



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 31

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 1976

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR.S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have one petition to present, Sir, on behalf of a total of 875 citizens in the electoral district of LaPoile. Forty-eight of the signatures, Sir, are from petitioners, residents of Petites; forty-eight more, residents of LaPoile; and thirty-five in Grand Bruit. I do not know if there has ever a petition presented before in this hon. House on behalf of the residents of Petites. Probably half the members of this House, Sir, do not even know, -

AN HON. MEMBER: I know.

MR. NEARY: -do not even know where Petites is located.

MR. ROBERTS: I know where it is.

MR. NEARY: Certainly the other half probably do not know where Grand Bruit is, and have never been in LaPoile.

MR. PECKFORD: Come on now!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege and honour for me to be able to present a petition on behalf of these wonderful people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did you say 800 - odd petitioners?

MR. NEARY: Yes, but I am coming to that. The rest of them are from Channel-Port aux Basques area; forty-eight from Petites; forty-eight from LaPoile; thirty-five from Grand Bruit; and 744 from the Channel-Port aux Basques area, which incidently really did not get all that recognition in the House of Assembly that it should have gotten down through the years. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is that "We, the undersigned do humbly petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to request that public hearings be held throughout our Province to obtain information and hear briefs on the matter covered by the government white paper on the proposed snowmobile legislation, and further that no such legislation be enacted prior to the holding of such public hearings."

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the petition was circulated by members of the newly formed Rod and Gun Club in the Port aux Basques area. In supporting the petition, Mr. Speaker, calling upon the government to hold the public hearings before legislation is enacted, I might say, Sir, that the government's white paper on the proposed snowmobile regulations has aroused, to say the least, Sir, strong feeling throughout this Province, especially in the rural parts of Newfoundland and Labrador. It is rather regrettable Sir, and rather unfortunate indeed that the minister responsible for this white paper did not do a better P.R. job, probably no fault of the minister's, Sir, because to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, it is the first time that there has been any evidence, any attempt, I suppose, at allowing the democratic process to influence a government in taking a major policy decision. The only other time, Sir, to my recollection that I heard a white paper mentioned in this hon. House was when the Leader of the present old-line Liberal Party was Minister of Health. He proposed to bring in a white paper on health in this Province. The paper to my knowledge never saw the light of day.

So it is regrettable, Sir, that it was misunderstood. I would say that the minister himself probably got a lot of flack from his own members and even his own colleagues in the Cabinet because of the way that the paper was presented. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in order now to find out what are the most representative feelings and the most representative reaction to the white paper, especially, Sir, in the rural areas because the people somehow or other feel in the outlying areas - as the minister knows because both he and I attended a meeting in Stephenville, I think it was, probably about the first meeting the minister attended after the white paper was circulated, and I was with the minister at the time and then we had a little bit of feedback down in the Channel-Port aux Basques area - but somehow or other, Sir, the people in the rural areas, the

MR. NEARY: outports, feel that the white paper was written by a townie, by somebody who had no knowledge whatsoever of the rural parts of the Province, and again this is rather unfortunate because personally I do not think that is correct.

But in the meantime, Sir, I think that the Department of Tourism should now hold public hearings in - not all over Newfoundland, but in five or six key points throughout the Island part of our Province and the Mainland part of the Province, Labrador, so, that real, genuine snowmobilers, snowmobile owners, may attend these public hearings, Sir, and present their views; and even, Mr. Speaker, those who may be opposed to snowmobiles operating in the Province at all, who have views to the contrary, that they be given also an opportunity to present their views at public hearings. And the reason I suggest five or six points around - I am sure that the minister has had a tremendous number of petitions, letters of protest about certain parts of the white paper, especially the restricted and controlled areas and probably, Sir, it may be unnecessary to hold public hearings, I do not know. The reason I am suggesting five or six places is because I do not think that the government should go, or the taxpayers should go to the expense of holding hearings all over Newfoundland and Labrador. Five or six major centres would be quite sufficient. If public hearings are held, Mr. Speaker, then when legislation is brought before this hon. House for adoption we will not only have the satisfaction, Sir, of knowing that we have drawn on the experience and the resources of other Provinces of Canada in the legislation that they have in the other nine Provinces that we have been able to gather together, but we will know, Sir, that our legislation represents the true feelings and the true attitude of the people of this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure again to ask leave of the House to have this petition placed upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates, in this case the Minister of Tourism. Before I table the petition, Sir, I want to congratulate the minister, and probably I am the only one in the House who will do it because of the flak that it has gotten, I

MR. NEARY: do want to congratulate the minister for having the foresight and the courage to circulate this white paper. It is the first attempt, Sir, that I have seen in my fourteen years in this House—although some members are taking political advantage of it, leaving the impression that it is already the law. It is not the law. It could become law and we have to guard against certain objectionable parts of the paper. I do want to congratulate the minister for circulating a white paper before he actually brought the legislation into the House.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition delivered by the member from LaPoile. This decision was taken at a meeting which I attended in Stephenville, or near Stephenville, about a month ago and there are other petitions along the same line which will be delivered in the House in due course.

The snowmobilers, or the Bay St. George Snowmobile Club, as well as the Pod and Gun Club in Port aux Basques felt that there was no time to adequately present their feelings to the government and many things in the white paper were objectionable to them. They feel that a select committee would be the most effective way in which they can express their dissatisfaction, and to put their views forward. It gives me great pleasure to support the petition from the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few brief comments.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! Before I recognize the hon. minister I would like to inform the House that in the gallery we have Mr. C.H.G. Witt, Consul General for the Netherlands, and Mr. Anthony Ayre who is the Netherlands Consulate in Newfoundland. and I am sure the members would wish to bid them welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to comment briefly on the petition presented by my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and in doing so I would like to clear up a couple of items that the member mentioned. One; I would like to say, Sir, that the White Paper, contrary to the opinion of a number of people throughout the Province, and certainly contrary to some people in the news media is not a White Paper of the Department of Tourism or the Minister of Tourism. It is a White Paper of this government. Such a White Paper is not issued, Mr. Speaker, without the approval of my colleagues in Cabinet. I am not sure when this message is going to get across, especially to certain members of the news media who seem to feel occasionally that when a minister issues a statement or makes a decision that that decision is simply his, as if he were running the Province all by himself. It is very difficult to understand how such an opinion is given any credence by people who should obviously know better. My hon. friend mentions the public relations aspect of it, and I am the first to say to him that I agree that there is a need, and there was a need for public relations. But, Mr. Speaker, when anyone attempts to do anything in public relations in this Province in recent years, they are condemned - a waste of money, always a waste of money.

I have to say to my hon. friend - and in saying this I exclude him because I know exactly what his position is on this White Paper. We have discussed it on a number of occasions, and he has made his views very clear to me - but I can say, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of him, on the other side of the House I have not received any recommendations, any comments from other members. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the roles and one of the prime jobs of a member of this House is indeed to do public relations on behalf of his or her constituents and especially in relation to subjects which affect their constituents to such a great extent as this particular subject does.

MR. HICKEY. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that some hon. members, not all of them, but some, would too busy making cheap political points on this White Paper. I thank the hon. member for recognizing -

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. HICKEY: and having the courage -

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: The minister is now entering into debate which is not allowed in supporting the petition.

MR. PECKFORD: He is commenting on the petition.

MR. HICKEY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am not entering into any debate, I am simply stating a fact. Surely that is not a debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: A fact is a fact. It is not debatable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I, as I have said -

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

A point of order has been raised as to whether comments on the petition are entering into the area of debate. As I am sure hon. members know, Standing Order 97 of our House states that there shall be no debate on a petition unless the House has it under consideration. We have established in some regard a precedent during this sitting that there may be comments on petitions, but I do not think the House does intend that these comments should get into debate or indeed near debate. So I would bring that to the attention of all members and ask the hon. minister to continue with his remarks.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly do not want to start a debate on this, and I certainly was not of the opinion that my comments would allude to any debate, because, as I have said, what I have stated are facts and if my hon. friend, the House Leader on the other side, wishes me to present those facts, I will indeed in

Mr. Rickey.

writing to him, give him clear-cut evidence of some of his colleagues who have attempted to make cheap political points out of what can only be termed to be a very good and worthy measure, being a White Paper, and as my hon. friend said, the first one issued in the Province.

I will gladly accept the petition as presented by my hon. friend, Mr. Speaker, and certainly give it consideration. It would be improper to state here in the House as to what will become of it. I simply want to state that my department are eager as yet, and will continue to accept and appreciate any comments by hon. members on the other side or indeed any members of the public even though the time, as set, for representations has now passed. Nevertheless we are still receiving some and we will continue to accept them.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Are there any further petitions?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MP. FLICHT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition, the prayer of the petition so ably presented by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I rise to support it, Sir, for two reasons, two basic reasons. One is that I am from a district that is totally and completely against most of the recommendations as presented in the White Paper. The other one is that I am personally against it. I have had a considerable amount of experience in snowmobiling in this Province, as much probably as any member of this House sitting here today, and I intend to support any petitions that oppose the White Paper as has been presented.

As stated in the petition, Mr. Speaker, there appears to be no input at all in the White Paper from people who are knowledgeable in the operation of skidoos, or for that matter people who are concerned with the damage that skidoos are doing to our wildlife or our environment. There are recommendations in the regulations in the White Paper that are worthy of consideration. However, the feeling in this Province, the feeling of the people I have talked to, Mr. Speaker, and the letters that I have received from all over Newfoundland, the phone calls I have received from all over Newfoundland, is that most of the recommendations in the White Paper are simply not acceptable, and certainly not acceptable outside of the limits of St. John's.

I suppose that anyone who rises to support petitions or to oppose the White Paper will be accused of trying to make cheap political points. I find this bewildering, Mr. Speaker, because what is a person supposed to do if he believes in something or is opposed to something? The moment that he gets up to oppose a White Paper -

MR. HICKEY: Why did you not send us your information -

MP. FLICHT: Mr. Speaker, I received -

MR. HICKEY: It is too late for that.

MP. FLICHT: The minister indicated in his ministerial reply that the

MR. FLIGHT:

members of the opposition did not have input into the White Paper. I will speak for myself. I was not aware there was a White Paper in the process of being drawn up until I received it at my home town after the House had closed. Nobody had invited me -

MR. HICKEY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend but I do want to correct. I did not say that there was no input by MTA's. I said there were no recommendations, basically no recommendations, received from MTA's after the White Paper was issued with the exception of a few.

MR. MORGAN: It is criticism only.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair will not consider that a point of order but as an explanatory note.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I accept the criticism from the hon. Minister of Highways that or -

AN HON. MEMBER: Tourism.

MR. FLIGHT: No, the Minister of Transportation and Communications had indicated that the only thing that came from me, I presume, was criticism. He is absolutely right, Mr. Speaker, and that is all that is going to come from me is criticism of most of the points in that White Paper.

