company in return for the \$43,500,000 which they are paying and the contracts of Labrador linerboard? Now these are

MR. W. ROWE: referred to, Mr. Speaker, as essential parts of the agreement, and I am wondering if before the agreement is finally ratified by this House the minister intends to do the House the courtesy of tabling and distributing to the members of the House these essential parts of the agreement which have already been entered into.

MR. SPEAKER (Ottenheimer): The hon. Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. MAYNARD: We have been looking at some of the schedules, I think there are eight of them, LLL-1 to LLL-8, that form a part of the agreement. There are some of those schedules which contain, as the hon. member would realize, some fairly confidential corporate information which I am not sure whether Abitibi Price would want to be made a public document. However, if there are things that Abitibi Price would agree to being made a public document by tabling in the House of Assembly, then I would have no reservations about it. There are other things, such as the financial statement of the Labrador Linerboard for the few years that it was in operation, which I think has already been tabled in the House or is -

MR. NEARY: We have not had the annual report. We cannot get them.

MR. MAYNARD: The annual report is the financial report that has been in the statement of the Public Accounts that has been tabled in this House on a number of occasions.

MR. NEARY: No. No.

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

MR. NEARY: No. It is not in the Public Accounts.

MR. SPEAKER (Otteneheimer): A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary, Sir,

The hon. minister is surely aware that Labrador Linerboard has never been under the control or jurisdiction of the Auditor General -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. W. ROWE: - as it is a private corporation which happens to be wholly owned by the government. It is not a Crown corporation.

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it seems to be a matter which can be cleared up fairly easy. Will the minister undertake to table in this hon. House, giving him the benefit of the doubt on so-called confidential corporate information which I cannot envisage at the moment - after all Abitibi Price are looking for a ratified agreement by this House - but assuming there is something in the schedules 1 to 8 which is confidential - I cannot see that applying to the financial statements of Labrador Linerboard, or the contracts of Labrador Linerboard, or the equipment and assets of Labrador Linerboard which should be part of the public domain - will the minister undertake to table in this hon. House, and it should be readily

Mr. W. N. Rowe: available, the information which will be contained in the schedules to the agreement which he is asking us to ratify as members of this House? Will he undertake to table this essential information in the House either today or tomorrow?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. MAYNARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, whatever is possible to table of the schedules I will certainly do that. I will undertake to go over them this afternoon with staff from the department. Whatever can be - if there is something that I believe should have the approval of the purchaser before it is tabled then I will try to get that as well - but whatever is possible I will table. It is a fairly thick one. I hope the hon. member does not want me to make a copy for every member of the House because it is a fairly large document. But I will undertake to table whatever is possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay, and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, because the hon. the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) are not in their seats, Sir, I would like to direct my question to the Deputy Premier, the Acting Premier, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, Sir - we are now hearing a lot of complaints about the annual complaints about the price of lobsters in this Province, especially the price that is being paid by three Nova Scotia buyers who are purchasing lobsters in this Province - if the government have done anything about stabilizing the price of lobsters? Are they going to do anything about it? Do they know anything about it? Has it been brought to their attention? Does the government have any complaints? Are they investigating it? Is anything at all being done about the price of lobsters? We are right in the middle of the lobster season now. Is anything being done about stabilizing the



Mr. Neary: price of lobsters in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The Acting Minister of Fisheries.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take notice of that question and I will refer it to my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, (Mr. W. Carter) and he will answer it tomorrow or the next day he is in the House.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman aware that these three Nova Scotia firms that are buying lobsters in Newfoundland are paying below union wages? Is the hon. gentleman aware of that? Or is anybody in the government aware? If so, are they doing anything about it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Acting Minister of Fisheries.

MR. N. WINDSOR: The answer to that is the same, Mr. Speaker, I will take notice and refer it to my colleague.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, every year the Provincial Government issues licences to buyers to come into this Province to purchase lobsters. Does the minister know if this year that the companies who are buying these lobsters, the three Nova Scotia companies,

MR. NEARY: were given licences on a selective basis? Were they just given renewal of their licences for last year or did the government take a look at these companies and insist that they pay a certain price per pound for lobster in this Province? Or did they just give them the licences without any restrictions?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. minister.

MR. N. WINDSOR: The answer is the same, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the original questioner, and I will then recognize the hon. gentleman from Port au Port.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask a question, Sir. I give up in frustration and I wish to put this down as not being satisfied with the minister's answer, Sir, and I wish to debate the matter on Thursday coming during the Late Show.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman). Now I should preambule by saying that the year before last the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) said that if the lobster buyers in this Province did not justify their prices that they were giving to the fishermen that he would take away their licences. We then saw the Fishermen's Union bring in an independent into the Province last June who said he would offer \$2.00 a pound for lobster and, immediately, all firms - regardless of whether they were in union areas or not - immediately, the prices jumped. What I am asking the minister is, Has there ever been any evidence of price fixing by those fish companies or has the minister's

MR. HODDER: department ever looked into the possibility of price fixing by the fish companies in this Province as far as lobster prices are concerned?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I can say with confidence that my department has not looked into the question of price fixing. The question of price fixing, which is governed by the Combines Investigation Act or whatever the name of the succeeding Act is - I have forgotten the name now - but the Combines Investigation Act is an exclusively federal Act, so any time I have had complaints - not on this particular issue - I have referred them to the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and they conduct the investigation under the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act or the Act that was brought in, I think, last year to replace it and I have forgotten the title of it.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. HODDER: Surely, I must say to the minister that his department would be cognizant of the fact if they came across any evidence of this and would refer to the proper authorities, and I would ask the minister if perhaps he could look at some of those companies? Because it is the belief of the fishermen that they are being used, that the Province's lobster fishermen are being used by the big companies, and I think events over the past two years have shown that. So I ask if he would look into it.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated I would recognize next the hon. gentleman from Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Sir, my question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and it refers to

MR. RIDEOUT: the obvious agreement between the minister's department and the Government of Canada under the former Winter Capital Works Programme or some years ago. In view of the fact that the minister's department has made financial arrangements with, well, publicly I am aware of three or four, communities in the Province to enable them to pay back in the interim the payments on those Winter Capital Works Programmes, can the minister tell me whether or not this same arrangement will now be offered to all communities in the Province who are currently experiencing financial difficulties because of the pay backs under the Winter Capital Works Programme?

MR. SPEAKER (Ottenheimer): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for the question. It is a very valid question. It is an issue; as the hon. gentleman is aware, this is the Winter Capital Works Program that was initiated by the federal government from 1973 to 1975. At that time there were agreements entered into between these municipalities and the federal government whereby a portion of the funding that was made available would be forgiven and a portion of the labour cost, and the balance of course would be by way of a loan from the federal government to the municipalities. Debentures have now been issued by the Department of Municipal Affairs on behalf of the federal government. All that we are requesting as a department is that these debentures be signed and returned to the federal government. The department then does not accept any responsibility for repayment of these.

However, because these debentures came out in October and November of 1978 there was

MR. DINN: undue hardship on some of these municipalities in that there was no budget provision made in their annual budget for that year to repay these amounts. As a result a number of municipalities were not in a position, they could not absorb these amounts. If you are talking payments in the amount of \$5,000 on a \$300,000 budget, perhaps you could absorb it. But in smaller municipalities where their budget may be in the order of \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year, obviously this amount could not be handled. And in certain isolated cases where the municipality approached us and said, "We cannot pay it; will you assist us?" we did provide some special grants. But it is not a policy that we are making available to all municipalities. If we did it would cost the Province something in the order of \$370,000 a year to pay back all the annual payments on all the Winter Capital Works Programmes. We are not in a position to do that, we do not have the financial resources, neither should we be paying back loans that were made by the federal government to municipalities. It is the federal government's responsibility, not ours, and I do not think this Province should be forced to bail out the federal government on this programme which was ill conceived in the first place and ill managed by the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER (Ottenheimer): A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.  
Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the minister's department dragged its heels for five years in preparing those debentures, in view of the fact that it took two years in one instance

MR. RIDEOUT: for those debentures to go from one office in the minister's department to the Department of Finance for preparation, would the minister tell the House whether it is fair that those small municipalities like Ming's Bight, Middle Arm and so on be forced to pay accrued interest while his department and this government dragged its heels preparing the debentures?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. minister.

MR. N. WINDSOR: No, Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with the hon. gentleman more. In fact, I have sent a telex to the hon. Andre Ouellet, the minister responsible for urban affairs, stating exactly that, that since the time period is such that the interest payments in many cases have added fifteen, twenty and twenty-five per cent to the cost, and in some cases even higher, by the way, to the initial principal of the loan, the amount that had to be repaid, that I am saying that the Federal Government should write off this amount. I have sent a telex to Mr. Ouellet and I will table that telex for your hon. gentleman's information, Sir.

MR. RIDEOUT: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. minister for his action in that regard, but will the minister do one final thing and that is lift the freeze that his department has put on revenue grants to small communities in this Province so that they can continue to pay their garbage collectors and so on and not be acting as a collecting agency for the Government of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, we have no intention of acting as a collection agency for the Federal Government. All we are doing is withholding the revenue grants pending the signing of those debentures. The only responsibility that we have to the federal government is to ensure that the debentures are signed

MR. N. WINDSOR: by the municipalities. If the municipality would sign the debenture, the revenue grant would be released immediately. And how the federal government, if and when, or ever get their funding back from the municipalities is their problem. We have no intention of accepting that responsibility for the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) I have indicated I will recognize the member for the Strait of Belle Isle next.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) Mr. Speaker, is anxious to get on the queue. Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). I earlier gave him notice, and I apologize for the brevity of the time period of the notice, but I think the minister is familiar with the subject matter. Can the minister tell us whether he is as yet in a position to tell the House when a start will be made on the construction of a new road between Main Brook and that point on the Northern Peninsula Highway between Eddies Cove East and the airstrip, it is near the Boiling Brooks area on the Northern Peninsul Highway, can he tell us when a start will be made on that road?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot. There is some work included in our roads programme for the hon. member's district for this year in conjunction with the DREE programme that is going on, but I am not certain if this is included in the programme or not. I will certainly get the information for the hon. gentleman for tomorrow.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister.

By way of a question, I will give him an answer: It is not in the DREE programme. Would the minister undertake to see if it is going to be put in the next shopping list that goes up to DREE for road work to be done on the Northern Peninsula? This road, as the minister knows,

MR. ROBERTS: will complete the loop around the Northern Peninsula and will bring immense advantages, not only to Main Brook but to the people of Roddickton, Bide Arm, Euglee, Conche and Croque and the other communities served by the road. It will bring them immensely closer to the hospital and immensely closer to the large employment opportunities, relatively speaking, available at St. Anthony. Would the minister undertake to include that on the next shopping list, I think is the phrase that is being used, with which he and his colleagues approach DREE in the hope that DREE will be generous as they have been hitherto?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. minister.

MR. BRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform the member that I will be very happy to see that that is included in the next shopping list.

MR. ROBERTS: I will do what I can to see if they buy it.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members for Stephenville, Trinity-Bay de Verte, Windsor-Buchans, Terra Nova and Bellevue, time permitting.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Windsor). Now that the minister has been in his department for some time and is familiar with the area 13 development, could the minister indicate when he believes that these blocks of land will go on sale in the Stephenville area? And could the minister also indicate what the government's intention is for the accumulated interest that is now building up on this land that has been lying idle for several years since it has been developed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about area 13. I have looked at it personally and I have discussed the implications of having this land and the interest on that with the officials in the department and the corporation. We are looking at that in overall policy position and as far as the sale of the



May 8, 1979

Tape No. 1126

AH-4

MR. WINDSOR: property is concerned we  
are proposing to put a limited number of lots on sale almost  
immediately and the balance then will be put on sale as the  
demand increases.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. member for Trinity -  
Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: I have a few questions for the Minister of  
Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). I wonder if the minister  
could inform the House as to whether or not there is any intention on  
the part of his department to move the personnel or the facilities of  
the highways depot out of Old Perlican to another part of Trinity Bay  
or Conception Bay?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. C. BRETT: Not to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker,  
but again I will try to obtain that information, but I certainly have  
not heard anything to that affect.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, could the minister undertake to  
provide the House or table some information or documentation assuring  
the House on behalf of the people of Old Perlican and area that in  
fact that highways depot will not be moved nor the personnel therein.  
Just as a matter of information to the minister, this kind of a rumour  
and information seems to be an annual thing and each year I have to ask  
the same question. In fact, there was a case when there were plans  
on the part of the department to move the highways depot out of Old  
Perlican to some other part of Conception Bay, and I would ask the minister  
if he would be kind enough to assure the House that such a movement  
will not take place this year or any time within the foreseeable future.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister  
of Mines and Energy (Mr. Doody) is no doubt he is aware we are looking  
at a reduction of the work force at Buchans by almost 50 per cent, 166  
men have got their notices to be laid off in July with the remaining  
work force only looking at going into early 1980. Mr. Speaker, my

MR. G. FLIGHT: question is it is a known fact that there are ore bodies in the immediate Buchans area - to name the ore bodies, the Skidder ore body, Great Burnt and Tulks. And it is a known fact that if these ore bodies were to be developed it would have the affect of prolonging the life of Buchans and possibly avoid having to lay off the personnel concerned. My question, Mr. Speaker, is this: have Abitibi Price up to this point in time requested any subsidies, any financial assistance from the Province by way of building access roads to those ore bodies that I referred to or by way of extending hydro to those ore bodies that I have referred to? Has Abitibi Price made any request of government for any kind of financial assistance that would make it possible for them to mine those ore bodies economically and thereby have the effect of extending the life of the mine?

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

MR. W. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is undoubtedly aware the Buchans situation is one which the department has been very closely monitoring and been involved in. The Skidder property is a lot closer to Buchans and it is, from a transportation point of view, the most obvious extension of the mine to start on and it would be the least difficult in terms of accessibility. The Tulks Brook area would appear to be a more lucrative one that has not only copper but some other metals as well. So the company has indicated to government that if they can demonstrate to their own satisfaction that the Tulks Brook property particularly is an economically viable, feasible operation, then they will be coming to government with a request for a bridge across the river because the Tulks Brook property is on the wrong side of the lake. They will need some help in building an access road from that bridge back up to Skidder and into Buchans. The original target date for that assessment was to have been late Fall of this year. However, in view of the fact that the layoffs which the hon.

MR. DOODY: member has mentioned are imminent, we have been in touch with a company and they have agreed to try to push that date forward and we hope to get a definite commitment from them as to whether or not they are prepared to go ahead with the development by late Summer, or at least mid-Summer of this year. Now what mid-Summer is in Newfoundland of course may be a very opened ended sort of date. We would hope that that probably means some time in July or August. In any event, the Deputy Minister of Mines and Energy together with other

Mr. Doody: officials are going to Buchans, I think it is on the 10th. of this month, the day after tomorrow, together with senior officials of various other departments. They will meet with company officials and with officials of the Buchans Action Committee with a view to determining exactly what the requirements of the company would be and to do everything that we possibly can to facilitate the opening of these two deposits.

The third deposit, the Great Burnt deposit, will need a hydro line, and that will not be a problem. The Upper Salmon, if it is developed, would not have a bearing on the deposit, it is on high ground, and I have been told that it would be a separate entity and would not be involved. The access road from there would be a bigger proposition. They have not gone as far toward examining the feasibility of developing it, but it is a real possibility; all these things are possibilities with regards to Buchans and we are trying to push them ahead as quickly as we can. I might also say that there are also right now running a drift out from the McLean shaft working in Buchans itself with a view to trying to determine if there is an additional pocket in behind there, and that work is now ongoing so hopefully, that one can come into production if there is anything there before we even get into the skidex or into the Tulk's Brook area.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, that kind of dragged out answer is one of the reasons that Buchans is in the problem it is in today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister this; since the base metal prices-copper, lead, and zinc- are probably right now the highest time it has ever been on the world markets, the highest time it has ever been -

AN HON. MEMBER: And gold.

