

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Otteneheimer): Order, please!

Hon. members will recall that yesterday an hon. member to my right rose on a question of privilege on which I reserved decision and which I am now in a position to give. The matter pertained to remarks in a speech by an hon. gentleman to my left of May 7th. First I should point out that I give a decision on this under the general framework of order rather than privilege, understanding the gist of the submission of the hon. gentleman to my right to be that his allegation of the unparliamentary nature of the remarks of the hon. gentleman to my left. It is not necessary, I do not believe, for me to re-read those remarks. They are in Hansard and are ascertainable for anybody who wishes to see them.

In reading over that section, I find myself in a somewhat difficult position in the literal understanding of the words. They are not of an unparliamentary nature in that literally there is no allegation of wrongdoing, suggestion of influence peddling or that. In the overall context, and the authorities will substantiate my opinion that it is in the overall context that I have to consider, in the overall context certainly they are, if one wishes, ambiguous in their effect. They are capable of an interpretation to the extent that they are not unparliamentary; they are capable of an interpretation to the result that they are unparliamentary. Given the ambiguous nature of the statement or series of statements, what I will

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer )

call upon the hon. member to do is not to withdraw them but to clarify the position in informing the House. I will call upon him to state to the House that it was not his intention to allege any wrongdoing.

The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, in complying

with your ruling, I will say it is unfortunate the manner in which my comments were interpreted by certain members of the House of Assembly, because there was never any accusation made by me of any wrongdoings. I want to clarify that as pointed out by Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:

I think that disposes

of the matter. I think the operative part is the hon. gentleman has stated is that he did not allege any wrongdoing.

MR. NEARY:

I thank, Your Honour, very

much for taking the trouble you have taken.

#### STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased

to announce the appointment of Mr. A.L. White as Deputy Minister of Transportation and Communications.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. White was born in

St. John's but received his primary and high school education in Buchans. Mr. White attended Dalhousie University and Nova Scotia Technical College graduating in 1964 with a degree in Civil Engineering. He joined the then Department of Highways in that year as a Resident Engineer and in the intervening years has held the positions of District Highway Engineer, Construction Engineer and Assistant Deputy Minister (Technical Services) prior to his appointment as Deputy Minister.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. White is married to the former Cynthia Giles of Grand Falls and they have three children.

Mr. Tom Whelan, who has been acting Deputy Minister of Transportation and Communications, will continue in his responsibility as Deputy Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer)

Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we want to congratulate Mr. White on being appointed Deputy Minister of Transportation and Communications and wish him well in his new position.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. member for Exploits.

DR. TWOMEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition on behalf of 236 residents of Point Leamington. The prayer of the petition: "We, the undersigned taxpayers of the town of Point Leamington, do hereby petition the provincial government to allocate funds for the continuance of the water and sewer system. We who are not serviced are continuously plagued with the shortage of water and freeze-ups. We feel that there is a desperate need to extend the services to each house owner. We have waited patiently for the past three years, since the beginning of the session and we feel that the services are long overdue us. We humbly beseech you to give your immediate attention to this matter of great concern to us."

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Point Leamington are

DR. TWOMEY: not alone are unique in signing such a petition as this. Their sentiments and their feelings have been echoed and re-echoed in many communities across the Province. Water has always been a right in Newfoundland. It is available in practically all communities from varying sources. In Point Leamington, those who have a water system have to carry it in jugs and in buckets. However, it becomes more cumbersome when it has to be carried or transported for other household uses. The disposal of the water can present some health hazards as it is contaminated by soaps, detergents and particles. This health hazard varies from place to place depending on the soil, its porosity and also as the land slopes to the sea. I ask the minister to give their petition his full consideration when decisions are made after the Budget has been handed down in the coming few weeks. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. the member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Sir, I rise to support the petition presented by the hon. member for Exploits district (Dr. Twomey). Seldom do we get a petition, Mr. Speaker, from the other side of the House from communities in their districts looking for water and sewer. And I fully thought that the town of Point Leamington had a programme for the installation of water and sewer system, but if they do not, well, I certainly support their efforts in trying to get one.

The good doctor who represents that district speaks well of the health hazard in that area, and that health hazard is evident in many other places throughout Newfoundland. And water and sewerage is something that is desired in many parts of this Province, and in my own district as well, and I am sure we will hear

MR. F. WHITE: much more of that as the session goes on. I do support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. the Minister for Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, just in rising briefly to accept on behalf of the department a petition from the residents of Point Leamington, let me say that we are very aware of the problems being experienced down there. I understand that something in the order of \$1 million has been spent on a water and sewer system in Point Leamington to date and certainly, as the hon. member knows, in the Budgetary considerations and considering the Capital Works programme for this year, we will give every possible consideration to Point Leamington as we will to 308 other municipalities in the Province.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of and signed by 1,688 residents in the

MR. T. LUSH: Southeast section of the Terra Nova district. The petition, Sir, is related to road conditions in the area and is requesting the Government to take action with respect to initiating immediately a programme of reconstruction and upgrading and paving of the roads named in the petition. Reading from the petition the petition is for upgrading and paving of the road from Port Blandford to Musgravetown, the road from Musgravetown through to Cannings Cove, and the road from Lethbridge through Brooklyn to Jamestown and the Winter Brook area. To the hon. House of Assembly: "The petition of we, the undersigned, being residents of and electors in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, humbly request that the Government allocate funds in this fiscal year to start a programme of reconstruction, upgrading and paving of the road from Port Blandford to Musgravetown and the road from Musgravetown through Cannings Cove and the road from Lethbridge through Brooklyn to Jamestown, Winter Brook." And the petition goes on to state that, "These roads are in a deplorable condition, resulting in tremendous inconvenience and unnecessary expense to the motoring public and are an obstacle to the full development of the vast natural potential of the many communities concerned. The road from Port Blandford to Musgravetown provides thousands of people in this area with the most accessible and the most economic route to the Trans-Canada Highway."

Just as an aside Sir, this road actually is the lifeblood to the communities named. And then, "Without a good road from Musgravetown to Cannings Cove and from Jamestown to Winter Brook to Brooklyn and Lethbridge, there is no way to get out of these communities to say nothing of getting to the Trans-Canada Highway. All of these roads are used extensively on a daily basis by adults commuting back and forth to work and by students commuting to school. That many people will continue to suffer great inconvenience and hardship, that our area will not be fully developed if these three roads are not upgraded and

MR. T. LUSH: paved in this fiscal year, we therefore petition the Government to take immediate action to do same."

Now, Sir, we are talking about three roads which actually make up one section of road, really. And the main road we talk about there is the road from Musgravetown to Port Blandford, which is the link to the Trans-Canada. Now, Sir, there is not much I can add in support of this petition. It says everything. It makes all of the major and salient points that one would want to make in convincing the Government of the necessity to pave and upgrade these roads in this fiscal year. But what it does not say, Mr. Speaker,



MR. T. LUSH: what it does not say in the petition is the absolute frustration and anxiety of the residents in having their roads neglected and left in a state of disrepair year after year, whilst at the same time observing a portion of their tax dollars being spent in adjacent districts watching pavement being laid down, Sir, as if it were going out of style in districts adjacent, the district of Trinity North and the district of Bonavista South. But, Sir, this is the fourth time that I have presented a petition on behalf of these people, these same communities, these same residents, the fourth time. I do not know how many more petitions were presented by previous members, but I do know that the last member for the district, and the member who is now the present Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Moran) I know that he presented similar petitions, I know that, and with the same results as this hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

Well, in view of these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the obvious government neglect for an area with tremendous resource potential in terms of agricultural and forestry development and in terms of the fisheries and tourism, all of which require good roads, a good transportation system, in view of these factors and circumstances, Mr. Speaker, and in view of this apparent and obvious discrimination, one wonders, Sir, at the patience, the good will and the civic responsibility of these people.

Indeed, Sir, I am forced to wonder how long all of this frustration and anxiety can be continued after being rejected year after year. Sir, it is shameful how a government could be so callous and negligent and discriminating to an area with such potential, an area that is making and can make much more of a substantial contribution to the economy of this Province.

MR. T. LUSH:

Sir, in the name of justice, fair play and equitable treatment I beg and implore the government to allocate monies in this fiscal year to reconstruct, upgrade and pave these roads named in the petition. Sir, I support the petition and ask to have it placed upon the Table of the House and referred to the department to which it relate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Otteneheimer): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Sepaker, I just want to speak brierly in support of the petition, Sir, so ably presented by my colleague, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). My hon. colleague, Sir, pointed out the importance of having this road upgraded and paved, a road, by the way, Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour is probably aware, that passes through one of the most beautiful, one of the most scenic parts of this Province and which is very important to the tourist industry in that area because the road is adjacent to the Terra Nova National Park. And apart from that, Sir, I believe there area number of sawmills in that area and it is well known throughout the Province as being a big farming area and I would assume that fishing is fairly big in the area. So just from a point of view of developing the natural resources of that area alone, Sir, apart from the convenience of the travelling public, the people who have to go back and forth between the area to come into Gander and into St. John's and so forth, apart from that it is terribly important that this road be upgraded and paved as quickly as possible for the development of the area so that the people can carry on gainful employment and contribute to the economy of this Province as they have done in the past and could do much better if they had suitable roads to drive over.

So I support the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I do hope that the member's plea, the member is almost begging the administration, almost on his hands and knees begging the Minister of Transportation and Communications to recognize that this is a serious problem and something that should be rectified at an early a date as possible.

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

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to also support the petition so ably presented by my colleague from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), and in so doing may state that I have on a number of

MR. J. WINSOR: occasions risen on the same line, petitions for roads to resources and God knows what. Now that we have a new Deputy Minister, I would certainly like for once to see the government come out with a planned operation for dirt roads. I do not think they can do all the dirt roads that have to be done, and I do not think I need say what the real needs for paving these roads really is because everybody knows it. They are murder on cars, they are making the economy of each of the different areas almost impossible to conduct properly. But I would like to see a co-ordinated plan by this government, working in co-operation with their new Deputy Minister, and I think his plan always has been to lay down a rigid plan, advertise it, tell the people you are going to do certain roads this year and certain others next year and stick to that plan on a non-partisan basis.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. J. WINSOR: If we could do that we would be doing something wonderful. I support the petition.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) on behalf of 1,688 residents

MR. F. ROWE: of the Southeast section of that particular district regarding the upgrading and paving of the roads in the area of Port Blandford, Musgravetown, Canning's Cove, Lethbridge, and a few other communities that escape my memory at the present time.

Sir, aside from the normal use that roads are usually put to, Sir, I would suggest that in this particular case, as is the case in other areas throughout the Province, there are great tracts of good agricultural land, and one of the problems that the local farmers have in the area is an adequate road system to get back and forth to the plots of land that were probably established quite some number of years ago. I realize that this is regarding more important roads than what one might consider to be agricultural access roads or something along these lines, but anywhere where you have the possibility of a feasible and viable farming industry, agricultural enterprise in this Province, I think the Department of Transportation and Communications should make every effort to see to it that the roads are upgraded to the extent that the products, the farmers, the workers, can get back and forth to their land, taking care of their products and of course getting the products out of these particular areas.

Sir, one other point that I might raise, and unfortunately the Minister of Transportation and Communications is not here this afternoon, probably the Premier might wish to indicate to the House of Assembly what exactly is the status of the road programmes for the Province this year?

MR. W. ROWE: The same as in other years.

MR. F. ROWE: We have not had a budget, Mr. Speaker. We have had interim supply but we do hear from time to time announcements of paving of roads, and reconstruction of roads and I have heard,

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, that in fact the government has its plan already set out for road paving for this year. Now I would like for the Premier to deny or confirm that possibility; Either the road programme has been set out or it has not. Here we go again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Ottenheimer): A point of order has come up. The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: I think, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was anticipating it. The petition period has certain definite constraints in it, one of which is that there be no debate and the hon. gentleman is getting into a debate on the general

MR. W. MARSHALL: road paving or road programme of the government.

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): To the point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: I believe in supporting a petition, the hon. member is quite correct, you are not allowed to debate during the support of a petition. I was not debating, Mr. Speaker; I was simply asking a straightforward question and that is one of the things that you are allowed to do in the support of a petition, to ask a question of a minister or the Premier of this Province. So I submit I must have struck a raw nerve on the part of the hon. House Leader opposite and it is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Obviously the rule is quite clear. With respect to supporting petitions one may not debate the matter at hand, I would say a passing reference by way of comparison or emphasis to an overall road programme. I would not rule out of order; to develop it at length would be. With respect to questions, I suppose in supporting a petition one may ask questions rhetorically, but obviously one does so without expecting answers, I think, because that would come in the Question Period. But I would not say it would be wrong to ask them rhetorically.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, that is another notch the hon. member cannot put in his belt. Sir, I quite sincerely ask the Premier, not even rhetorically, simply and straightforwardly, whether or not the administration has the road programme already formulated for this present year and whether or not in support of the petition he would relate to the House what the essence of that particular programme is? Sir, my time has practically run out, I simply close by saying that I give this petition my wholehearted support and I hope that

MR. F. ROWE: the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), will see it fit to support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my support to the petition from the nearly 1,700 petitioners of the Terra Nova district for some upgrading and paving. I have to watch my p's and q's here because the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is - a little jumpy, wanting to impose the same lack of development on Terra Nova that he has imposed for years on the Battery.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) has supported a petition by a government member. I would hope in the interest of fair play we could have the Premier support this particular petition from an Opposition member.

MR. WHITE: Not likely.

MR. SIMMONS: I would hope he could see that. Where now is the Premier's much touted sense of fair play?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!



MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) I must point out the hon. gentleman is quite obviously getting into an area of debate here.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would, in supporting the petition, like to know what plans the government has for this particular year insofar as the Terra Nova district is concerned. What are the plans for upgrading and paving? True, we have not voted the Budget, we have voted Interim Supply for three months, which members will recall voted quite a large chunk for transportation on the argument that the projects had to get going early to be completed before the construction season is over.

MR. NEARY: That is right. And they tell us that we do not have to wait until the Budget because programmes are going ahead.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right. It is my understanding that the department has essentially the money it is going to get this year for road upgrading purposes, so there is no need to use the 'wait until Budget' argument insofar as the Terra Nova request is concerned, and I hope we could now have the detail of what the government plans to do in Terra Nova this year, whether it is going to be something to meet the needs of the people concerned without any reference to partisan considerations or whether we are going to see the approach used in the Ferryland by-election, the old pork barrel, break the law approach. But whatever the approach, Mr. Speaker, let us have it now and let us find out what the people of Terra Nova can expect in response to their much repeated request both to their present member and to the former member who did not deliver very well on this particular issue.

MR. SIMMONS: Perhaps he can use his influence now in Cabinet to see that these roads are upgraded and paved. It is the least these people can ask. My colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and my colleague from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) have well made the points about the variety of reasons why these roads ought to get some priority, including the very well-founded argument that these are, in a very real sense of the term, roads to resources - agricultural, fisheries, tourism. A good argument, Mr. Speaker, can be mounted and has been mounted for these roads in terms of their resource potential and their resource productivity.