MR. MORGAN: Why not some recommendations!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared and so are hundreds of other people - I have attended meetings in this past month where hundreds of people have indicated their desire and their willingness to meet, or have their representatives meet with the Minister of Tourism with the hope and the prayer of having some input into the legislation that will be forthcoming covering the regulations under which skidoos will be operated in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, if supporting petitions and if opposing the White Paper per se as it is means that one will be accused of

MR. FLIGHT:

using it for cheap political purposes, then I stand here and accept that criticism because I will so do. Mr. Speaker, I support wholeheartedly the petition so ably presented by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins) The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I -

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. WELLS: Oh, I am sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I would just like to say a few words on that petition, Mr. Speaker, if I may, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: First of all I would like to say, if the House will bear with me, by the way that although the hon. Minister of Tourism is getting the flack for this from the hon. Minister of Social Services, from the hon. Minister of Education, from the hon. Minister of Health, to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs; government is responsible for that, not the Minister of Tourism, And nothing was done by the Minister of Tourism that was not approved by every man sitting on the front benches of this House.

When we talk about the question of the white paper, Mr. Speaker, I think during the past three years almost, two years in the House of Assembly, those members who sat in the last session of the House will recall question after question, when is it coming out? When is it coming out? It came out, Mr. Speaker, as a result of many representations from a lot of people across this Province, maybe not done officially by request, but certainly done with a lot of input unofficially and in some cases officially from many groups around this Province.

But I would like to suggest in the petition from the hon. member, you know, nobody on this side of the House rejects the fact that people across this Province are to have an input in it, in my area, and in my hon. colleague's from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) and my hon. colleague from St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy), and my hon. colleague from the Burin Peninsula (Mr. Hickman) or from the Northern Peninsula (Mr. Maynard) have many different problems in respect to snowmobiles. And I can assure the hon. members of this House that we have our arguments

Mr. Rousseau:

too, but, of course, maybe are under the misconception that we no longer live in a democracy. What we are attempting to do as a government, and the Minister of Tourism is only the frontal attack of it, and what we are trying to do is to give the people the democratic right to have their input into these regulations. The white paper is merely a request for suggestions. Now the Minister of Tourism will be told certain things by us in Cabinet or in Caucus, and he will be told in the House, and he will be told by these representations that are made to people, and it is unfortunate that the people of this Province have misread this... maybe that is our fault, I do not know what fault it is - but I think the concept of a white paper is a fine concept. It is an opportunity for everybody in this Province, in the many different areas, in the many different regions to have input into it, and nobody is saying that the regulations they have now are the regulations that are going to be now and forever. The regulations I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that come out of this white paper will be looked at with serious consideration after every representation made by everybody across the Province. I do not think that the minister himself or his department or the government is that insensitive to the feelings of the people in the Province. So I would not like for hon. members across, especially the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in respect to his petition, think that the government is against this sort of thing. The mechanics we may argue because this may take some time, but certainly the representations have been asked. I can say for my own part that even now that the deadline is passed, the minister has said privately to me that anything will come in he will accept as many as he can, and give them sympathetic consideration they deserve. And it is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that this concept of a white paper, which I think is a very good concept in this Province and which I hope will continue, has been misinterpreted and maybe because of the problem we had in this particular instance. Government may learn that in future white papers we would not have the same sort of problem. But I can assure the people of this House and the people of this Province that the

Mr. Rousseau:

government will give sympathetic consideration to every representation made in respect to snowmobile regulations.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS) Are there any further petitions?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I want to have a few words on the petition presented by the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), to support the comments made by my colleague the Minister of Tourism and the previous speaker.

It seems to me that the criticism that is arising here is the fact that a lot of the members, and this is not meant to be an unkind criticism, but a lot of the members are not aware of what a white paper is all about.

MR. ROWE: Make it clear.

MR. W. CARTER: In that the - and this I believe is probably the first one.

MR. F. ROWE: Any particular side?

MR. W. CARTER: No. One second now. This is probably the first one that is being issued by government in this Province in the past twenty-six, twenty-seven years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER: And of course the fact that maybe they are not acquainted with the importance of a white paper is understandable.

MR. ROWE: On a point of order, please!

MR. W. CARTER: But certainly it is a vehicle by which people who will be affected by the regulations are given a chance to respond and to react.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: On a point of order, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A point of order has been raised.

MR. F. ROWE: I believe, Sir, what is happening now is that we are not only supporting nor debating the petition presented by the member from LaPoile but we are in fact debating the white paper itself.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is what it seems like.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes. And this is not -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: - the purpose of this particular order of business of the House of Assembly. This is the place where we present and support petitions, And we are off track completely, and I would suggest, Sir, that we end debate at the present time on this particular petition, unless we are prepared -

MR. NEARY: Take it off the floor of the House?

MR. F. ROWE: -unless we are - I am not finished - unless we are prepared to support the petition. But we are talking about a different topic entirely and that is the white paper itself. Now I am quite sure, Sir, that all members of the House of Assembly understand what a white paper is, and we do not need the ministers of the Crown to explain to members on this side of the House, or any side of the House, what a white paper is.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. the House Leader.

MR. WELLS: I think the position arrives in this House where one's views on petitions happens to change frequently depending on which side the member is who happens to be speaking. I think that it is quite clear, and I do not think at the moment that the hon. member is doing anything different from what has been done since the House opened to resume this session a week or so ago. There has been a tremendous amount of time taken up -

AN HON. MEMBER: Too much!

MR. WELLS: -Too much, quite frankly, as my hon. friend says - dealing with petitions.

MR. NEARY: This is not the time to be making a point of order. This is the time to get on with the business of the House.

MR. WELLS: No, I know. But the thing is that members in this House, Mr. Speaker, are going to have to, I think, if we are going to get through the business of the House at all, Nobody wants to curtail remarks on petitions. If they could be short enough! I mean, surely the matter of a minute or two would seem to me to be long enough -

MR. NEARY: Only take time enough to give the message.

MR. WELLS: - that is right - to indicate whether one supports or otherwise. I do believe that debate on the petition and discussion of the merits of the petition, should be reserved to the general debates, such as the Address in Reply, the Budget Debate, all the debates when one can speak generally on petitions.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to that point of order as well because there has been an awful lot of time taken on petitions so that we do not get into the debates, and I want to get into the debate later on. We have been a half an hour on it as of now. I draw Your Honour's attention to Standing Order (92), Your Honour, of the Standing Orders. It says that, "Every member offering a petition to

MR. MARSHALL:

the House shall confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it and the material allegations it contains. In no case shall such a member occupy more than five minutes." So, Mr. Speaker, it would appear to me that a lot of the debate that has occurred on petition, debate and talk with respect to petitions, is outside of Standing Order (92) and while the petitions are beneficial they are blocking up the time of the House so that we are not getting into the debate, the useful debate and the necessary debate that should be occupying our time. We are coming here every day and spending an hour to an hour and a half, and the rule is there -

MR. NEARY: You want to cut them out.

MR. MARSHALL: - the rule is there, Mr. Speaker, if it is enforced, for the purpose of curtailing, and I would suggest, respectfully suggest that this perhaps should be the mode we should take.

MR. W. CARTER: This is the exact reason, Mr. Speaker, why I am making these few remarks. I do not - the fact that there will be -

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please! Order, please! May I ask the hon. minister is he speaking to the point of order?

MR. CARTER: I am still talking to the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Pardon me, just to comment on the point of order. A point of order is before the House, and as I indicated a little while ago we have set some precedent in this sitting for comments after the original hon. member has presented a petition. On that point I think the Standing Order (92) limiting time to five minutes does refer to the presenter of the petition and nowhere in our Standing Orders is there anything said specifically about those who comment on the petition. So we are going purely on precedent here that we have really established, I understand, in this sitting. I think the feeling of the House is that we have perhaps gone beyond what is intended and I think that discussion on this particular position now has spilled over into debate. I would ask any further hon. members who wish to comment to be as brief as they possibly can and to carefully observe the feeling of the House that the remarks should be directed solely to the petition and to whether they support or otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly follow the ruling of Your Honour, but I want to make it quite clear now that in my comments I was referring to the petition, indeed offering it my support. I think that the white paper that was presented by government on the regulations we are now discussing, at least the ones referred to in the petition, that is the purpose of it, to solicit ideas, views, expressions of interest, objection approval and what have you, from people who will be affected by the regulations that are contained, or at least outlined in the white paper.

But I cannot help, Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat to again repeat what I said earlier that it is quite obvious that the hon. members opposite are not used to white papers. They have been here for the past twenty-five and there has never been one presented.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. W. CARTER: But I should point out to them -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER: I should point out to them that in the other House, in Ottawa, in the House of Commons, that white papers are very prevalent. Almost every major issue that arises will result in a white paper or a pink paper or a green paper, yellow paper, call it what you want, And that is done for the very reason that we are doing this, to solicit ideas, views, and expressions of interest, approval or otherwise, from the people that will be affected by it.

But certainly, Mr. Speaker, I do support the petition. I respect the right of the petitioners to make their views known and to do it in a manner which they have elected, through their member, and I am sure that before any regulations are implemented that are contained in the white paper that other Newfoundlanders, all Newfoundlanders, will be given a chance to express their views and to disapprove of the recommendations or to approve of them, whichever they might see fit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Any further petitions?

The hon. House Leader.

MR. WELLS: Yes, one further petition, Mr. Speaker, and I will be very brief, It is a petition from approximately 100 people in my own district of Kilbride and Your Honour's district of St. John's South, from His Honour the Speaker's district of Waterford-Kenmount and from the district of Mount Pearl. And essentially what it concerns, Mr. Speaker, is the land freeze and it is an objection registered on the part of 100 people as to the land freeze itself and the freezing of agricultural land, and they bring up various things in a rather long letter, which I will not read, attached to the petition and they ask that government give consideration to this matter and to altering the terms of the land freeze so that more building can go on in the districts concerned with this.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition and support the petition and ask that it be tabled and referred in due course to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues I would simply like to -

MR. NEARY: I thought I was up first.

MR. ROWE: Just a minor-mix up 'Steve', You will have your turn, I am not going to be very long.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House I would like to support the petition presented by the Minister without Portfolio on behalf of I believe 100 citizens in the districts of Kilbride, St. John's South, Mount Pearl and I think he mentioned one other -

MR. WELLS: Waterford-Kenmount.

MR. ROWE: Waterford-Kenmount, I am not completely, Sir, familiar with the details concerning the land freeze although I am aware of the fact that there is concern and need for the altering of the terms of the land freeze and I would simply like to add our support to the

MR. ROWE: petition.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Any further petitions?

MR. NEARY: I wholeheartedly support the prayer of the petition, Sir. This has been a very thorny subject ever since it has been introduced, the land freeze by the government, and they either have to now, Sir, move or get off the pot. They either have to offer these people the going price for their land or they have to lift the freeze, one thing or the other.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Any further petitions?