MR. FLIGHT: - does not the minister believe that if Price Abitibi had any intention of mining those deposits that they could mine it now under the present pricing system on the world markets? And again the question, Mr. Speaker, is whether at this point in time Price - and I want a year or no answer, if the minister would give me a yes or no answer - whether at this point in time that Price (Nfld.) and Abitibi have requested any financial assistance to get those ore bodies under production in time to avert the kind of a layoff or the kind of a shutdown that we are looking at in Buchans within the next year? Any tax concessions, assistance for access roads - assistance for hydro, any proposal in front of this government that the minister can table if he had to, a materialistic request from Price (Nfld.)? I know Price (Nfld.) have been talking to government for the past three years, but have they made the kind of request that would enable that mine to continue going and to avoid the kind of layoffs that we are going to be looking at in the next couple of months?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. DOODY: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a sort of a long-drawn-out question that makes a short concise answer very difficult. A number of discussions have been ongoing with that company. That company, like most companies, would be most anxious to get all of the financial help from government that government is willing to give it. I might say that if it is necessary for financial assistance, whether it is the form of some sort of a tax turnaround or whether it is in the form of access roads or whether it is in the form of a bridge or hydro help, we will certainly take that into consideration. We certainly have no intention of giving that company or any other company a blank cheque to go ahead and develop what may be a very profitable operation. That is why I have indicated earlier that the senior officials of the various departments are going to Buchans or will be in Buchans within the next two days to

Mr. Doody: try to look at the whole question and get the answers in concise form, in a form that we can look at and examine, and give definite and concise answers to. To date we do not have that sort of request. We have vague generalities of saying, 'If we can develop, of if we can deem the skidder or Tulk's Brook to be economical, then would government do so and so?' We say, "Come in with the facts and figures and let us weigh them and make a value judgment on that basis." We just cannot give that company or any other company a blank cheque, much as we would like to be able to get that thing moving as quickly as we can.

MR. FLIGHT: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A final supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister indicate - this question was asked last year, as a matter of fact, to the previous Minister of Mines and Energy - would the minister indicate how long this Province, the Government of Newfoundland, is prepared to allow Price Abitibi to sit on those three ore bodies, proven, fairly high grade ore bodies - the qualities are there that could warrant the development and the production of those ore bodies - how long does this government intend to let that company sit on those ore bodies and develop them when they see fit? Or is this government prepared to take the attitude that you either mine it now in conjunction with the main Buchans operation or give it up?

MR. NEARY: They are not going to tame Paul Desmarais.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DOODY: I doubt very much if Mr. Desmarais is very deeply involved on the Tulk's Brook operation. However, if he were I have no doubt that the thing would get a great deal of attention. He is very interested in this Province, he has shown it, he has demonstrated it through his work at the University. I might say that the government has absolutely no intention of allowing any company to sit indefinitely on a profitable or feasible ore deposit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. DOODY: What has yet to be demonstrated to us is the grade of ore, the quantity, and the profitability, all of that deposit and the working thereof.

The hon. member says that it is a rich deposit, that it is very profitable and that it is viable and feasible. I cannot get that kind of advice -

MR. FLIGHT: It should be developed (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DOODY: I cannot get that advice from the geologists in the Department of Mines, who I think are, with great respect, somewhat more knowledgeable than the hon. member. As soon as that advice and proof is available then government will make an appropriate decision.

MR. FLIGHT: The mine is closing down. 500 men are going to be out of work in another year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. DOODY: It is feeding time, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member, my notes indicate, for Terra Nova is next on the list.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I questioned the Minister of Mines and Energy respecting three phase power, electrical power.

MR. RIDEOUT: And he laughed at you.

MR. LUSH: This three phase power, Mr. Speaker, is a heavier type of power that is required to meet the demands of larger, industrial, electrical machines, equipment, etc. Despite incisive and repetitive questioning,



MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I could not get any satisfactory answers on that particular day. I specifically wanted to know, Mr. Speaker, who or what body or what agency paid for the initial cost of extending three phase power to a community for industrial purposes. And the minister in his reply told me or told the House that the costs were a matter to be ironed out between the distributor of the power and the retailer. But he did indicate that he would undertake to look into it more fully and to inform the House. My question to the minister now is has the minister looked into this? Can he inform the House today who pays for the extension of three phase electrical power to a community for industrial purposes or is the government involved in any way? Do they have any policy respecting the payment of costs for the extension of three phase power to a community or an area for industrial purposes.

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, we are well aware of the fact that three phase power is a very important part of an industrial operation. We also realize that some of the plants, we talk particularly of fish plants in this particular case, are very far away from a three phase source. It is an expensive proposition getting them in there and nevertheless they are almost vital in terms of a constant reliable source of power to the sort of motors that are needed in these operations. In light of that a Policy Committee of Cabinet, working very closely with the Department of Fisheries, who are taking the lead in this, are trying to devise a policy of assistance to fish plant operators to enable them to have access at a reasonable rate to a source of three phase power. What I am saying is that government is presently developing

MR. DOODY: a policy which it hopes to be able to put into effect in this regard within the immediate future.

The reason for the lack of detail the last time the question was asked was simply because I knew about as much about the answer as the hon. member seemed to know about the question. We were really not in phase on that particular area at that particular time. But it is coming under control now and hopefully we will be in a position to distribute three phase power at an economical rate to the industrial consumers in the Province shortly.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER (Otteneimer): Order 13. The adjourned debate on Bill 15.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have two minutes left, I am informed reliably by the table. So I obviously will not go into too much detail about the bill. Suffice it to say, Sir, by way of summary that we on this side of the House are in total favour of the principle of divesting the government of Labrador Linerboard and passing it over to a private enterprise company of good standing and good caliber. There is no doubt that the Abitibi Paper Company is a company which falls into that category. Our dispute and complaint about the government's actions, Sir, result from the fact that this government seems to think that we have to fall down and genuflect in front of Abitibi Paper Company and indeed the government itself, and to sing the praises of this agreement.

In fact this agreement, Sir, while good in principle

MR. W. N. ROWE: is not in the total best interest of the Province at all, not because of Abitibi Paper Company's fault but because of the fact that the Government itself because of its mismanagement over the past five or six years since it took over that company, the mismanagement and incompetence shown and worst, the absolute blunder in closing down the plant when it did not have to be closed down financially or otherwise and the hardship imposed, and Government statements by the former Premier, the member now for Humber West, by Mr. Crosbie, by other hon. members on that side of the House that the plant, the Linerboard mill, was not worth a dollar. The litany, the chapter of mismanagement and idiotic statements issued and uttered by that Government concerning the Linerboard mill, Sir, rendered that mill almost valueless in the marketplace, and we are lucky now to be able to get \$43,500,000 for the mill.

MR. S. NEARY: Crosbie said he could not give it away for a dollar.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The fact is, Sir, that we are not getting good value in return for the mill. The mill is worth far more than that, its replacement value is ten times \$43,500,000. Its value in the marketplace is worth far more than that and if this Government, Mr. Speaker, had not shown its incompetence, had not blundered so badly, had not smeared and maligned the mill itself by saying it was in the wrong place, there was no market for the product and so on and so forth, that it was hopelessly conceived, all of these things, Mr. Speaker, that mill would have been perceived to have been a much more viable operation and would be returning to the Province today much more money than \$43,500,000.

We are in favour of the principle of the bill, the principle of the agreement. We are against, Mr. Speaker, utterly, the incompetence, mismanagement and perhaps worse, which has been shown by this Government throughout the whole piece. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Ottenheimer) Hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

MR. L. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, this does not indicate that I am going to speak at length, it just indicates that I am glad that I can stand up straight in this House and speak.

AN HON. MEMBER: Have you got a bad back?

MR. L. WOODROW: No, not a bad back but a clean heart.

And there is nothing in my character that anybody can say about me in this hon. House. I want to make that clear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. WOODROW: I should start off, Mr. Speaker, by saying that, and I say this respectfully to the Leader of the Opposition, I think we should make a novena of prayers for having this mill disposed of in such a fine manner.

I also feel that, and I think the hon. Leader knows this, I am probably not so well qualified as he is or probably not as good as some of the members on this side of the House and on the other side as well to speak, but the hon. member knows that if this mill had not closed down the Province would have lost its capital credit rating. And he also knows -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. WOODROW: Mismanagement or not. He also knows that the markets for Linerboard mill are very poor, they have been poor for the last number of years and they continue to be poor in the world markets.

Now, Mr. Speaker, by way of introduction I would like to say that as a member from the West Coast of the Province, member for the Bay of Islands, I feel obligated and am pleased to be able to say a few words on the bill entitled, "An Act To Provide For The Ratification Of The Sale Of The Stephenville Linerboard Mill And Its Conversion To A Newsprint Mill."

May 8, 1979

Tape No. 1130

SD - 3

MR. L. WOODROW:

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, first of all that I am disappointed that more input has not been put into this bill <sup>BY</sup> the non. members from St. George's (Mrs. H. McIsaac) and Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) although I feel they will be speaking later on. In fact, it is only today that two of them are in the House. They probably had some other business in their district, if they

MR. WOODROW:

did, well that is quite legitimate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:            On, on!

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer)   Order, please! Order, please!

MR. WOODROW:                    I would like to have order, please.

The hon. the member for

Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) spoke on Friday and it is good to know that he is going to support the bill. And I feel all other members in the hon. House will support it. The Opposition's preoccupation with alleged scandals and rumours of wrongdoing concerning the mill serves only to dampen the mood of enthusiasm in the area and discourage further badly needed investments in the Province. I think it is time we should, Mr. Speaker, bury the past, because what is done is done and cannot be undone. And if we are going to continue wrangling with each other, this hon. House will not make any progress and the people of the Province will suffer.

Every government in every country, and certainly in every province of Canada, has had its failings. And just for example, we could take a look at the Smallwood administration. I say this respectfully - I am stating facts. I would like to draw this to the attention of the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) who was speaking last week about all the failures and the promises of the Moores administration. Just take a look at the failings of the Smallwood administration. Look at the rubber factory in Holyrood, the machinery plant out in Topsail, the glove factory in Carbonear and the shoe factory in Harbour Grace, etc. The only two that survived during his tenure of office from 1949 to 1971 were the gypsum plant in Corner Brook and the cement plant, and they were nursed along by subsidies from the Smallwood and the Moores administration until finally they were sold to a

MR. WOODROW:                   reputable company, Lundrigans Limited, and are now no longer a liability but an asset to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. And I feel sure the hon. members on the opposite side of the House realize how close Lundrigans Limited were to the Smallwood administration.

AN HON. MEMBER:                   They did, too, after the 1972 election.

MR. WOODROW:                   Let me answer that. I heard that remark made before and I would like to say that last year Lundrigan's Limited received \$37 million in contracts from the present administration.

                                  The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) went at great length to outline the broken promises of the Moores administration. And I would say that the hon. Frank D. Moores, the former Premier, would be the first one to admit his failings, but I feel sure that he worked hard for his Province under very difficult circumstances and in trying and uncertain times.

MR. HICKMAN:                   One should not run down a man when he is not here to defend himself.

MR. WOODROW:                   He will have his own time to defend himself.

                                  Mr. Speaker, I have to stop and digress a little now. I wonder what importance really are the hon. members putting to this bill? It is no joke that people up in the Bay St. George area, these are people who have suffered, and as far as I am concerned, it is no joke for me, Mr. Speaker, to speak on this bill.

                                  I would like to state that if in the seven years of the Moores regime he did nothing only put the Linerboard mill on an even keel, his years in office would be worthwhile. I feel that the people of Bay St. George

MR. WOODROW: and all of Newfoundland would agree with me.

I would like at this time before I continue further, to congratulate the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Doody). I did not even tell him I was going to congratulate him - probably that is why he stayed here, he did not know a thing about it - for the part he played in the reopening of the mill. It must have been a very sad day in his life when he had to announce the closing of the mill; however, the reopening of the Linerboard mill as a paper mill must have been one of the happiest days of his life. And I feel, Mr. Speaker, that all hon. members will agree with me that this hon. member I just mentioned worked very hard to get this mill, as I said, on an even keel.

I would like to continue on now, Mr. Speaker, on the divestiture effort and look at what happened. First of all, an advisory board was picked and on that advisory board you had some fine men. I notice my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) did not agree with all of them.

MR. NEARY: I never made an 'X' on them, they were all fine men.

MR. WOODROW: However, we had men such as Mr. Charles Tittmore, President



MR. WOODROW: Price Company Limited, Chairman of the Board; John Andrews, Executive Vice-President, Consolidated Bathurst;

MR. NEARY: Oh, boy!

MR. WOODROW: L. H. Ayre, Chairman, Ayre and Sons Limited; Mr. William Bennett, President, Iron Ore Company of Canada;

MR. NEARY: Oh, my, that is Desmarais' -

MR. WOODROW: E. F. Hewlett, Chief Executive Officer, Hewlett Groups Limited;

MR. NEARY: A quarter of the -

MR. WOODROW: Roland T. Martin, Deputy Minister of Finance, Secretary of the Board; Jack Shirley, President, Bowaters (Canada) Limited; J. B. Sweeney, President, Labrador Linerboard mill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, maybe if the hon. member who is twitting me now had made these recommendations, everything would be all right. In fact, where else could one go to find better men than the names I have just mentioned?

"The provincial government was faced with the probability of incurring further substantial cash drains from continuing losses of the company, the possibility of downgrading of the Province's debt rating if this cash drain was not stopped. In November, 1976, the government established an advisory board of senior executives, namely, from the pulp and paper industry." And, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get ruffled, in fact, I feel as much at home now, for example, as if there were nobody in the House. So no matter how much people try to ruffle me I certainly will keep my cool, I can assure you of that. Because this is a great thing we can talk about. It is a wonderful thing for the West Coast of the Province.

MR. NEARY: Who said that about the credit rating?

MR. WOODROW: It was said by the advisory board.  
"The object of the advisory board was to assess and evaluate the company's situation as to market, product line, wood requirement, recommending a long-term strategy for the company in the light of results of these analyses."

"In April, 1977, in its preliminary report, the advisory board concluded that continued operation of the mill at that time would result in further substantial losses." So, Mr. Speaker, what are we going to take? Are we going to listen to the advisory board or listen to speculative things said by people who really, I would say, were not in a position to know what they were talking about? And in fact, it makes me wonder, Mr. Speaker, sometimes when I think of the wrangling going on in this hon. House, one saying something, another saying something else, how the people of this Province must be muddled. In fact, this is borne out, certainly, on our Open Lines. They do not know what is going on. I think it is our place in this hon. House to help the ordinary Newfoundlander. That is what we are here for. And as long as we pay attention to ourselves, I think, we are only hindering the work of helping people throughout the Province.

"Consequently, the board recommended the orderly shut-down and mothballing of the mill to give the Province time to study all possible conversion and divestiture prospects while minimizing the cash drain." Imagine if it had kept on going! Where would this Province be today?

"In July, 1977, the board reaffirmed its recommendations and further recommended that should market conditions warrant production of any product

May 8, 1979

Tape 1132

EC - 3

MR. WOODROW: line, the Province should not  
attempt to operate the mill without participation

MR. WOODROW: by an established pulp and paper organization. The government accepted the Advisory Board's report and production at the mill was terminated August 26, 1977.

I know what this meant for the people in the Bay St. George area. In fact, in talking with many of them they were naturally disappointed. I have talked with people in Stephenville and they were disappointed almost to the point of no return, but I think they realized why the mill was closed down. I believe most hon. members will agree that it was the only alternative, the only thing that government could do to help the people and eventually get the mill sold to private enterprise. A custodial work force of approximately one hundred people was retained to put into effect carefully planned mothballing procedures. Mothballing was completed in April 1978 at a total cost at that date of approximately \$1 million. A custodial work force of fifty people have continued to be employed at the site.

To show, Mr. Speaker, how the advisory Board worked let me continue. A list of potential buyers was developed. And what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is fact. "The Chief Executive Officers were identified and the best methods of introduction established. An investigation was also initiated into the tax considerations involved in the sale of the Labrador Linerboard Mill Limited and resulting tax benefits which would accrue to the Province. In the first instance the divestiture efforts concentrated on the sale of the mill for linerboard production." You can see that they still tried to keep it operating as a linerboard mill. "Thirty-nine international linerboard producers were identified"- thirty-nine, Mr. Speaker-" as well as a major container manufacturer who might be interested in vertical integration. By November 1977 sixteen presentations had been laid before twenty-four representatives of prospective purchasers, government and industry groups in Finland, France, England, Panama and the United States. In addition"-

MR. NEARY:

What?

Mr. WOODROW:

- it brings the hon.

member to life. "In addition six United States organizations had received the memorandum but declined the offer of a personal presentation.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, through concentrating its efforts on the reactivation of the mill for the production of linerboard the divestiture committee also assessed alternate products. Using a computer-based simulation model, alternative product opportunities were assessed and analyses showed that based upon reasonable selling price expectations newsprint offered the most attractive returns. Newsprint offered the most attractive returns on investment and called for the lowest wood requirement." You recall, Mr. Speaker, that it was, I think, impossible to get the wood from the Island portion of the Province and it had to be taken from Labrador which cost, something

Mr. Woodrow:           around \$105 a cord in comparison to - at the Bowater mill they tell me they can get wood for as low as \$40 depending of course on how far they have to go to get it.

MR. FLIGHT:   (Inaudible) Labrador Linerboard (inaudible) or Price Abitibi are not going for that linerboard (inaudible) either.

MR. WOODROW:       Well thank God they changed their minds, let us say that.