I heartily support the petition and would hope that we can hear soon that these roads will be upgraded and paved in this construction season.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I was half waiting for the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), to get up. I was half expecting the Premier to say something.

Mr. Speaker, I stand to speak briefly in support of the prayer of the petition presented by

MR. CALLAN: the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) asking for upgrading and paving of some sections of road in the district of Terra Nova. And like other previous speakers, Mr. Speaker, I am at a complete loss to understand what the government's programme is. Is there any system to it? Is there any rationale to it? Or is it all done on a political basis or a political bias? It is difficult to understand, Mr. Speaker, especially in view of the fact I understand that the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) is today out in Westport. Is that where the minister is?

MR. NEARY: Trying to head off another delegation coming into St. John's.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, on April 9th there was a delegation in from Westport and I remember the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) getting up in this House and asking the Premier, drawing attention to the fact that the delegation were in the galleries, and asking the Premier a couple of pertinent questions and then I, since I have always been concerned with roads and so on and especially as there are about fifty miles of unpaved roads in my district - Markland, Southwest Arm, Adeyton of course are names that are quite common to members of this House of Assembly as they are to many people throughout the Province. And, Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question that was asked, the same type of question that the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) is asking today, I think, "when can the people out in that district expect some kind of an announcement or what have you regarding their road?" the Premier in answer to a question that I asked, in view of the fact that Interim Supply in the amount of \$356 million has been passed to take us up to the last of June, and one of the reasons for granting that Interim Supply was so that the provincial government could carry on with its roads programme and get tenders called and so on before it got too late in the year, too late in the Summer, in answer to that question the Premier said, "Mr. Speaker, primarily

MR. CALLAN: because there are certain ongoing commitments, this is why some roads are being announced and others are not. Primarily because there are certain ongoing commitments that government have made over the years to DREE programmes. He mentions specifically DREE programmes. I do not know if Westport is part of a DREE programme or not. And then he says capital works and so on, Federal-provincial agreements. For example, the Trans-Canada agreement. Well that was on April 9th, Mr. Speaker, and I was very -

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Order, please! I must point out the hon. gentleman is obviously engaging in debate and it is quite obvious in citing a transcript of remarks, and that is the essence of debate.

MR. CALLAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me finish up and perhaps I can get on to this in

MR. CALLAN: Question Period. What I was going to say was this, that there does not seem to be any system, any rhyme or reason to the way that the government is announcing their road programme. A tender call went out last week for seven or eight stretches of road, some of which are not part of any DREE agreements that I know of, so the question has to be answered and I think the Premier should answer the question. You know, what about the people out in the district of Terra Nova, Markland, and other areas of the province; what road programme does the government have or is it ad hoc? I support the petition,  
Mr. Speaker.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the report on those matters transacted by the Minister of Labour and Manpower during 1978 and required to be tabled in the Legislature, "The Labour Relations Regulations, 1978", "The Rules of Procedure of the Labour Relations Board," and "The Labour Standards Regulations."

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy would be in his seat, I had a few questions in connection with pollution, but seeing he is not there I will direct my questions on another subject to the hon. the Premier in the absence of the hon. Minister of Education. Would the new Premier tell the House if the government has changed its policy in connection with the budget for Memorial University, if the new Premier feels that the budget of Memorial University should be made public, presented to members of this House, that we should get more details from Memorial than we have gotten in the past?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, at the present moment there is a special Cabinet committee that has been put in place to deal with the university and they are presently examining the whole question of Memorial's budget and whether there is any change of policy as it relates to its budget and making it public or whatever, or tabling it in this hon. House are decisions which will be made in the next few weeks. The fact of the matter is right now it is being examined at the present moment, the whole question, by a special Cabinet committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman inform the House then if the sub-committee of Cabinet, apparently they are studying everything now, if this sub-committee is also looking at the reasons for the reduction in a fifty per cent drop, decline in enrollment at the university for the Spring semester? The registration in the Spring was down by fifty per cent. Could the hon. gentleman tell us, or does the hon. gentleman know the reason for it or is the sub-committee of Cabinet studying this?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, today the Cabinet committee met with the Board of Regents at the university. I have met with the representatives of the Student Council in the last two or three weeks and the representatives of the Student Council have also met with the Minister of Education. This thing is not just a study. We are in active negotiation, would you say, or discussion with the Board of Regents of the university, with the President of the university, with the Student Council of the university, to examine the whole question of the university, the exact nature of the drop in student enrollment and that kind of thing and the reasons for it. I am aware that there is the drop and so on and it has to be seriously looked at. We discussed this at length with the members of the Student

PREMIER PECKFORD: Council and no doubt the Cabinet committee have talked about it with the other management and the President of the university. And I do not know right off the top of my head, I suppose I could give all kinds of reasons for it as could the hon. member, you know, it is a serious matter that has to be looked at and I think that is what the hon. member is getting at and I agree with him. And the students are very concerned about it as well because it does not augur well for the kind of - you know, if one looks at the university and hears statements that it is an elitest university or something and it has to do with costs for students outside of town coming in and so on, then you know that whole thing has to be examined. And if it can be directly related to, if one of the causes has to do with money and affordability, then it is a pretty serious question and we are going to have to do something about it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Otteneheimer): A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: I appreciate the hon. gentleman's frankness, Sir, in answering my previous questions but would the hon. gentleman indicate if the physical

MR. S. NEARY: structure, if the physical assets over at the university would be affected in any way? I understand they are going ahead now with a big expansion programme and putting up a \$10 million - is it a \$10 million library? A \$10 or \$12 million library!

AN HON. MEMBER: \$8 to \$10 million.

MR. S. NEARY: An \$8 to \$10 million library over there. But the physical assets over there, will they now be affected by this cut in enrollment in any way, shape or form? Will all the buildings, for instance, be used at maximum capacity or will the Committee of Cabinet be studying the actual, physical plant, if you want to put it that way, at the university? And if so, will there be any need to expand the university any further? Also, while the Premier is on his feet perhaps he could tell us if there will be any cut in the faculty at Memorial as a result of this fifty per cent reduction in the Spring enrollment.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the issues that the Cabinet Committee talked about, no doubt, today with the Board of Regents and which the Minister of Education (Mr. T.A. Hickman) is talking about with the President of the Student Council and other people at the university and why these meetings have been rushed up in the past couple of weeks because of the budgetary process that we are into.

On the question of physical facilities, I think any of us who have been involved in education over the years would argue and I think I would argue fairly strongly that, for example, in the case of the library, which I think has a \$14 million price tag as the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) informs me, the library to me is the heart and soul of the university, a good library. And I do not see, for example, a library as being affected by this whole question of student enrollment. You have got to have books and you have to have resource materials and it should not be related at all to the numbers of



PREMIER PECKFORD: people that are enrolled in that institution,

So on that score, the other thing is as one looks at other areas of expansion physically into like a school of business. a small business school or business school per se, it seems to me to be a part of an overall - I have had long talks with President Morgan about this - a part of the strategy that Government and the Newfoundland society wants to have in the next ten years here. Because I think if we have better consultation with the university they can help train Newfoundlanders who are going to be - one of our problems is the entrepreneurial skill and managerial skill in small business around the Province is not as strong as it should be. and the university has to help Government and help Newfoundland society, generally, make it better.

So on a number of areas like the library, like the business school, I think good, sound arguments can be made for continuing the expansion as long as it is a selective expansion based upon some of the goals which Government has for the development of the Province. But if it is as in other areas which are not high priority areas for Government, for us to go in the next ten years, then I can see some argument for restriction on physical facilities.

MR. S. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Otteneimer) Supplementary, hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: In view of the seriousness of the situation, Mr. Speaker, which has really been now confirmed by the hon. the Premier, that the situation at Memorial is serious, that this reduction. a fifty per cent reduction in Spring enrollment, apparently, has sort of jolted everybody now into trying to take a realistic look at the university to see if we are headed in the right direction, will the hon. gentleman now agree with something that I have been advocating for the last several years that it is about time, and I do not think the Committee of Cabinet can do this, that an independent impartial study was taking a good look at our whole postgraduate education system in this Province including the university

MR. S. NEARY: to see if we are getting the value for our dollar and if we are headed in the right direction in the field of post-secondary education in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: (Ottenheimer) Hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I think the whole idea is appealing to me that we take, perhaps, a fresh look at post-secondary education in the Province. I will take the suggestion from the hon. member under advisement at this point in time and consult in and with the Cabinet Committee that is now working on the university to see. But I think the idea is a sound one and I am very pleased that the hon. member gives it such a high priority in the Question Period to ask it because I believe with him that it is a serious matter and it is a big question. It is not going to mean five miles of road paved in the Terra Nova district tomorrow or whatever, or a water and sewer system for Point Leamington the next year, but it will darn well decide upon how we are as people in 1995.

MR. S. NEARY: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are all quite proud of the university of course and we want to make sure the university is - the future of it is - safeguarded and that it will head in the right direction, Sir. But looking at it long range, I am also looking at taking a short-range view and the hon. the Premier mentioned this earlier, so I just want to ask him, looking at it short range, if steps will be taken immediately to make sure that the students' future is safeguarded, that the rising cost per student would be looked at right away and that the university will not become accessible to sons and daughters of

MR. NEARY: rich people in this Province only. This is the immediate, but over the long haul I would certainly agree with the hon. gentleman, and I appreciate the fact that the hon. gentleman is thinking along the same lines that I am, because this is very important to Newfoundland and to the future of post-secondary education in this Province. So I would like to ask the Premier to take an immediate look at these two items and then look at the long range future of the University.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, I mean to look at that immediate now as it relates to what the hon. gentleman said and then take the long term look. And I think we are on the same wavelength and we will be pursuing that in the next couple of weeks.

MR. NEARY: It may be the only time in our political career.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. members for Port au Port, Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, Bellevue and Trinity - Bay de Verde.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the hon. gentleman asks his question, I would like to welcome to the House on behalf of all hon. members, the Mayor of Portugal Cove, Mrs. Carol Mitchell, accompanied by councillor, Clarence Kent. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey).

In light of the fact that the people on social assistance in this Province have not had

MR. HODDER: an increase in almost two years while the prices have been going up and cost of living and fuel prices and that sort of thing have been quite high and increasing at a great rate, can the minister tell me now whether there will be or he anticipates an increase for social assistance recipients in the near future?

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I can tell my hon. friend that there was an increase last year. It is not two years, there was one last year. I can appreciate what he says in terms of the anxiety of the people who are affected by social assistance and their wish to have an answer to this very question. During the Budgetary process, this is a matter which is before Treasury Board and a decision will be made, I hope, in the not-too-distant future. As soon as there is, I will be very happy to communicate - I hope, at least, I will be happy to communicate it to all the recipients.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I believe in 1973 the former Premier of the Province said at that particular time that the social assistance payments would be geared to the minimum wage. And I note, Mr. Speaker, that the minimum wage has gone up and social assistance payments have not. Does the minister expect that this will give added impetus to the Budget and whether the Budget will, indeed, have some increases?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, it is true that the social assistance rates and the whole question of

MR. HICKEY: increases, there was an attempt to tie the rates into one, the cost of living and also have it relate to the minimum wage for the Province. We have not disbanded that policy, indeed, we are looking very seriously at it and we have not been able in the past number of years to keep pace with the inflationary rate although each year we have given an increase. But the whole question, as I said, of social assistance rates as they apply to the cost of living, minimum wage - that whole question is being looked at now and hopefully, the matter will be resolved in the not-too-distant future.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) A supplementary.

MR. HODDER: When this whole matter is looked at, would the minister take into account the fact that there are two types of people on social assistance, those who cannot work for some reason or other and have to draw social assistance, and those who are truly handicapped? Will the minister be looking, perhaps, at giving a different rate of social assistance to those who are truly handicapped over those who, perhaps, can get their own fuel and their own wood and that sort of thing?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have to inform my hon. friend again that both I and my colleagues for the past number of weeks have been looking at this very question and I totally agree with him that there are varying needs among those recipients, as he says, people who through no fault of their own, based on

MR. T. HICKEY: illness or handicap cannot supplement their income versus the unemployed who possibly can supplement their income in some small way. I acknowledge that there is a great difference between the two groups and we are looking at that situation. I have to say to him we disbanded the two-rate system a number of years back and I think it would be a step backwards to adopt that kind of policy. I think whenever we give an increase in assistance to recipients it should be straight across the board. I acknowledge that there are people with varying needs and I think that that has to be dealt with on an individual basis and I would hope that that will be the policy that we would follow in whatever we do. But I think it would be wrong to separate the people on social assistance purely because of individual need. I think that as taxpayers, as people for whatever reasons they find themselves receiving social assistance, I think they have a right to a standard rate and I think it would be a step backwards to change that.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): Before the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) asks his question I would welcome to the gallery, on behalf of hon. members, two other visitors whose presence has been drawn to my attention, the Mayor of Musgrave-town, Mr. Alfred Saint accompanied by councillor Charles Butt. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these gentleman also.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Doody). I refer him to the Churchill Falls generating station and I understand that Lobstick apparently the company, the Crown corporation CFI Co is experiencing considerable difficulty with the Lobstick facility I understand the water is eroding it in quite a serious fashion and

MR. SIMMONS: that there may be a fairly imminent need for some major reconstruction. I wonder could the minister just update us on this and indicate what is the nature of the problem and the kind of costs the corporation may be looking at in terms of reconstructing it adequately.

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

MR. DOODY: I do not have that detail with me, Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is a problem at the Lobstick dyke, I know that there is a survey underway and repairs are being constantly made there. How serious the situation is or how expensive it is is something that has not been costed yet. There is no immediate concern. I gather from the officials it is well under control but there has to be a certain amount of repair work done to ensure the stability of the dyke. And as I get further details I will only be too happy to inform the hon. member and the House.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: The hon. minister has indicated that to his knowledge there is no immediate need for concern. It is my understanding that that may not be entirely the case, that the situation is deteriorating quite rapidly. I wonder if the minister would undertake to get the details and perhaps brief the House on it fairly soon and in so doing, would he, in particular, ascertain whether there is any anticipated interruption in the output of the generating station. Is the nature of the reconstruction job such that it would require a shut-down or a partial shut-down of the facility during the reconstruction period?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: Sir, I will try to get that information as quickly as I can.

MR. SIMMONS: A further supplementary on the same point.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder also would the minister undertake to relate his information to the particular question of any financial penalties which may be involved there. I understand that there is a penalty clause which has been invoked on a number of occasions, a penalty clause when CFLCO cannot provide a certain volume of output to its main customer, Hydro Quebec, and I wonder would the minister undertake to determine whether the problem with the Lobstick facility has any cost implications in terms of penalties?