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: I rise to present a couple of petition in the series of electricity petitions that we have been receiving lately. I have one here from the Local Improvement District of Seal Cove in White Bay, and I have one here from the Community of Roberts Arm in Green Bay. I think probably that all that needs to be said in support of these petitions have been said during the past few days in this House, so that in that spirit I support them and I ask that they be laid on the table of the House and referred to the appropriate department.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Any further petitions?

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of the town of Badger. The petition contains approximately 350 names. Again the prayer of the petition is opposing any further increases in electric power and in keeping with my colleague's remarks, the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), I think there is nothing that I can say in support of this petition that has not already been said. I support the prayer of the petition and wish to have it laid on the table of the House and be dealt with by the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Are there further petitions?

The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: I have leave to present a petition on behalf of some eighty-five citizens of the community of New Perlican in the district of Trinity - Bay de Verde, Sir. And this petition relates to the increase in electrical rates which were announced while I was absent from the Province, as a matter of fact. Sir, obviously the petition objects to the original 40 % increase and any subsequent alterations that have been made over the last few weeks. Sir, in speaking in support of the petition, I can only say that a few months ago I stood here in this House and predicted that we would be, in all likelihood, facing an increase in electrical rates in the Province, or a ration of electricity, because of the failure of the government to use alternative sites of hydro power in the Province instead of zeroing in or putting all its eggs in one basket on the Gull Island site development.

At that time, Sir, the Minister of Mines and Energy distinguished himself by calling me a twit, with or without the 'w'. Now since I have returned to the Province I have witnessed and read the electrical rates that were passed or approved by - the increase in electrical rates that were approved by Cabinet. So, Sir, we on this side are certainly in favour of any petition of this nature that comes

Mr. F. Rowe.

before the House in objecting to the proposed increase in electrical rates in this Province, and Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be placed upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the evidence of profiteering, Sir, reflected in the Provincial Registry Office in the matter of the land transaction in connection with the construction of the Aquarena over here on the campus of Memorial University, and also in view of the Premier's comments made in The Evening Telegram, made publicly, condemning the Summer Games Committee for not calling public tenders, will the minister responsible for recreation inform the House what action is going to be taken to remove the veils of secrecy and possible wheeling and dealing and collusion in this whole matter that involves over \$5 million of provincial government's money?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. House Leader.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the question of the hon. the member, I think the hon. member is referring to a question which he asked some days ago, or some hon. member asked some days ago, I think the hon. member for -

MR. NEARY: I am the only one on this side who has asked a question.

MR. WELLS: Since the hon. member asked the question, with respect particularly to the land transactions, I have had copies of the transactions taken from the Registry of Deeds, Mr. Speaker, and I have examined them. The price - from the deeds themselves, the price is not clear of what was paid, but it would appear to me that for one piece of land of approximately 0.6 acres, just over half an acre with a house on it, was paid \$175,000, and for another piece of land which would appear to be something of the order of seven to eight acres, the figure is not clear, but there is an affidavit attached to the deed to indicate that it is worth not less than \$500,000.

MR. NEARY: What was paid for it?

MR. WELLS: Well now does the hon. member want an answer to the question? The point is, Mr. Speaker, I think that the prices appear to be such that I believe that an explanation should be asked as to the whole transaction, and I am in the process now of drafting a letter to the committee asking for an explanation, asking the basis on which these prices were paid.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary on the same point, Mr. Speaker, and that is I wonder if the hon. House Leader would be good enough while looking at this transaction, in the reporting of the item mentioned you will find that there were a certain number of dollars paid for specific pieces of property but also there was the wording "certain other considerations." Would that information be available to the House and what are the consideration?

MR. WELLS: I do not know what those considerations are but I think I should make it clear to the House that if and when, presumably

MP. WELLS: when an explanation is received the explanation will come to the government and it will be a government decision, of course, as to what is done with that information. I cannot commit the government at this time to tabling it in the House. This is a matter for government to decide.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health, would the minister inform the House as to the current status of planning for the proposed Burin Peninsula Hospital?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. member is asking the question because of an item which appeared in The Daily News today, and I think it was on the radio station a little while ago, where the Health Council on the Peninsula made a statement that they have been trying to get an appointment with the Minister of Health since January. I have checked out the department and there has been no contact between any of those people and myself or the department, no contact whatever.

With regard to the hospital, planning is continuing but there is to be no construction in this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I would like to ask the Minister of Health, Sir, what extraordinary action, if any, his department is taking in connection with the Baie Verte drinking water supply that apparently is polluted with asbestos and what extraordinary action his department is taking with regard to the occupational health hazard in the mine and in the mill in Baie Verte?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I answered the second part of that question in response to some hon. member opposite last week. With regard to the first part, the Director of Occupational Health, Dr. Colohan, and the Director of Public Health Inspection Services, Mr. Strong, were in Baie Verte

MR. COLLINS: last night at a meeting. I have not received a report from them yet.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary; would the minister indicate if Dr. Colohan went to Baie Verte on just a routine mission or did he go down with the intention of holding a public meeting?

MR. COLLINS: There was consultation with the mayor in Baie Verte, Mr. Speaker, and Dr. Colohan's visit and Mr. Strong's visit was as a result of that after a meeting was set up with the Town Council.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for, I suppose it might be all right to address this to - no, the Minister of Education is in the House, and that is concerning an announcement today concerning the Pine Grove School. There is speculation apparently that the government will make available something like \$50,000 or \$55,000 to effect necessary renovations or whatever to the school. One, is this a fact, and, secondly, when will the money be presented or forthcoming to effect the necessary preparations or renovations there?

MR. BOUSSEAU: If I may, Mr. Speaker, it comes under the Department of Public Works in the sense that we are doing the work. I was asked a question this morning by one of the newspapers in the Province and I checked on it and indeed there is authorization for an expenditure somewhere in the area of \$50,000 to \$60,000. I think the figures if \$56,000, I do not know precisely. This was communicated this morning publicly to that paper. For the information of the House, number one; the gymnasium; there is to be some work done on the gymnasium, the removal of some wooden beams. This cannot be done until the Summer because of the fact that it would take the gymnasium out of circulation for a while. Steel is being ordered now and it will be installed, the beams, for the open space this Summer when the school is closed.

Number two, in respect to the heating problems they have, the radiators, there is somebody from the Department of Public Works down there now. They have been checking on the parts that are needed to improve the radiation equipment. As soon as the parts are specified as to which ones we want they will be ordered and as soon as they arrive they will be installed. On Friday, as a result of tenders being called, the firm of, I think, Amos Spurrell will be doing the carpenter work in respect to the renovations, all the work that has to be done down there. They should have started this morning, actually, but because of the storm they are not able to but they will be starting tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): A supplementary?

MR. NOLAN: No, I would like to thank the minister.

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

MR. BODDER: A question for the Minister of Fisheries. Would the minister advise the House of the condition of the scallop beds in Port au Port Bay and whether the Bays will be open to residents for the commercial fishery, or is it already open?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of that question. I will have an answer at a later date.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. the Premier if he has checked out the reports emanating from Churchill Falls that the salaried employees, the management people in Churchill Falls, are getting preferential treatment when it comes to gasoline to operate their cars to take their children to school in thirty below temperatures, while the rank and file cannot purchase gasoline? Has the Premier checked this out?

Would he also when he is on his feet tell us what role the CFLCo jet is playing in this whole matter while the dispute is on at Churchill Falls?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOOPES: Mr. Speaker, regarding both questions, really it is a matter of the Hydro Commission being involved. We have been involved in this context, that we want to, if humanly possible, bring the situation to the realm of possibility, I guess, at this stage of the game, of trying to get both parties back at the table so that they can talk and try to resolve all the problems that are there. The specifics that the hon. members mentions, I do not know the details of them, but certainly what I am very concerned about, as I know he is and other people in this House, is that the situation be resolved as quickly as possible and get everything back on an even keel.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Would the Premier undertake to get the House the information as to whether or not there is any discrimination in the distribution of gasoline, you know, to the ordinary rank and file as opposed to management people? This seems to be causing an awful lot of fuss.

PREMIER MOOPES: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we will find out whatever is outstanding in this particular dispute, but what I would rather do,

PREMIER MOORES:

which I think would be much more proper, is to come to this House with a resolution to the whole problem.

MR. NEARY: Yes, but this has nothing to do with the dispute.

This is the sale of gasoline.

PREMIER MOORES: Well it does really.

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

MR. F. POWE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could clear up certain curiosities with respect to his meeting with Premier Bourassa lately. Did the Premier indeed agree with the Premier of Quebec that all Canadians should be held financially responsible for the Olympic Games or -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. F. POWE: - I am not finished the question yet - or did the Premier agree with the Premier of Quebec on the patriation of the constitution, or both, or is one separate from the other?

PREMIER MOORES: Neither, Mr. Speaker, neither.

MR. F. POWE: Mr. Speaker, may I follow this with a supplementary? Did the Premier make any sort of a - I do not want to use the word deal - but try to make any sort of an agreement with the Premier of Quebec with respect to the Upper Churchill agreement, which is presently in effect towards changing it for the betterment of Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, unlikely as it may sound to the Opposition we are not in the habit of making deals. The situation is that I said in regarding both the Olympics and the patriation of the constitution a very definitive position as to various responsibilities I had in both. We will be talking with Quebec Hydro and the Quebec Government next week regarding the hydro and energy development of Eastern Canada - not just specifically any one segment of that - and that will be subject after that discussion I hope of further progress.

PREMIER MOOPFS:

But regarding the constitution, which is the main one - I answered the olympic question yesterday, I think - regarding the constitution as such, the patriation of it, I was there only in one capacity and that was as this year being the Chairman of the Premier's Conference and

Premier Moores.

they are totally in a neutral position, I think this is fair to say, and I think this was my position at that time. I listened to what Premier Bourassa had to say. I have been advised that a letter from the Prime Minister will be going to all Premiers in Canada this week outlining the position whereby a first ministers' conference may be held. If it is, the agenda, one would assume, would be enclosed. I think what has to be considered here is what does that agenda include? Now it can be the Prime Minister saying that this is the final opportunity to talk about the constitution, or it can be that it will be ongoing discussions. And that is what has happened for several years, as we all know. If it is ongoing discussions I think there is work that can be done over the next year until the Premiers' conference next August in Alberta. However, if it is going to be a definitive conference whereby the Prime Minister intends to bring back the constitution unilaterally, the thing that concerns Quebec, particularly, I could say would concern me as Premier of this Province, and I would think, but I am not sure, but I think would concern other Premiers in Canada is that if the constitution can be brought back unilaterally the amendment formula to that constitution could also be done unilaterally.

Now when we talk about the amendment formula we are talking about things where there are provincial or federal controls, and there are a great many grey areas in the constitution today, Mr. Speaker, that were not there a few years ago, areas such as social programmes administered by the Province, encroachment if you like, into the resources of the provinces. You are talking about the urban development programmes. There are a great many areas where there is a grey area between the federal and provincial responsibility. This would concern, I think, most people, but really for this point in time, Sir, I think what is best to say is that depending on receiving the Prime Minister's letter that will dictate whether I contact the other Premiers across Canada or not, and I think it is a fair comment to make. But there were no commitments

Premier Moores.

made on the constitution or strategy of how to approach it.