A one machine mill would require about 150,000 cords annually - now this is good for the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) - a one machine mill would require about 150,000 cords annually compared to 335 cords for the Linerboard production - that kind of helps to answer the question of why we had to go to Labrador to get the mill - "and 450,000 cords for bleach craft pulp."

Now, "by early 1978 twenty-one further presentations and meetings had been held with prospective purchasers and government officials, and some interest was beginning to develop for conversion to bleach craft and newsprint." This brings out, Mr. Speaker, how hard the advisory board worked. I feel if the Liberal Party had been in power at this particular time that perhaps they would have gone through the same channels.

MR. NEARY:           No way.

MR. WOODROW:       I am speaking, in fact, unbiased, I am speaking, I hope, as a true Newfoundlander and as one, first of all, whose heart is certainly with the West Coast of the Province, but with all of the Province in general.

MR. NEARY:           Are you a Newfoundlander?

MR. WOODROW:       That is where I was born yes. Bell Island by the way, which you did not know.

MR. NEARY:           I thought you came over from the other side.

MR. WOODROW:       It had also been established that substantial tax benefits would probably be available to a purchaser with profitable paper interests in Canada. A decision was therefore made to concentrate the divestiture effort on profitable Canadian owned newsprint and craft pulp producers; they wanted to keep from the United States and keep from

Mr. Woodrow: foreign countries altogether - "As well as United States parents of profitable Canadian subsidiaries in these fields.

Mr. Speaker, "A list of thirty-seven such organizations was prepared and a new series of presentations and discussions initiated. The presentations led to decisions by the following organizations to evaluate fully their initial interest in the Stephenville opportunity." Now these are the companies involved again, Abitibi Paper Company Limited, Bowater Incorporated, Canadian Cellulose Company, Consolidated Bathrust Limited, Helvenus Pulp, A.G. whatever that means, Kruger Pulp and Paper, Parsons and Whitmore, MacMillan Bloedel, a well-known company. Each evaluation team from the interested companies was assisted by members of the divestiture committee in arranging the appropriate involvement of various provincial and federal departments and agencies. The committee applied for and obtained an important advance ruling on taxation from the Ministry of National Revenue which provided a positive general background for a specific advance ruling request by each of these interested companies.

In October 1978, both Consolidated Bathrust Limited and Abitibi Paper Company Limited presented to the Divestiture Committee substantial proposals for the acquisition of all outstanding shares of Labrador Linerboard Limited and the conversion of its mill to the production of newsprint. Both proposals were thoroughly analyzed by the Committee prior to submission to Cabinet for a final decision on the purchaser."

MR. WOODROW: You can see, Mr. Speaker, that it took a lot of time and effort. I recall in this House a couple of years ago I heard the hon. Joseph R. Smallwood say that it took him eleven years to get the paper mill going in Corner Brook. So in order to get it on a good foundation, or on an even keel as I said, this thing cannot be rushed into. So I firmly believe, I am convinced that the government of the day did their utmost, did all they could, to put this mill where it is today.

MR. NEARY: Closed it.

MR. WOODROW: Well here again the hon. member is saying, "Closed it down." Well okay, fine. But it had to close down in order to re-open. Remember the seed must die in order to give life. And I say perhaps there was something went on, wrongdoings and the like, but all of these things have to be proven.

"On November 16, 1978" - this must be a great day for the present Minister of Mines and Energy and the government in general of the Province. "On November 16, 1978 the Minister of Industrial Development," of course, who is the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Doody), and Abitibi Paper Company Limited, entered into an agreement whereby the Province agreed to sell to Abitibi all the outstanding, no par value common shares, 5,000 shares of Labrador Linerboard Limited for a total price of \$43,500. Now imagine about a year before that date the mill could have been sold maybe for \$1. But the government of the day, they stood out and they got, I suppose, what they could.

Now for the Province the signing of this agreement was the culmination of many months



MR. WOODROW: of negotiations with various private interests in an attempt to divest itself of the Linerboard mill and to have the facility reactivated as a viable entity.

"Under the terms and conditions of the agreement the Province agreed - just to mention a couple of the things they agreed on first of all - to reimburse Abitibi for the minimum monthly payment under the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro agreement for the supply of power. If during the period up to December 31st., 1998 Abitibi is forced to suspend operation due to a lack of wood as a result of a forest fire or a budworm epidemic to provide Abitibi with a supply of wood for the newsprint mill for a period of twenty years commencing January 1st., 1980. To provide Abitibi with a supply of water up to 6,000 gallons per day at the rate of seven cents per 1,000 gallons." By the way, this is supplied by the Water Services of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. "To convert the Linerboard mill facility into a newsprint mill with a design capacity of 150,000 tons per annum. To have a second newsprint machine under substantial construction by the end of 1987, provided a sufficient supply of wood can be made available." And we hope by that time there will be lots of wood available. "To give full opportunity and preferential treatment to Newfoundland contractors and Newfoundland manufactured goods." I must say I am very pleased with that. Because I feel that, and not being biased at all to other provinces, I do feel that where possible contracts should go to Newfoundland contractors and not to people on the Mainland. "To give full opportunity and preferential treatment to Newfoundland contractors and Newfoundland manufactured goods and services

MR. L. WOODROW: when calling tenders for the supply of such contracts and goods and services required in the conversion process provided always that the local contractors and goods are competitive in price, quality and delivery." Now this one here, to pay the Province the sum of \$43,500,000 as the full and final purchase price for the outstanding shares of Labrador Linerboard mill limited payable as follows: \$6 million on December 21st., 1978; \$10 million noninterest bearing note maturing December 31st., 1979; \$27,500,000 noninterest bearing note maturing December 31st., 1979. This note may be paid off at the option of Abitibi for providing the Province with preferred shares of Abitibi having an aggregate per value of \$27,500,000."

So, Mr. Speaker, I do feel that everything possible was done to put this mill on an even keel and, as I said, I feel sure that what I have quoted are facts. Now if there are any wrongdoings, well fine, I hope that those who have done wrong will be brought to justice. But the alleged wrongdoings are not wrongdoings until the person is proven guilty. I feel sure then and I want to join with the member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil), the member for St. George's (Mrs. McIsaac) and the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) I feel sure that they must be extremely happy and they will be extremely happier as the mill unfolds itself. And I know as members of the Opposition - if I were in Opposition myself naturally I would have to try to find loopholes. Probably when other hon. members begin to speak they will probably find some loopholes and that is their work. But I do feel a good job has been done in getting this mill on an even keel.

MR. L. WOODROW: Now I thought the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) would be here to listen to what I have to say now. But I want to say before closing a word about John Crosbie who played a major part in settling down the mill. I knew the late Percy Crosbie. He was a man who was not afraid to take chances, he was a loyal Newfoundlander and he certainly played a major part in the economic life of the Province.

MR. S. NEARY: Is that Joey Smallwood?

MR. L. WOODROW: No, this is the late Percy Crosbie. I knew him well. I could go in his office on Water Street anytime. He was a man down to earth and as I said he was a man who was not afraid to take chances.

MR. S. NEARY: He always had a dollar in his pocket.

MR. L. WOODROW: More than one dollar I would say, Sir.

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should know.

MR. L. WOODROW: His son John - well any contributions he made to me they went to the various parishes I worked in and I am very happy to say that.

MR. S. NEARY: John was

MR. L. WOODROW: Absolutely, he is yes.

MR. S. NEARY: John was not his son.

MR. L. WOODROW: I think so.

MR. S. NEARY: He is Ches' son.

MR. L. WOODROW: I am sorry, I meant Ches, I meant Ches Crosbie.

MR. S. NEARY: You should get them straight now.

MR. L. WOODROW: Well, he is straightened out already by the way, Ches is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Ches always had a dollar in his pocket too.

MR. L. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member will agree with what I am going to say now but I have to say it in any case. There is no reflection on him, no reflection on the hon. member. His son John is a good politician and a hard worker and I think a loyal Newfoundlander. In fact, recently he was quoted from Ottawa as being one of the ablest debaters in the House of Commons and, in fact, he certainly showed this here in the House as well. And, in fact, he has been - a lot of things have been said over the past few days about him and the like, but when I see Mr. Crosbie, we will say proven guilty by some judge, then perhaps I will be talking with the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). But he has not yet been proven guilty of any of things that he has been accused of.

MR. S. NEARY: 'Luke' is getting tired.

MR. L. WOODROW: And this is what I am going to say.  
I think because of the

May 8, 1979

Tape No. 1137

GH-1

MR. WOODROW: fact that he work so hard to get this mill on the go, in fact he had a lot to do with it, I think the mill should be called the John Crosbie Paper Mill. Now I hope that will be considered by the -

MR. MCNEIL: The hon. member cannot be serious.

MR. NEARY: The John Crosbie blundered.

MR. WOODROW: Well, it could be, you know.

AN HON. MEMBER: The people of Lochmond -

MR. WOODROW: Do not forget, you know, that there was a place in my district called Charlie's Bluff. It referred to the hon. Charles Ballam. In fact, he always told them he would not put a road to Lark Harbour because of the bluff but he finally got it there and if you talk to him now, he will joke about this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it really has been a great pleasure for me to have these few words and I have tried to state facts and I am very happy, you know, to know, and as I said, that I can stand in the House, I can stand up straight and speak. I think that all hon. members should feel the very same way and I hope they do because after all what we are doing - we are working for the Province, for the poor people in the Lapoile district, in the Bay of Islands district and Bay de Verde-Trinity district and any district of the Province. That is all I am here for and if we are here for anything else, in fact, when the next election is called, I think, we will be given our due reward by the people who sent us here.

I think all members of the House will agree that this is a very solid and satisfactory arrangement, since as early as last year the Linerboard mill would have been bought for as little as one dollar. With the Abitibi takeover, residents on our West Coast can look forward to a successful, permanent industry that will provide a

MR. WOODROW: bright and secure economic future for the area. All Newfoundlanders, I feel, Mr. Speaker, are justly pleased with the manner in which the Provincial Government handled the Labrador Linerboard mill issue and the recent developments regarding the Abitibi proposal. The future will demonstrate that our decision was indeed a sound and realistic one in the long-term interests of our West Coast, and I am certainly happy and I hope that the Labrador Linerboard mill will do a whole lot, not only for the Bay St. George area and for the Bay of Islands area, but for the whole Province as well.

.Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. MCISAAC: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Ottenheimer) The hon. member from St. George's

MRS. MCISAAC: I will try to stand straight.

MR. F. ROWE: Straighten up there now, 'Hazel'.

MRS. MCISAAC: I will straighten up now, Mr. Speaker, and say my few words. Stand straight and tall.

I am not sure that I could follow the member from Bay of Islands in what he was trying to say. I -

MR. WOODROW: Not sure of what?

MRS. MCISAAC: I am not sure that I followed the member from Bay of Islands in what he was trying to say.

MR. WOODROW: (Inaudible)

MRS. MCISAAC: I am following you now but I am not quite sure that I followed what you were trying to say. First you took a slice off of me because I had not had enough input into it and up until this moment I did not have my opportunity to rise in the House and say anything. And then right on the heels you sympathized with me or wanted to share my joy in having the mill reopen. Now, you know,

MRS. MCISAAC:

we cannot have it all ways.

Either I am happy about it or I am not and you are either going to share my joy or whatever, but in the meantime I certainly to not agree that it should be called the John Crosbie Paper Mill. I think the member said that John Crosbie should be congratulated for the part that he played in settling down the mill. I have to go along with that. He set it back anyway if he did not settle it down. He closed it down, and -

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER:

If he had not (inaudible).

MRS. MCISAAC:

Yes, that is fine. We took a bit over here too, but in the meantime I am happy that the mill is reopening and I certainly hope that it will be a success. I was disappointed that it closed. I said that in my speech when we debated the shutdown of the Linerboard mill, and if I am not badly mistaken the member from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) took the same stand. I believe that the member took a swipe at the government for closing down the mill. I do not agree that it was the only thing that could have been done at the time. I think that the mill could have been left open. How much did it cost to close the mill? We do not know. We do not know what it cost to close the mill down.

MRS. McISAAC: With severance pay and everything else that went along with it, and mothballing, it probably would have been much cheaper to keep the mill open than it was to close it down. I have not seen any figures that I can argue one way or the other on that, but I know one thing, that it certainly did hurt the people of Bay St. George. The people of Bay St. George had to pack up, sell their homes, sell their cars, most of them, campers - anything that they had, and get moving and find a job anywhere and everywhere that they could find it. Half of them were in -

MR. WOODROW: Do they understand now?

MRS. McISAAC: No, they do not understand now. They feel the same way now that they felt when the mill closed, that there was no need for the mill to close down. It was closed for the sake of reopening. And the people in Bay St. George were set back and they were hurt financially to a point that, well, they will never recuperate from it. Sure, they can pick up now and go on, but they will never get back what they lost. Most of them sold their homes out there for little or nothing. And if you can look and say the mill had to be closed because it was costing the government so many million dollars a year, what is a few million dollars a year when you are talking about the livelihood of hundreds and thousands of people who had to sell everything that they owned and move on?

MR WOODROW: credit rating

MR. NEARY: Who told you that?

MR. F. ROWE: Sure, he denied that for the whole year -

MR. NEARY: The government denied that, sure.

MR. F. ROWE: - that they closed down because of the credit rating. Now he is saying they closed down because of the credit rating.



MRS. McISAAC: Sure, they closed it down because of the credit rating.

MR. F. ROWE: But they denied that.

MRS. McISAAC: But that was denied, yes.

MR. WOODROW: I think it would bankrupt the Province.

MRS. McISAAC: The Province was bankrupt, that is why they closed it - yes, fine, okay - and that does not mean that the mill was not a viable operation then, does it?

MR. WOODROW: I said that in

MRS. McISAAC: The mill was a viable operation - the mill could have been. Mr. Sweeney came in there, he turned it around, he saved millions of dollars while he was there; he asked for a chance to keep the mill going and he said that it could be a viable operation. There was no reason in the world for the people of Bay St. George to have to leave their homes, sell their homes, sell everything that they had worked for for years and move on. They could have remained in Stephenville. The mill could have been a viable operation and probably Bay St. George might have been better off today, and I believe it would have been if that mill had never been sold.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. WOODROW: Produce the facts

MR. NEARY: You are right on there, "Hazel"

MRS. McISAAC: The facts have not been produced otherwise.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MRS. McISAAC: And it was nothing but the waste, the scandal or alleged scandal, the mismanagement, government interference and everything else that went on out there that caused that mill to be closed down. And the member gets up and praises the Moores administration and criticizes the

MRS. McISAAC: Smallwood administration. That is water under the bridge now - it is gone. The mill is gone. The people of Bay St. George have suffered and they have been set back to a point where they will never get back what they lost. No matter how hard they work from now on, they have lost what they worked for. They had to give up their homes, and it is only the people who lose their homes and lose their cars and lose everything that they have worked for for years who really feel the effect of it. It is okay, we can stand here and talk about it - we have not lost anything. I was not affected by the mill, but I know people in my area who were affected by the mill through the woods operation and through direct employment with the mill. And it is fine for our members to say that the mill had to be closed down - you cannot put dollars and cents on the livelihood of people, on people who have built up homes and their personal belongings over the years; and you cannot just say, 'We will close down the mill. We will take the jobs from them and close it down. Too bad, let them go where they like.' They are scattered all over God's creation. They are scattered to the four corners of the earth - there are no corners, it is round, is it not? But they are scattered all over the globe. And it has cost them thousands and thousands of dollars. It has cost them everything that they worked for. And the member can sit there and say that the government did the right thing in closing it down. I would say they did not. You cannot put dollars and cents on that. The government did the wrong thing by closing it down - I said that when I stood here before to speak on Labrador Linerboard and I still say there was no reason to close it down.

MR. NEARY: You will never get (inaudible).

MRS. McISAAC: The market was looking good, everything was looking rosy when down it goes.

May 8, 1979

Tape 1138

EC - 4

MR. WOODROW:

(Inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

I beg your pardon?

MR. WOODROW:

The hon. member agreed with the closing down. She said in her speech (inaudible)

MRS. McISAAC:

I agreed with the closing down. I believe that the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) was also against the close-down of the mill.

MR. WOODROW:

Yes, until I got all the facts.

MRS. MCISACC:

Well, I do not know if the hon. member for Bay of Islands got all the facts, but I did not get all the facts and I did not agree with the close down of Labrador Linerboard Mill.

Mrs McISAAC:

I did say finally that something had to be done, you know, we have to pick up and go on from there, it is water under the bridge. And I say that today, it is water under the bridge. It is closed down now and all the harm has been done to the people, financially and in any other way that you want to look at it, that is all water under the bridge. There is not a thing that can be done about it now. Those people have suffered and the people in my area, in the woods operation have suffered. That is water under the bridge. We cannot help that now. I am quite happy that the mill is going to reopen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MRS McISAAC:

They will not forget it.