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

MR. DOODY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if there is an interruption of supply to Hydro Quebec there is indeed a clause in that infamous contract which contains a penalty



MR. DOODY: to the company. I have as of now no knowledge of an interruption of power to Hydro Quebec. To the best of my knowledge there is none in the foreseeable future. There is no such interruption. But that is the sort of information that I will undertake to get for the hon. member. I have taken a note of it and will do what I can to get the information.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier regarding the Come by Chance oil refinery. Does the First Arabian Corporation, and did also Mr. Shaheen, indicate in their proposals that they had a source of crude oil supply? Does First Arabian have a source contract or a source of crude oil supply for the Come by Chance refinery and did Mr. Shaheen also indicate in his proposal that he had a source of supply of crude that, of course, is only one of several ingredients that would obviously be part of the opening up of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I think both proposals that were presented indicated a source of crude.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Are these source contracts? Let me ask the Premier that.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: At this point in time we are not in a position to say whether there is a source contract or not. That is subject to the talks that we are now having with the First Arabian Corporation and will be announced, or the House will be informed of that in due course.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, this crude oil that is coming from Mexico, that the federal government is talking about, would this enhance the Come by Chance operation or would it be detrimental to it or would it make any difference or not?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Doody) no doubt could answer that question better than I can. On the factual side, my own off the-top of the head comment would be, I do not think it affects it one way or another that much.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier, when Mr. Tamaraz, who is supposed to be in the Province on Friday I think, when Mr. Tamaraz does come to this Province will provision be made for Mr. Tamaraz to come into this House and answer questions as the former owner of the refinery agreed to do and so on? Mr. Tamaraz on his first visit to the Province met privately with the government and then met with the Opposition members. I do not think any provision has been made for a meeting with the Opposition this time around. Will provision be made for Mr. Tamaraz to come into the House of Assembly and that will be part of the debate that will ensue, I hope, on the Come by Chance refinery?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the whole thing would be well served to go through that kind of an operation of having somebody coming into the House of Assembly. It is an unusual kind of situation and I think that all the information will be provided. Mr. Speaker, we are the representatives of the people here. All the information on the First Arabian -

MR. NEARY: What do you mean, we are?

MR. PECKFORD: When I say 'we', all the members of this hon. House.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not differentiate. I do not

know if the hon. member does. But I respect the hon. member as a member of this House. I respect the people that he represents both as a district and I know he speaks on behalf of a large constituency which goes much further than Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, and for that I am deeply grateful. I hope that we will always be able to, Mr. Speaker, in this hon. House, be able to refer to 'we'. When we say 'we' we are talking about all people in this House because we are also important and have such a major role to play in the destiny of our Province. I will always, when I say 'we', be referring to all the members of this House. I am sure all the other members feel the same way, and that to me is a sign of co-operation and the new mood and esprit de corps that this parliament in Newfoundland is now building up to the people so that once again we are going to have all politicians of all political stripes looked upon with a great deal of merit and respectability. And to that I am grateful and in that vein I say that all the details on the First Arabian Corporation's proposal will be provided on the table of this hon. House so a full and complete debate on it can be held and the Opposition will be fully informed on all those matters as we move down with this new mood that we have in the House.

MR. CALLAN:

A final supplementary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Thank, you.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer)

A final supplementary.

The original questioner.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, when Mr.

Tamaraz is in the Province on Friday can we expect then that the report will be tabled in this House? The First Arabian proposal.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I think the hon. gentleman

understands we are

PREMIER PECKFORD: talks with a corporation which is involved in trying to reactivate an industrial enterprise. There are a lot of things to be discussed and negotiated. As soon as they have been negotiated and can be released, the information will be released. Whether we can do that after Friday or not will depend on the talks themselves. But I cannot undertake right now to commit an information flow to the House on Monday based upon Friday's meeting because it is difficult to anticipate how fruitful and how much information will be available and can be released at that time, given the sensitivity of the whole thing.

MR. SPEAKER(Ottenheimer): I will hear one more supplementary from the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), then the hon. gentleman for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F.B.Rowe).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would say let the word go out to Mr. Tamaraz of First Arabian today, that we resent the fact that he is not meeting with the Opposition. We cannot cross-examine or ask First Arabian any questions.

MR. J. CARTER: Did you ask 'Billy'.

MR. NEARY: This is going to be a private meeting. No, but let the word go out today from this Assembly through the Premier, or through the Government House Leader or somebody.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Question, please!

MR. NEARY: My question to the hon. gentleman is that I can never understand, Mr. Speaker, why the two proposals have not been put on the table of the House. One party, apparently the Shaheen group, are prepared to make their proposal

MR. NEARY: public, the other crowd are not. Why can we not have the two proposals on the table of the House so we can take a good hard look at these proposals ourselves in the House? Why must it all be done behind closed doors, in private?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, let the word go out from this Assembly today that there is a government in Newfoundland which negotiates on behalf of the people and that is why we were elected, to try to bring to this Province additional jobs under terms and conditions which will satisfy us, satisfy the people of Newfoundland and that we are going to get on with some reasonable, rational economic development which will be in the best interest of everybody. And as long as the system of government is such in this Province and in this country, there will be a government and there will be an Opposition.

The government has a role to play. We are now discharging our responsibilities as a government and we will continue to do that in future, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries. In view of his dismal performance with the Fisheries Council of Canada, Sir, over the last few days, I wonder if the minister could indicate to the House without claiming that he is a great Newfoundlander and he is ashamed that such a question is being asked, which is his usual tactic, if he has had a

MR. F.B. ROWE: change of policy with respect to his stand-off against Ottawa in matters pertaining to jurisdiction over the fisheries in this Province whereby instead of confronting Ottawa, he will co-operate with Ottawa in all matters pertaining to fisheries management and jurisdiction in this Province?

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

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I did not get the first part of the question.

MR. CALLAN: Dismal failure.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Dismal failure there with the Fisheries Council of Canada in Calgary over the week.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, I did have the pleasure of addressing the Fisheries Council of Canada meeting in Calgary on Monday. And I think he said the shameful statement I made. If standing up for Newfoundland and the rights of Newfoundlanders -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Now we know where you stand over there.

MR. NEARY: I said you were going to say that.

MR. W. CARTER: If defending the rights of our people, Mr. Speaker, to have first crack at the resource that is ours by right, if that is being shameful, then I am guilty and I cannot do much about it.

My position at the conference, Mr. Speaker, has not changed from the



MR. F. ROWE: can, in fact, gain greater grounds by co-operating with Ottawa, because after all, they expend the greatest amount of money, \$250 million compared to our \$20 million in matters pertaining to the fisheries. Why it is not a better strategy to co-operate and consult with Ottawa on a two-way basis rather than confronting them. Because his counterparts in the rest of the Atlantic Provinces and in British Columbia agree that we have to have a central policy with respect to jurisdiction and control over the fisheries. They do agree, and we agree, that there should be control.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) A point of order has come up.

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the Question Period is not for the purpose of making debates. You are to ask questions. There is a normal preamble, but I suggest the hon. member is getting into the realm of debate there.

MR. SPEAKER: There is certainly a strong case to be made that the preamble was of unnecessary length and of an argumentative nature, but I think the hon. gentleman has, in fact, asked his question.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: I give notice that on tomorrow I wish to repeat the question.

MR. W. CARTER: I do not get a chance to answer?

MR. SPEAKER: Having called Orders of the day, I will have to ask, Does the hon. minister have leave to answer the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, give him leave, yes, yes.



MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) If he has no leave, actually -

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I think the record -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to clarify this point, Sir, if Your Honour wants leave, I would suggest that we carry on until 4:30 p.m. with the Question Period by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The only leave I was asking was whether the hon. minister would have leave to answer the question recently asked.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, leave

MR. NEARY: If we can carry on until 4:30 P.M., Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: That is different. That is not the proposition I put.

MR. NEARY: Oh, well, then no way!

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I think the record should show, Sir, that the Opposition asked a question on a very important subject, fisheries, and yet would not allow me to answer it. And it is very important.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members Day, we now proceed to the adjourned debate on Motion 1.

The hon. the member for Windsor -  
Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words on the resolution before us, Sir, that this House look at putting together a Select Committee to look at the employment situation in this Province today. And, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the resolution. But in looking at the employment picture in Newfoundland today, Mr. Speaker, one, I suppose, would have to look at the resources that we have available to us to create jobs and I suppose we would have to ask ourselves why the unemployment picture

MR. FLIGHT: in this Province today, is 18 per cent of our work force unemployed - during the 1950s and 1960s, Mr. Speaker, we had 6 per cent unemployment - and ask ourselves why. What happened that we came from 6 per cent unemployment to 18 per cent unemployment? The resources are the same, Mr. Speaker. We have the same resource based industries in this Province now that we had during the 1950s and 1960s. So where were our people working? And, Mr. Speaker, our people were working in jobs that were funded by the - when the government funded the private sector. When a man was working in 1960 for Lundrigans building a school over in Corner Brook or in Burin or building a hospital in Grand Falls, he never considered the possibility, never even thought about it, that he was working for the Government of Newfoundland. He was employed by Lundrigans or Nova or McNamara or one of the contractors. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason why we had a 6 per cent unemployment position in this Province in the 1950s and 1960s. And when this government, Mr. Speaker, in the early 1970s decided that there would be no more public spending, no more road construction, no more hospital construction, no more school construction, no more rural electrification, no more water and sewerage systems, then they had to recognize the fact that they were going to create massive unemployment in this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, we have massive unemployment, and as long as we go the way we are going, as long as we are going to depend on the resource sector to provide the jobs that the minister talks about to stop our young Newfoundlanders by the thousands from going to the Mainland, while we are going to withhold funds from the private sector in this Province - fund the social sector, create jobs that way, then we are going to have high unemployment.

May 9, 1979

Tape 1172

EC - 4

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, assuming we want to create employment, what do we have to work with? - forestry,

MR. FLIGHT: fisheries, tourist development, to a lesser extent offshore oil I suppose. Let me deal, Mr. Speaker, for a minute with the forestry. In order for the forestry of Newfoundland to create the jobs and sustain all the jobs that we have a right to expect from that resource, the forestry has got to be well managed. And, Mr. Speaker, the forests of Newfoundland are far from well managed. We have the two major paper companies and in a few days or at least a year we will have three mills. Now I do not see Price (Nfld.), Abitibi Price (Nfld.), Bowaters, or the Linerboard operation after the Linerboard starts employing any more people than they are employing now. Indeed they are employing a lot less than they employed ten years ago. So they are well staffed, all the people required by Price (Nfld.) to work in the mill and to provide the logs are in place. So there is no reason for us to believe that the two companies, Abitibi Price, Bowaters will create any new jobs. We appreciate the ones they are providing now but there is no reason to believe that they will create any new jobs. Indeed the concern is that automation may cut into the jobs we already have, the kind of a trend we have seen the past ten years in the forestry. So people will start to look at the forestry and say, "Well what other areas of forestry can create jobs in this Province?" And I think in rural Newfoundland the obvious one is the sawmill industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I heard the minister a few days ago saying that there were around 1,500 sawmill licences.

MR. MORGAN: 1,400.

MR. FLIGHT: Okay, around 1,400 in this Province, and the idea was to convey to the people of Newfoundland that we have got a sawmill industry.

MR. MORGAN: 1,400 operators.

MR. FLIGHT: 1,400 operators. The minister forgot to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that of that 1,400, 257 do not even have their licence but they are not operating.

MR. MORGAN: No.

MR. FLIGHT: That is true, from facts ascertained from his own department today. 800 of those 1,500, Mr. Speaker, produced less than 10,000 board feet of lumber in this Province last year.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. FLIGHT: You cannot build a house - 10,000 board feet of lumber cannot build a house today. That means, Mr. Speaker, we have less than 500 sawmills operating in this Province that we would class as a commercial operation and we would perceive as employing people. And I say, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. House that out of that 500 there is only probably a handful, maybe ten or less that are stable sawmill industries where the employees that they have are not threatened, where they are not scratching for a living, where they are not fighting the government, fighting the forestry department, fighting the paper companies. We do not have, Mr. Speaker, a viable commercial sawmill industry in this Province the way we should have and the way we could have if this Province was prepared to address itself to a sawmill industry.

And, Mr. Speaker, why do we not have a sawmill industry? When I hear people wanting to justify the fact there is no sawmill industry in this Province I hear them saying stuff like, "Well, you know, if you give a guy a small John Dier and a small mill, \$15,000, \$16,000 worth of equipment he suddenly believes that he is a big operator and goes out and buys a four wheel drive and a Cadillac and suddenly he is in trouble financially. They are not good entrepreneurs. They are not good investment people. They do not understand how to run business." Mr. Speaker, the

MR. FLIGHT: sawmillers in this Province are just as good businessmen as the retailers. If the retailers could not get the product to sell their business would go under and as long as the sawmillers in this Province have not got access to a timber supply they are going under. And until the minister and his department are prepared to recognize the fact that until timber limits and a sawlog supply is made available to the sawmilling industry in this Province there will be no sawmilling industry. It is as simple as that. They do not have the resource, Mr. Speaker. The one problem with our sawmill industry today is that they cannot get the sawlog supply to sustain their operation simply because every bit of merchantable timber in this Province worth talking about is held by the two major paper companies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me deal with Abitibi Price for a few minutes. Abitibi Price, Mr. Speaker, is a good corporate citizen. The hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) found reason a few days ago to go on an open line show in this Province and defend Abitibi Price saying they were good corporate citizens, they had operated in this Province for seventy-five years and they were fantastic corporate citizens. And I want to agree with him on most of the points he made. The member also decided it was necessary to malign me personally on that programme, Mr. Speaker, to say that the kinds of things I was saying in this House, if I keep saying them that I will have the effect of driving investors out of this Province, that I am not appreciative of Price (Nfld.), that I have no desire to see a company like Price (Nfld.) operate, that kind of thing. Unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, what the member said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that member said that Abitibi Price is a good corporate citizen. Now what does the

May 9, 1979

Tape No. 1173

NM - 4

MR. FLIGHT: member for Grand - and I regret very much that the member for Grand Falls is not here today - what does the member for Grand Falls mean when he says Abitibi Price has been a good corporate citizen? Well, Mr. Speaker, I will

MR. FLIGHT: submit this; they are a prime employer in the Province, they own most of the timber rights in this Province that they do not necessarily need to own, they have built a fine town in Grand Falls and they had the sense in 1961 to realize that company towns are not a good concept, that their corporate image would be affected if they continued to hold on to the town of Grand Falls. And so in 1961 they turned the town over, a good foundation, good services, good homes, well laid out municipal plans, in 1961. And they give the town of Grand Falls \$100,000 a year in lieu of taxes. So they are good corporate citizens. And, Mr. Speaker, they hold good parties. I will tell you that any member of the House of Assembly that lives within striking distance of the Grand Falls Abitibi operation gets invitations to the socials. They are good corporate citizens in that sense. I recognize that they are good corporate citizens and I recognize what Price Abitibi contributes to the economy in my own district, Mr. Speaker. My district is totally, practically totally dependent on the success and on the future performance of Price (Nfld). But is that supposed <sup>to stop</sup> me from questioning their operation when I see them operating in a way that is not to the betterment of this Province? What is good corporate citizenship, Mr. Speaker? Let us look at how good a corporate citizen they are. I do not know how many members of the House realize that Price (Nfld) have owned for this last fifty years fifty-one per cent of the ASARCO operation in Buchans. ASARCO has been perceived as being a bad corporate citizen. They kept the wages low, they refused to open up the town, people could not build their own homes, they just put the clamps on and they made life very miserable for the people in Buchans. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that while this was going on, while ASARCO was taking that kind of flack - and it took two strikes, one with violence to expose it, four or five years ago, Anglo Newfoundland Development and Price (Nfld) were raking off fifty-one per cent off the top. They were not