What we are talking about is something of me hearing the Québec particular concern, and as my responsibility as Chairman of the Premiers' conference for this year passing on that information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for Trinity - Rav de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Did I understand the Premier to say that he will be meeting with officials of Quebec-Hydro within the next few weeks?

PREMIER MOORES: No, the Province of Quebec.

MR. F. ROWE: The Province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, is this in connection with the Upper Churchill agreement or projected work on the Lower Churchill?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had made it clear, and I am sorry that I did not. What I think we were talking about is that Premier Bourassa and his Minister of Mines and Energy, and myself and the Minister of Mines and Energy will be meeting the first part of next week to talk about, not just the Upper Churchill or Gull Island or the regional grid but really about the energy situation as it applies to Eastern Canada because Quebec and Newfoundland and Labrador are the only producing provinces today in hydro electricity. There are very little other opportunities in Canada. So we will be talking with them regarding all the facets that involve energy in Eastern Canada.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Premier, Sir, if he has had an opportunity in the last few weeks since the hon. Don Jamieson has been appointed Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, if the Premier or any representative of the provincial government have had an opportunity to sit down face to face with Mr. Jamieson

Mr. Neary .

to discuss any plans or proposals or assistance within Mr. Jamieson's new department, that Newfoundland can take advantage of? If so, would the Premier tell us what they are?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The answer is, Mr. Speaker, that I have had a couple of meetings with Mr. Jamieson since he has been in his new portfolio. He has been on a trade mission to the Far East for three or four weeks I guess, and we have not criticized such an overseas mission at all from our side of the House. But the fact is, Sir, that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: - the fact is, Sir, that, yes, we have talked to Mr. Jamieson. We have talked very much in the area of development in Industry, Trade and Commerce, and I would hope and expect and think that it will be very helpful in the months ahead.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member from Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: A question to the hon. Minister of Education. In light of the fact that the minister promised the House that he would give a statement on the Bay St. George Community College - I think that was said in November, that he would make a statement on the Bay St. George Community College - is the minister now prepared to give such a statement?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Education.

HON. W. HOUSE: Sir, the Community College concept was set up early last year, and we sent a man out there to set it, Mr. Doug Fowlow, and I had been waiting for a report from him to give in the House while the House was opened there in the Fall. But I did not get a report from him before the House closed, and I could not give a report in the House. So shortly after the House closed we got the report and we made an announcement through the media. And I think everybody heard that, I am sure they heard it on the West Coast, and I am sure they read it here.

MR. NEARY: Can you get a copy of the press release?

MR. HOUSE: Yes, I can get a copy of the press release.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member from Conception Bay South.

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the acting Minister of Public Works. For some time there has been discussion regarding, including in this House, the necessity for additional space for the provincial civil service and for the provincial government generally. Have tenders been called for additional space? Has any tender been awarded? And, if not, when will we have some information regarding this?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The acting Minister of Public Works.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that as notice, and the question is a little too general. Have tenders been called since when? What time period? Or what are the areas that the hon. member is talking about?

MR. NOLAN: Well, have tenders been called for additional space from now since Cabot arrived?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, -

PREMIER MOORES: Come on down to a nice quiet place.

MR. NOLAN: But I do not drink the same stuff you do, 'Frank'.

No answer?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No. I am going out as soon as you whiten down because you are red enough.

MR. NOLAN: No answer?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Tenders were called some months back, Mr. Speaker, but no decision has been made on that. As a matter of fact about a year ago, but no decision was made.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister.

Is it correct then - is the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition correct that a contract has been entered into with Mr. Craig Dobbin for the old communications building down on Water Street,

MR. ROUSSEAU: No.

MR. NEARY: Is this correct as reported in the newspaper quoting the Leader of the Opposition?

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. ROUSSEAU: To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, the government have not entered into a contract with Mr. Craig Dobbin for the COTC Building.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for LaPoile on another supplementary.

MR. NEARY: The acting Minister of Public Works and Services, Sir, promised me about a week ago to get me some information on, No. 1, the target date of completion of the Health Science Complex, and whether or not the consulting, the management - what do you call him? the management -

AN HON. MEMBER: The project managers.

MR. NEARY: - the project managers were going to be replaced -

PREMIER MOORES: Scrivener.

MR. NEARY: -that Scrivener were going to be replaced by a local company.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, the target date of completion of the Health Science Complex is January 1, and it will take about three months to commission, so it will be some time available for occupancy around the 1st. of March or April.

In respect to the second question, we have nothing whatsoever to do with Scrivener Newfoundland. They are now being controlled by a receiver. Now there are two options to that receiver, because apparently Scrivener Engineering is gone into receivership and there are debentures owed by Scrivener Newfoundland. And under the debenture that is owed, of course, the receiver enters into the picture here in respect to Scrivener Newfoundland Limited. And there are two options in respect of the receiver over which we have no control. The receiver may either sell the company or sell the shares of the company, or sell the rights they have to manage the Health Science Complex. In the case of the former, if the shares are sold by the receiver to any company, that is purely outside of the hands of government, Government has nothing to do with it, it is purely in the hands of the receiver. If that is done then government has three months in which to give notice that it is not satisfied with the person who takes over, in the one instance, if the companies shares are sold. In the second instance, if the contract is sold then government has the right to approve whoever will be taking over the contract. And to my knowledge the receiver has not come to government yet with any definite proposal in respect to either.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member from Windsor-Buchans.

MR. ROUSSEAU: To my knowledge it is they, it is not -

MR. G. FLIGHT: I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. In his statement rejecting an industrial inquiry for the Churchill Falls dispute, he indicated that the two parties concerned will be meeting in St. John's Thursday, or at least it was proposed that they would. Can he now confirm to the the House that they are indeed meeting in St. John's tomorrow, or shed any light on the proposed meetings?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

HON. E. MAYNARD: Providing that both parties can get in from Montreal and Churchill Falls, Mr. Speaker, they will be meeting tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation and Communications: What about the seat belt legislation now, is it going to be brought in this session? Does the minister still intend, or has the minister taken a decision to make seat belts compulsory in this Province as they have done in Ontario?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

HON. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, any consideration or any final decision will be announced on that regard at the appropriate time in this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Tourism be good enough to bring us up to date on his most recent trip to Spain, the state of the Norma and Gladys, the crew, the temperature in Malaga and so on?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: The what?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: How about the salt-and-pepper cap?

HON. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where to start. I will give the hon. gentleman the weather forecast -

MR. NOLAN: Start from Torbay.

MR. HICKEY: I will give the hon. gentleman the weather forecast first, and other than that it was approximately sixty-eight degrees according to my -

AN HON. MEMBER: Thermometer.

MR. HICKEY: - according to my instruments when I landed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that because that is the first time that I have been able to breath easily since I got back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: I am told if I had been looking at the set on Friday I might have some doubts about that as a result of a certain editorial. However, Mr. Speaker, becoming a little more serious I might tell my hon. friend that the voyage has gone quite well.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: The receptions were just fantastic. More than a thousand people a day went and visited the vessel -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: - an estimated 25,000 according to one of the Spanish newspapers, an estimated 25,000 people visited the boat and viewed her from the wharf. An interesting point, Mr. Speaker, on the seaworthiness of the vessel which has caused a great deal of concern and comment especially from some hon. members opposite and some of the news media, I might set some minds at ease now, inform them that the vessel's average speed is six and a half knots. She averaged eleven knots coming from Cadiz to Malaga.

AN HON. MEMBER: How so?

MR. HICKEY: The other five knots, Mr. Speaker, was due to fifty mile an hour gales and forty foot waves. So that should answer any questions about seaworthiness.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: I do not have her position today as yet. I might tell my hon. friend I neglected to give some information the last day I gave a position report. The Captain also requested a pepper-and-salt cap, size six and seven-eights.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Could the minister tell us if the Province has yet entered into an agreement with the Government of Canada in connection with the renewal of the R.C.M.P. contract, both provincially and municipally?

MR. HICKMAN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the minister tell us when he expects to sign a new agreement or if there is any difficulties in negotiating an agreement? What is the problem?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, there has been a redrafted contract. We have decided as provincial Attorneys General, that is the eight provinces who are parties to the policing contracts with the Government of Canada, that instead of having the Federal Government present us with a contract that we would have to accept or reject we would turn the scales and we presented them with a contract and asked them to accept it. We thought it was a very good contract. There has been no reaction from the Solicitor General of Canada. I see no point in pushing him because unless and until he arrives and signs a new contract the old contract is in full force and effect.

MR. DOODY: He is probably asking some judge what to do about it.

MR. HICKMAN: But we have done our work and the contract that has been submitted on behalf of this Province is pretty much identical except for certain peculiarities of this Province.

MR. NEARY: What about the Newfoundland Constabulary? Do you intend to put them into Corner Brook and Churchill Falls?

MR. HICKMAN: Both police forces are operating very effectively, very efficiently in the Province of Newfoundland. I am delighted to report that both forces are receiving and have been receiving justly the accolades of the people of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Answer the question! Answer the question!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. J. NOLAN: A question for the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker. We notice in the news in the last day or so that apparently lie detector tests

MR. NOLAN:

are being administered in this Province, or are about to be. I am wondering what the position of the minister is on this matter?

PREMIER MOORES: Always tell the truth.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us give it to him.

PREMIER MOORES: I have never had to give one yet.

MR. NOLAN: Well I would say you are probably very lucky.

The other question, Mr. Speaker, is regarding wiretapping in Newfoundland. Has there been any wiretapping in the last twelve months in this Province?

PREMIER MOORES: Not since the last administration.

MR. NOLAN: Not since the last administration. These are my questions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will answer the second one first, because that has to be dealt with and can only be dealt with under the appropriate provision of the Criminal Code of Canada. I am governed by that, by these provisions. With respect to the first question, Mr. Speaker, the polygraph tests that are used by police forces in Canada and that are being used here, and have been used here for some time, are aids to investigation and nothing more than that, and have never been treated by the police as anything more than an aid to investigation. I am told that they have a very high degree of accuracy and I would emphasize that they can only be used at the request or with the consent of the person submitting to such a test. There have been requests from time to time, I am told, by counsel for persons under investigation that their clients submit to that sort of test. But it is an aid and nothing more. You could not go into court and simply produce the results of a polygraph test and say, this is the sufficient proof for a court to convict or acquit. There still has to be the same degree of proof, proof beyond all reasonable doubt, of the guilt of any person accused of an offense.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEADY: Would the Minister of Social Services, Sir, tell the House how many families are presently living in city hotels and motels and in boarding houses? If the minister does not have the information would he undertake to get the information for the House and tell the House whether this is a serious problem

MR. NEARY:

at this particular moment or not?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I will take note of the question, and try to get the answer tomorrow.