They will never forget it. How can you forget when you have been hurt the way that those people have been hurt out there, when they have lost everything? It is easy to say they will forget it. Paint it over. Give it another coat of paint and forget it. They will not forget it. They will never forget it. They have been hurt too much to forget it. I would like to know how much it cost to keep the mill open. If we knew how much it cost to keep that mill open - to close that mill down I mean, if we knew how much it cost to close that mill down, to keep it in mothballs, to pay the staff that was there, to pay the severance pay and all the people who ended up on unemployment, the economy of the place was set back where it may probably never get back to the point that it was when Labrador Linerboard was there. You weigh all of this and you just tell me that it was the best move on the part of the government to close down that mill. No, I will never swallow that one. There was wood enough left in the woods that was cut by Labrador Linerboard, left lying around in the woods, there was enough there to keep the mill going for two years. Not to say anything for what is on the bottom of the lakes and all

MRS McISAAC: along the coastlines. The scandal and the mismanagement and everything, all put together - hang on until everything comes out. until the enquiry is completed and then we will know why the mill was closed. Hopefully we will know why the mill was closed. Then we will know if it was cheaper to close it than to keep it open. From the stories that I am getting - and I think that I am in an area where I pick up quite a bit and I have been talking to quite a number of people who worked there, who worked directly with Linerboard and who knew what went on and who will tell the stories - if all that I am hearing and if all the rumours are true, eventually it will come out and we will know then why Linerboard was not manageable. As far as I am concerned it was not manageable because there was too much scandal, waste, mismanagement. And after Sweeney came there he turned the thing around and it looked like it was going to work, but there was too much interference and he could not keep it going. There was no way that he could operate it even though he proved to government that he could save millions of dollars and had saved quite a bit in the short term that he was there. He got the boot too. He could not stay there because there was too much government interference, so that was the end of it. As far as I am concerned the Moores administration did nothing for Bay St. George. They closed down Linerboard, put everybody out there on their ear, business people, woodsmen, people who worked in Linerboard, just set them right back on their ear, that is what the Moores administration did for the Bay St. George area. And I support this bill. I am quite happy that the mill will re-open. However, I just hope that it reopens and that this time it does stay open. The bill looks good. I hope the bill is - there is probably a lot of it, there's a lot that's not in there, and there's a lot to be determined because there's a lot left to your imagination. You have got to try to figure out little bits. There is a bit of information in there, there is an awful lot that is not there. so, it is hard to say what will happen when the mill opens.

MRS MCISAAC:

But I know one thing, when you have got an area where there is about 4,000 people, I suppose right now, registered with Canada Manpower, anything looks good. When there are 4,000 people lined up at Manpower office looking for work. people who are on Social Assistance because unemployment, even though it is a little bit better than Social Assistance it does not last forever, and when people either have to draw unemployment or live on Social Assistance, there is no way in the world that they are living, they are barely existing. And I would say there are approximately

MRS. H. MCISAAC: 4,000 people now registered with Canada Manpower waiting for the mill to open and there is certainly not going to be 4,000 people employed with the mill. We will get a few jobs out of that but we still got them lined up at the welfare office door. So, I suppose, with the direct employment and the spin-off woods operation whenever that commences - I understand that they are hoping to start marketing in 1981 and it is only 1979 now so we have got two more hungry years to look forward to in Bay St. George unless something else is done. But I guess it is a start. All I can say is, in closing - I do not want to draw this thing out - I want to support the bill. As I said, half a loaf is better than none, A slice is better than none right now, and in Bay St. George we are to the point now where we will take a slice of bread if we can not get a loaf. I would certainly like to see some more information come out on it, as to just what the figures are, what it cost to close that mill down or to mothball it.

Thence, the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. L. Woodrow) said something else that I would like to comment on. He said, "What are the people out there thinking?" He said, "We have got a crowd of people in here. One person says one thing and the other one says something else." Well, I thought that this was what the House of Assembly was all about. I thought that this was a forum for debate where we could come in here and if I want to say something I say it and if somebody else says something opposite well, he is entitled to do it. But, apparently, we are not supposed to do this, we are all supposed to think alike. So I do not know who is misled, if it is myself or the member from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), but as far as I am concerned we are in here to debate and it is not a debate unless there is a difference of opinion. And as long as I have an opinion, I am going to express it one way or the other, I do not care what anyone else's opinion is I am going to state my opinion

MRS. H. MCISAAC: because I believe that the House of Assembly is a chamber for debate. If we can not bring it in here and debate it and kick it around and have different opinions on it then what are we going to do? Everybody can go to the media with their different opinions sure. I do not think that is the place to go either. I think that this is a forum for debate and as long as it is, we are entitled to come in here and debate and have our differences of opinion regardless of what they are.

Well, I would like to know what the people in Bay St. George are going to do for the time being? Sure, the Linerboard mill or the mill is supposed to open. The renovations should start or conversion should start but that is not going to take up all slack in Bay St. George.

When does the woods operation start? Four thousand people on welfare is something that the Government should certainly be concerned about because they are not going to be on unemployment forever, they are going to be on welfare. And whether Government has the money to keep them going is something else. As far as the Linerboard mill is concerned it never should have closed down. It is opening up again and I say, "Thank God that it has been so." Whether it is a good move-I do not say it is the best move that could have been made or that we have got the best price that we could have gotten. I think that we were lucky to get the \$43,500,000 or whatever the figure is, I am not quite sure now, but I do not think it is enough for Labrador Linerboard. But it is probably the best we can get since we destroyed our chances of getting a better price. Because if we advertised that the mill was not worth more than a dollar, it was no good, there is nobody going to be anxious to go out and buy something that is useless. So, I would say that we are very fortunate to get what we got for it. But if it had not been downgraded to the point that it was



May 8, 1979

Tape No. 1140

SD - 3

MRS. H. MCISAAC:                    they may very well be getting \$243  
million for it instead of \$43 million, top price

Mrs. McIsaac: or what it cost anyway. It is going to cost double that to ever build another one. I cannot understand why the thing was destroyed, and the chances of selling it were destroyed. It was downgraded to the point where it was not worth a dollar, and the government said it was not worth a dollar, and they could not get a dollar for it. So who is going to be fool enough to come out and offer \$200 million for it, if the government said it was not worth a dollar? I think that we should have been pushing it, and saying that it was worth every penny that was put into it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MCISAAC: But instead of that here we are now getting \$43 million for it, and I suppose we are lucky to get that, more than lucky. So if government had stayed out of it and let Mr. Sweeney operate it for a while; I do not think that it would have cost government too much to let him go on for another year to give it a try. He was willing to give it a try. He said that he could turn the thing around and make it viable. No, that was not the idea, the mill had to go. It was never meant to work, it had to go.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Big Bad John.

MRS. MCISAAC: So it went and the people in Bay St. George suffered because of it and they will not recuperate, they will never recuperate from it, they have lost too much. They have lost their homes. They have lost everything out there. They had to sell or give away what they had and go to greener pastures, and the government will look up and say that they did the best thing possible. They went against, as far as I am concerned, the recommendations of the Advisory Board. They did not say sell the mill, get rid of it. But that was argued last year and the year before so there is no point in rehashing all that.

But I want to just finally say that I support the bill and I just hope that the mill turns the economic situation that exists in the Bay St. George area today around. I hope that there will be spin-off from the mill, from the woods operation and I just hope that a year from now Bay St. George looks brighter than it looks

MRS. MCISAAC:

right now. There are a lot of people there who did not give up, who stuck with it but they suffered through the last year and a half and they may very well suffer more before the mill is open and operating. But I certainly hope that it will bring a ray of light to the Bay St. George area and hopefully it will take about 3,000 or 4,000 people off of unemployment or welfare or whatever they are on and put them back in the ranks of the employed. Because there is nothing as degrading as to have to walk up to the welfare office and look for handouts is what it is. It is not really handouts because it is their own tax money, but right now people in that area consider it handouts because they have got to be there every second week in order to keep their families alive and it is all due to the fact that Labrador Linerboard was closed down, it never should have been closed down. It would have been a booming area right now if it had not been closed down. It is opening again, good! Fine! I support the bill and hope that something will be done about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Ottenheimer): The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to say that I certainly understand the concern of the member for St. George's (Mrs. McIsaac). And I am sure that if she were asked to she could give instance after instance of families that have been dispossessed and their family life disrupted, homes that have had to be sold and a great deal of dislocation and industrial misery. An outsider would wonder in going over that mill site how such an apparently prosperous looking mill could close. I went over the site twice, first in 1972 before it was finished and then I think it was in 1974 after it was, you know, going full steam. All the equipment looked to be new. The planning seemed to be carefully done. The operation seemed to be integrated. The logs flowed in one end, were barked and chipped, the chips flowed into this large machine which seemed to operate quite efficiently and the linerboard seemed to come out in these great rows and from there they went into a big shed where they were picked up by a great magnetic

MR. J. CARTER:

crane and very efficiently loaded onto waiting steamers. You would think to look at it that it did, could and should pay and that the last few years have been really a disastrous interlude.

When you look at it a little more closely, Mr. Speaker, you realize that the villain is the Labrador wood. That mill was conceived to handle something like 400,000 cords a year of which only about 200,000 were available on the Island. The other 200,000 had to be gotten from the Labrador

MR. J. CARTER: and it was a sad fact, possibly partially due to inefficiency, mostly due to distance and climate I think. that Labrador wood was not and is not and cannot apparently be harvested satisfactorily. Of course, my first involvement with the mill was when we formed the government back in 1972 and we found the very first day that we sat down as a government that the very first item of business was that John Doyle could not pay his bills and he needed an immediate injection of cash to the sum of \$1 million; and, of course, that was given under pressure and then we sat down to say, "Well, what will we do with the mill?" It was an uncompleted mill at the time and as I remember there were three choices. The first choice was to let it sink. Let John Doyle find the money the best way he could. Chances are his only sources were sources that would not look too kindly upon him if he were not able to repay the money; and, in fact, the more bloody-minded among us thought that it might be a good idea to let his chickens come home to roost. And I will tell you this, if we had, he would not now be down in Panama living the life of 'Riley'. That was one possibility, but then against that was the argument that there were a lot of innocent investors who had invested in good faith and what were we to do with them?

The second choice was a very strange choice; It was to put it into trusteeship, just put it into limbo, sort of mothball it in its uncompleted form and hope that someone would come along and buy it. The argument against that at the time was that, well, maybe who would want to buy an uncompleted mill, something that

MR. J. CARTER: had not been tried and tested and that all the money that had been poured into it, and at that time I think it was something like seventy millions of dollars, all that money would be down the drain, so trusteeship was decided against.

The third choice is what we actually did. We finished it and ran it ourselves with a view to selling it later. There was no intention of closing it and then hoping for a buyer to come along. We had hoped to run it, prove that it could be run efficiently, sell it even at a loss - we hoped it would only be a slight loss - and then find a buyer for it who would run it as a linerboard mill. But the situation with Labrador wood would not allow us to make it even a half-paying concern. No company in their right mind would ever buy it as a linerboard mill. Even today it cannot apparently pay as a linerboard mill and, of course, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Doody) has the facts and figures that I certainly accept. I will not go into them now, and I think they are available to everyone, anyone who wants to seriously sit down and study this situation with the mill. The facts and figures are there and I think they are only open to one interpretation and that is that the mill could not pay as conceived.

On the other hand, it is very necessary to have pulp and paper operations in the Province because our sawmilling industry cannot pay unless the top part of the stick can be sold as a pulp stick. Our woods are not big enough for us to make a properly paying sawmill industry. About half of the tree that is cut down has to be used for pulp sticks, so a contractor goes out and cuts so

May 8, 1979

Tape No. 1142

GH-3

MR. J. CARTER:            many cords of wood. If he did not have an outlet for the pulpwood size, he would only be able to get half as much as he can harvest, so it is absolutely vital that we have an outlet for our pulpwood and that we be able to sell pulpwood at all times. Furthermore, some of the trees in a forest never do attain a size sufficient for a sawmill so it is absolutely essential that we always have this pulpwood outlet.

So the government closed the mill

MR. J. CARTER: and perhaps it closed it too late, but it was closed and now it is sold and I think it can be opened again. And the nature of the mill is going to be changed, it is going to be a paper mill and it is going to operate at less than 400,000 cords of wood capacity. I understand that it will be operating at something like 200,000 cords of wood per year.

Now, here I would like to digress for a moment. I certainly find myself in agreement with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) - this may seem strange - but I do feel that television should be admitted into the House at all times. In fact, I would find it very amusing to see the member for LaPoile perhaps doing a dance up the floor. He could perhaps do the dance of the Sugarplum Fairy to the amusement of all of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: I am sure that he would love nothing better than to have himself on television at all times. In fact, I notice, observing the hon. gentleman, that he seems to get quite depressed if his name is not in the news for even as much as a day at a time. But be that as it may.

AN HON. MEMBER: He goes on (inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: That is the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) you are talking about, is it not?

MR. J. CARTER: Well, apparently, some politicians do need publicity to keep them going and I suppose it is an occupational disease.

Mr. Speaker, to get back to Bill 15 again, I understand that the \$43.5 million is the first amount to be paid without any guarantees so that there is no further need for Newfoundland to pay any money towards the continued operation of the mill. We are off the hook as far as having to subsidize the further operation of the mill. We are



MR. J. CARTER: also off the hook in that we do not have to subsidize any conversion. Even if the conversion to newsprint does not work at first, we are not obliged to pay any more money for further conversion. Also, the company is agreeing to pay a penalty clause, that is to say, if they are not producing within a certain length of time they pay so much, and if they are not open for a longer length of time they pay a great deal more.

I would also like to touch on a more general topic, Mr. Speaker. This House, since we have opened, has seen a number of charges. In fact, every year we have a great many unfounded charges laid at somebody's doorstep, and I think it is a pity either that we are not all lawyers or that there are any lawyers in the House. I think the lawyers among us would be the first ones to say that a charge is not a charge until someone's name has been mentioned - in other words, you have to give a name. That is the first thing. You also have to give a date - a date when a deed was done. It is no good saying that somebody did something before 1900. I am sure the statute of limitations would have run out long since. Also, you have to name the deed - what was done - that somebody did something at such and such a time and in such and such a place. So you have four elements, you have the name, the deed, the date and the place. It is no good saying that somebody did such and such in New Zealand - that is a little beyond our jurisdiction. And yet, time after time people get up and say so and so did something, somewhere, sometime, and that is supposed to stick. And I would just like to establish these ground rules, that if these four elements are not present then you do not have a charge. And I see the Leader of the Opposition nodding - I am sure he agrees with me that if these four elements are not there there is no charge and there cannot be any charge.

MR. SIMMONS: A badly stabbed body is not necessarily a proof of murder.

MR. J. CARTER: It depends who the person -

MR. SIMMONS: Because you have no date, you see.

MR. J. CARTER: Well, if the hon. gentleman's body, filled with stab wounds, were to turn up in a ditch, I would assume that he probably -

MR. SIMMONS: They would check Mount Scio Farms first thing in the morning -

MR. J. CARTER: - I might assume that the hon. gentleman did it himself unless there were stab marks in his back.

MR. SIMMONS: But no date, eh? Stunned!

MR. J. CARTER: I would also like to deal with some lunacy from the Leader of the Opposition.

I believe in his speech - and I have just made rough notes - that he said that the costs of closing the mill were greater than the costs of keeping it open.

MR. J. CARTER:

Now, I can not give you specifics because I do not have all the facts in front of me but it is my understanding, correct me if I am wrong, that the day by day cost of keeping that mill running was equal to the day by day production, that is to say, if 400 tons of linerboard were produced the cost of producing that was double the cost you could sell it for. So for every day every ton of linerboard you produced you were losing precisely that amount of money. Now, that situation could not continue. But of course the Leader of the Opposition swept that under the carpet because in his philosophy money does not matter. And I think this applies to Liberal philosophy generally. Money is not important. You know if there is not enough money - print more. This is the thread that runs through all their arguments. And I think I can sum up his tirade by the following four lines. "When you hear the voice of the knocker, / And you hear his hammer fall, / Remember the fact that the knocking act, / Requires no brain at all."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I just have a very few words. I think that most that has to be said has been said in this House. The last time I rose to speak about the then Labrador Linerboard mill I think at that time I spoke for some four and a half hours and I have no intentions of going over that again. I think most of it has been gone over in the past week by many members on both sides of the House. I think it is useful though to speak about some of the things that happened in the past with Labrador Linerboard limited because I do not think the lesson should ever be forgotten in Newfoundland or it should ever be forgotten exactly what happened there. And I hope that sometime in the future that perhaps some research student will go back and look at the documents relating from the time the mill was conceived, I suppose, in the minds of the then government until the moment when Abitibi Price took over the mill.