MR. FLIGHT:

good enough corporate

citizens to say to ASARCO, look we think you are misusing our  
Newfoundlanders. They were not that good a corporate citizen, Mr.  
Speaker. They knew that was going on but they took the fifty-one  
per cent. And maybe it was the fifty-one per cent that they raked  
out of Buchans that made them appear to be good corporate citizens  
in the rest of the Province. Mr. Speaker, during the IWA strike -  
the bitterness is still around this Province - some of the factors  
that lead to that strike, Mr. Speaker, were the deplorable working  
conditions in the camps owned by Abitibi Price now, Anglo  
Newfoundland Development then, and the wages that were being paid.  
They were not such great corporate citizens that they would say. It  
is not right for us to keep our workers in these deplorable, indecent  
conditions. Mr. Speaker, they are not good enough corporate citizens  
to recognize the rights of the Pentecostal assemblies in this Province.  
In Grand Falls they give \$50,000 a year to the integrated school  
board and \$50,000 a year to the RC school board of the Central  
Newfoundland area but they refuse to give a cent or a grant to the  
Penetecostal assemblies in towns where the schools are situated. Is that good  
corporate citizenship? Is it good corporate citizenship, Mr. Speaker,  
that when they built the mill and in all the years since and the  
additions and the rest, I am not sure that they were concerned to  
a point where they could have put in machinery or done what had to  
be done to lessen the effect of the pollution that they are dumping  
into the Exploits River. Now tomorrow somebody will accuse me of  
demanding that Price (Nfld) clean up their act and stop the pollution  
from going in the river and that will have the effect of closing them  
down. I am not saying that but I am saying that if we want to hold  
up Price Abitibi as a great corporate citizen like the member for  
Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) who represents it does, we should have all  
the facts on the table. They were not great enough corporate citizens  
that when they built the town of Grand Falls in the first place,  
their town, to think about the pollution they would be dumping into

MR. FLIGHT: the Exploits River by refusing to put in a treatment plant. They are not good enough corporate citizens to recognize the contribution the town of Windsor has made to their operation. The town of Windsor since that mill started has been as valuable to the Price operation as Grand Falls. Thirty per cent of their work force comes from there. When they decided to have a closed town and pick the people they wanted to live in Grand Falls, they let the other people who they would give jobs to but refused to give houses too go out to Windsor and build and there stems Windsor's problem today. They are not good enough corporate citizens to recognize the contribution Windsor is making to their operation and give them a \$100,000 grant or a \$30 or \$40 or \$50,000 grant in lieu of municipal taxes. So what is good corporate citizenship, Mr. Speaker? And I will tell the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan)

MR. G. FLIGHT: and tell this House of Assembly that we had better get on our knees and pray, Mr. Speaker, that Abitibi Price is a good corporate citizen because I doubt if most of the people of Newfoundland or members of this House realizes just what chunk of the economy of this Province that Price Abitibi now controls. Just listen to these towns; Buchans, Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls, Badger, Millertown, Buchans Junction and now the whole West Coast Stephenville. Abitibi Price holds the economic lifeline to everyone of those towns. That is a fair chunk of our Province, Mr. Speaker, And Abitibi Price controls the best part of the timber resource in this Province. So we had better hope for the sake of the people living in these towns that Abitibi Price is a good corporate citizen.

And I will tell you we had better watch - remember the B.C. experience when Canadian Pacific a month ago was going to go out and buy MacMillan Bloedel. Premier Bennett felt obligated to take a day off from his vacation and come back and say, B.C. is not for sale. We had better watch that Consolidated Bathurst or some other giant conglomerate do not decide to buy out Abitibi. Maybe someone in Newfoundland would have to say that Newfoundland is not for sale. Because if we have any fears that the company that might be looking at buying Abitibi Price is not a good corporate citizen, or we would not want them controlling the part of our economy that Abitibi now controls, so we had better be careful.

Mr. Speaker, now what have I said up to this point in time, Mr. Speaker, about Price (Nfld.) in this Province. What have I said that would put the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) in a position to go on Open Line and say that I am anti-Abitibi, that I would drive out investment? What have I said? I have accused, Mr. Speaker, in this House-I have said this, that we are witnessing a terrible waste of the forest resource. I said that the first day I came in this House and I will be saying it the day I go out of this House.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Let me read it into the record I never maligned any official of Price (Nfld.), I have never mentioned any official of that company, I have never maligned the company, the corporate body itself, I have simply questioned the way that they are harvesting our forests and the way that the Department of Lands and Forests is prepared to allow them to harvest our forests. And we are witnessing in this Province, Mr. Speaker, a colossal, sinful, indecent waste of our forest resource under Price Abitibi's management and under Bowaters' management.

Mr. Speaker, how are we witnessing this waste? We are looking at hundreds of thousands of cords of wood, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before and I will say it again and I will keep saying it and I will be more effective as a private citizen. I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, that as a member of this House of Assembly having got up and said this, that it has not got more reaction from the department's concerned or the general public or the media. I got a feeling I could be more influential as a private citizen, then I would not have an axe to grind or be on a vendetta. We have hundreds of thousands of cords of wood that have been cut in this Province by Abitibi Price up to this day, that have never seen the paper mill in Grand Falls and will never see it. Hundreds of thousands of cords, Mr. Speaker!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. G. FLIGHT: Oh, production, months of production, cut by the paper companies, boomed in some cove in Red Indian Lake with a flimsy boom that Price could not care less about, and a little breeze of wind comes up and breaks the boom and out goes the production of a whole camp, 40,000, 50,000, 60,000, 70,000 cords of wood out in Red Indian Lake, 48 miles long, drifting around the lake, Mr. Speaker, and most of it goes ashore. And now they are having trouble maintaining the water level of Red Indian Lake and I will tell the Minister of Lands and Forests

MR. G. FLIGHT: (Mr. Morgan) and I will tell the people of Newfoundland, the people in Grand Falls that Price means so much to, that there are thousands and thousands and thousands of cords of wood that if not put back in the water by hand will never float again. Take any member of the House of Assembly and any minister in and show it to them.

Mr. Speaker, Price (Nfld.) goes into here, Bowaters goes into there, they cut what they want to cut and they leave the rest. There is enough fringe, there is enough wood left after Price and Bowaters have gone through an area to support every sawmill in this country but you are not allowed to go in and cut it. You cannot go in and cut one piece to build a porch on your house. And that timber then becomes overmature and falls down. It is a loss to the economy. But that is the kind of control they have and that is the kind of waste we are seeing, Mr. Speaker.

No reforestation, Mr. Speaker, to this day by Price (Nfld.). If there were any reforestation we would not be seeing oceans and oceans and oceans of birch growing up where they cut the spruce and the fir. And they talk about reforestation!

MR. G. FLIGHT: So, Mr. Speaker, what are we going to do about it? Now, Mr. Speaker, my standing up in this House and saying this should this give the member for Grand Falls (Mr. J. Lundriqan) or any minister there the right to stand up and say that I am anti-Price (Nfld.)?

Mr. Speaker, in the Fishery when we - every year we have a fish glut and every member in this House their conscience is bothered. They say, "Oh my goodness, it is terrible to dump that fish." But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, we do not have the facilities in this Province, the processing facilities to handle the glut, to handle the fish - no criticism of the fishermen, no criticism of anything, it is a fact of life. But we become terribly upset and our conscience bother us when we have to throw that fish back in the water, throw it away and everybody says, "Oh, what a waste of a resource." Well, Mr. Speaker, does not the same thing apply to the forestry in this Province? If the Newfoundland people, if the ministers and the members in the House of Assembly and the people who have got to live in this Province were aware of the kind of waste we are seeing as a result of the kind of forest management that the Department of Forestry has permitted and has condoned, should they not be as concerned about the waste of our forest resource as they would be about the waste of our fish resource?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said and let the word go out, let the word go out to the press and tomorrow you will hear somebody saying on the other side of the House - the member for Grand Falls (Mr. J. Lundriqan) or the member from Deer Lake (Mr. W. House) or the Minister of Forestry (Mr. J. Morgan) - saying that I was anti-Price (Nfld.), that I did not appreciate their contribution to the Province. Mr. Speaker, what I am saying I say now for everyone to hear and I want it quoted in every newspaper in Newfoundland and quoted in my own district that we are witnessing, we have witnessed from the point and from the time that operation started to this day.

MR. G. FLIGHT: We are witnessing a colossal, sinful, criminal waste of the forest resource.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear.

MR. G. FLIGHT: I can take the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. J. Morgan) into - never mind the wood that is floating around the lakes, that is obvious - I can take the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. J. Morgan) into wood roads four miles off the main paved road to browse of wood that were there for the last five years, cords, four foot pulp, left there. I can take him to the landings, Mr. Speaker, where there is unbelievable waste when it is in the slashing operations. Wood left everywhere - unbelievable. And the Premier had the gall, the ex-Premier, four years ago, to come back from Norway and say that "We have to utilize the forest industry. We have got to create 5,000 new jobs in the forests over the next five years." There is only one year left now and we have lost about 1,000 jobs in the forestry since that. "We have to utilize the bark." Somewhere in the Scandinavian countries they use the bark for fixing up roads. They have to utilize the sawdust, the tops and the bows. How can one, Mr. Speaker, have any respect for that kind of statement after spending one day, that is all it would take - one day, walking over the operations of the various paper companies in this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, let the word go out that I have a vendetta against Price, that I want to drive them out of the Province, if you want that kind of thing. I have got no desire to drive Abitibi Price out of the Province. I have a desire though to see the forestry utilized in a way that will provide the maximum amount of employment again in this Province, that we can have a decent sawmill industry in this Province, that we do not see waste, that we do not have a Department of Forestry that is prepared to condone the waste. No wonder we are finding it hard, Mr. Speaker, to retain good people in the Department of Forestry. No wonder the two deputy ministers have left this last month or so, they cannot

MR. G. FLIGHT: stand this kind of criticism and the Government is not prepared to give them the authority to do anything about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. G. FLIGHT: I tell this House, Mr. Speaker - here a line that the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. J. Lundrigan) can quote in Grand Falls tomorrow - if I had the authority as vested in the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. J. Morgan) right now -

MR. MORGAN: God forbid.

MR. G. FLIGHT: -if I had that authority, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MORGAN: God forbid.

MR. G. FLIGHT: -I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in a period of six months, or however long it took to negotiate, that waste would stop. It would either stop, Mr. Speaker, or the paper companies in this Province would find themselves facing legislation that would stop it.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear.

MR. G. FLIGHT: I will tell you that.

Let me tell you the biggest waste of the wood resource, Mr. Speaker, as I see it anyway, is the wood that is left lying around after they have passed through. Their transportation system, the wood they waste as a result of their transportation system! What would be wrong, Mr. Speaker, I have asked this question, what would be wrong with bringing into this House an act, a beachcomber's act? Let us licence people in this Province to pick up wood that is drifting around our lakes. What would be wrong with that? It could not hurt Price (Nfld.). I tell you what it would do - it would guarantee Newfoundland that the next time that Price (Nfld.) intended to store in any cove on Red Indian Lake forty or fifty cords of wood, it would guarantee that they would then make sure that the booms were strong enough to hold that wood. But now, they could not care less. If they knew that we had some beachcombers ready to pick up the wood that they were prepared to strew around the country and let float in our lakes, I tell you that Price (Nfld.) would take a second look at the booms that they use around our Province and that would solve forevermore,



MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the loss of wood and I would not have that to criticize anymore. I would not be able to say to the Minister of Forestry, "Take your helicopter and go up and look at the hundreds of cords of wood and thousands of cords of wood in various coves that will never float again." After the initial clean-up there will be no more need of - and the beachcombers would not make much money either after the first year or two. All we would do would be to guarantee that Price (Nfld.) would not operate in such a slack way as they are and Bowaters would not operate in such a slack way as they are when it comes to booming wood in the water and the lakes and shores and rivers in the rest of this Province.

MR. NEARY: Right. Right on.

MR. FLIGHT: Any member who would go on an open line show and accuse me, Mr. Speaker, of maligning company officials -

MR. NEARY: The sign of a desperate man.

MR. FLIGHT: - or, Mr. Speaker, accuse me of not being appreciative of Bowaters or Price, and being critical of Price (Nfld.) to the point that I would injure their operation, or that I would say anything that would have the effect of closing down Price (Nfld.) or driving investment out of this Province, Mr. Speaker, any member who would do that is dishonest and hypocritical, Totally dishonest and totally hypocritical, Mr. Speaker. Now I will tell the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), he is not here but he will read this speech I hope, we are going downhill towards an election, Mr. Speaker, As a matter of fact, by the way the member for Grand Falls has been on radio in Central Newfoundland this past few days it is a sure sign, I would say, that maybe we are going to have an election. Because it is the only time that he would - Something would have to have him on radio, it is the first time now in six months.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member's party is certainly going downhill.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, we are going downhill towards an election.

MR. MORGAN: You are going downhill towards a collection -

MR. FLIGHT: I hope we are not going downhill towards an election the way that hon. member went uphill towards the leadership.

MR. NEARY: 56 votes.

MR. FLIGHT: 56 was it?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is pretty good.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, we are going to make the right decision. I hope he makes the right decision in forestry not the kind of a decision he made at the convention.

MR. MORGAN: I am pleased with the man we got.

MR. FLIGHT: I wish the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) was in his seat when the Minister of Forestry said, "Sorry John, I have to make the right decision." Remember that? All of Newfoundland saw that. He made the right decision. I wish he would make the same decision in forestry.

MR. MORGAN: We have a leader over here, more than your party has right now.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, we have no leadership, up to this point, in forestry my friend. There has been no leadership in forestry up to this point in time. We will see what the performance of the hon. -

MR. MORGAN: I am three weeks in the department.

MR. SPEAKER (Ottenheimer): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: We will see. I am prepared to withhold judgement. I am prepared to withhold judgement on that minister and his performance in forestry, and I am prepared to stand and defend everything that I have ever said. And before the House Leader leaves I would like for him to hear this.

MR. MARSHALL: The House Leader would not leave if the hon. gentleman -

MR. FLIGHT: We are going downhill towards an election.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) - the Province.

MR. FLIGHT: We are going downhill towards an election, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say to the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) now, and the hon. Premier and any other, the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan), one of the issues in Central Newfoundland, and I am prepared to make it an issue, is Price (Nfld's.) management of the forest resource. I am prepared to go into Grand Falls and Windsor and say publicly every criticism that I have ever made of Abitibi Price in this House and I am prepared to have the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) defend Price (Nfld.) if he thinks it needs defending. If that is what he wants, if he thinks it is necessary to defend the good corporate citizenship of Abitibi Price I am prepared to take the same position in Windsor-Buchans or in Grand Falls as I have taken here today and I am prepared to let the chips fall as they may. I am prepared to have that an issue, the only issue, if the member wants to have that the issue, and we will see what the people of Central Newfoundland who know what is happening in our forests,-

MR. R. MOORES: That is calling your bluff.