MR. MURPHY: It is a very serious problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I think all the ammunition has been probably used now on the other side of the House. I would like to ask a question which I think has substance. The question is to the acting Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation. What progress is being made on the proposal from the Number Valley Association for the mentally retarded for the establishment of a training center for mentally retarded adults in Corner Brook to serve the Corner Brook-Bay of Islands area? The scope of the problem is as follows: The pressing need as it presents itself to us is for a center to train from twenty-five to thirty mentally handicapped persons. Mr. Speaker, I ask this question because when I was a member of the city council in Corner Brook I was interested in this organization, and I am sure that this government, with the compassion that it has, will look favourably upon a proposal such as this one.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: I am delighted to receive the question from the hon. member and do my best to answer it. Quite seriously, Mr. Speaker, the request has been received and obviously the government is concerned about the whole matter of mental health and the amount of money that can be provided for facilities. So that the request made by the groups in the hon. member's district is now being considered by government and when the budget is brought down and financial provisions for the coming year are made known in the House, well at that time and in the consideration of it, then whatever funds can be provided for mental health all over the Province will be

MR. WELLS:

provided, and the hon. member is going to have to wait, I think, until that time for the detailed answer. But we are extremely concerned with the matter.

MR. WOODFORD: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: A question for the hon. the Premier, Sir. Would the

MR. NEARY: the hon. the Premier, Sir, would the hon. the Premier indicate what is going to happen to the Western -

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! This will be the last question of this period.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. the Premier indicate what is going to happen to the Western Memorial Hospital, is it going to be closed, kept open, turned into a nursing home, what precisely will happen to the Western Memorial?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, first of all here in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition and the absence of the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) and the around-the-bay-crowd who are obviously storm bound, around the bay, I suppose, to Hogan's Pond, I would gladly like to give an answer to that question.

MR. NEARY: Now, now -

PREMIER MOORES: The situation is that I will be meeting with the citizens committee and the hospital committee in Corner Brook. The government's position I think has been made fairly clear. This is a year of restraints. We have announced that in our building programmes in hospitals. There has been a delay in the opening of hospitals. There are a great many things in the way of restraints that will be revealed at the time of the budget that has to be dealt with. In Corner Brook we have got a \$22 million expansion that is opening as part of the addition to the Christopher Fisher Hospital. The Memorial Hospital out there, it is not a matter of its being abandoned, it is a matter of what it is to be used for and when. It is not this government's intention to close it and neglect it, Sir. There would be maintenance facilities, there would be -

MR. NEARY: Geriatrics -

PREMIER MOORES: - several things that can be done with it. But what the people on the West Coast or anywhere else have to realize at this particular point in our history is that only so much can be done at any given time, and I will be meeting with these people and telling them in no uncertain terms what we feel is our limitations in what we can do and certainly to the utmost of what we can do we will do it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): This being Private Members' Day when the House adjourned debate the discussion was on the motion which is now number seven on today's Order Paper and the hon. Minister of Justice had adjourned the debate.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this has to be the longest debate since the Long Parliament of many years ago on a resolution. I understand that I have but five minutes left and I will not trespass upon the time of hon. gentlemen beyond that.

We, as I have said before, will most assuredly vote against this resolution because the resolution seeks to call upon the members of this Legislature to abdicate their responsibilities. I listened yesterday when there was a petition being presented with respect to the CN services that are being provided to this Province. There is an area in the development of this Province which we do not need a select committee to tell us is of vital importance to the economic welfare and development of Newfoundland and Labrador.

But when the petition was being, for what of a better word, debated, I listened very carefully to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and he indicated to me the disturbing philosophy that he has been expounding during the debate on this resolution. He said, and I am paraphrasing his words, that the government have been talking about the lack of service of the CN, that we are the government and what are we going to do about it, but there was not one suggestion, not a solitary suggestion as to whether we should go up and picket the hon. Otto Lang's office, because he has the only say, the only jurisdiction, the only responsibility for transportation services in the Province as far as CN are concerned; whether we are going to pass resolutions and send them on the Parliament, or what else I do not know because no one suggested or would dare suggest that it falls within the responsibility of the Government of Newfoundland.

Mr. Hickman.

But, Mr. Speaker, in closing may I draw to the attention of the hon. House the kind of delays that we have been experiencing in the transportation development, or the development of a transportation policy for the Province of Newfoundland by our federal counterparts. Some years ago, as the hon. gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) will recall, the then Minister of Transport, Newfoundland's representative in the Government of Canada, the hon. Donald Jamieson, appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Russell Lake of Fortune to report on the transportation requirements of the South Coast of our Province. Parts of that report were made public. A vital part of the report as to whether there should be a port of call, a regular port of call for the Argentia ferry service was not made public and my recollection is that our colleague, the hon. Minister of Fisheries, when he was a member of Parliament, asked that that report be tabled in the House of Commons, and he was not successful in having it tabled.

Two years ago the late Thomas Dalton was appointed to look at a port of call for the Burin Peninsula for the East Coast ferry. I was somewhat disappointed in the recommendation of that report in that I felt that economically and from the point of providing the necessary shelter and navigational facilities, and to provide the shortest turn-around, that the port of St. Lawrence was the most logical place. But be that as it may, there was a firm recommendation by the late Mr. Dalton that Marystown be chosen as a port of call, a regular port of call, for the North Sydney - Argentia ferry. That is over a year ago. We are no closer today to having a port of call on the Burin Peninsula by the ferry than we were when the late commission was appointed about six years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hickman.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the economic development of the Burin Peninsula is being very seriously impeded, very seriously retarded because of the failure of the Government of Canada to provide adequate transportation facilities, particularly by way of an East Coast ferry and providing a regular port of call on the Burin Peninsula. If we had that regular port of call, apart altogether, Mr. Speaker, from the benefit to the tourists going to and from that part of our Province, we would be able for the first time to ship fresh fish out of the Burin Peninsula into the very lucrative markets of the New England States. This today is barred because of distance and time to the fishermen, to the fish producers on that part of our coast.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that instead of wasting our time with a select committee going around and doing the very job for which we were elected, that we could do much better by directing our attention to some very positive recommendations, and I can think of a no better recommendation that should emanate from this House than that the Government of Canada get on with the job, meet its commitment, establish the port facilities on the Burin Peninsula that are necessary and just watch that industrial area of our Province continue to grow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: And watch the close to full employment that we enjoy down there become absolutely full employment, and watch the influx of Newfoundlanders who are attracted to that area by job security, jobs based on the development of our resources, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: - and if you want any proof positive of the validity of a programme that is based on resource development, then

Mr. Hickman.

I invite hon. gentlemen in this House to come with me to the Burin Peninsula and there you will see strong industry based on our own natural resources and an industry that provides job security. But simply what we are saying to the Government of Canada, under this constitution that you are so anxious to patriate, you have an absolute responsibility for the transportation services inter-provincial. And in this case you have badly, scandalously, inexcusably, let down the Province of Newfoundland and that is only one area insofar as transportation services are concerned.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that my five minutes have long since expired.

MR. DOODY: No, no, carry on, by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: I am not seeking leave of the House to carry on, but may I say, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution does not commend itself to me. I trust it does not commend itself to hon. members opposite. We have heard from, I think, the hon. Leader of the new-line Liberal Party, the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), that he and his caucus have decided that they cannot support that kind of resolution. Certainly, whether they do or not his speech is not the kind of speech that could be interpreted as being in support thereof. But be that as it may, whoever supports it, whoever feels that it is the kind of resolution that deserves the support of this House, I for one cannot see any merit in it. I cannot see where that kind of resolution would do anything other than relieve hon. members of the responsibility that is imposed upon us following our election to this Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the resolution that has been moved by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I think it is a good resolution, Sir, and probably one of the more positive things that has been done since this session of the House was convened. Mr. Speaker, to refresh the memories of some of the members, we basically want a select committee appointed to enquire into and to report upon the prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador, including the prospects for economic growth and development, and in particular a consideration of those types of development which are best suited to foster and to encourage the way of life most desired by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, while we talk about economic development, Mr. Speaker, I think that rural development in Newfoundland falls into this category in some respects, and I would like to say a few words about that. I do not intend to talk very long. I want to say a few things about some developments in my district and some of the problems that the people are having with respect to obtaining government assistance in this regard. I would like to say that I was disappointed by the Minister of Justice stating that they did not intend to support this particular motion. The minister stood there for about forty-five minutes and criticized Ottawa, as he is prone to do on occasion. I think that some of them should probably change their tune about this particular resolution.

I feel it would be a retrograde step to let this motion die on the Order Paper, and, worse still, to have it defeated. There are hundreds, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of men in this Province and women too who have good ideas about development who have never had a chance to put them forward and this particular select committee that we are talking about would give them the chance to do just that.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: I agree with some hon. members who have spoken in this debate that Newfoundland has been studied to death. We have had all

MR. WHITE:

kinds of studies, reports. Memorial University has done some and each department of this government has done a lot of reports and studies on Newfoundland and the potential for economic and rural development here. But the data gathered from those various studies, Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wonder if they have ever been correlated and put together in a precise proposal in terms of what is best for the Province. There are studies kicking around Memorial University and kicking around the departments here and kicking around the departments of Ottawa, and I think a select committee could look at all those studies and bring them together and hopefully come up with some concrete proposals to present to government.

Members of the legislature, some members, do not have very much to do when the legislature is not open, and I feel it is time that we had this select committee and got on with the job of finding out what other people think other than ourselves about the development of this Province. A new study needs to be done, Sir, I suggest, a brand-new study, with more emphasis on what we can do to best utilize the natural resources of the Province. So I would call upon hon. members to support this resolution and to give it some second thought. I know the Minister of Justice said they did not intend to support it, but I would like for him to give it some serious thought and maybe when the time comes, if it ever does in this session, to getting around to voting on it, that we can do just that and pass it and have the committee established.

Mr. Speaker, I recently accepted an invitation to attend a rural development meeting in Boyd's Cove in my district. The Lewisporte Area Development Association held its annual meeting and I went along to listen to complaints and hear their suggestions with respect to job creation. Some of those complaints I wanted to mention here today, not merely in a manner of complaining but also in terms of suggestions that could be passed on to ministers of the crown and hopefully have something done about them.

Mr. Speaker, the complaints were astounding, and how I wish

MR. WHITE:

every member of the House could have been there, and particularly a select committee been there to listen to some of those people when they were talking about the bureaucracy and the red tape they run into when they try to get things done, complaints about the delay in obtaining suitable land for agricultural development and complaints generally about that kind of bureaucracy.