MR. J. CARTER:

Because I believe that if that were to be done in a proper manner I think we would have a lesson for future generations of how not to handle a particular part of the economy of this Province and how government's can mismanage and blunder and do everything that is wrong and perhaps tear apart a community, send people without work to other parts of this country and other countries. I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be a useful lesson for all of us.

But so far as this particular situation at the present time is perceived in the Bay St. George area, I think most people are very pleased that a company like Abitibi Price has come into Bay St. George in that I think people are now breathing a sigh of relief that there will be some stability to the region. Because since 1971, when this became an election issue and I believe, Mr. Speaker - and I remember comments like the mill is the wrong place, the thing cannot work - right from the very beginning - it is a bluff emanating from the Opposition benches at that time. I think that probably what happened, Mr. Speaker, was that the Opposition at that time when they became the government had convinced themselves that the mill could not work and from that point onward behaved in that particular way. And once you convince yourself that something cannot work it is very difficult to make it work. As I say, Mr. Speaker, as far as the people of Bay St. George is concerned it is almost - it is one of the most fantastic things that has happened there in a long time. I do

MR. HODDER:                   hope, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the Linerboard issue or the mill issue is closed now in the Province. The people of Bay St. George, I think they have had enough of having the mill kicked around as a political football. We do not have to tell these particular people exactly what happened in the mill because a lot of them worked there and they know exactly what the history of the mill is and where the blame should lie and where the praise should be given. And, Mr. Speaker, all I want to say is that the mill may not have been sold for the - or the deal may not be the best one in the world. I am happy that it is coming to an end, that it has come to a conclusion, that we are looking forward now to getting some work, getting some employment and we are looking forward to the area growing. I might point out though, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that the mill is now in operation will not make Bay St. George prosperous. That is only one component of the industrial base of Bay St. George and that at the present time if you look at the lists of people who are on social assistance in that area and the lists of people who are drawing UIC and if you go check with Canada Manpower and you see the number of people unemployed and you look at the possible jobs that the mill can provide, both direct jobs and indirect, you realize that we still have a problem in Bay St. George of enormous magnitude; and that this government must look at that particular area of this Province and say, "We must do something about it by opening or signing an agreement with Abitibi Price." That does not do anything to help the unemployment situation in large measure. But I think that that has to become for whichever government is in power in this Province, that they must look at the Province and look at

MR. HODDER: the pockets of unemployment in the Province and someone must bite the bullet and take steps and measures to combat these situations. I know that my district probably has the highest unemployment in the Province. Certainly, Western Newfoundland and Labrador is one of the highest unemployment areas in - well, Newfoundland is the highest unemployment area in Canada and that is the highest unemployment area in Newfoundland. I believe my district of Port au Port is probably the highest in that particular federal area. And when you look at the fact that the West Coast is a storehouse of treasures, there is the fishery, we have mining, we have pulp and paper, we have agriculture, all we need to do, Mr. Speaker, is put it all together and the area could be one of the most prosperous parts of this Province and perhaps one of the most prosperous parts of Canada.

I do not think it should be forgotten that by signing an agreement that the mill will start, that the problem will go away there. It is a help. People are pleased with it. They are looking forward to going back to work. They are not particularly pleased, Mr. Speaker, with the way that the government has handled the whole deal. I could, I suppose, go through some of the things that have been talked about in this House and been talked about after the mill closed. I do not believe for one minute, Mr. Speaker, that it should have closed. We had at that particular time, we had a government which took over and tried to run a mill. We had a manager there, who was under direct orders from the government, who could not make decisions. We had systems for the mill, transportation systems which were not worked out. We had wood handling

MR. HODDER: systems which were not worked out. We had a mill which was run in the interest of the government rather than the interest of economics. I think that many of the decisions the government made - I think perhaps that is another lesson from this particular mill, that many of the decisions that the government made were in the interest of particular interest groups in the Province and not in the interests of the mill itself. And that is one thing that private enterprise does very well, Mr. Speaker. Private enterprise runs systems in the interests of itself, in the interest of the profit motive and it seems to be the very best system as I think will be proved in Stephenville.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I say that the mill itself will offer the people of Bay St. George stability, and while I say that the people of Bay St. George, I suppose, in the desperate circumstances that they are,

MR. HODDER:

they are not particularly interested whether it was a good deal that was signed, whether it was a good deal that was made or not. While that may be so I will certainly say this, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Bay St. George do not throw any bouquets or laurels at this particular government for the handling of that mill and it will be as my friend and colleague from St. George's (Mrs. McIsaac) said, it will be years before some people will ever get back to the position they were before, people who have sold their houses, people who have moved away and people whose families have been broken up, people who will not return to Bay St. George. There are many who will not return, some will. We only can hope now, Mr. Speaker, that with the stability that Abitibi Price will give, and they have indicated that they will be good corporate citizens of the area, that the stability that it will give the area will, you know, give us a brighter future. Already, I suppose, you can see some signs of that in the area. You see businesses moving in and you see plans for the future, something that could not be done before because of the political nature of Labrador Linerboard Limited.

I think, Mr. Speaker, one thing has been proven at least that the slogan of the hon. gentlemen opposite in 1971, that the mill was in the wrong place, has certainly been disproved. And I think certainly, I believe that the mill will prosper and will continue to prosper. I will be voting for this particular bill as will my colleagues. As I said before I do not think it is a perfect bill, I can see lots of things wrong with the deal but, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of the people of Bay St. George and in the interest of the area itself, I will be supporting it and I hope that this is the end of the debate and that we can go on to greater prosperity in the area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity today, rather than any other day, to comment upon this bill now before the



PREMIER PECKFORD:

House. I say that primarily because I follow the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and only in the last hour I left the hon. member's district. When the hon. member as he so rightly says, that this reopening of the mill at Stephenville does not necessarily provide all the employment answers for the Bay St. George area, he is so right. I today, Mr. Speaker, visited Cape St. George, Mainland, Blue Beach and Fox Island River where I held meetings with the local citizens and local fishermen's committees as part of an ongoing effort to get around the Province, number one and number two, in this particular instance to keep a number of commitments I made to the various groups out there about a month ago. When the hon. gentleman says that the conversion of the Linerboard mill to a paper mill and the reopening and reactivation of that, that does not answer all of the unemployment or employment problems, whichever way you want to look at it, of the area, he is so right. Because a lot of the resource potential that exists in the Bay St. George area is not based on wood, it is based on fish on the Port au Port Peninsula. And as we look at the Port au Port Peninsula today we see a great revitalization of the fishing industry and a lot of infrastructural activity going on today, this year and next year to try to put in place harbour developments and fish processing facilities to give some other dimension to the unemployment problem or employment problem in that area.

However, Mr. Speaker, after saying that I think it is fair to go on to say that - and I think the hon. member for Port au Port has just said it as well as I or anybody could say it - that it does provide a base for the localized Stephenville area, at least, and Stephenville Crossing area because with the coming of the Linerboard Mill, as with other activities like that around the Province, there did develop a fairly high level of skilled tradesmen, if you will, who became then unable to go back easily either into the lumber woods, if that was their earlier trade or wont, or into the fishery but now are skilled tradesmen, used to a middle-class kind of living and, therefore, once the Linerboard Mill closed down they were unemployed totally and had to move to other places in the world, as far away as Iran, as we all know, and other places in Canada and the United States. But this does provide the economic

PREMIER PECKFORD:

base to Stephenville and Stephenville Crossing and even places further than that and St. George's to some degree I guess, the town of St. George's, that is needed. And the point is now that we must build on that base. Now we are out of the depression, if you will, we are out of the situation where there is absolutely no economic base in the area, to a situation where we do have a foundation at least and now it is on that foundation that we must expand.

One of the

PREMIER PECKFORD: interesting statistics in the whole Stephenville area which is important is that before even this conversion was signed, or the sale of the mill was signed with Abitibi in a visit that I made to Stephenville, I think there were somewhere around 800 to 1,000 jobs at other manufacturing kinds of enterprises on the old base. They are using the warehouse facilities, the brewery, other manufacturing plants Atlantic Design Homes and many other small and medium size manufacturing enterprises which were attracted to the Stephenville area because there was already some infrastructure in place. There was a warehouse to buy at a reasonable price - to rent or to buy. So that you had some diversification of the employment opportunities in the area even when the mill was closed down. But now we have a conversion underway, we have one of the most reputable, if not the most reputable company in the world taking it over, the largest newsprint manufacturer in the world. And unlike the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) on this point, I think whether the people of the Stephenville or Bay St. George area are throwing bouquets at the government for this particular sale, I think when all is said and done - when history records, when economic historians record the story of the linerboard mill - that they will, in my view, look favourably upon the deal that we have entered into with Abitibi Price on this whole operation. I think that is the true test, history will be the test. At the present moment, perhaps, there are many who still have bad feelings about the whole linerboard situation.

And to take the hon. member up on another point he mentioned that people on this side of the House had paraded around that the mill was in the wrong place. I think the hon. gentleman has his facts wrong. What was said in 1970 and 1971 as it related to the mill being in the wrong place was that, if you are going to use Labrador wood, the mill is in the wrong place. If

PREMIER PECKFORD: you are going to use Labrador wood the mill is in the wrong place and that was proven to be so that the transportation costs and the wood costs in that area would not dictate the mill being in that place. Now whether in fact you can viably put -

MR. MCNEIL: (Inaudible) Crosbie.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am speaking as I understand the situation and as I expressed some concern about it eight or nine years ago or six or seven years ago. Whether there was a particular hon. gentleman on this side who just categorically said the mill is in the wrong place, full stop, without any concern for wood near the area, that could very well be, the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) might be correct. But what I am saying is that from my remembrance of comments at that time and my own comments that I made at the time and in the last four or five years I have said repeatedly, 'The mill was in the wrong place as it relates to using Labrador wood as its base.' No question about it, it is in the wrong place. But as it relates to using wood in that area, obviously now we have a viable economic unit there to work on.

The other point I think, Mr. Speaker, that should be kept in mind here when we talk about whether, in fact, this whole conversion attempt is necessary, forget about the sale. One could sell the industrial complex for a linerboard mill or one could sell it for a newsprint mill. I think it is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that the largest newsprint manufacture in the world, and a company that is familiar with all kinds of paper products, chose to convert it to newsprint. And contrary to what some people have said, the linerboard market today is not any better appreciably than it was when we announced the close down of the linerboard mill, that the so-

May 8, 1979

Tape No. 1147

DW - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD:            called projections that by 1980  
see a massive turnaround, a dramatic turnaround in the markets  
for linerboard; in other words, that their markets would improve  
and be enriched so that by 1980 or some

PREMIER PECKFORD:

magic year, linerboard would sell at a very high price and would stay permanently at that price to allow for the Linerboard mill to make some profits, which is completely unrealistic, and today, 1979, bears that out. That is no evidence to prove that by 1980 the linerboard mill at Stephenville, if it remained a linerboard mill, would be able to compete in world markets by selling linerboard. That is just not true, it is erroneous. The only way that it has any long term future, not for me to say, but Abitibi Price, a company much more qualified in these matters, has determined that the long-term future of a paper operation at Stephenville is in the news-print business and not in the linerboard business. I think that is proof enough. I think the record, Mr. Speaker, on the whole question of Labrador Linerboard is a very good one from the point of view of the close down, the committee that was involved in trying to sell it, involving the local people, the union, the local leaders in the Bay St. George and Stephenville area, is a very good one. And I think that if anyone in the future in Newfoundland, where we have a economic slow down in a certain area based on some industrial enterprise, that they would do well in the future to look at the example of what happened at Stephenville and use it as an example, perhaps even going back to determining whether you establish something in an area, and how you establish, and what kind of planning goes into it. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, if one went right back to the beginning of Linerboard mill, the first criticism one could make is that very little planning went into the whole question of establishing a Linerboard Mill in Stephenville. That was number one, poor poor planning, that the proper work and research was not done. and, therefore, we were left with a pretty, you know, bad deal, when you come right down to it. And, therefore, then when we got into the whole process of trying, number two, I guess the next big mistake was for government to believe in its wisdom, given the depression in the area and all the rest of it, that it could run it. I think that is a major mistake and I guess everybody in this hon. House whose has had anything to do with the Linerboard mill has admitted that we tried our best. We gave it our best shot and we did it

PREMIER PECKFORD: in very hard times. And I think the decision at the time, if we had to do it over again, or any government had to do it over again, would have taken that decision because the economics of the time, the depression in the area and all the rest of it, dictated it. And we thought that we had an opportunity, a chance. It is a good question as to how good we thought the chance was. It might have been less than 50 per cent that we could make it work, but the chance was there that we might be able to make it work. There was a chance. So let us go take the chance - and we failed. So number two mistake was in government trying to run an industrial enterprise of that magnitude, given the fact that government had very little experience and in running linerboard mills, none at all. So that was the second big mistake that was made. Then I think, thirdly, when, after recognizing that we could not run it, we recognized that in the pocketbook and we started to lose money badly, the taxpayers of Newfoundland started having to pump twenty and thirty and forty million dollars a year into that enterprise. For whatever reasons, there was a lot of, I agree inefficiency in the operation, not only at Stephenville but more particularly in Happy Valley - Goose Bay area. A lot of loggers from the district of Green Bay worked in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and they used to come back home, Christmas time and sometimes in the Summer when there was a slow down, and tell some wild and wooly stories about the wonderful life they were having in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. And that, you know, they could get paid almost as much or more there than they could if they went to work with Price or Bowaters near at home, and they did not have to cut near the amount of wood and yet got paid just as much and drive around in trucks and all the rest of it. So they were having a gala time for themselves. So there was a lot of inefficiency in the system - no question. But I think the decision to close down the mill was the only one that could have been taken. And I do not think, and once again I think history will record favourably upon that, that the close down of the linerboard mill was such that some dramatic act had to occur

PREMIER PECKFORD:

in order to focus attention upon a very serious problem. It is no good for government to go to the marketplace and start lamenting publicly or across the board room table that, "Look, we have an industrial enterprise here in Newfoundland that is producing linerboard mill based on some great spruce in Labrador, and mix it with a bit of fir and even with a bit of birch and we can give you a great product here. Now we are losing money, \$27 million one year, another year \$32 million, another year close to \$40 million, but we are sure you can make it work." It do not think that would sell very well in the boardrooms across the world. And so some dramatic act had to occur and of course that could only be, given the amount of tax money we were losing, to close it down. And then, after closing it down, do what should have been done



PREMIER PECKFORD:

perhaps right from the very start and that was to involve the local people in the whole question. So then a committee was established to get involved in selling the complex, telling what it was all about, showing the kind of wood supply we had and go around to the various corporations in the world and see what was happening, give them all the facts, not hot air but just give them the facts, tell them what we had, tell them the experience that we had and then let them do it. And forty different corporations were contacted and there was a substantial communication with a lot of them and after all the communications - and not only did we involve the local people but we also got a number of experts in the field to be permanent, sort of, employees of that committee so that they could do a lot of the background and research work whilst the local people were still involved to okay and cross the 't's' and dot the 'i's' and ask important questions related to the local area and so on.

And so after all of that it ends up that two major corporations, primarily Canadian corporations, presented realistic proposals for the purchase of that mill. And as a number of hon. gentlemen on this side have already said, I think the day that the Government of Newfoundland announced the close down of Linerboard Mill the value of that mill was very, very small. I think the fact that we got \$43 million, whatever the exact figures are, for that mill is a good test of the value of that kind of a committee that was put in place.

Mr. Speaker, I have not had a chance to read some of the speeches in this debate, but I have been in and out of the House and listened to some, and I do not know who has paid tribute to whom. But I think the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Doody) deserves a lot of credit, the former Minister of Industrial Development, as it relates to this whole question of the Labrador Linerboard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I think perhaps he was closer to it as it kept on moving down the road than any other particular minister in the government at that time in my view, from what I remember. The present

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Minister of Industrial Development (Mr. Maynard) was also involved in it to a great degree and is now piloting the bill through the House and there were others, including the former Premier who were involved and had a lot to do with it. I think the one hon. gentleman of all hon. gentlemen on this side who had a lot to do with it was the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Doody) and he is to be congratulated for the way in which this thing moved along, the committee moved along, the ongoing communications that they had with the department at that time and with the minister. I have heard several individuals related to that time and they give the present Minister of Mines and Energy a lot of credit for the way the thing was handled. And so we were able to sell to one of the most reputable, the largest newsprint manufacturer in the world this complex which has had a very troubled economic history. Now of course we are all in hope that the present sale, which will be ratified by the passage of this bill, will see the reactivation of that industrial enterprise and 300 to 400 permanent jobs created which will give the economic foundation to a depressed area that has had problems right from day one for a long, long time.