MR. FLIGHT: - thinks of the issue. And they appreciate their \$10,000 and \$12,000 and \$15,000 and \$20,000 a year cheques from Abitibi.

Badger appreciates the contribution that Abitibi is making, the sole base of their economy. Millertown appreciates the contribution that Abitibi is making, the sole base of their economy. They would not have me in here criticizing and questioning Price (Nfld.) wrongly. No way! They owe too much to Price (Nfld.). But I am prepared to go into those communities and talk about the forestry methods that we see practiced by Price (Nfld.)

May 9, 1979

Tape No. 1177

NM - 4

MR. MORGAN:

They would not listen to you.

MR. FLIGHT:

Come in, Mr. Minister. Come in,

Mr. Minister. Any time, Mr. Minister, come in and let us talk about what I am talking about now.

Mr. Speaker, the minister got on radio the other day, I must apologize to the minister for not being here when he made his great ministerial statement about how

MR. FLIGHT: this government had decided that it was not necessary to have a massive spray programme this year, how they were going to go to Et. Mr. Speaker, what the minister was not prepared to admit - it was interesting that he was the only member on that side of the House that was opposed to the budworm spray programme - what he was not prepared to admit, Mr. Speaker, is that last year, before the spray programme started all the signs were there. There was evidence that the budworm was on a down turn, that the epidemic had collapsed, that there was no need for a spray programme, that there was a danger, a danger in having a spray programme, that you would perpetrate the problems in the areas we sprayed. But no, Sir, they went on and they sprayed. And the minister knows that that programme was ill-advised and ill-conceived and should never have taken place.

MR. R. MOORES: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: It should never have taken place. And if we wanted proof, in the minister's statement a couple of days ago we are going to have -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. FLIGHT: That is no point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I thought that we were debating -this is Private Member's Day today- a resolution before the House on the unemployment problems in the Province and the appointment of a Select Committee to travel the Province to look at the problems of unemployment and to see what can be done to overcome that problem. That is the motion that we have so far spoken against on the government side, we do not see a need for a Select Committee. So far, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who is now speaking in debate is not speaking at all on that topic. The subject of the spray programme was brought before the House last

MR. MORGAN: week and it was a matter for discussion at that time and not now.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, that is the most stupid point of order that I have ever heard. If we have a chance to create jobs - the resolution talks about having a Select Committee go out and look at what is going on in the Province, Mr. Speaker, with an eye to creating jobs based on what they see. And I am telling the minister that if we do not manage our forest right that is a resource that we will lose, that we will not have the capability of finding jobs. So, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the potential, the way we are going to manage the forests in this Province to create the maximum employment we can.

And, Mr. Speaker, that is a stupid point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Cross) To that point of order. The motion does debate unemployment in Newfoundland. With regard to the rule of relevancy it would be certainly wide-ranging and it would be hard to bring a member to order for speaking irrelevantly to this motion. So there is no point of order and I would ask the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) to continue.

MR. FLIGHT: So, Mr. Speaker, the minister admitted - and of course there is another reason too that the people of Newfoundland will recognize, that we may be into an election year. Now we will see what the government are prepared to do to get elected. They know that the spray programme in this Province was a very, very unpopular programme. They knew the people of Newfoundland were convinced that there might not be a need of a spray programme.

MR. R. MOORES: That is right.

MR. FLIGHT: When the crunch came, Mr. Speaker, they made the right decision, no question about that.

MR. R. MOORES: For election year.

MR. FLIGHT: But it was made easy by the fact that they were in an election year. The minister knew that.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) - I have had enough to say about Price (Nfld.), Mr. Speaker. I want to say

MR. FLIGHT: here now that I think Price (Nfld.) is a fantastic corporate citizen. I would do anything within my power to keep Price (Nfld.) Abitibi operating. I would close up every sawmill in Newfoundland today, every single one, if I felt that the sawmill industry was jeopardizing the Price (Nfld.) operation. Anything I could do to keep Price (Nfld.) operating I would do, but I reserve the right, Mr. Speaker, to see that that company operates in a way that is in the better interest of this Province. And I see evidence, Mr. Speaker, and I can bring every member of this House into positions and show them, show them where you have to question the harvesting techniques of that company, and I believe we have a right to get up and point that out, Mr. Speaker, without being accused of being anti-socialist or being anti-development, driving away investment money.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Ludrigan), you know, as I pointed out a few days ago or a few minutes ago, ASARCO is perceived now as being poor corporate citizens, that they did indeed treat their employees rough and it took a couple of strikes to point out exactly what was going on in Buchans, one strike with violence. Based on that member's performance, Mr. Speaker, if anyone in the 1950's would have raised their voice and said, "Look, you know Price (Nfld.) is not acting in the better interests of this country", then he would have stood up and accused him of being unpatriotic and trying to drive out investment. We did not know what was going on in St. Lawrence, Mr. Speaker, what Alcan was doing until we read Dyin' Hard, and I suppose if somebody had wanted to stand up in the forties and fifties

MR. FLIGHT: and question and criticize the mode of operation of Alcan in St. Lawrence, then that member would have stood up and said, "You are unpatriotic. You are trying to drive out investment."

MR. R. MOORES: Good point, good point.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the member felt a desire to defend Paul Desmarais, now Paul Desmarais, Mr. Speaker, the great industrialist, the local boy got rich. I would not know Paul Desmarais, Mr. Speaker, if I fell over him there and I have no great desire to know Paul Desmarais. It seems to me that the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) marks his successes by reeling off names of people that he can associate with. Mr. Speaker, does anyone in this Province think that the student body, all our young people all over Newfoundland that will want to come to that university, could care two hoots whether Paul Desmarais is the chancellor or the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is the chancellor. I doubt if there are many Newfoundlanders today, adults and students, that could tell you, if you say the name Paul Desmarais, "Oh yes, that is the chancellor of Memorial University". I am not aware yet, Mr. Speaker, that the appointment of Paul Desmarais has had the effect of reducing the cost of education at that university. I am not aware that the appointment of Paul Desmarais has made it possible for hundreds and hundreds of young Newfoundlanders who could not afford to go to Memorial last year, I am not aware that his appointment had made it possible for those people to come into university now.

What the member for Grand Falls should be more concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is instead of getting up and singing the glories of Paul Desmarais, he should be worried about the ability of the thousands



MR. FLIGHT: of young Newfoundlanders who cannot any longer go to that university.

MR. NEARY: But 'Desmarais' has become his God-father of late

MR. FLIGHT: What he should be doing is talking about one of the issues that he raised in Grand Falls when he wanted to get elected, the regional college. It is more important, I tell you, it is a bigger concern in Central Newfoundland, in his district, that we have a regional college there so that our young people in Central Newfoundland could afford to go to first and second, third year university than there is about who is the chancellor of Memorial University, Paul Desmarais!

Mr. Speaker, if the member of Grand Falls (Mr. Ludrigan) wants to talk about creating employment in this Province, he would better advised instead of defending the great corporate citizen, Abitibi Price, instead of defending Paul Desmarais, he would be better advised to deliver on the promise that he made year after year that there would be an expansion to the Central Newfoundland Hospital. He would be better advised to deliver on that one, where it took the Premier a year after he was elected and before he was elected, and the Premier said, "Yes, there will be an expansion. This is not a flippant political promise. This is not the kind of a promise a member can make and get away with." He went in and made a commitment to the Board of Directors of the Grand Falls Hospital. That would have the effect of creating some work in Central Newfoundland, the expansion of Central Newfoundland Hospital. His constituents are more concerned about his performance in that area than they are in his defending Desmarais or his defending

MR. FLIGHT: Abitibi Price or the big conglomerates in this country. His constituents are concerned about his ability to deliver the road work, Bishop Falls - Grand Falls, that he announced and all the Ministers of Transportation at the time announced would get a priority under the new DREE subsidiary agreement,

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. FLIGHT: Right! That would have the effect, if done, of creating some jobs in Central Newfoundland, in Grand Falls, Bishop Falls, Windsor, his area, the area in Newfoundland that he represents. He would be better advised delivering that but no, Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) is not interested in delivering on those kind of things, on the materialistic things that would have the effect of creating jobs in his constituency. he is more interested in getting up and making great speeches about what a great contribution

MR. FLIGHT: Paul Desmarais has it made now that he is the Chancellor of the university.

MR. NEARY: Tell them about Great West Life. that is the only contribution they -

MR. FLIGHT: What a great corporate citizen Abitibi Price is after seventy-five years.

MR. MORGAN: You are being brainwashed.

MR. FLIGHT: Ah, Mr. Speaker, come into Grand Falls and the minister will see who is getting brainwashed on this issue. Come into Grand Falls and we will see who is getting brainwashed on this particular issue, Mr. Speaker. How much time do I have left 'Steve'?

MR. NEARY: Six minutes.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, and I do not pretend to be an expert on the fisheries but I want to mention this.

MR. MORGAN: What are you doing -

MR. NEARY: Do not be free loading boy.

MR. FLIGHT: There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that the fishery is now and is becoming more and more the backbone of the Newfoundland economy. But, Mr. Speaker, I can reel off some towns again that are not very dependent on the fishery and will not benefit very much by a good fishery unless we change the concept of fishery development. I want to hear the minister - Unless we look at the possibility of processing our - First off let it be said right now that unless we get full processing in this Province, as long as we are shipping out the raw resource the way we are now, forget the employment contribution that fisheries will make to Newfoundland apart from the fishermen who are catching the fish. And if the fishery is going to be the backbone of this Province, as the minister indicates it will be and I believe it can be, then we have to look at the concept of having processing plants, maybe in towns in Central Newfoundland,

MR. FLIGHT: You know, Gander, Grand Falls, Badger, Buchans, Deer Lake, even Corner Brook, Glenwood, Clarendville, Springdale. A lot of Newfoundlanders live in those town who will not benefit from a fisheries boom unless we can look at the concept of having processing plants and that kind of thing, even inland in Newfoundland. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the minister that there is a polarization, he might not have picked it up yet, building up in Newfoundland against the fishery. We are seeing 160 men laid off in Buchans in two months, Mr. Speaker, the bulk of those men are fishermen and they are in their forties, who left New World Island, the Cottle's Islands, and the Whale's Gulches and the Bridgeports and went to Buchans because they could not make a living at that time in the fishery, and they did not want to go on welfare. They went to work and they went in the mines for ten years. And now they are losing their jobs in the mines.

It is as natural as the air they breathe for those men to believe that they can go back to the fishery. Why not? They were fishermen until they were thirty years old, and good fishermen. What happens? No licence. The one job that they could - talk about creating jobs, Mr. Speaker, the one job that Newfoundlanders on the shady side of thirty-five who went into the logging operations in this Province, who went into the mines - because if they had the wherewithal, the educational standards and the rest they would not have gone into the mines, they went into the mines because they were not that well equipped to go into any other sectors of the economy, and now, Mr. Speaker, believing that they have a right to go back to the fishery they cannot get into the fishery.

And there is another issue here, Mr. Speaker, too. It is with regard to licencing and the Province should have some input into this.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is what your friend -

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. FLIGHT:

The Province should have some input in this and I tell you now, Mr. Speaker, we have fishermen demanding the sole - they do not want people going out and catching fish other than bona fide licenced fishermen and I contend we are seeing the thin and the wedges. It started with the lobster, the salmon and now it is the cod and it will go on down to a point where one day the only people who will be able to fish, jig a fish in Newfoundland, if the trend goes, is a bona fide licenced fisherman. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is going to be the case you watch the polarization. We have farmers in this Province making a living trying to grow vegetables. Well I contend, Sir, it is no more unfair to say to a fisherman, "Buddy boy, you can fish for six months a year and make \$18,000 but you are not coming in and growing vegetables in your back garden because we have some guy in Codroy or Grand Falls or Wooddale who is trying to make a living growing vegetables."

So, Mr. Speaker, there is a danger here. If we do not look at what is happening here in this Province you could get an awful backlash in the fishery. The people of Newfoundland believe and appreciate what is happening in the fishery. But there is a danger. Every Newfoundlander has got a God given right and if you want to look for grounds for revolt, I do not care where he is living, if he is living in Badger or Buchans or Hant's Harbour, if you want to look for a basis for revolt you allow a situation to develop where a Newfoundlander born and bred is told he cannot go out and jig a fish. And Mr. Speaker, I believe that, as I say I do not want to stand up here and pretend that I am expert on the fishery, I am not an expert on the fishery, I was born in a fishing community, I know a little bit about it but I know the trend that we are looking at right now with the fisheries becoming the exclusive right of the bona fide fishermen who received a licence,

May 9, 1979

Tape No. 1180

NM - 4

MR. FLIGHT: and if we ever get to a point where that is where it ends then, Mr. Speaker, there will be all kinds of demands made on fishermen. They will not be able to go in the woods and cut wood in the off season, they will not be able to grow vegetables because they will be encroaching on somebody else's right.

MR. G. FLIGHT: to make a living. They will not be able to grow a little savoury in the back garden they will have to buy it from the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). And I think that is a danger, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: He will be the only one with a license.

MR. G. FLIGHT: One quick word, Mr. Speaker, I am running out of time and there are other things I want to say. To the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Power); I believe, Mr. Speaker, that when we run out of our renewable resources and, I suppose, it is possible to visualize the forestry one day, when the electronic field of this world is developed to a point, we may run out of the need for newspaper. If we get instances like they are talking about, the developments in the electronic field that will make newspapers obsolete - you got T.V. and everything being flashed around and that kind of thing, it might be down the road but it could happen. We could make a breakthrough in plastic, I suppose, that would replace paper. Well, if that were to happen, Mr. Speaker, I believe we only have two or three real, guaranteed resources, one is the fishery, another one is tourist development.

And in ending, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Minister of Tourism that he should listen very much to what Mr. Vic Young, Chairman of Hydro, is saying. Because when you look at hydro development, it is a funny thing about it, Mr. Speaker, when we want to develop the hydro potential of this Province we have to look at the very part of Newfoundland that is most valuable to us from a tourism development area. I am not going to get into that now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to save that for a little later. I am going to end this. I have two minutes left and I am just simply going to end it, Sir, by saying that I will support the resolution, I will vote for it.

MR. G. FLIGHT: But, Mr. Speaker, it matters little whether I vote for it or vote against it. The government will bring in their numbers and by brute force they will carry this vote. But in so doing, in voting against this resolution what they will be doing is confirming once again for all the people of Newfoundland that under their stewardship they could not care - it does not matter to them that under their stewardship the unemployment rate went from 6 per cent to 18 per cent, under their stewardship thousands of our young Newfoundlanders are flocking away from this Province going everywhere West. It does not matter to them, they will still vote against this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to end, Mr. Speaker, by saying this, that the employment job development policies of this government has been disastrous to Newfoundland. And, Mr. Speaker, insofar as job development is concerned, this administration for the past five years has been a curse on this Island. Thank you.