The Crown Lands Division, Sir, of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture must be one of the most understaffed or inefficient sections of the civil service. I could, Sir, but I am not going to at this moment, document case after case of delays in obtaining leases and grants, files getting lost or reported to be lost and, Sir, in this particular case I am not blaming the present minister of the department. He at least, Sir, shows some signs that he is concerned about this situation and some significant developments have been coming out of that particular department lately. But the process is still too bureaucratic and needs, I feel, to be streamlined badly indeed and I hope the minister does something about this. The complaints are coming in

MR. WHITE: from all over the Province and I am sure that most members on this side have received them, as I have. The minister is receiving them all the time and I think it is something that we should raise publicly and what I am doing now, and I also take note of the fact that the minister has showed some concern for this particular matter and some intention of doing something about it.

I also feel, Mr. Speaker, there has to be more and closer co-operation between the departments of government, especially the important factor of development in the Province and where development comes into play between the departments that have to do with development in Newfoundland.

For one piece of agricultural land, Mr. Speaker, a person may have to go to a half a dozen departments—Environment, Rural Development, Municipal Affairs, Health, Forestry and Agriculture, and usually Transportation and Communications as well. Each, I fear, Mr. Speaker, is doing its work totally independent of the other and in some cases maybe in total contradiction. Surely there can be greater co-operation and more efficiency when it comes to one department working in conjunction with another. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that restructuring, if this was caused by restructuring, had some capital serious ill effects and the gulfs that have been opened between the departments of the government, departments that I have been dealing with, badly need to be closed.

Let me tell you of one example of what I mean by, in this case, the way in which departments work contrary to each other. The Lewisporte Area Development Association, in conjunction with a couple of local businessmen, have been planning a venture in that area for quite some time but a little while ago they were forced to practically drop the matter altogether. The potential land was found, capital for development was readily available, a market existed, but red tape, Sir, I suggest stopped the project.

It was a blueberry undertaking in the Boyd's Cove area. Land was

MR. WHITE: to be cleared, burned over, blueberries planted, they were then to be harvested and canned in a local canning plant. The Agriculture Department approved the area. The gentleman in Central Newfoundland, Mr. Wood, told me himself the site was an excellent one. Agriculture passed it. Crown Lands in this particular case was no problem. Transportation and Communications did not have any major objections to it, but Forestry and Agriculture stalled on the proposal and that is where it erred there. They said that there was too much good timber on the site. That is what they said, there was too much good timber on the site and they said it was an obstacle that could not be overcome at that particular time.

Now apparently no thought was given to cutting down the timber and selling it to one of the paper mills in Newfoundland and providing additional employment in the area at that time and at the same time clearing an area that blueberry development could go ahead. And talking about blueberry development, it was suggested in yesterday's paper, Mr. Speaker, that blueberries could be worth about \$10 million -

AN HON. MEMBER: Ten million pounds.

MR. WHITE: - ten million pounds, is it? - ten million pounds in the Province and yet because of this bureaucracy that I have been talking about a particular development in my district did not get off the ground. But we are going to revive it again and the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture can expect to see some people in that regard in the next little while.

Perhaps, Sir, it is time we looked at a greater role for the Department of Rural Development in this Province. Perhaps the Department should take on a broader role, or a more broadened role and attempt to cut through some of the red tape that small businessmen with imagination and with some plans for particular projects in outport areas of the Province are finding it difficult to cut through. The Rural Development Authority, Sir, has not worked to the extent that it was designed to and that it was anticipated it would work. There were too many bad loans made, and I am sure the minister would

MR. WHITE: probably agree with that, too many bad grants were given out and too many small loans, Sir. Sometimes I feel it is just enough to get a man in to his neck. Many need working capital for particular projects and I would like to see more of that done and more selection on the basis of the best projects that could be developed by Rural Development.

I hope, Sir, the minister takes a serious look at this Rural Development Department. I would like to see an overall plan of rural development, of rural development policy, not just based on the lines of the Rural Development Authority but a more broadened policy with respect to what we are going to do in our smaller communities with respect to their development.

A statement a few days ago by the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development with respect to the sawmill industry was a step in the right direction, Sir. I applaud it. But I am sure the minister would be the first to admit it is nothing more than a band-aid approach. But at least the principle, Mr. Speaker, has been established in this particular

MR. WHITE:

regard, the principle of government assistance to a resource industry during a period of the year when it is difficult for the people concerned to obtain capital. It has to be followed, I feel, in the agriculture department. Here is something that could provide thousands of additional jobs in this Province, agriculture, Mr. Speaker. A lot of people are interested in getting involved in it. There is a lot of agriculture potential and I think with some proper planning we could find a lot more people involved in agriculture in Newfoundland. But I feel, Mr. Speaker, the farmer must become bigger and the government must aid in the marketing of produce.

Sir, I have had some random thoughts on agriculture in the Province. There are farmers in my district, Mr. Speaker, who still have their vegetables in storage from last Fall because they could not sell them then. There will be markets for them this coming Spring, Sir. They know that. But in the meantime where do they obtain additional capital and sufficient capital to prepare for the coming growing season? It has been suggested to me, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the entire area of marketing root crops in Newfoundland - by that I mean potatoes and turnip and those kinds of things - could be looked into by the government and maybe some kind of board established-along the lines of the wheat board in Western Canada - where all the vegetables are purchased, held in storage until the market conditions improve so that people who are farming could have a chance to get some money and buy some equipment and buy the kinds of things they need to get involved in the agriculture business the next year following. More market evaluation, Mr. Speaker, should be done, in my opinion. I do not think it would be too difficult to determine in this Province how many sacks of potatoes we would need or how many tons of turnip we would need or cabbage or whatever, some market evaluation by a team of people. Then we could give some direction to our farmers and let them know how many potatoes we need grown this year and how many turnip we need grown, and if we need more potatoes, well, they can be told that as well. We could do a

MR. WHITE:

survey of the major wholesale and retail places in Newfoundland to find out exactly. The rotation of crops in this particular instance is very important. Crops need to be rotated from year to year in order to keep the soil fertile and that kind of thing.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The problems with the environment concerning Newfoundland farmlands -

MR. WHITE: Well probably somebody should start telling them because there are acres and acres of dry land in this Province, acres and acres of dry land that is blowing about because of that.

Mr. Speaker, a select committee, I feel, could look at market conditions in this Province and maybe put on paper the state of the agricultural industry in Newfoundland because it is in a bad state at the moment, and I am sure most farmers would agree, although some improvements are at least attempted to be made.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said in recent days with respect to jobs and the obtaining of same in this Province. What potential does the tourist industry have? Sir, I feel it has a great potential and it is not even partially tapped at the moment. But Sir, again I feel it is a case of doing a half-ass job with something that could be beneficial to the Province in terms of new dollars coming in and it is a resource based industry, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I would like to draw to your attention, Sir, a phrase just used by the hon. gentleman that I believe, Sir, might be considered to be unparliamentary. The reason I draw it to Your Honour's attention - I do not take offence to it but once we let these things get out of hand here, Your Honour, then it is likely to turn into a bar-room brawl, you know, a year from now. So I would like for Your Honour to give us a ruling on that.

MR. WHITE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. The phrase I used is a typical Newfoundland colloquialism. It is commonly used, Sir, and it describes, you know, it is not a full ass. It is just half an ass and the remark is intended to mean the animal.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I do not have the reference directly in front of me now but Beauchesne speaks to some length on the use of animal terms. One is not allowed to use the word cur, dog, so on and so forth, donkey. Most of these terms are not to be used when they are applied to hon. members or groups of hon. members. I do not recall Beauchesne speaking in this vein in regard to thoughts or activities. So at this point in time I would not rule the hon. member out of order.

MR. WHITE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the tourist industry there a moment ago, and sometimes I wonder what we are doing to persuade Newfoundlanders to visit our Province. Lots of people are doing things I feel, Mr. Speaker, to keep people away from Newfoundland, and I think this is something that all members of the House should be concerned about. There have been things in the last few weeks, Mr. Speaker, with respect to CBC television nationally and the seal hunt that I feel are giving Newfoundland the black eye, and I think it is time that we spoke out about them.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that CBC National documentaries and the seal hunt combined outweigh any good thing that we could hope to do in the realm of promotion in the next few months. It is sickening, Sir, in my opinion, sickening the way this Province has been shown on Mainland television, and never underestimate the power of television. Last Tuesday night, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Could we have a quorum call, Sir. I know it is a bad day, but, Sir, there are enough members around to have a quorum in the House when a member is speaking, making such an important and eloquent speech.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. GOUDIE): Will the Clerk count the House, please? Will the hon. member from Lewisporte continue, please.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, just before the member from LaPoile rose to call a quorum, I was speaking about a couple of things that I feel are damaging the tourist industry in Newfoundland, and something that we should talk about, and we should act about. I do not know what we can do in this respect, but it is something that we should look into. I was referring, Sir, in one particular case to a national CBC television programme of last week, last Tuesday night, it was called The Fifth Estate, and on that particular programme they took a twenty or a twenty-five minute section to deal with Newfoundland. I do not know how many people saw it, but it dealt mainly with the unsavoury

Mr. White:

and bad aspects of Newfoundland. It was very unbalanced, Mr. Speaker. It showed the industry that is failing at the moment, in terms of Come By Chance, and the linerboard mill in particular, and a host of other things that failed in this Province, including things from ten and fifteen and twenty years ago. But it did not deal with the successful mining operation that we have to any great extent, nor did it deal with the pulp and paper industry that is very successful in Newfoundland, nor did it deal with the hydro development in Newfoundland, in Labrador, that has been fairly successful. And I feel, Mr. Speaker, it is time we said something about those things. If we feel that we are being treated unfairly by a national television network then we should say so, and I am saying so now, and I have seen a lot of documentaries in my time, I feel that this particular one was. It was put together by Peter Reilly, who incidentally is a former member of Parliament, but he did a bad job, in my opinion. He tried to balance Newfoundland and he did not balance it at all, He just wanted to sensationalize and show the kinds of damaging things that goes on in Newfoundland.

I feel that the programme literally crucified the Province, and I charge, Sir, that it was done in an unbalanced fashion. And God knows, Sir, if things are not bad enough with Come By Chance closing, but to have our nose rubbed in the dirt by Mainland journalists is more than we can stand for. The programme itself,

MR. WHITE:

just to refresh the memories of certain members, was called the Majestic Newfie Joke. Sir, one line of the script in particular even wondered if Canada could really afford Newfoundland and perhaps we should not be part of Confederation at all. Sir, that hurt a great deal. I have heard other members talk about it, and I would like to hear more members express their opinions on that particular programme.

Sir, why did this gentleman not give a clear picture, a balanced one, of our failing industry and that which is prospering as well?

MR. MORGAN: The Fifth Estate?

MR. WHITE: The Fifth Estate last Tuesday night, yes. They did about a twenty-five minute section on Come By Chance and on the Linnerboard Mill and on the Rubber Plant and on Valdmanis and everybody.

MR. HON. TREBET: Said it was a Newfoundland joke.

MR. WHITE: It was just one programme that - you know, I do not complain about programmes - but I think it was in very bad taste and I think more people should talk about it.