But as the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) says, and I totally and absolutely agree with him, that does not solve all the problems which relate to the St. George area—no way. The people of Fox Island River are going to fish and they can have a good fishery. The people of Cape St. George are going to do a lot of fishing and with the proper harbour development they are going to succeed at the fishery. And you can do a lot of agricultural development on the Port au Port Peninsula, sheep raising and a lot more. Therefore we must not suddenly think or even believe it to be the right thing to do, to suddenly take people from Fox Island River or Mainland or Boswarlos or wherever and just automatically transport them to Stephenville so that they can have a nice job as a welder or a draftsman or something else. They just might not want to do that. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that they should not do that. I think an economic mix in the Bay St. George area, as in Newfoundland, is what

PREMIER PECKFORD:

is necessary so that you do not only have your eggs all in one basket but you use the natural talents of our Newfoundlanders in any case. That is the kind of mix we want and we must continue to put in new monies into Port au Port Peninsula as we do around the Province to develop the fishery and to develop the other things that we do naturally.

This is an important bill of ratification, Mr. Speaker, which I think turns the corner to some degree on the attitude and the way governments have handled industrial enterprises in this Province. Let us hope that this bill and the reactivation of the Labrador Linerboard mill will be a symbol to all governments in the future to make sure that when they go about industrial development -

AN HON. MEMBER: Look before you leap.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is right, that you look before you leap, and that we do things properly and that perhaps one of the sure safeguards that we do is to use some of the examples from this process to make sure the local people are involved, because if they are are very often they come up with some of the very basic, sometimes simplistic questions but the ones that need answers most directly to ensure a viable operation for a long term. I think it is an important bill, one that we are very happy to bring in at this time, and I am sure I speak for all hon. gentlemen on all sides of the House when I say that we are, as a Legislature, as a Parliament of Newfoundland, going to pass this unanimously and hopefully the labour problems at Stephenville at the present moment will fade into nothingness in the next few weeks so that the conversion attempts can get on without any labour strife and we can have some foundation on which to build some future for the people of the West Coast and the Bay St. George area in particular.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Ottenheimer) The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just a few remarks on this bill before the minister closes the debate on it, because the Premier of this Province, Sir, has just made an admission that nobody opposite would accept or admit to in this whole debate. The Premier of this Province has now stated that there were two mistakes made, two mistakes made with respect to this Linerboard mill or the mill which now presently exists in Stephenville.

Mistake number one, Sir, he said was the placement of the Linerboard mill in Stephenville itself with the woodcutting operation taking place in Labrador. Well, Sir, if that was a mistake it could certainly be considered a mistake of the heart because one can remember quite well what was happening during that time. The plan was to put a linerboard mill and a woodcutting operation up in Labrador and suddenly we had the disastrous situation of the Americans pulling out of Stephenville, and in an effort to resolve that problem of massive unemployment in the Stephenville area and create employment at the same time in the Labrador area, the government honestly and sincerely split the concept basically in two geographically. The woodcutting operation in Labrador, transport of the wood to the West Coast for the salvation of the people of Stephenville and Bay St. George area, Sir, and it was the government that did that.

MR. NEARY: Not Canadian Javelin.

MR. F. ROWE: Not Canadian Javelin. Obviously there were some negotiations, I suppose, went on but the fact of the matter is, Sir, that the government in a sincere, honest effort tried to solve two problems at one time.

May 8, 1979

Tape No. 1150

GH-2

MR. F. ROWE: Now, mistake number two, according to the present Premier, is the fact that the government took it over in the first place and attempted to run it. And, Sir, that is quite an admission, quite an admission, because was there really any proof, any proof, I have not seen anybody opposite give us any documents to prove beyond any doubt whatsoever that that Linerboard mill was headed for the rocks? Why not give a try to private enterprise? Why not let it continue on? Give it a try? If it fails, what happens if a company fails, Sir? What happens when a company fails to turn over a profit and the bills keep building up? What happens to that company or individual householder, the company or individual cannot meet his bills. Having been in politics for eight years, I ought to know what I am talking about. A person or company which or who cannot meet their bills, eventually ends up going up the spout;

MR. F. ROWE: in other words, has to declare bankruptcy. Now, Sir, I am not so sure - I just do not know the answer - but nobody has proven to me in this House or outside of the House that it was absolutely necessary for the Crosbie-Moores government to take over the operation of the Linerboard mill -

MR. NEARY: Right! Right on!

MR. F. ROWE: - which has cost this Province hundreds of millions of dollars.

MR. NEARY: Three hundred million dollars.

MR. F. ROWE: Four hundred million minus forty-three million, whatever that is. It has cost the people of this Province in excess of three hundred and fifty million dollars. Now what did they achieve, Sir? The achievement of the government's takeover of the Linerboard mill was eventual close-down -

MR. NEARY: Crosbie sold some of the equipment.

MR. F. ROWE: - the unemployment of some 2,000 people, was it?

MR. McNEIL: Yes.

MR. F. ROWE: Two thousand people thrown out of employment, complete social disruption, people being forced to leave not only Stephenville, but the Province, and they have the gall opposite to accuse hon. members opposite of being responsible for resettlement, but, Sir, when we resettled it was because of the people's choice and it was within the Province, closer to health and medical facilities. The hon. crowd opposite, Sir, their method of settlement is to Alberta or Iran -

MR. NEARY: Saudi-Arabia.

MR. F. ROWE: - Saudi-Arabia, for purposes of employment; people forced to leave to make a dollar.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, this is a startling revelation that the Premier of this Province has made here today, that mistake number two was the fact that they took over the Linerboard mill. And, Sir, I think that was the real mistake, because as I said before and I will repeat again, that mill under the previous owner -

MR. NEARY: Canadian Javelin.

MR. F. ROWE: - Canadian Javelin -

AN HON. MEMBER: With 20,000 shareholders.

MR. F. ROWE: - with 20,000 shareholders, could have survived or it could have failed - it is very simple, black and white - could have survived or could have failed. If they failed or diversified -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: - exactly - diversified if need be. As it happens now the member was just helping me along there. I am told and other members have said that linerboard is in demand now. Is that correct?

MR. NEARY: The market was never as good and the price was never as high.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) could be diversified (inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: That is right. Okay, it could have been diversified. The important point, Sir, is that the question now looms very large whether the takeover of the Linerboard mill was a wise decision, and I ask, Sir, after hearing hon. members on this side talk about some of the questionable activities that went on during and after the takeover of that mill, whether there were not some motives other than the best interests of this Province involved in the takeover of that Linerboard mill -

MR. SIMMONS: That is for sure.

MR. F. ROWE: - which eventually had to close down anyway.

MR. F. ROWE:

And that close-down, Sir,

we have been told time and time again, cost more per year than keeping the operation going in terms of money directly into the operation and the social upheaval that resulted from the 2,000 people being thrown out of work in that particular instance - having to sell their homes and their property at rock bottom prices - and now if these same people want to move back to Stephenville, they will probably have to buy their own homes back at ten times the price they sold it for.

MR. HICKMAN:

(Inaudible).



MR. F. ROWE:

I am stating a figure to make a point and the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) knows that. The real estate was at rock bottom when she went down out there -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. F. ROWE: - and obviously real estate now - I am not in real estate but you do not have to be an expert -

MR. NEARY: The speculators were out (inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: - to realize that in order to buy a home out in Stephenville now it would certainly cost you a heck of a lot more money than to have tried to buy one two or three years ago.

MR. NEARY: The legal beagles were out there months ago, speculators.

MR. F. ROWE: It is as simple as that. And, Sir, back at the time when they closed down the Linerboard Mill we asked the government and every member of the government and we debated it in the Throne Speech debate, the Budget debate and we asked questions orally through press releases, what is the real reason for closing down the Linerboard Mill. Is it the fact that the financial houses of the world, the financial advisors to the government, were saying, "Close her down or else it is going to affect the credit rating of this Province"? And for a full year or two or more - I stand to be corrected -

MR. NEARY: Denied it.

MR. F. ROWE: - they denied, month after month, year after year, that they were closing down the Linerboard mill because of advise from their fiscal advisors because it might affect and decrease the credit rating of this Province. Denial after denial.

MR. NEARY: Moody shut her down.

MR. F. ROWE: And, Sir, in fact they said "the only reason we are closing down this mill is because it is not economically feasible to operate." That is the only reason given opposite.

Now, Sir, in the last few days we have heard in this hon. House members opposite get up and say, admit years later, take a complete refersal on it.

MR. NEARY: Confession now is supposed to be good for the soul, you know.

MR. F. ROWE:

That one of the reasons they had to close down the Linerboard Mill -

MR. NEARY: Forgive and forget.

MR. F. ROWE: - is because it would have affected their credit rating if we did not close it down. Sir, you know, we talk about honesty in government and integrity in government and the image of politicians. I mean, Sir, you cannot tell the people of this Province -

MR. NEARY: Get off your knees.

MR. F. ROWE: - one thing two or three years ago and then take a complete opposite and different stand two or three years later.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. F. ROWE: This was not a case of things changing, having to change with the times. The hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) admitted this afternoon that they had to close her down or the Province would have gone bankrupt.

MR. NEARY: Moody (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Would have gone bankrupt.

MR. NEARY: Is that right?

MR. F. ROWE: Would have gone bankrupt, no less.

MR. WOODROW: That is the reason why we could not put a hospital in Grand Falls.

MR. F. ROWE: Okay, okay, we will continue on. Keep her coming. Keep her coming. We were supposed to be bankrupt.

MR. WOODROW: (inaudible) the Speaker.

MR. F. ROWE: We were supposed to be bankrupt, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: What about Craig Dobbin's helicopters? How many hospitals (inaudible)?

MR. F. ROWE: We were supposed to be bankrupt in 1969 and 1970 and we had a debt of \$700 million. Now we have a debt of \$2.7 billion.

MR. NEARY: No, \$3 billion.

MR. F. ROWE: Almost \$3 billion and we are still not bankrupt.

MR. WOODROW: Look at the cost of inflation.

MR. F. ROWE: Oh, look at the cost of inflation. Look at the cost of everything. The fact that I am making, and hon. members opposite will

MR. F. ROWE:

not distract me from the point that I am trying to make, is that at the time of the close down every member opposite denied the fact that the reason for the close down of the Linerboard Mill was because it might affect the credit rating of this Province. They denied it. And now hon. members this very week and last week say, "One of the reasons we had to close it down is because it might have affected our credit rating," and the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) says, "We had to close it down or else we would have gone bankrupt", let alone a credit rating being affected, we would have gone bottoms up, bellies up.

MR. NEARY: He forgets the two blasts on either side of the Straits of Belle Isle, \$110 million.

MR. WOODROW: On the verge.

MR. F. ROWE: So, Sir, it cost us \$220 million, this blunder.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. F. ROWE: The Lower Churchill cost us \$110 million for blowing off a couple of sticks of dynamite.

MR. NEARY: We could buy a lot of hospitals out of that.

MR. WOODROW: Speaking of blunders (inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Oh, speak about blunders. I wish the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) would do something one of these days. I will challenge the hon. member for Bay of Islands to do one thing.

MR. WOODROW: What is that (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes, boy.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, that goes without saying. At least he gives himself some good advise.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MRS. MCISAAC: That is unparliamentary.

MR. F. ROWE: I would challenge the hon. member for

May 8, 1979

Tape No. 1153

GH-1

MR. F. ROWE: Bay of Islands to draft up a list and table it before the House a list of the failures of the Liberal administration from 1949 to 1971 -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: - just one. Mr. Speaker, may I speak -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) the likes of Pelcon.

MR. F. ROWE: Draft up a list of the failures and while he is at it draft up a list of the successes - social, industrial and otherwise in this Province - and the hon. member who was the first declared Liberal in 1975, the first declared Liberal candidate, the first declared Liberal candidate, then went LRP, one of the first LRP candidates, and when he went out sniffing around Bay of Islands, suddenly found that there were a few more PCs out there than he anticipated so he bolted to the PC party to save his own political skin.

MR. WOODROW: (Inaudible) any banner - thank God, I am a lucky -

MR. F. ROWE: Well, that is the only one you can thank for it is God because you could not win anything other than yourself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the closedown:  
I maintain that if you want to call it a mistake for the administration of the time when they had to locate that Linerboard mill in -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) - grinning.

MR. F. ROWE: I know he is grinning, what else can he do?

The previous administration, Sir, had a very serious situation on their hands. The people of

MR. F. ROWE: Stephenville left in the lurch, the Americans had pulled out, and they tried to put together a package that would be of benefit to Newfoundland and Labrador, the people of Stephenville and the people of the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area. Sir, I agree in retrospect that the real villain - and I must say the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) made one of his better speeches since I have been in this hon. House, because he really put his finger right on the problem there - the real villain - it is unusual, I must admit - but the real villain here was the fact of the source of wood supply. It was a terrible situation and if we could have had agreements to get the wood on the Island, if this is where the mill was going to be, fine and dandy; we might not have had the problems that we have now. If the mill was located in Labrador, we might not have the problem that we have now, but, Sir, for the Premier of this Province, now having been in the administration for the number of years that he has been, to admit publicly and openly that the second big mistake was the fact that they took over the mill is just something else! I am sure his colleagues must have had a terrible shock when their leader got up and cut the logic out from under them this afternoon, because every member opposite who has stood up so far in this debate, every member opposite has been defending the administration that sits over there, has been criticizing the previous administration now for two weeks. That has been the song and dance opposite. Hammer 'Joey'. Hammer the Liberals. What great guys we are for taking it over. What great guys we are for closing her down. What great guys we are for selling it again, and their own leader, Sir, gets up this afternoon and cuts the feet right out from under them and said, "We made a bad

MR. F. ROWE: mistake, a miserable blunder in taking over the Linerboard mill when we did. Mistake number two", he said, "mistake number two."

I submit, Sir, that if the government did not touch it with a barge pole that we would be better off today for the reasons that I have stated. Either Javelin would have pulled the thing through or it would have gone bankrupt and if it had to have gone bankrupt some other private entrepreneur would come along, look at the situation, figure out what went wrong and probably bought it at a reasonable price but then we had in the intervening years since then the likes of big, bad John Crosbie going around the Province, going around the world, saying the Linerboard mill was ill-conceived,

MR. F. ROWE:                   poorly built, poorly operated.  
The people could not operate it properly. It was not worth a buck. We cannot get rid of it for a buck." That is good promotion when you are trying to sell a mill later on down the road. That is good promotion. I must remember that now when I am ready to turn my car in, to go around saying it is not worth a cent, not worth a cent, and then try to sell it. That is what the great John Crosbie did.

AN HON. MEMBER:               (Inaudible) - John Crosbie.

MR. F. ROWE:                   If the mill fails, Sir, if the mill goes down, down the tubes, I would agree with the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow): They should put on the tombstone out there 'The John C. Crosbie Memorial Stephenville Paper Mill'. That is the only thing that I would agree with him on, but if it is a success it is not due to one John C. Crosbie. I pray, Sir, that it will be a success and I hope that it will be a success and I will repeat as have my colleagues said in the debate that we are wholeheartedly behind the principle of this bill, but the hon. House Leader opposite, Sir, sits there and grins and moans and groans and screams and shrieks and, thank God he does not streak, but, Sir, he gets there and every time an hon. member on this side asks a question that might seem to be critical of any part of this bill at all, raise a question or criticize, you know, we ask, "What is this LLL-2 all about? What is this LLL-3 all about? What is this LLL-1 all about?" We just ask a simple question about that and you know according to the gospel of the House Leader opposite we are against the bill because we dare question certain items in the bill and certain things that

MR. F. ROWE: are not even in the bill. Certain information - my hon. colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, raised a number of points that were not brought before the House nor are they contained in the bill, and the hon. members opposite think that by us sincerely asking questions, trying to improve the agreement if it can be done - it obviously cannot be done now; it is signed. We are just asked to ratify this - but because we are trying to improve something through the method of debate for which our forefathers fought in a western democratic society, because we dare ask questions, we dare ask whether we could not have gotten a better deal, we are characterized as being totally against the bill. Well, Sir, there might be a lot of Irishmen in Newfoundland, but they are not too green to burn.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member's colleague thought it was a bad deal - (inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Some hon. members consider this to be a bad deal because we think it could be a better deal, but that does not mean we are against the deal, you know, if Abitibi, a legitimate corporation, got the best deal they could get. If I was in business and if I was the head of such a corporation, I would obviously be acting in the best interests of that corporation and the shareholders of that corporation. That is my job. What we are asking is whether the deal is in the best interests of the people of this Province and whether we could not have gotten more for the sale of that mill.