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

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on this motion to set up a select committee to roam around the Province and to talk to the people about unemployment. And, of course, I see the resolution as being good just only to generate debate. I think that is the only purpose it is going to serve because it is a poor attempt, from what I have heard in the last number of Wednesdays, to do anything about the unemployment problem.

From where I stand, of course, this kind of thing is just basically a political move. It is good for the Opposition to want to get around the Province and say a few things. But I am going to vote against it, as the rest of our members have stated, basically because, of course, it is not going to address the problem. I think if we take a look at what we are doing, which I shall delve into a little later,



MR. W. HOUSE: I think we have been making great efforts in resolving the unemployment problems and we have been, I am sure, interfacing with the people who count in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to address something to a study that was done last year and it was brought in, I think, when I was Minister of Labour and Manpower and I am going to talk a little bit about the NDP on this particular one and its counterpart or another one of its arms, the Canadian Labour Congress and the Newfoundland Federation of Labour in the context of this thing now that we have burned our boats. They set out, last year as a wing of the NDP, to say that they were going to resolve the unemployment problems in Newfoundland. They were going to put a human face on the problem and they were going to come up with some - of course, at the first part of it they said they were going to come up with some resolution and tell people what to do.

By the end of it, Mr. Speaker, when it was all said and done they did put a human face on it. They went around and talked to people and they came up exactly with what I knew - I knew of course that there was some unemployment in some areas, some severe unemployment in areas like the Stephenville area - but they failed to come up with any solutions. They made a few airy generalities, pious platitudes and so on about capitalism not working, and we have to get into, of course, public ownership of industries and so on and that would resolve our problems. At the end of it they said it was not their mandate to come up with solutions and it shows me, of course, that they have no solutions. That is the NDP and in this case their arm, the Canadian Labour Congress. They did not even make a token attempt, Mr. Speaker, to solve the unemployment problems. They even had that printed in Ottawa. They did not even use the printing plants we have in the Province. So they have no ideas it seems to me, with

May 9, 1979

Tape No. 1181

DW - 4

MR. W. HOUSE: all due respect to the people who  
did the study, they have no ideas how to resolve what they  
say is a massive problem.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Also we have heard speeches from the Opposition in the last month or so, every Wednesday, and I have yet to hear any suggestions, apart from a few specious ones, as to how to resolve the problem if indeed there is the massive problem that we are talking about. So both -

MR. FLIGHT:

It is eighteen per cent.

MR. W. HOUSE: Eighteen per cent? I will deal with that one a little later. So both the Liberals and the NDP do not have any clues as to what to do about it and it is a very important topic. I do not want to sound facetious or to pontificate on the problem, but we have to look at Newfoundland in the historical context and look at these great days that the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) was talking about when we had 8 per cent unemployment. If you go back to 1970 that is what was talked about, we had 8 per cent unemployment. And today they are saying we have 17 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have got to recognize is what are we comparing when we say it was 8 per cent a few years ago. Look, Mr. Speaker, when it was 8 per cent we had 126,000 people working in this Province, when it was 8 per cent unemployment, or a participation rate of 138,000 for only 42 per cent of the population over fifteen years of age. Today in the work force 52 per cent of the people over fifteen years of age are counted and we have brought about, I think it is something in the vicinity of 45,000 jobs in a seven year period, a larger percentage of our people working than ever before. And I think you can go throughout this Province right now, and particularly in the outports, and you will find that the standard of living is higher than ever before.

So what we are saying is, you know, we are foing with figures and that first preamble stating, "Whereas the employment is doubled", is just a misrepresentation; it is no such thing. There never was a bigger percentage of our people working than are working now and also our welfare rolls are down. Now I can give

MR. W. HOUSE:

you just a little classic example of what has happened. I will take the community in my district of Jackson's Arm, which is a very proud community, that had a fair amount of work going on years ago but only the men were working and I would say at any time during the year there were no more than twenty people in that community unemployed. So the unemployment rate in the community was not very high. Last year we had a booming fishery there where everybody was working, there were about seventy or eighty women working in the plant from the beginning of May right up until November and then they became eligible for unemployment insurance and they became a statistic. The unemployment in that area looked as if it were about 70 or 80 per cent but look how wealthy the people were in correspondence to the time when there was no unemployment. So this is where these figures are not telling the truth.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the Opposition get up and say, "It was great when we were in power. Look, we only had 8 per cent and now it is 17 per cent", we have to look at these facts as a misrepresentation as far as I am concerned. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another thing that I have got to present to the Opposition which I am sure a lot of people do not know. The member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) spoke to us today and he mentioned about the young people having to leave the Province. And the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) yesterday, in discussing the Labrador Linerboard talked about the great numbers of people who went out of the Province. Well let us take a look at what has happened, because I am comparing when you were in power and we are in power; I want to look at the previous ten years, from 1961 to 1971, and see what happened. We had a resettlement programme and it certainly was not only a resettlement programme within the Province.

MR. FLIGHT:

We have one now.

MR. W. HOUSE: It was a resettlement programme that went out of the Province, went far afield. Mr. Speaker, from 1961 to 1971 the net outward migration in this Province was 33,700 people who

MR. W. HOUSE:

in that ten year period left this Province. Now I do not know the number of workers there, but you can assume that a lot of them were young people and young married couples, and I would hazard to say

MR. W. HOUSE: that at least there was 20,000 workers. That is another way, Mr. Speaker, to keep down your unemployment, just send them out of the Province.

Now, I have not got full statistics on what has happened in the last number of years, but from 1971 until 1976, which was a five year period that we have got statistics on, the net outward migration from this Province was 1,850. And you can say perhaps in that time only about a thousand of these were workers. Now, that is statistics that I have gathered from the Department of Manpower. So, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is you can keep your unemployment rate down if you send them all out of the Province or if they can not get a job to become a statistic. So what I have said there then, I think we have done remarkably well in the last number of years. Also that we have just got a net outward migration in the first five years of this regime of only 1,850 says two things, that the opportunities are drying up in Canada. You can not go to Toronto and get jobs. We have got to find the jobs home and by virtue of the fact that we found 42,000 jobs is manifestation of the great work that we have done.

The other thing, of course, why people stayed home is because they did see some opportunity and of course this Government offered to free them, let Newfoundlanders enjoy and they wanted to stay home. Perhaps that is the other reason too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I was Minister of Labour and Manpower it use to hurt me certain times in the month when the statistics from Ottawa would come out talking about the unemployment rate in Newfoundland. And the member for Terra Nova (Mr. T. Lush), who is not here this afternoon, spokesman for labour was always talking about it every time the release came out about the terrible situation in the Province, about the drastic unemployment and so on. And of course he stated emphatically time after time that it was totally a provincial responsibility the people that we

MR. W. HOUSE: have unemployed. Mr. Speaker, obviously there is some role that the Province has to play, and I think we have played it well, but basically the real problem with unemployment, that is permanent unemployment, is the fact of course of fiscal policy, federal fiscal policy, transportation policy, tariffs and so on. You know, Mr. Speaker, we are a great boon to the centralist Canada. We are the Province that buys just about everything that we use and consume from central Canada and just about everything we produce is sent out of the Province and that is good for Canada. But their centralist policy, of course, and their tariff policy does not allow us to have our goods refined before it goes out and consequently we do not have these labour intensive industries. I believe we need a better federal policy to create more jobs in this Province.

I was talking to a friend of mine a couple of days ago who was in farming and he had to import a ton of hay. The ton of hay cost him forty-five dollars to buy. It cost him sixty dollars to get it transported. Now, that shows, of course, how the user-pay or the transportation policy mitigates against development in this Province. That shows why people do not invest in the Province is because of these federal policies.

MR. HOUSE: It looks like in Newfoundland everything we buy we buy at retail and everything we sell we sell at wholesale and we pay freight both ways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is this resolution asking us? I said I am not going to support it because what I have said of the preambles. The preambles are not telling the truth anyway, but basically we are doing what the resolution says. We are doing what the resolution says. We are working with business associations, we are working with interest groups, we are working with the unions. Mr. Speaker, we have thirty or forty rural development associations across this Province that are funded by the department at least to the extent where they get a development officer. These groups are the key people all across Newfoundland who are interfacing continuously with the various departments - Rural Development, Forestry, Agriculture, Fisheries, Industrial Development. We have fishery associations, farming associations and that is where we are getting our input, These are the people who are determining what is good to be going on in the communities around, what we can do for employment. These are the people and these are the ones we are working with and we have put a lot of programs in place.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why our taxes are so high today is because we are picking up some slack that the federal government should be doing. We are subsidizing firemen. We are subsidizing the fishery and we are subsidizing the rural development programs, so I think we are doing a lot. We are looking at the cost-benefit of what we are doing and I am sure we are making progress.



MR. HOUSE: For instance, look at Labrador Linerboard mill which we are debating now on the regular sittings of the House. One of the great things that this government had to do was to put some of these things that were thought up overnight onto a sound business proposition. We know that Labrador Linerboard mill had to close. It had to close because it was not a success as linerboard, it could not be, and it had to suffer a little bit of what I call an industrial crucifixion. It had to get worse before it got better. We are putting it on a sound basis now. It is going to be built on rock now rather than the sand that it was built on by the Liberals in those days. The same thing is going to happen to the refinery and, Mr. Speaker, we get that going along with the fishery and our rural development programs, I think we are in for a good future in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) tear it down to build it.

MR. HOUSE: They had to tear it down to get it built.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to use up the time of 45 minutes today because I think I am only going to repeat what other people have to say, particularly those in the resource departments.

I think we are on the road to rapid recovery and I am happy to see some of the things that are happening. Look at the fishery, for instance. I heard the other day where the fishery, and I guess the minister will speak to this when he talks on this resolution, the fishery has increased by 40 per cent - that is, the number of people involved. Romeo LeBlanc, the minister in

MR. HOUSE: Ottawa, says, "Well, we cannot let that continue because, of course, it is going to upset their plans". Well, I say that we have to get all the people in the fishery that we can. We have to make sure that we are the ones who can exploit the total fishery around this Province and I give the minister all the credit that I can for his stand when he was in Central Canada the other day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: We have taken issues that have been unpopular. One of the things that was unpopular was the closing down of the mill, but it was necessary. It was not politically good at the time, but it was realistic and it was honest and I think that is the way we have to go in this Province and that is the way we are going and I believe we will see, we can boast in an era when Canada itself is in a recession that our welfare rolls are down. And there is a large number of people over fifteen years of age in the work force at least reasonably and when the outward migration is not so pronounced we have given positive leadership and I think a direction that will see a better future for this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to cease  
from

MR. W. HOUSE:

speaking any further. I will vote against the resolution because I believe we are doing a much better job than a select committee can do. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in connection with the present motion. I would like to congratulate the government for the stand that was taken some time ago in connection with the close down of the Linerboard mill. It was regrettable that such action had to be taken but in order for things to cool off and to make an assessment of what resources were available this action was very necessary and as a result of that action we have today one of the greatest companies in the pulp and paper industry in Canada now about to set up operation. I am sure that it is going to be most successful. What we have to remember is that we on this side of the world are living in a market economy and we cannot lean too far towards the socialist theories. It is just beyond the scope and the role of government to operate business and I think possibly the taking over of that mill was, in my opinion, a bit of a mistake.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: Possibly that mill should have been let go the course of any business that is in trouble and that would be to go into receivership and, as I said before, we are living in a market economy, a buyer would come forward and would take the thing in hand and make it operate. I think that we should live and operate in a market economy and governments should operate on a limited government-private property concept. With all its shortcomings the market system is the only one that seems to operate.

So I am quite sure now that with the Abitibi Company at the helm the Linerboard mill in Bay St. George will be a huge success. I can appreciate the hardships and the anxieties of the people out there when that mill closed because I happen to represent a district that found itself in the same position when the United States

MR. PATTERSON:

Naval Base phased out. For years I had advocated that -

AN HON. MEMBER: But it is not phased out, it is still there.

MR. PATTERSON: Well, it went from 4,000 down to 1,000-or down to 113, rather. So I would consider that a phase out. For many, many years I kept needling the government that preparation should be made for that day and I kept constantly reminding them that we were depending on the whims of a foreign Congress and that is not a very good, sound basis for any community to base its economy on. But nevertheless we went through those dark days down there and the people adjusted themselves to it. Many went back to the fishery. So much so that the fishery is booming, it is flourishing down there today. I do not think that we need a commission to delve into the unemployment problem in Newfoundland. I think what the government must do is create the climate and once the proper climate is created businessmen will come in because capital stays where it is well treated. Once you start nationalizing and confiscating businesses and taking them over for government to run within a very -

MR. NEARY: Like the Churchill Falls Corporation.

MR. PATTERSON: That could be cited as one. I am not going to be a capitalist today and a socialist tomorrow. I believe in the free enterprise system with all its shortcomings.

So I think that the role of the government should be to provide technology and the marketing system, funding where necessary providing there is equal equity on the part of the company. So I am delighted now that the Abitibi Company is in charge of that mill out in Stephenville and I am sure

MR. PATTERSON: the people out there are very happy  
and things should be very well for them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: It is our turn, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not see anybody standing.

MR. MORGAN: No. Nobody on your side wants  
to speak. It is your motion. Nobody speaks on it from your  
side.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention  
to speak on this resolution this afternoon but a question asked  
this afternoon by the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde  
(Mr. F. Rowe) to which I was not able to provide an answer prompted  
me to say these few words because the subject matter, Mr. Speaker,  
of the question having to do, of course, with the contents of the  
speech that I made in Calgary on Monday, having to do again with  
jurisdiction of our fisheries, I think is one of the key factors,  
for example, in the development of our fisheries. I think we all  
agree that the development of our fisheries is going to play a key  
factor in the future social and economic progress of our Province.

The hon. member I think mentioned  
licencing, or at least one of the members opposite, the matter  
of licencing of inshore fishermen and he prophesied that in the  
not too distant future it might well be that a person living in  
Newfoundland would not be able to catch a few fish for his own  
table without first having obtained a licence from Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that if that day ever does come I think that  
it is going to be a very sad day for Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders,  
because the right to be able to go out in your boats and to catch  
a few fish certainly that is part of our heritage and we should not  
stand by and allow Ottawa, the present or future governments, to do

MR. W. CARTER: anything that would have the effect of jeopardizing that very basic right of the average Newfoundlander.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member this afternoon I think referred to as shameful certain comments that I made in Calgary when I dared stand up in front of the elitists of Canada in terms of the fishing industry, that is the Fisheries Council of Canada, and make known the Province's position with respect to jurisdiction. I make no apology, Mr. Speaker, for my comments. In fact, I am serving notice now on the hon. member opposite and the Opposition that I shall take advantage of every opportunity I get to point out the importance of Newfoundland getting more jurisdiction in terms of our fishery resource. For example, he made reference to the fact that the other provinces, and he named them, the provinces of British Columbia, PEI, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and he said how come that these provinces appear to be operating on a different wave length, that they are not tuned in with the Newfoundland position? Well, of course, that question more appropriately should be addressed to the ministers representing these provinces. I am not certainly going to presume to be able to answer for their actions or their words in Calgary but I should point out that the attitude of some of the provinces did come as a surprise to me because - and I am not going to name the provinces for obvious reasons but it is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that certain gentlemen, certain of these people are inclined sometimes to want to run with the hares and hunt with the hounds, as the saying goes, and they say one thing in private and then when it comes to getting on the news media, or standing up in public they appear to take different positions. And maybe if I were a Nova Scotian, Mr. Speaker, or a resident of PEI, or the other Maritime Provinces, it might well be that I would be reluctant to maybe fall in line with the Newfoundland

MR. W. CARTER: position. I contend that we had a special case in that we did bring to Confederation with us in 1949 eighty per cent of that which is now considered to be Canada's East Continental Shelf. That I think is something we cannot lose sight of, one fact we should not ignore.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will the minister yield?