The seal fishery, Mr. Speaker, here is something else that while it is a federal matter I think we should be talking more about it, and not just in the sense of, you know, whether or not the seal hunt should be prosecuted each Spring at all - those are facts and figures that we could get into - but the way Newfoundland is being portrayed in terms of the seal hunt. Here is the biggest red herring, Sir, in a long time that has been thrown up. We are being portrayed across the nation and throughout the world as the North American barbarians and no one is making any attempt to tell our side of the story.

What are the facts? Does the Minister of Fisheries have them? I doubt it, Mr. Speaker, and simply because it is a federal matter and he washes his hands of the whole affair. I agree with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that Mr. Cashin, Richard Cashin, has done a fair amount in recent days to publicize the economic aspects of the seal fishery and he deserves some credit for it. But he is about the only

MR. WHITE:

one that we have heard in the sense of making a dramatic attempt to publicize the seal fishery and the good side of the seal fishery.

We passed an unanimous motion here in the House, Mr. Speaker, but it did not get anywhere. I did not hear it on the National News, on CBC nationally, and I think that that is the kind of thing that we have to get into. My point is, Sir, that we just are not fighting back anymore. Do we want to save the seal fishery or put on somewhat of a feeble fight and hope that it will go away and that we will be able to forget the whole messy affair? Well, let us get the facts and make them known right across the nation. You know, can the herd sustain its yearly yield or yearly quota? If it can, well let us make it known. Is it indeed a good source of income for thousands of Newfoundlanders? Well if it is, let us look at it from the factual standpoint. Maybe it is time, Sir, we need to look at national advertising as a means of getting our point across. There does not seem to be any other way we can do it, in my opinion, at the moment.

Last night on television, those who might have watched television last night, I just could not help but feel only one side of the story was being told when I sat there and watched a baby seal crying on television, crying right at the camera, and then a club coming down smashing it and blood going everywhere. Absolutely, totally disgusting and ridiculous! What the camera failed to do - you know, if the guy behind the camera had simply panned up a little bit and shot the face of the guy who was killing the seal and did an interview with him, I am afraid it would have gone something like, you know, how many kids do you have, Sir. Well I have ten or fifteen or I have ten or twelve kids. How much money do you make? Well I make \$6,000 a year and half of it comes from the seal hunt. And you do not like killing baby seals. No, Sir, I do not like killing baby seals but I have to do it to make a dollar. Those are the kinds of things to get a balanced view of the seal hunt.

There is going to be such a national outcry about this killing of baby seals that we are going to be forced into something that we do

MR. WHITE:

not want to get into and that is probably doing away with the hunt altogether which I do not want to see unless it is necessary, and it should be necessary only, or necessary or not necessary, only on the basis of facts, whether or not the herd can be maintained with the quotas we have today, whether or not it is an economic asset to Newfoundland and those kinds of facts are the only ways we should be viewing the seal hunt at the moment.

Mr. White.

Mr. Speaker, on the economic side of the seal hunt, as I was just saying, I wonder if we are taking it far enough? What about the thousands of tons of perfectly good meat that is left there each year on the ice to go to the bottom of the sea? Some seal meat is canned but not very much. I heard a suggestion the other day from somebody that probably we should try to find a cure for seal meat, some kind of cure, maybe salting seal meat. We have, you know, meat that is high in protein content, and a lot of countries around the world meet that kind of food, and we should look more closely at it, I am afraid, and I would like to see this government look into the possibility of finding out if any particular cures for seal meat are available, where they could be obtained and whether or not market conditions exist. I understand now that last year we in Newfoundland, those who canned seal meat, were not allowed to export it, I understand now that that has been changed, and we are allowed to export seal meat in cans. Well I would like to see it develop even further and probably some form of cure found for seal meat, and I suggest we could probably make millions more from that particular venture. Perhaps we could even market seal meat under a new name, Mr. Speaker. We have done it before. I think it was turbot that was marketed under Greenland halibut awhile back. Then it was changed again to Greenland turbot, I think. Maybe we can do the same thing with seal meat, probably change the name. I do not know what we could call it, but we could call it something or other. The bad publicity with the seal hunt may have some effect on people who would want to buy it to eat it. Maybe if we changed the name or looked at that it would be a good idea in terms of, you know, selling seal meat outside of Newfoundland.

On a side issue, Sir, when I attended the annual meeting of the Lewisporte Area Rural Development Association the other night, to which the minister was invited but could not attend at that particular time, they served a delicacy after the meeting was over. It was domestic rabbit. There is a person in my district who is developing domestic rabbits.

Mr. White.

He has reared - I guess you could call it - thousands of them, or pretty close to thousands of them now. They are going to can them this year, and they are trying to get market for them, and the rabbit was quite good, and it is domestic rabbit. I do not know if you have ever tried it or not, but Graham Linfield down in Campbellton - he has got several hundred there now, and Lew Evely is going to can them this year and hopefully they will find a market for them.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Is he the president of the association?

MR. WHITE: No, he is a member of the association, and not president.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: How are they killed?

MR. WHITE: I do not know how they are killed. I would not want to speculate on how they are killed, but I have no idea, Mr. Speaker.

I found that there are a number of things in my district in particular that people are thinking about getting into. I mentioned earlier the kind of bureaucracy they run into, and I would like to see the Rural Development Department co-ordinate more and more the various departments so that some of the red tape is cut through in getting to the source of the problem with respect to how a person can proceed with his development without having to wait for a report from Forestry and Agriculture, and a report from Transportation, and a report from Health, and a report from everybody. Then it is six, or seven months or eight or nine months or a year has gone by. I had a meeting this morning, Mr. Speaker, with the Minister of Rural Development and the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, and I saw an indication that that was being done there so it is a good thing all around.

Mr. Speaker, that is about the few comments that I wanted to make on this particular motion. I think that we should appoint a select committee of this House to study development possibilities in Newfoundland. Sir, I would like to see a study of the smaller kinds of industries we would get into. There are lots of people out around

Mr. White .

the outport areas who have little ideas they have always had in the back of their minds. They have never tried it on anybody for size. They would like to try it on for size to somebody, and I think they would welcome a select committee of this House to go and sit down with them, to ask them questions about their proposals and to come back and report to the House probably with some unique ventures on how to develop this Province. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Goudie): The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the nature of this resolution is a very, very important resolution. It says that, in effect, there should be a consideration of those types of development which are best suited to foster and to encourage the way of life most desired by the people of Newfoundland. It certainly is a very important resolution, a resolution with respect to the type of industrial development and economic growth which this Province

MR. MARSHALL: should seek. And aside from the oppressing financial situation in which this Province presently finds itself, I would think that this is the one, in my book anyway, that would have the next priority.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that a select committee of this House is really going to contribute to that inquiry to any particular degree. This particular type of resolution and this particular type of inquiry is really something that should take the attention, not of a select committee, but really of this whole House in full and complete debate and inquiry. We do not need an inquiry, I might state, we do not need an inquiry to find out the way in which the members of the Opposition would wish to develop this Province, the way in which they would attempt to have economic development. Because they had an appreciable period of time, Mr. Speaker, in government and we saw exactly foursquare how they would develop this Province.

They adopt, as we know, the adage of develop or perish. They adopted the philosophy of jobs regardless of job security, regardless of the overall cost, the net cost to the people of this Province. After all, they are the party of the oil refineries, they are the party of the electric reduction plants and they are the party of the Melville pulp and paper. So, Mr. Speaker, there is a need of inquiry for the proper type of industrial development of this Province, but there is no need of an inquiry to determine what type of economic or industrial development would be pursued by the Leader of the Opposition in the event that he formed the government - that is the Liberal Government - because we know what type of development that they would have.

I do not know why this resolution was really brought in. I do not know whether it was to pretend to the people of this Province that they are adopting a different type of philosophy, that they want to adopt a different type of philosophy. I do not know whether the resolution is really an apology to the people of Newfoundland for the philosophy that was followed, but certainly it should have been

MR. MARSHALL: accompanied with that. Or maybe it is an attempt by the Opposition to paint themselves as the vehicle of change, to latch on to a more convenient type of approach to industrial development, convenient for the present time, in the hope that the public awareness will forget what they have done in the past, and that they will cloak themselves with the position of being the party that is justified to regain power in order to change the things that they set in motion.

Now it is almost incredible that such a resolution can be seriously, really, brought in by the Leader of the Opposition when you consider what went on in the past. And we have to consider what went on in the past. You have to ask yourself, can a party which pursued such a definite economic development policy for so long while in power and which, Mr. Speaker, to a great extent is directly responsible for the financial vice now squeezing the life-blood out of this Province, whether that party can now convince the public of this Province that a different approach ought to be taken and cast the blame upon others for their failures and present themselves as hope for the future? Now can that happen? Can that possibly happen, Mr. Speaker? Incredibly, I have to say in Newfoundland it is possible.

I am absolutely amazed how in this Province people can put forth a position and practice a position as the Liberal Party did in the past, and with impunity afterwards take a diametrically different position within months, weeks, days or even hours and still be accepted with credibility.

MR. NEARY: What about Shaheen?

MR. MARSHALL: We will get to Shaheen in a moment if the hon. gentleman will possess himself of patience. He will hear about Mr. Shaheen and a few other matters.

But, as I say, Mr. Speaker, it is utterly amazing that this particular approach can be taken. But in this Province it can be, because it can be and it has been. And programmes that had been carried on by this government, which had to be carried on because of the large commitments of money, are now being turned around as our programmes when really what the government has been doing is trying to save and solve the Province. I say that this government is going to be buried ten feet deep unless certain members in the government itself - and I mean in the direct government itself - are up on their feet from time to time and explaining and defending their position rather than appearing to sit down and just mutely take what is being cast.

It is as if, Mr. Speaker, in this Province there is no record that exists either in the memory of the public or in the great press which we have in this Province. Now I am not going to talk about the press because once before I talked about the press at a do I was attending and everything gets distorted. I speak my own personal view when I speak this, Mr. Speaker, that the former leader of the Liberal Party, the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) yesterday spoke about in this Province there was a bankruptcy in politics, political bankruptcy. With that I think most of us can concur. That is nothing new. It is my opinion, and as I say I know as I state this opinion that everything else I say afterwards, if anything is reported will be underneath what I am now going to say. I also happen to think, Mr. Speaker, that there is a bankruptcy in this Province with respect to the press because people are allowed to take diametric, different positions, absolutely opposed to what they took before and still, incredibly, have these positions accepted with credibility.

It is as if the press - and the press report them, the press report these positions without comment. They change from day to

MR. MARSHALL:

day and back and forth so that now the Leader of the Opposition is almost painted as the person now who is advocating a different type of industrial development in this Province.

MR. NEARY: And they are not for that 100 per cent.

MR. MARSHALL: I could give one specific example of this, just one specific, very patent example. Two Saturdays ago there appeared in the Evening Telegram - and then I say I know that all this part will probably be the only thing that will be reported is what I say, if anything, in the House.