Sir, I had not intended to speak on this debate at all but I had to get up and say a few words when I could not believe my ears after two weeks of debate, of listening to that hon. crowd over there criticizing



May 8, 1979

Tape No. 1154

GH-3

MR. F. ROWE:                   the previous administration and  
everything was their fault, all the mistakes were made by  
Joseph R. Smallwood and his administration, I could not  
believe my ears when the leader opposite gets

MR. F. ROWE:

up and cuts the legs right out from under his own colleagues, his own ministers, his own backbenchers, and admits that the second blunder - I think it was the first blunder; the second blunder was the fact that they took over the mill in the first place. Sir, I could not believe it. It is something, Sir, that I hope the people of Newfoundland will hear loud and clear, that the Leader of the administration opposite is in total disagreement with every hon. member who has spoken on the other side to date.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is incredible.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, he is trying to create the image of the nice guy, the good guy, the truthful guy.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the debate.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be only too happy to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. minister.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 P.M. and that the House do now adjourn.

On motion, that the House at its rising do stand adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 9, 1979 at 3:00 P.M.

VOL. 4

NO. 27

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MAY 8, 1979

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION EXPENDITURE 1969-1977

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT MONIES \$</u>	<u>*OTHER THAN PROVINCIAL GOV'T MONIES INCL. DREE</u>	<u>**TOTAL</u>
1969	4,350,658	480,563	4,831,221
1970	4,149,989	399,231	4,549,220
1971	7,239,475	4,650,935	11,890,410
1972	8,375,738	7,880,504	16,256,242
1973	8,191,767	1,253,253	9,445,020
1974	8,100,623	9,910,540	18,011,163
1975	12,496,544	11,340,683	23,837,227
1976	12,697,373	24,497,563	37,194,936
1977	<u>13,694,929</u>	<u>16,373,251</u>	<u>30,068,180</u>
	<u>79,297,096</u>	<u>76,786,523</u>	<u>156,083,619</u>

\*Includes School Board Funds; School Taxes and Assessments; Insurance proceeds; Canada Works Funds; Parish Contributions; Loans; etc.

\*\*This represents the total value of all School Construction financed by the Province, DREE, and other funds.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

BOARD

101

VINLAND INTEGRATED SCHOOL BOARD

1.	St. Anthony Elem., St. Anthony	\$ 1,300,000	1974
2.	Pinsents Arm All Grade, Pinsents Arm, Labrador	34,570	1976
3.	Raleigh All Grade, Raleigh	558,924	1977
4.	Northern Elem., Cooks Harbour	227,460	1977
5.	St. Lewis All Grade, St. Lewis	140,895	1977
6.	Lodge Bay All Grade, Lodge Bay, Labrador	76,062	1977

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-77

Board

Straits of Belle Isle Integrated

102

1. Straits Elementary, Flower's Cove	\$257,000	1971
2. St. Genevieve Elementary, St. Genevieve	\$314,240	1972
3. Roddickton Elementary, Roddickton	\$420,000	1976
4. Main Brook High, Main Brook	\$ 58,000	1976
5. Green Island Elementary, Lower Cove	\$884,748	1977
6. Mountain Field Central High, Forteau	\$1,187,262	1977
7. Canon Richards High (Extension), Flower's Cove	\$185,000	1977
8. St. Augustine's High (Extension), Plum Point	\$270,000	1977

Deer Lake Integrated

1. Elwood Regional High (Extension), Deer Lake	\$80,000	1969
2. Central High (Portable Classroom), Sops Arm	11,000	1969
3. Hampden Elem. (Extension), Hampden	43,000	1970
4. High St. Elem. (Extension), Deer Lake	15,000	1970
5. High St. Elem. (Renovations), Deer Lake	7,000	1971
6. Central High (Extension), Hampden	32,000	1971
7. Main Dam Rd. Elem. (Extension), Deer Lake	75,000	1971
8. Howley Elem. (Repairs), Howley	8,000	1972
9. Harbour Deep All Grade, Harbour Deep	50,000	1972
10. Hampden Elem. (Extension), Hampden	54,000	1973
11. Jackson's Arm All Grade (Repairs) Jackson's Arm	16,000	1973
12. Elwood Jr. High, Deer Lake	790,000	1974
13. Pasadena Elementary (Ext. & Renovations), Pasadena	204,000	1974
14. Central High, Sops Arm	522,000	1974
15. Reidville Elem. (Ext. & Renovations), Reidville	44,000	1974
16. Cormack Elem. (Renovations) Cormack	11,000	1974
17. Pollard's Point Elem. (Renovations) Pollard's Point	14,000	1974
18. Elwood Regional High, Deer Lake	1,500,000	1975
19. Central High, Hampden	838,000	1976
20. Main Dam Road Elem. (Ext. & Renovations) Deer Lake	200,000	1976
21. Jackson's Arm All Grade (Portable), Jackson's Arm	24,000	1976
22. Cormack Elem (Extension) Cormack	110,000	1977
23. Hampden Elem, (Repairs), Hampden	10,000	1977
24. Pasadena Elem (Portables), Pasadena	56,000	1977
25. Repairs to various schools, Deer Lake & Howley	20,000	1977

Board

Green Bay Integrated

104

1. Hall's Bay Elementary, South Brook	\$46,247	1972
2. Ricketts Elementary, Seal Cove	125,599	1972
3. Woodstock Elem., Woodstock	126,914	1972
4. Beothuck Collegiate (Ext.) Baie Verte	208,873	1973
5. Hillside Elem. (Extension) La Scie	144,883	1973
6. Cape John Collegiate, La Scie	692,667	1973
7. Bayview Elem., Nipper's Harbour	55,538	1973
8. Long Island Academy, Beaumont	312,934	1974
9. Grant Collegiate (Ext.) Springdale	1,048,448	1974
10. Ming's Bight Elem., Ming's Bight	68,734	1976
11. Dorset Collegiate, Pilley's Island	1,431,058	1977



Exploits Valley Integrated

1. Lincoln Road Elementary, Grand Falls		
Repairs	1970	\$ 5,020
Repairs	1972	\$ 6,834
Repairs	1973	\$16,108
Renovations	1974	\$35,762
Renovations	1975	\$27,452
2. W. B. Booth Memorial High, Windsor		
Repairs	1970	\$ 6,575
Extensions	1972	251,522
3. West Elementary, Bishops Falls		
Repairs	1970	\$11,290
Portables	1970	12,073
4. East Elementary, Bishops Falls		
Portables	1970	\$24,146
5. Junior High, Botwood		
Portables	1970	\$36,219
Portables	1972	7,896
Portables	1977	15,290
6. Glover's Harbour		
Portables	1970	\$12,073
7. High School, Grand Falls		
Extension	1973	\$69,769
Repairs	1975	5,995
8. High School, Point Leamington		
Renovations	1971	\$28,913
Repairs	1975	6,754
9. Elementary, Leading Tickles		
	1972	\$215,160
Repairs	1973	25,915
10. Primary, Grand Falls	1976	\$1,339,949
11. Primary, Botwood (Ext)	1972	\$151,498
12. Jr. High, Botwood (Repairs)	1976	\$110,886

Expenses Valley Integrated (Cont'd)

13. Clyde Brooks Elementary, Windsor		
Renovations	1972	\$ 4,714
14. High School, Buchans		
Extension	1973	\$ 79,131
Repairs	1974	35,728
Portable	1977	14,611
15. Memorial Academy, Botwood		
	1974	\$567,195
16. Elementary, Millertown		
Repairs	1973	\$ 9,079
17. Elementary, Point Leamington		
	1976	\$633,703
18. Elementary, Peterview		
Portable	1973	\$ 18,808
19. Elementary, Cottrell's Cove		
	1976	\$676,188
20. High School, Bishop's Falls (Portables)		
	1975	\$ 21,600
	1976	32,651
	1977	19,706
21. Elementary, Bishop's Falls		
	1977	1,503,299
22. Miscellaneous Additions & Repairs		
	1970-75	\$ 30,562

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

Board  
106

Notre Dame Integrated

1. Summerford Elementary, Summerford	\$ 347,409	1970
2. Moreton's Harbour Elem, Moreton's Harbour	140,490	1971
3. Newville Elementary, Newville	188,158	1971
4. Twillingate Elementary, Twillingate	247,136	1971
5. Comfort Cove Elem., Comfort Cove	290,124	1972
6. Virgin Arm High, Virgin Arm	275,185	1972
7. Norris Arm Elem., Norris Arm	164,664	1973
8. Durrell Elementary, Durrell	218,668	1973
9. Change Islands All Grade, Change Islands (Renovations)	42,430	1973
10. Lewisporte Elementary, Lewisporte	1,900,921	1975
11. Loon Bay Elementary, Loon Bay	616,650	1975
12. Lewisporte Reg. High, Lewisporte (Renovations)	124,471	1977
13. Junior High School, Lewisporte (Renovations)	47,780	1977
14. Campbellton High (Ext.), Campbellton	456,312	1977
15. Twillingate Central High (Renovations), Twillingate	51,842	1977

Terra Nova Subsidized

1.	Gander Academy (Extension), Gander	\$ 246,660	1972
2.	Glenwood Elementary (Ext.), Glenwood	58,536	1972
3.	Eastport High (Extension), Eastport	66,838	1972
4.	Hare Bay Jr. High (Ext. ), Hare Bay	75,710	1972
5.	Hare Bay Elementary, Hare Bay	680,674	1973
6.	Fogo High School, Fogo Island	551,043	1973
7.	Musgrave Hr. (Portables), Musgrave Hr.	37,951	1973
8.	Dover (Portable)	16,192	1975
	Eastport (Portable)	16,192	1975
	Carmanville (Portable)	16,192	1975
	Frederickton (Portable)	16,192	1975
9.	Gander (Portables)	36,724	1975
	Middle Brook (Portable)	18,362	1975
	Clarkes Head (Portable)	18,362	1975
10.	Gander Senior High, Gander	2,531,000	1976
11.	Glovertown Elem, Glovertown	1,415,643	1976
12.	Hopkins Academy, Wings Point	1,075,693	1977
13.	Smallwood Academy (Ext.), Dark Cove	319,040	1977
14.	Port Albert Elem. (Ext.) Port Albert	30,226	1977

School Construction 1969-1977

rd  
B

Cape Freels Integrated

1. Newtown Elementary, Newtown	\$ 64,000	1969
2. Wesleyville Elem.(Ext.), Wesleyville	90,000	1969
3. Bishops Meaden Elem. (Ext.), Badgers Quay	40,000	1970
4. Trinity Elem. (Portable) Trinity B.B.	15,000	1970
5. Trinity Elem. (Ext.) Trinity, B.B.	30,000	1971
6. Lester Pearson Me. High, Brookfield, B.B.	657,800	1973
7. Wesleyville Elem. (Repairs), Wesleyville	22,300	1973
8. Centreville Wareham Elem., Wareham	514,000	1975
9. Trinity High, Trinity	249,500	1977
10. Wesleyville Elem. (Repairs), Wesleyville	9,000	1977
11. Lester Pearson High (Ext.), Brookfield	11,960	1977

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

BONAVISTA-TRINITY-PLACENSIA INTEGRATED

Board

109

1. All Grade School, Sunnyside	\$ 259,649	1971
2. Elementary, Little Catalina	213,934	1973
3. Elementary, Come By Chance	100,566	1974
4. L.R. Ash Elem., Lethbridge	37,719	1974
5. High School (Renovations), Musgravetown	14,397	1974
6. All Grade, Random Island	526,458	1974
7. All Grade, Swift Current	281,382	1974
8. All Grade (Portable), Arnold's Cove	18,047	1975
9. Elementary (Extension), Port Rexton	454,350	1975
10. All Grade, Little Heart's Ease	1,096,117	1977

---

School Construction 1969-1977

card  
110

Avalon North Integrated

A. New Buildings

1. Elementary, Chance Cove	\$ 84,829	1969
2. Elementary, Norman's Cove	296,786	1970
3. Elementary, Winterton	462,982	1973
4. Elementary, Western Bay	354,684	1973
5. Elementary, Bay de Verde	532,135	1974
6. Elementary, Victoria, C.B.	1,407,139	1975
7. High School, Bay Roberts	3,116,052	1976

B. Exterior Extensions

1. Elementary, Shearstown	18,269	1970
2. High School, Dunville, P.B.	25,684	1970
3. Elementary, Dunville, P.B.	37,988	1970
4. Elementary, Fair Haven, P.B.	13,094	1970
5. Elementary, Clarkes Beach	63,529	1970
6. Elementary, Dunville, P.B.	50,832	1971
7. High School, Victoria	48,392	1971
8. Elementary, Spaniards Bay	39,950	1971
9. High School, Norman's Cove	139,650	1971
10. Elementary, Shearstown	137,727	1972
11. High School, New Harbour	75,181	1972
12. Elementary, Fair Haven, P.B.	9,230	1973
13. Elementary, Dildo, T.B.	261,387	1973
14. Elementary, Coley's Point	143,289	1973
15. High School, Heart's Content	303,301	1974
16. Elementary, Port de Grave	11,736	1975
17. Primary, Harbour Grace	49,973	1977

C. Interior Renovations

1. Brigus Elementary, Brigus	\$ 5,605	1970
2. High School, Bay Roberts	9,677	1972
3. Primary, New Harbour	14,214	1973
4. Elementary, Hearts Content	7,400	1973
5. Elementary, Hearts Delight	12,108	1973
6. High School, Harbour Grace	8,800	1973
7. Elementary, Hants Harbour	13,709	1973
8. High School, Carbonear	6,630	1973
9. Elementary, Upper Island Cove	36,483	1974
10. Jr. High, Dildo	9,661	1974
11. Elementary, Norman's Cove	12,043	1976

D. Portables (16) Total cost of \$301,725 (1971-76)

1. Spaniards Bay (4)
2. Carbonear (4)
3. Chance Cove (1)
4. Old Perlican (1)
5. Bay Roberts (1)
6. Hants Harbour (1)
7. Dunville (1)
8. Brigus (1)
9. Clarkes Beach (1)
10. Green's Harbour (1)

E. Other Construction

1. Sewer System for Elem. School, Norman's Cove	6,847	1975
3. School Walls for New Harbour, Upper Island Cove & Salmon Cove	7,075	1969-1973
Total	13,922	



School Construction 1969-1977

Board  
111

Avalon consolidated

1. MacDonald Drive Elem, St. John's	\$1,427,755	1972
2. MacDonald Drive Jr. High, St. John's	2,618,074	1972
3. Goulds Elem., Goulds	772,240	1973
4. Mount Pearl Central High, Mount Pearl	4,500,000	1975
5. Cowan Heights Elem., St. John's	1,840,015	1975
6. Virginia Park Elem., St. John's	1,466,802	1976

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1966-1977

112

Burin Peninsula Integrated

1. Seaman's Memorial, Garnish	\$ 55,940	1969
2. Sheens Hill Elem. (Renovations), Burin	97,319	1969
3. Fortune Collegiate, Fortune	355,567	1969
4. Salt Pond Elem., Salt Pond	1,406,367	1972
5. Partanna Academy, Grand Bank	1,140,594	1972
6. St. Thomas School, Grand Le Pierre	120,196	1974
7. Boat Hr. Elementary, Boat Harbour	24,979	1975
8. Sheen's Hill (Renovations) Burin	6,314	1975
9. John Burke High (Renovations), Grand Bank	96,292	1975
10. Frampton Elementary, Monkstown	57,339	1976
11. Sheen's Hill (Repairs), Burin	17,305	1976
12. Harfitt Elementary (Repairs) Salt Pond	13,999	1976
13. St. Mary's Elem. (Renovations), Lamaline	88,931	1976
14. Jacques Fontaine High, Jacques Fontaine	1,488,781	1976
15. Lake Academy, Fortune	1,511,668	1976
16. Sheen's Hill Elem., (Renovations) Burin	56,663	1977
17. Pearce Reg. High (Ext.), Salt Pond	454,907	1977

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

Bay D'Espoir, Hermitage, Fortune Bay Integrated

1. King Academy (Ext.), Harbour Breton	\$ 125,500	1972
2. John Watkins High, Hermitage	269,045	1973
3. Greenwood School (Ext.), Milltown	146,800	1974
4. King Academy (Portables), Hr. Breton	41,298	1975
5. St. Saviours (Portable), Hermitage	22,000	1975
6. St. Peters, McCallum	314,000	1975
7. Seal Cove Int., Seal Cove, F.B.	440,000	1975
8. St. Lawrence School (Ext.), Bellecram	245,000	1977
9. Florence M. Williams School, Pools Cove	181,000	1977
10. St. Simon & St. Jude (Ext.), Francois	33,000	1977