MR. W. CARTER: I will yield in a moment if the hon. member does not mind, I believe that Newfoundlanders do have an historic right to the cod

MR. W. CARTER:

stocks within our waters. I can understand the reluctance maybe of a province like Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island or maybe to a lesser extent New Brunswick joining in the Newfoundland position but certainly, Mr. Speaker, that does not lessen the validity of the Newfoundland case and certainly I do not think that we should back away from that position. I do not think we should back away from the proposition that as Newfoundlanders we do have certain special rights. God knows we do not have too many rights, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the economy of Canada, the economy of the rest of Canada but we do have certain rights and I think it is incumbent on us as a government, certainly it is incumbent on me as a minister to protect those rights. I am at a loss, Mr. Speaker, to understand the attitude of some of my friends opposite and I am not saying all of them, but certainly some of them, certain other gentlemen in this province, who appear to be insulted if a Newfoundlander, if a Newfoundland minister dare to say anything that will have the effect maybe of offending somebody in Ottawa. I am at a loss, Mr. Speaker, to reconcile that kind of an attitude in this legislature, in this province. And there appears to be a feeling that is permeating the certain segments of our society that would have us get on our knees almost every single morning and give thanks to Uncle Ottawa for their benefits and the cheques that keep flowing into this province from the federal coffers, but, Mr. Speaker I do not think that the real role of a Newfoundland minister of the Crown, or a member of this legislature, or indeed of a Newfoundlander. I believe that we must stand up for the rights of our province, the rights of our people and in my view the jurisdictional over the fisheries, certain aspects of it, is one of the rights that we should enjoy as a province.

MR. S. NEARY:

Would the hon. member yield for me to ask a question? Just as a matter of curiosity, could the hon. gentleman tell me why the Fishery Council of Canada went inland to Calgary, which is a meat producing province, to hold a conference?



MR. NEARY:

Why did they not hold it in one of the provinces that is identified with the fisheries? Why go all the way out to Western Canada? Was there any reason for that, you know?

MR. W. CARTER: I can not answer

myself the same question, Mr. Speaker. Certainly for the benefit of my friends and my fellow Newfoundlanders, I think it is maybe a little consolation to know that it was not the weather that brought them to Calgary because it snowed there for the two days -

MR. NEARY: But I do not understand it. Why did they not go-

MR. W. CARTER: -most atrocious weather I think that I have seen. It would make our weather look like Florida weather.

MR. NEARY: If they went to B.C. or the Atlantic Provinces -

MR. W. CARTER: That is right

MR. NEARY: - you would understand it, but Calgary?

MR. W. CARTER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess the Fisheries Council of Canada is made up of people and in some cases a lot of them do strange things, that we do not agree with.

MR. NEARY: So you do not know the reason for it.

MR. W. CARTER: That is right. Mr. Speaker, I will get back to what he said a moment ago that certainly I do not think we should ever apologize for demanding our rights, demanding that we do have greater<sup>a</sup> say in the further destiny of our province, our fishermen. I am not so sure that a fisherman on the northeast coast of our province or on the northwest coast of our province, the lobster fishermen, should have to go, cap in hand, to some Federal bureaucrat to endeavour to get a license in order for him to make a living, to support his family. It seems to me rather ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, that jurisdiction, for example, in the matter of the licensing of our domestic fleet should be vested in the hands of the Federal government, in the Federal bureaucracy. In my travels around the province, and I do it quite extensively, I find that at least nine out of ten fishermen that I talk with, they come to me with a problem that concerns the Federal

MR. W. CARTER:

government, problems for which they can not get answers or resolutions from the Federal authorities. I believe that we as a government, as a province are much better able to know what the fishermen want, certainly in terms of the domestic licensing than the bureaucrats sitting on the banks of the Rideau Canal in Ottawa. I do not think that we should ever apologize for trying to change that system. I do not think that we should ever accept as being shameful any minister of the Crown who would go to Calgary, or indeed anywhere else, and put that position forward.

MR. W. CARTER:

One of the gentlemen opposite, I think, Mr. Speaker talked about secondary processing, at least the labour intensive - ness of secondary processing in fishery. Of course, that has got to be our objective. I do not think any Newfoundlander gets any real charge out of the proposition that we appear to be still the proverbial hewers of wood and drawers of water. I think our objective, by one means or another, by every device possible, our objective must be to encourage further processing of our raw material. That, Mr. Speaker, is now taking place in some areas. It is being encouraged, for example, by the provision of financial assistance by government under the various plans that we now have in place. I can name just two, for example, two or three in the fisheries and that is the government's recently announced deficiency guarantee program. And that is a program whereby fish plant operators, entrepreneurs in the fishing industry who want to modernize or expand or diversify their fishery, their fish processing operation, can get a government guarantee for loans that they might require to undertake these improvements. We have another program to assist the smaller plant operators whereby a small plant operator today who wants to get equipment to allow him to do certain secondary processing can now come to the government and get a loan up to \$150,000 at a very favourable interest rate. And, of course, I can not forget the Fisheries Loan Board, that is all part of the overall scheme of things, which in 1978-79 that loan board made available to our fishermen, Mr. Speaker, by way of loans, \$47 million, \$47 million against \$9 million in the previous year, an increase of - what? - over 400 percent, 500 percent, at 3-1/2 percent interest. That is one of the programs that I think this government must be very, very proud. And one that is certainly having a very dramatic effect on the development of the fishing industry. For example, the \$47 million that we gave out in loans in 1978-79, for the money spent on new boats alone, Mr. Speaker, would account for the provision of an additional 2,000 jobs in the harvesting sector of the fishing industry. And, of

MR. W. CARTER:

course, 2,000 jobs in the harvesting sector, and I do not know what the exact multiplier is but I think you would probably talk in terms of 2.5:1 so you are talking maybe - what? - an extra four or five thousand jobs in the processing sector. So in that particular area alone, and that is, of course, in the inshore sector of the fishery, in 1978-79 by virtue of the assistance made available under the Fisheries Loan Board and other programmes, and I should add by virtue of the initiative that is shown by a lot of fellow Newfoundlanders in the fishing industry, four, five or six thousand additional jobs were provided in 1978-79. I was rather surprised, Mr. Speaker, that today there was not a question put to me by the Opposition with respect to the present situation in the lobster fishery. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, and I was here this afternoon when the Question Period took place, it seems to me that an industry that is going to be responsible for putting five or six or seven million dollars into the economy this year, one that at the present time is rather shaky because of certain things that are happening, it seems to me that that question deserved - at least that problem deserved a question today from the House, when in fact my friend opposite, who is the critic on fisheries, the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) elected to ask a question that has very little relevance in terms of the present day problems in the fishing industry and chose to ignore completely the problems facing our lobster fishermen.

MR. FLIGHT:

It was asked yesterday.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have had meetings - maybe I can spend a moment on that subject because it is important - I have had meetings and discussions today with various people concerning the lobster fishery and I am finding that

MR. W. CARTER:

even though, Mr. Speaker, it is a well known fact that the union negotiates by way of a collective bargaining process, it is the union's responsibility to negotiate prices to the fishermen. I think in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, that we are fortunate, in fact we are the envy now of the other Atlantic Provinces, envied because of the fact that we do have a very aggressive and a very well organized Fishermen's Union in this Province. That union has been working as hard as it can, Mr. Speaker, to negotiate a price for lobster from the various lobster buyers and there are four or five or six buyers in the Province. It is interesting to point out that about 70 per cent of the total lobster production, Mr. Speaker, goes to three or four companies, the National Sea-Nickerson group, the UMF, the Hopkins consortium. These four companies are responsible for purchasing about 80 per cent, between 70 and 80 per cent of the lobsters produced by our fishermen. These people have been unwilling to agree to a price for the lobster being paid fishermen. We all know of course that the price being paid at the opening of the season was around \$1.70 or \$1.80 a pound and that price has since dropped to \$1.50 a pound.

There have been charges, and I believe in the House yesterday, charges were made that maybe there is some hanky-panky taking place, maybe price fixing. It might well be that these four giants, as it were, in the lobster business are guilty of maybe a breach of the Combines Act but certainly guilty of price fixing to the detriment of our Newfoundland fishermen. I have my own suspicions, Mr. Speaker, and I am not prepared now to say what they are or to make a definitive statement on this, but I have my suspicions that maybe the companies are guilty of manipulation. I know that in previous years they were guilty of it and I have no reason to think that they have changed their style since that time. I believe it is quite possible that these large companies are in fact manipulating the market and in so doing affecting the price that is being paid to fishermen.

MR. HODDER: Would the hon. member allow a question?

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, of course.

MR. HODDER: These companies, these four large companies, if you suspect that they are guilty of price fixing, what I would like to ask the minister is, you know, how come these companies still receive licenses in this Province? This was the tenor of my remarks yesterday and I did make them because I have suspected that as well and the minister does hold the power to take their licenses and I think that is a very strong power and perhaps one that should be exercised.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I shall exercise that power if my suspicions are confirmed, if it can be shown to me beyond doubt that these companies are guilty of price fixing or manipulating the fishermen I can tell you now, and I serve notice on them through this House and through the press, that I will have their licenses revoked before they get the chance to know what happened to them. I will not hesitate for one moment, not one second, to revoke the license of any company that is guilty of manipulating the fishermen of our Province or fixing prices to the detriment of our fishermen and I shall do that, Mr. Speaker, if I have to whenever the time arrives.

I serve notice too, Mr. Speaker, that next year, in light of what has happened, Mr. Speaker, in the past three or four years that I am getting a little sick and tired of going through this exercise every single year, having to look in behind corners and finding out exactly what is going on and are they in fact price fixing, are they manipulating prices, depressing prices for their own benefit, I am getting a little sick and tired of it. Last year we went through that exercise. I had to take certain measures last year. But, Mr. Speaker, I am serving notice now, Sir, that in future, at least as long as I am minister in this department and have

MR. W. CARTER: the right and the authority to issue licences, that in future there will be no licence issued to any buyer of lobster unless that buyer, Mr. Speaker, agrees to pay the negotiated union price.

MR. NEARY: \$2.00 a pound.

MR. W. CARTER: That company, Mr. Speaker, in future any company who gets a licence from us to purchase lobster from our fishermen will first have to satisfy me and my department that they are prepared to sit down with our union and negotiate a firm price for their lobster if they are going to buy, and to stick with that price. That will be a condition of getting a licence to purchase lobster in Newfoundland for our Newfoundland fishermen. And then and only then, Mr. Speaker, can we be sure that our fishermen will get the price that the market can bear and not the price that maybe is being manipulated and depressed by certain people whose motives are often quite questionable. And I question the motives of some of these people today. And I said a moment ago that if I can find out for sure, and if the investigation that I have launched, Mr. Speaker, proves beyond doubt these companies are in fact price fixing or playing footsie with the fishermen and the market well then they will lose their licence before they get a chance to know what happened to them.

MR. NEARY: It is too bad there is no way they can hear you saying that. We could certainly make television today.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, whether we make television is unimportant.

MR. NEARY: It is important. The warning in the House. The warning is out, the warning signals are up.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I could speak at length, I suppose, on what is happening in fisheries. I intend later during the session to maybe initiate a debate on the fisheries development of our Province and our plans. Certainly I am hoping that the House will allow us the chance to lay our plans out, as it were, and to outline in

MR. W. CARTER: some detail some of the things that we intend to do in 1979-1980.

MR. MCNEIL: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. W. CARTER: Yes.

MR. MCNEIL: Would the minister bring us up to date on what is happening on the cold storage units that are proposed across the Province?

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, Last November in our Fishery Development Seminar we announced then plans to provide additional cold storage capability in the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Three.

MR. W. CARTER: No, we announced two actually at that time; one on the Northeast Coast of our Province, a facility that was estimated to cost around \$3 million or \$3.5 million. And one on the West Coast of our Province at about the same price. I did not want to be caught up, Mr. Speaker, in the bind of the problem of trying to find out or at least to decide where these facilities wanted to go.

MR. NEARY: Especially before a leadership.

MR. W. CARTER: We commissioned an engineering firm, Mr. Speaker, to take a look at the Northeast Coast and at the West Coast and to recommend to me sights where these facilities should be built.

MR. NEARY: Are they picked now?

MR. W. CARTER: That study is now about completed. I have not yet received the final report.

MR. NEARY: Any indication of where they are going?

MR. W. CARTER: There will be one facility built on the Northeast Coast.

MR. NEARY: Where?

MR. W. CARTER: Where I am not prepared to say. And of course one on the West Coast of the Province.

MR. NEARY: In Port aux Basques?



MR. W. CARTER: That, of course, Mr. Speaker, will supplement the Argentinia facility that my hon. friend from Placentia is very proud of and rightly so, having worked with us on that -

MR. NEARY: Who is going to operate that facility at Argentinia?

MR. W. CARTER: That facility in Argentinia will be operated by a private Newfoundland company whose business it is to operate public cold storage.

MR. NEARY: Who is that?

MR. W. CARTER: I think it is Harvey and Company. They will do it for the government.

MR. NEARY: Will they be paid a management fee or what?

MR. W. CARTER: It will be on a straight business operation.

MR. NEARY: Commission basis or management fee?

MR. W. CARTER: On a commission basis. On a commission basis, yes.

MR. NEARY: No management fees?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting things that is certainly encouraging from where I sit, I think from where all of us sit, to witness is the interest being shown by Canadian investors in this Province. And a moment ago we talked about the two cold storage facilities.

MR. NEARY: You are not surprised at that, are you?

MR. W. CARTER: The two cold storage facilities, initially it was our plan to build these facilities and maybe do as we are doing in Argentinia, allow at least a private company to administer the facility for the government on some kind of a commission or a management basis.

MR. NEARY: No tender call.

May 9, 1979

Tape No. 1190

NM - 4

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we did. We did in fact call tenders for the Argentia facility. We received a number of proposals, a number of which came from Central Canada.

MR. S. NEARY: And Harvey's was the best.