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

ard  
14

Port aux Basques Integrated

1. St. George's Elem. (Ext.), Burnt Islands	\$ 34,746	1971
2. LeGallais Memorial (Ext.), Isle aux Morts	102,196	1972
3. St. Michaels (Renovations), Rose Blanche	19,782	1972
4. La Poile Elem. (Ext.), La Poile	19,211	1972
5. Installations of Furnaces at Grand Bruit, Petites and La Poile	10,575	1974
6. Holy Trinity (Ext.), Codroy	65,000	1977
7. St. Augustines Elem. (Ext.) Margarae- Fox Roost	155,700	1977
8. St. George's Elem. (Ext.), Burnt Islands	647,149	1977

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

BAY OF ISLANDS-ST. GEORGE'S INTEGRATED

Board

115

1. Curling Jr. High, Curling	\$ 672,000	1969
2. Herdman Collegiate, Corner Brook	385,000	1970
3. Country Road School, Corner Brook	300,000	1971
4. Templeton Collegiate, Gillams	644,000	1971
5. Stephenville High, Stephenville	1,800,000	1972
6. Lark Harbour School, Lark Harbour	260,000	1973
7. Cox's Cove Elem., Cox's Cove	800,000	1973
8. Corner Brook East Jr. High, Corner Brook	2,500,000	1974
9. McIvers School (Extension), McIvers	8,600	1975
10. Holy Trinity, Meadows	75,000	1975
11. McKay's Elem., McKay's	300,000	1976

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

Board

St. Barbe South Integrated

116

1. Holland's Memorial (Ext.), Norris Point	\$	191,000	1971
2. Memorial Elementary, Norris Point		337,300	1972
3. Trout River Elem. (Ext.), Trout River		40,100	1973
4. Trout River Elem. (Ext.), Trout River		61,300	1973
5. Elementary, Parsons Pond		24,551	1975
6. High School, Daniel's Harbour		187,644	1976
7. Rocky Harbour Elem, Rocky Harbour		852,321	1977

STOCKS OWNED BY THE GOVERNMENT 1960-1977

Board  
117

Labrador East Incorporated

1. Port Hope Simpson (Ext.)	\$ 162,437	1973
2. North Star Primary (Ext.), Happy Valley	164,275	1973
3. Peacock Academy (Renovations) Happy Valley	4,218	1974
4. Henry Gordon Academy (Renovations) Cartwright	25,622	1974
5. Lake Melville High (Renovations), North West River	31,045	1974
6. North Star Primary (Renovations), Happy Valley	149,170	1974
7. North Star Primary (Renovations), Happy Valley	134,148	1974
8. Amos Comenius Mem. (Ext.), Hopedale	81,225	1974
9. Goose Elem. (Portables), Goose Bay	597,123	1975
10. North Star Primary (Renovations), Happy Valley	15,087	1975
11. Jens Haven Mem. (Renovations), Main	54,716	1976
12. Henry Gordon Academy (Ext.), Cartwright	253,257	1976
13. Jens Haven Mem. (Ext.) Main	188,124	1977
14. Peacock Academy (Renovations), Happy Valley	131,186	1977
15. Peacock Academy (Ext.), Happy Valley	350,815	1977
16. Henry Gordon Academy (Renovations), Cartwright	10,752	1977
17. Yale Elem., (Ext.) North West River	415,205	1977
18. Integrated School (Ext.) Mud Lake	13,262	1977
19. J.C. Erhardt Me. (Ext.) Nakkovik	216,354	1977
20. St. George's School, Paradise River	194,700	1977
21. North Star Primary (Renovations) Happy Valley	15,357	1977
22. Amos Comenius Mem. (Ext.), Hopedale	325,737	1977

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1968-1977

Board  
118

Labrador West Integrated

1. C.E. McManus (L.S.), Labrador City	\$ 121,000	1972
2. Harrie Lake, Labrador City	245,000	1975



SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

Board  
126

Burgeo Integrated

1. St. John Elem. (Ext.), Burgeo \$ 175,000 1973

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

Board  
127

Ramea Integrated

1. St. Boniface Elem. (Ext.), Ramea	\$ 66,500	1969
2. St. Boniface Elem. (Ext.), Ramea	75,000	1972
3. All Saints All Grade, Grey River	250,000	1976

School Construction 1969-1977

Board  
129

Conception Bay South Integrated

1. Upper Gullies Elem., Upper Gullies	\$ 1,087,132	1974
2. Topsail Elementary, Topsail	885,982	1975
3. St. George's Elementary, Long Pond	1,300,000	1977

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

Board

Bay St. George Roman Catholic

501

1. St. Anne Elem, Falt Bay St. Georges	\$ 100,000	1969
2. Cassidy Mem. Elem, St. Fintans	115,000	1970
3. St. Anne Elem, Upper Ferry, Codroy Valley	490,000	1971
4. Primary School, St. Georges	448,000	1973
5. St. Michael's Elem., Stephenville Crossing	3,200,000	1976

School Construction 1969-1977

board

Burin Peninsula Roman Catholic

502

1. Marian Elem. (Extension), St. Lawrence	\$ 56,174	1970
2. Elementary (Renovations), Marystown	63,559	1971
3. Central High, Marystown	1,589,035	1971
4. St. Paul's Central High (Ext.), Rushoon	18,210	1974
5. St. Joseph's All Grade (Ext.), Terrenceville	35,496	1974
6. St. Lawrence Central High	3,157,620	1976
7. All Grade School, Rushoon	1,206,360	1977
8. St. Joseph's Academy, Lamaline	1,360,688	1977

School Construction 1968-1977

Board

Conception Bay Centre Roman Catholic

503

1. Assumption Jr. High (Portables), Avondale	\$ 52,000	1972
2. Chapel Arm Elem., Chapel Arm	400,000	1974
3. Long Harbour High (Ext.) Long Harbour	41,000	1974
4. St. Joseph's Elem. (Ext.), Harbour Main	300,000	1976
5. Holy Cross Elem. (Ext.) Holyrood	165,000	1976

School Construction 1969-1977

Board

Conception Bay North Roman Catholic

504

1. Corpus Christi Central High (Ext.), Northern Bay	\$ 145,000	1973
2. Bishop O'Neill Collegiate, Brigus	620,000	1974
3. St. Francis High & Elem., Hr. Grace	875,000	1974

School Construction 1969-1977

Board

Exploits-White Bay Roman Catholic

506

1. St. Pius X Central High, Baie Verte	\$ 500,000	1969
2. St. Theresa's Elem., Fleur de Lys	250,000	1972
3. La Rochelle Central High, Brents Cove	230,000	1972
4. Our Lady of Mt. Carmel, NOrris Arm	230,000	1972
5. Notre Dame Academy (Ext.), Grand Falls	225,000	1973
6. St. Catherine's High (Ext.), Grand Falls	150,000	1975
7. St. Michael's Central High (Ext.) Grand Falls	210,000	1975
8. St. Francis Xavier Elem., Windsor	1,800,000	1976
9. Coachman's Cove Elem., Coachman's Cove	70,000	1977



SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

Board

Ferryland District Roman Catholic

507

1. Holy Redeemer Elem., Trepassey	\$ 342,459	1971
2. St. Joseph's Jr. High (Ext.) Ferryland	124,769	1974
3. St. Joseph's Elem., Fermeuse	292,114	1974
4. Stella Maris (Ext.), Trepassey	333,200	1974
5. St. Patrick's Elem., Bay Bulls	325,597	1977

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

Board  
308

Gander-Bonavista Roman Catholic

1. Bonavista (new school)	\$ 229,484	1970
2. St. Joseph's Academy (Ext.), Gander	132,900	1970
3. St. Mark's (Renovations), King's Cove	25,033	1970
4. St. Gabriel's (Renovations), St. Brendan's	7,938	1970
5. Joe Batts Arm Elem. (Renovations), Tilting	4,306	1970
6. St. Aidan's Elem. (Portable), Plate Cove	50,768	1971
7. St. Gabriel's (Portable) St. Brendan's	23,704	1971
8. Fogo Jr. High, Fogo	247,315	1972
9. Sacred Heart Elem, (Repairs) Gambo	6,120	1972
10. St. Gabriels (Ext.) St. Brendan's	93,020	1973
11. Plate Cove Elem., Plate Cove	69,380	1973
12. Fogo Jr. High, Fogo	17,300	1973
13. St. Mark's, King's Cove	204,861	1974
14. St. Gabriel's (Ext.), St. Brendan's	79,448	1974
15. Plate Cove Elem., Plate Cove	148,793	1974
16. St. Marks, King's Cove	17,974	1975
17. St. Gabriel's, St. Brendan's	72,712	1975
18. Joe Batt's Arm (Renovations), Tilting	52,030	1976
19. St. Pauls Central High, Gander	2,279,983	1977
20. St. Mark's, King's Cove	15,546	1977
21. Sacred Heart Elem., Gambo	52,866	1977

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

Board  
509

Humble.-St. Barbe Roman Catholic

1. Stella Maris Elementary, Benoit's Cove	\$ 145,300	1970
2. St. Joseph's Elementary, Harbour Breton	245,000	1971
3. Holy Rosary Elem., Pasadena	300,000	1973
4. Xavier High, Deer Lake	840,000	1974
5. St. Theresa's Elem., Port au Choix	170,000	1975
6. All Hallows Elem., Corner Brook	273,400	1975
7. St. Anne's , Conne River	71,422	1976
8. St. Gerard's Elem., Corner Brook	798,000	1976
9. Stella Maris Elem., Benoit's Cove	51,830	1976
10. Our Lady of Perpetual Help, Corner Brook	230,000	1977
11. St. Joseph's All Grade, Croque	105,000	1977
12. St. Anne's High, Conne River	625,000	1977

Handwritten text at the bottom center of the page, possibly a signature or date.

School Construction 1969-1977

Board  
510

Labrador Roman Catholic

1. Our Lady Queen of Peace, Happy Valley	\$ 1,276,000	1971
2. Our Lady of Labrador, West Ste Modeste	108,588	1974
3. Notre Dame Academy (Portables), Labrador City	226,808	1976
4. Our Lady of Labrador (Ext.), West Ste Modeste	207,432	1977

11/11/77



SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1962-1977

Board  
512

Port au Port Roman Catholic

1. Notre Dame du Cap High, Cape St. George	\$ 255,798	1970
2. St. Thomas Aquinas (Ext.) Port au Port East	191,033	1970
3. Holy Cross (Ext.) ,Port au Port West	29,421	1971
4. Our Lady of Lourdes Elem., Lourdes	197,567	1971
5. Holy Cross (Ext.) Port au Port West	9,025	1972
6. Holy Cross (Gym) Port au Port West	130,273	1973
7. St. Thomas Aquinas (Gym) Port au Port East	112,123	1973
8. Notre Dame du Cap (Ext.), Cape St. George	88,198	1974
9. St. Anne's Primary, Mainland	50,767	1974
10. St. Thomas Aquinas (Renovations) Port au Port East	11,984	1974
11. Our Lady of Lourdes High, Lourdes	720,936	1975
12. Bishop O'Reilly High, Port au Port West	946,152	1975
13. St. Jean Vianney, Piccadilly	855,448	1976
14. Our Lady of the Cape Primary, Cape St. George	233,637	1976
15. St. Stephen's High, Stephenville	4,800,000	1976

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

Board

St. John's Roman Catholic

314

1. Portable Classrooms, various locations, St. John's	\$ 1,109,064	1969
2. Mary Queen of the World (Ext.), St. John's	403,410	1969
3. Holy Trinity (Ext.) Torbay	350,219	1970
4. St. Augustines Elem., (Renovations) St. John's	59,825	1970
5. St. Bonaventures (Renovations), St. John's	138,605	1970
6. Belvedere Central High (Renovations) St. John's	200,447	1970
7. St. Francis of Assisi, Outer Cove	295,108	1970
8. St. Kevins (Renovations), Goulds	124,077	1971
9. Our Lady of Mercy (Renovations) St. John's	91,212	1971
10. Holy Spirit (Extension), Manuels	383,134	1971
11. Immaculate Conception School, Bell Island	727,856	1971
12. Holy Spirit (Extension), Manuels	239,701	1972
13. St. Edward's (Renovations), Petty Harbour	20,408	1972
14. St. Francis of Assisi (Renovations), Outer Cove	23,290	1972
15. St. Bonaventure's (Renovations), St. John's	84,828	1972
16. Holy Cross Elem., St. John's	1,160,322	1972
17. Mary Queen of Peace (Ext.), St. John's	365,138	1974
18. St. Pius X Girls (Ext.), St. John's	474,873	1974
19. Holy Heart of Mary R.H.S. (Renovations) St. John's	52,603	1974
20. Holy Cross Primary, St. John's	817,590	1974
21. Roncalli School (Ext.), St. John's	422,959	1975
22. Mary Queen of the World (Portables), St. John's	91,036	1975
23. Holy Cross Elem. (Renovations), St. John's	35,298	1975
24. Holy Spirit (Portables), Manuels	101,944	1976
25. St. Michael's (Ext.), Flatrock	134,088	1976
26. St. Agnes' (Ext.), Pouch Cove	81,309	1976
27. Holy Heart of Mary R.H.S. (Renovations), St. John's	64,452	1976
28. Mary Queen of Peace Primary (Portables), St. John's	73,918	1976
29. Immaculate Conception (Portables), St. Thomas	69,599	1976
30. Gonzaga High (Renovations), St. John's	38,538	1976
31. St. Joseph's Elem. (Renovations), St. John's	35,885	1976
32. St. Francis of Assisi (Renovations), Outer Cove	48,248	1976

33. Our Lady of Mercy (Renovations), St. John's	\$ 42,237	1976
34. St. Edward's & St. Kevins (Renovations), Bell Island	115,569	1976
35. St. Teresa's (Renovations), St. John's	137,848	1976
36. St. Kevin's (Portables), Goulds	207,445	1976
37. Holy Trinity (Ext.) Torbay	265,549	1977
38. St. John Bosco (Ext.), St. John's	263,408	1977
39. St. Patrick's Girls Elem. (Ext.), St. John's	367,323	1977
40. Roncalli School (Renovations), St. John's	207,259	1977
41. St. Patrick's Hall Elem. (Renovations), St. John's	52,561	1977
42. Holy Trinity (Renovations), Torbay	46,247	1977
43. St. Peter's, Newtown, Mt. Pearl	1,570,841	1977
44. St. Pauls, East Meadows, St. John's	1,475,461	1977

45. Beaconsfield High School, St. John's	2,700,000	1971
46. Beaconsfield Elementary, St. John's	2,760,000	1975



SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

Board  
PA.1

Pentecostal Academies

1. R.W. Parsons Academy, Roberts Arm	\$ 250,000	1973
2. L.S. Eddy Mem. Collegiate, Stephenville	500,000	1973
3. F.G. Bursey Mem. Collegiate, Grand Falls	180,000	1973
4. Pentecostal School, Goochies	30,000	1973
5. Inter-Island Pent. Collegiate, Summerford	500,000	1974
6. G. Shaw Pent. Collegiate (Gym), Chapel Island	250,000	1974
7. D.C. Young Pent. School, Port Hope Simpson	110,000	1974
8. Charisma Pent. Academy, Springdale	900,000	1975
9. F. G. Bursey Mem. Collegiate, Grand Falls (Renovations)	100,000	1975
10. Alpha Pent. Academy, Point au Bay (Ext.)	80,000	1975
11. J. W. Bursey Pent. Academy, Embree	325,000	1976
12. Windsor Pent. Academy, Windsor (Ext.)	650,000	1976
13. Ridgewood Pent. Academy, Stoneville	385,000	1976
14. L.S. Eddy Mem. Academy, Stephenville (Ext.)	525,000	1976
15. Ecclesia Pent. Academy, Birchy Bay	350,000	1976
16. Elis Goudie Pent. Academy, Port Anson	150,000	1976
17. Harbour View Pent. Academy, Carl's Hr.	300,000	1976
18. Ralph Harnum Pent. School, Hawkes's Bay	325,000	1976
19. L.P. Purchase Pent. Academy, Botwood	870,000	1977
20. R. W. Parsons Pent. Coll., Robert's Arm (Ext.)	800,000	1977
21. Wm. Gillett Pent. Academy, Charlottetown, Labrador (Ext.)	550,000	1977
22. D.C. Young Pent. School (Ext.) Port Hope Simpson	650,000	1977
23. Pentecostal Eleñ. (Ext.) Postville, Lab.	180,000	1977

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION 1969-1977

Board  
S.D.A.1

Seventh Day Adventist

1. S.D.A. School (Renovations), Botwood	\$ 9,231	1974
2. S.D.A. School (Renovations), Botwood	60,850	1977
3. S.D.A. School (Extension), St. John's	39,722	1977
4. S.D.A. Academy (Renovations), St. John's	36,966	1977
5. S.D.A. School (Extension), Bay Roberts	75,000	ongoing