MR. W. CARTER: Harvey's, in our view, was a Newfoundland company. It had the best proposal in and we accepted it. But one of the interesting things that is happening is the fact that now we find that there are Upper Canadian companies, Canadians as far away as Toronto expressing an interest in coming into the Province to build public cold storage facilities. In fact, we have had an offer, Mr. Speaker, now from a certain mainland company, a large Central Canadian company, that is involved in that kind of business to come into the Province and start - I beg your pardon!

MR. S. NEARY: One of the food chains?

MR. W. CARTER: No, no. This is a -

MR. S. NEARY: A fish company.

MR. W. CARTER: No, no, not a fish company but a company that is solely involved in the provision of public cold storage. In the case of Ontario, I suspect it is not fish but wheat-or not wheat, but meat or some other produce that requires cold storage. But, Sir, any arrangement we make in this Province in that regard will be any facilities built will be built solely for the purpose of storage of fish. That is our main concern, of course. It has got to be. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of interest being shown in the Province in terms of fishery development. At the conference in Calgary a few days ago, I spoke to a gathering of 500 people, ministers from the other Atlantic Provinces spoke as well, but I think the record will show that all of the questioners, all of the questions from the floor were directed to the minister from Newfoundland because I think these people recognize that we do have a lot of potential in terms of fishery development and there is a good climate in this Province. We are, now, providing a very healthy climate to encourage private investors to come in here to spend money. In fact, in that regard I should point out to the House that in 1979 there are plans now on and off the drawing board, some have been completed, to spend in the fishing industry I would say close

May 9, 1979

Tape No. 1191

GH-2

MR. W. CARTER: to a hundred million dollars.

MR. NEARY: Private enterprise.

MR. W. CARTER: By private enterprise.

That will have the effect, Mr. Speaker,  
of increasing our through-put in the fishing industry of about 20 per cent.

MR. NEARY: You know about T. J. Hardy's big  
(inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER: Yes. That 20 per cent in the production  
in fisheries represents about 200 million pounds of codfish or at least  
fish, 200 million pounds of fish that would provide 2,000 man years of  
employment because for every million pounds of fish caught there are ten  
people employed on shore for a full year processing that fish. Every  
longliner on which we make a loan, Mr. Speaker, through our Fisheries Loan  
Board that employs five people and lands a million pounds of fish will  
provide not only jobs through the five crewmembers on board of that vessel  
but it will provide ten man years of employment for the people who work  
in the fish plants processing that fish. And when you say, of course, ten  
man years you are talking about twenty seasonal jobs, plus there are other  
spin-offs as well that are not included in that paper.

MR. NEARY: You might be interested in knowing  
that your boat has put ashore now close on two million pounds and that  
is only a matter of - what? - three months?

MR. W. CARTER: Now, there is a boat, a vessel that  
was built by the Fisheries Loan Board -

MR. NEARY: Good move.

MR. W. CARTER: - as an experiment that within the  
past month or two has, what, landed two -

MR. NEARY: Or less than three months, say.

MR. W. CARTER: - landed two million pounds of fish -

MR. NEARY: Close on two million pounds.

MR. W. CARTER: -that provides twenty full man-years of  
employment, employs five or six people on board. So, Mr. Speaker, you

MR. W. CARTER: talk about appointing a select committee to travel the Province to make notes and to listen about the various problems facing our unemployed. I am not sure that kind of an exercise is necessary. I think, Mr. Speaker, the time for talking is pretty well exhausted. I think we have gone through that exercise. There have been more studies. We had our select committees. I recall a few years ago we had a select committee going around the Province looking at the fishing industry and I am the first to admit that a lot of good came of that exercise but I think there is a time for talking, Mr. Speaker, and then there is a time for doing things. And I believe now that in this year of our Lord, 1979, that the time has come to do things and certainly I think this government has demonstrated now that we are in fact doers and not just talkers. I think in terms of the fishing industry, there has been a lot of activity, thanks again to the entrepreneurial skills of the people in the private sector, the daring and the initiative of our fishermen. A lot of things are happening, a lot of jobs are being provided

MR. W. CARTER: and I think Newfoundland is going to be much better off for it.

MR. F. ROWE: Do not forget the federal government's (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER: I give full marks, Mr. Speaker, to the federal government, but I must say here and now that the imposition of the 200-mile limit was not without some effort and some prodding on the part of a lot of Newfoundlanders and I am prepared to say now, Mr. Speaker, too and I hope that my friend from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), the great defender of Mr. LeBlanc and the Ottawa bureaucracy, the champion of the Ottawa toiling masses, I hope he is not too offended when I say that Mr. LeBlanc and his colleagues in Ottawa would never have declared the 200-mile limit except for two reasons, except for two reasons, Mr. Speaker. They withheld, they withstood all the pressure that was being applied on them from the fishing provinces and from others to apply the 200-mile limit and they came up with every conceivable excuse as to why they should not do it. In fact, I sat in the House of Commons one day and I listened to the Prime Minister make a statement that I could not believe, the most ridiculous statement, I suppose, ever uttered by a Prime Minister of Canada, when in reply to a question from some Atlantic province's M.P., Member of Parliament, he chastised the member for daring to suggest that Canada unilaterally declared a 200-mile limit. He went as far as to say that that kind of action could very well have the effect of setting off a third war. Can you imagine the Prime Minister of this country making that kind of a statement! And, of course, the people who are now in Ottawa by the way getting up and taking great credit and taking their bows for the 200-mile limit and the effect

MR. W. CARTER: it has had on the fishing industry are the same people who three or four years ago were up very, very loud in their condemnation of anyone who would dare suggest that Ottawa should declare unilaterally if possible or if necessary the 200-mile limit.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that they did not go far enough. Canada should have gone the full hog and gone out to the edge and the slopes of the Continental Shelf, and now the people who are saying that that cannot be done, and I hear it quite often, the minister in Ottawa and others say that we cannot do that because we are going to offend too many countries. These are the people who three years ago, four years ago, got up in the same place in the House of Commons and said, "We cannot declare a 200-mile limit", for the same reasons, and I do not buy that proposition. I do not buy the proposition, for example, that a country as we are should allow ourselves to be subjected to political blackmail by foreign countries who elect to act in a very irresponsible way in the area between our 200-mile and the edge of the Continental Shelf. I am not so sure, Mr. Speaker, that Canada should be so anxious to appease the Spaniards or the Portuguese or the Russians or the Cubans or the East Germans who, in many cases and in some of these countries at least, act in a very irresponsible way in terms of their fishing activity within the area between our 200-mile limit and the edge of the Continental Shelf. Our caplin stocks today, for example -

MR. NEARY: You cannot go wrong with that argument.

MR. W. CARTER: - our caplin stocks, Mr. Speaker, are, I suggest to you, on the verge of depletion by virtue of that fact, that they were given large quotas of caplin by the

MR. W. CARTER: federal government and they abused the rights they were given -

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. W. CARTER: - and the privileges and in many cases, Mr. Speaker, they were caught doubling their quotas. They were given a quota for a 100,000 tons and they were caught harvesting an amount twice that size. Now if these countries are going to act in that way and show such little regard for the need for good management and conservation of that resource, well then I think Canada should have the courage to kick them out and we can do that through very, very obvious means. We can impose certain economic sanctions on those countries. If Spain, for example, elects to be irresponsible beyond our 200-mile limit and unwilling, at least unwilling to co-operate and to adhere to certain well established principles and rules in terms of good management and conservation of the resource, well then the Spanish should be denied any quotas within the 200-mile limit, maybe even for all time. And there are other sanctions too that could be imposed on them. For example, we could, I am not suggesting we do that right now but if they elect again to ignore the rights of Canadians then I am sure that most Newfoundlanders would understand it if we were to deny the Spaniards access to our ports,



MR. W. CARTER:

and I am saying Spaniards for want of a better country. I suspect there are other countries that are equally guilty when it comes to abusing the resource and exceeding their quotas.

MR. NEARY: The Mainland boys are not (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER: I am not too concerned, Mr. Speaker, what the Mainland boys are saying or thinking. I believe -

MR. NEARY: No, I am talking about the Mainland trawlers and draggers.

MR. W. CARTER: Well, I give the minister by the way, in Ottawa some credit for his actions recently in declaring a buffer zone in the Province.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. W. CARTER: I do not think he has gone far enough and I think time will prove I am right. You can smile if you want to, but I think there are places in Newfoundland, in my riding, for example, where a fifty mile zone certainly would be more appropriate. There are places on the Northeast Coast where I would think fifty miles. There are places in the Province where three or four miles, of course, but I believe that they should establish buffer zones to protect the inshore fishermen and Canadian foreign trawlers should not be allowed to encroach in those areas.

MR. F. ROWE: And would you agree that it should be from headland to headland rather than (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER: Even that. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the minister in Ottawa has taken our advice and paid some attention to our pleas and our requests -

MR. NEARY: You were doing great now until you started talking politics.

MR. W. CARTER: - and say fit to at least go part of the way towards solving that very, very thorny situation and problem.

MR. F. ROWE: Keep out of the politics now.

MR. NEARY: Stay away from politics now and you will do all right. You were doing all right there for a while.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, that is about all I am going to say this time. Again I want to give full marks to my colleagues in Cabinet

MR. W. CARTER:

who have been very generous in terms of providing my department with necessary wherewithals to do the job that I think has to be done and the job that is obviously starting to pay off in terms of employment. I think today that contrary to the statistics that are being quoted with respect to unemployment - and I am not fool enough to pretend that we have suddenly reached the land of milk and honey, I know this is not utopia-but I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that things are coming along in the Province and I think those about to travel the coastal parts of our Province especially today can be encouraged by some of the things we see and hear. I think today our people, especially our rural Newfoundlanders living in our coastal communities - and this I think is where Newfoundland is, the 300 or 400 communities that dot the coastline that is real Newfoundland. And that is not meant to detract from our fellow Newfoundlanders who live in Corner Brook or Grand Falls or Gander or St. John's but I believe that is where Newfoundland is and I think that is where we are going to have to make it. I think certainly from what I see, I believe we are making some progress there because today Newfoundlanders in the coastal areas are, I think, better paid. They are given a chance to make a living from the fishery, some thing they like doing and are capable of doing and I think that the government should assess our role and one we are certainly in my view fulfilling.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the resolution, not that I am against committees travelling in the Province or having standing committees. I believe maybe there is, as our Premier has said, I think there is a very important role that can be played by standing committees of the House. In fact, I would strongly suspect that you are going to see a lot of committees or at least a lot more activity on the part of committees in future than you have in the past. I say, so be it. It is a good idea, an excellent idea. I think we have a lot of talent in this House on both sides that is goin to waste as it were because they are not given a chance to maybe do some of the things that they are quite capable and quite suited to do.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I again say that I am going to be voting against the resolution for the reasons I have given. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: It is a pity you did not win, boy.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, first in addressing myself to his particular resolution I would like to respond to some of the comments or perhaps follow along some of the comments that the Minister of Fisheries was making with regards to

MR. J. HODDER: the problem with the lobster fishermen in this Province. For some time now, and I will say this to the minister, that last year or the year before last the minister made a threat that if the lobster buyers in this Province did not justify the prices that they were paying the fishermen that he would take their licences.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was made during lobster season two years ago and I have never heard a follow up or any statement on that particular issue since. Now, Mr. Speaker, we do know that an independent came into this Province last year, he was brought in by the Fishermen's Union and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the Fishermen's Union seem to be doing more for the fishery in this Province than the provincial government, both in the getting of fair prices for fishermen and these prices have carried over into areas which are not represented by the Fishermen's Union and they have also done more for the fishermen in terms of marketing. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that this government must get into marketing.

Mr. Speaker, the lobster, last year a person came into this Province, he came in under controversy, he was brought in by the Newfoundland Food, Fish and Allied Workers and he was supposed to pay \$2.00 a pound. He promised \$2.00 a pound. And he promised that he would buy all the lobsters that was produced in this Province. Well, he did not make good on that, Mr. Speaker. He did not have I think the geographical knowledge, the knowledge of the fisheries, or perhaps the financing to do that. A funny thing happened in my district in that when I heard he was coming into Newfoundland I contacted him and I asked him would he be coming buying lobster at \$2.00 a pound in Port au Port as well as in Port au Choix, because most of the announcements I heard had come from that particular area. I had to explain to him first of all where Port au Port was, that it was a little triangle out on the West Coast and that it was a large lobster producing area and that we were hoping that it would be just as easy to collect lobster from there as from Port au Choix. So then

MR. J. HODDER: later I got in touch with one of his agents or one of his collectors in Port aux Basques, and I think maybe he did turn up in the district once, although I do not know for sure. But in the meantime there were three firms buying lobster in the district of Port au Port and, of course, I was on the local media saying that the man - he had promised me he would come - saying that he would be there, that I had had a promise from him and that he would have one of his collectors turn up. Just very bluff, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, me saying that over the local stations suddenly one of the smaller buyers in the area decided that they would put up their lobster. This was a buyer who sold to the American market through Air Canada, and really I suppose he could probably more easily put up the lobster, and the other place he sold was to the local inhabitants or the local people of Bay St. George. He put up his prices, I talked to a company by the name of Clearwater who is still buying out there, and I had asked them if they would be giving \$2.00 a pound as Mr. Snow was giving, which the Fishermen's Union had negotiated. They said, "You are crazy. You are nuts. We cannot afford that." But between the jigs and the reels and the publicity that Mr. Snow was getting across the Province, in an area of the Province where there was no union, all companies raised their prices to \$2.00 a pound. Suddenly this year the Fishermen's Union, there is no independent coming into the Province this year. There has been none announced. There has been no publicity. The fishing companies are off the hook. So the Fishermen's Union negotiated \$1.70 a pound for lobster. No one was in the district of Port au Port. Suddenly the prices started to fall. I think they did get \$1.80 or somewhere thereabouts on the first two or three days of the season and now we see the prices dropping again.

It is a strong feeling amongst the fishermen in my area and across this Province that if they were to collectively do something, and I guess the Fishermen's Union tried to do that in their

MR. J. HODDER: areas and I think perhaps it is a pity that the lobster fishermen of this Province cannot get together and keep their pots out of the water because I believe, Mr. Speaker, that lobster could be like caviar, if the fishermen were willing to hold the resource and if they could hold the resource and if we had the facilities in this Province to assist them in doing that until the markets are ripe then I think, Mr. Speaker, that the lobster fishermen in this

MR. HODDER:

Province could be getting as high as \$4 a pound because the lobster fishery is a very risky one and more and more people are getting out of the lobster fishery and getting into other types of fishery, and this means that a valuable resource, a group of people who could be earning a livelihood through that particular fishery are suddenly deciding to desert us because it is a risky fishery. And it is risky because every year two or three times the fishermen are wiped out. They lose their traps, they lose their gear. I must say if the minister did set up a program this year to replace this and to help it but I do not believe the program is nearly as large or as big as will be needed and I think that if we have a reoccurrence of the tragedy on the Southwest Coast and on the Northern Peninsula that we have had over the past three or four years, then we will find that the program which is the lobster trap bank which has been set up may not even supply a few communities but I do say it is a step in the right direction and I would like to see this program carried on in the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I note that it is just about six o'clock, and I will now adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 10, 1979, at 3:00 p.m.