MR. NEARY: What? Do you make the statement outside the House?

MR. MARSHALL: I will make my statements anywhere I want to, and I will make them in the House and I have made them outside the House and I will again.

MR. NEARY: Do not be cowardly now. They are not here to defend themselves.

MR. MARSHALL: This is with respect to Gull Island. To keep the power in the hands of the members he said it was going to be an open ticket to borrow as much as they needed. This is the business with the borrowing of Hydro Quebec, not in this session but in the previous session.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. MARSHALL: This is Mr. Wick Collins in his comment two Saturdays ago in the Evening Telegram. He said it was going to be an open ticket to borrow as much as they needed, "maybe billions of dollars without having to come back to the House of Assembly to get approval for each separate amount borrowed. Fortunately the Opposition saw the danger of putting that much authority in the hands of the few people outside of the House of Assembly and fought the government hard enough to get the bill changed." Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact - and one can refer to the same documents in the Evening Telegram or in The Daily News or in any periodical we have - firstly, that the members opposite are the people who enacted in 1966 that invidious amendment to the Revenue and Audit Act which put secret borrowing power in the hands of Cabinet.

The hon. members here opposite when they sat here were greeted

MR. MARSHALL:

with an act which I drafted myself in Opposition to cut this out, and voted against it. But it is also even more direct with respect to the statements made in that particular article by Mr. Collins in The Telegram that the government was not restrained, if we shall put it, by members opposite. They saw nothing wrong with it because after all this is really what they have practiced. But there happened to be three members on this side of the House who were painted at the time as being the Tory trio. They are not the Tory trio any more. They might be the Tory duo or they might be Tory anything. But the point of the matter is it is completely erroneous reporting. The members of the

Mr. Marshall:

Opposition on the other side were prepared to vote for this, and saw absolutely nothing wrong with it. And that is what I mean

AN HON. MEMBER: Not so! Not so!

MR. MARSHALL: by people being allowed - the record will show,

AN HON. MEMBER: Not so!

MR. MARSHALL: the record will show in the last session of the last Assembly that this was so. And this happens again and again and again in this Province, and it is not entirely the press, although the press certainly is to blame, but it is the public as well and nobody remembers -

MR. NEARY: I remember.

MR. MARSHALL: diametric opposite positions are taken by people from day to day that are completely different from what they had, and yet they are accepted with credibility.

So that is why I wonder, as I say, why the Leader of the Opposition could put forth this particular resolution. In my mind it takes a lot of gall on his part, a politically unconscious public or a dormant press, the latter breeds the former, and the former the latter, and then consequently we have a cycle.

Now I will say this about the hon. member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) when he was speaking, and I think he was entirely wrong, and I think he is wrong in his approach to economic development when he was speaking the other day, but at least the hon. member from Twillingate remains consistent with his position that he has. He does not attempt, as the Leader of the Opposition does, and I do not say that the Leader of the Opposition personally, I say the official Opposition - to attempt to weasel around their other positions, and try to attempt they are for something else that they were not for. He does not attempt to do that. But he talks - when he was criticizing, if you will recall, Mr. Speaker, this House will recall, the member from Twillingate was, the Leader of the Opposition for wondering whether the big business syndrome should be in our plans.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised.

MR. NEARY: A legitimate point of order. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if in accordance with the rules of this House it is in order for a member when he is speaking to refer to a previous debate or another debate that is taking place in this hon. House. My understanding of the rules, Sir, is that you cannot refer to another debate, that you have to stick to the particular debate on the Order Paper that is going on at the moment.

MR. MARSHALL: I will not put Your Honour to a ruling on that.

MR. NEARY: You are wrong.

MR. MARSHALL: I shall - it is not so, and I will not go into it with Your Honour on the issue, but I shall not refer to previous debates to make the position easier. If I may continue?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Because his Honour is new in the Chair, and it is the first time his Honour is in the Chair, I would like to exhibit a certain amount of courtesy as I know the hon. member from LaPoile would do to his Honour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: But I will refer, Mr. Speaker, to things that were said concerning-the other day, that I had heard said the other day-about big business. We said we need big business. And mention was made again about the the multiplier affect, again consistent with what one said some time before, that same gentleman said some time before on the other side, at least as I say, he is consistent, but I disagree whole-heartedly with him. The most effective speaker, the most effective speaker I suppose that this Legislature obviously has seen, and I sat here listening to him, and I thought, you know, I just wondered why it is that even nowadays as you look around this Assembly and you see people listening to him and sometimes they are almost nodding their head hypnotically, as they used to in years gone by, and what is it that he has that we poor mortals can look at. And what I think is that he

Mr. Marshall:

presents an image of what people really want to hear, because we all want these things, big businesses as people talk about, we want big business, we want the multiplier affects of the side industries, the secondary industries, we want cars, we all want everything, the best thing for everybody in Newfoundland that we can possibly get. However, Mr. Speaker, we must, I feel, ask and inquire as to the practicality of this pursuit of big business. There is no doubt that job creation is very important. But I say, and it has been patently evident in the recent events, that job security and the cost of the job itself also is extremely important.

We all must accept the affect of big business, and I would not want the words that I am going to say now to be distorted, but experience, I say, has shown that the type of big business that we want is the big business that is based on our natural resources. This resolution is a beneficial one, from the point of view of having this matter discussed, but I do not think that we should have a select committee. Because we must debate, and we must debate fully and determine the direction of this Province and its economic development. And to my mind perhaps the most important decision that could come out of this Legislature in the present session would be a commitment and a resolve to develop and accept and assist only those big businesses where the raw materials are located here, and to abandon, and to make a direct approach to abandon forever and a day the position of heavy industrialization where the sources of raw materials are not in the Province, and that must not, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, be the government's goal, whether it is the government or any government hereafter.

Now the member from Twillingate was enunciating, I want to make that clear, the policy of the Liberal Party. The actual Liberal Party is now attempting to enunciate another policy, but they are committed, I would submit, to that particular policy because they have this Province in a morass such as it has never seen before in its history and never will again, directly as a result of its economic development policies.

MR. NEARY: Now! Now!

MR. MARSHALL: And I hear the hon. member from Lewisporte (Mr. White) referring to the unsavoury programme on T.V. the other day with which I will agree with him. But the fact of the matter is, as I looked at it, and always the Mainlanders paint things much more harshly than they ought to be, but there was one message that came through loud and clear on it; that the industries that have failed in this Province and are causing problems in this Province are industries

MR. MARSHALL:

where the source of raw materials are not located here and every failure, most of the failures of the Liberal Government, of the government that occupied from Confederation up to recent times. Even if you want to go back - although we are told we should not go back, but I think that we should go back and the people should be aware of it because if you are aware of the mistakes of the past hopefully you are not going to be foolish enough to make them in the future - but even if you go back to the early development days of the Liberal Government to your steel plants and your boot factories and what have you and the various other things, these were places where the raw materials, Mr. Speaker, had to be taken from abroad and they failed. Now that was the policy of the Liberal Party whether they like it or whether they not, and they liked it and they enjoyed it very, very well when they were content to kiss the hem of the garment day by day of the now hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), that the policy of the Liberal Party has been one of jobs, jobs, jobs. We heard it over and over again, the multiplier effect, big business.

MR. NEARY: And yours is unemployment, unemployment, unemployment.

MR. MARSHALL: No, ours is not unemployment. The policy of the P.C. Party, Mr. Speaker, on assumption in power, and I am aware a little bit of the policy as I know all members are, but in those long gone august days I was in the position, for a very brief while of the, I suppose, political trinity, if you want to call it a P.C. Party, having been for a very short time occupy the august and exalted roles of policy Chairman, President and interim leader at that particular time, and I had a fair amount to do, as I think hon. members on this side will recall, with the formulation of the policy of the Party. The policy of this Party on assumption was put together not overnight but over a long period of time with an awful lot of people involved, a great deal of discussion and a great deal of consideration. Here again the policy of the P.C. Party is a matter of record that we have which was passed in the policy convention and adopted in 1971. But the people who formulated this particular

MR. MARSHALL:

policy, what struck them most, Mr. Speaker, was the nature of economic development, the emphasis on big business in the sense that we had to get industry no matter what the cost of the job, no matter what the job security, they would import anything from anywhere for the purpose of making a job, and that was their philosophy. At the same time the people who framed the policy, interpreted, and I think correctly, the fact that the rural areas of the Province had been forgotten because there was a syndrome in Newfoundland that had been enunciated by that same party at one time of burn your boats with respect to the fishery. A couple of hon. members on this particular side just the other day drew to my attention, they are members who had the privilege of going to school in the outports some years ago, that teachers used to say to their pupils that if you did not get educated that you would end up out in the fishing boats or you would end up out in the woods. We had similar things said to us when we were here in St. John's. So there was a psychology in this Province of being ashamed of the things that we had the natural resources to pursue. It grew up over a period of time with respect to the fishery, this is not to blame anyone, because these things creep up on people with respect to the fishery, with respect to logging, with respect to agriculture and what have you.

Consequently the swing, the pendulum, went right the other way towards the heavy industrialization and that is where the Liberal Party fell and fell full square. Now there was a danger at the same time of over-emphasizing rural development from the point of view of people would turn around and say, "Oh, we cannot have a Farley Mowatt type of society in Newfoundland in the quaint little place. We have got to do both." But these people realized that there had to be a balance between the two. The way it was expressed then, which came back after I heard the comment the other day, and I think this is true, that you have big business, yes, and I think this should be the philosophy, based on your natural resources, but rural development would have to be a big business and a large size of the big business of this Province. But in order to do this it would take a tremendous amount of education, direction, leadership, concentration, and what have you. That was

MR. MARSHALL: what we embarked upon, Mr. Speaker, and the proof of it was then very evident in our minds at the time when you looked at the situations with respect to, even then in those days, the effect with respect to Come By Chance and the then Melville Pulp and Paper, and the whispers with respect to ERGO and the large subsidies that were given out, and generally speaking the failure of the previous administration, and I use the word failure because their direction was a direction that was carried over, and perhaps necessary in 1949 and the 1950s, but the trouble is they hung on to it too long.

MR. NEARY: But that government is gone now.

MR. MARSHALL: Well that government is gone, I am just explaining what the position was with respect to the PC Party and their -

MR. WELLS: The ghosts are still here.

MR. NEARY: The ghosts are still here? It could only go so far with the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Mines and Energy -

MR. MARSHALL: If I could, Mr. Speaker; there is a rule also, Mr. Speaker, I think that hon. members are entitled to be heard in silence unless they invite interjections, and I by no means have invited any interjections from the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

So that was the policy. It was a policy then of balance, and it was a policy that required a lot of input into rural development because it had not been done in the past, and I think that is the nature of the direction in which this Province still has to go and has to go to a great degree.

MR. NEARY: Have you lost your momentum?

MR. MARSHALL: No, I have not lost my momentum, my momentum is building up again. The government has not lost momentum. What happened with this government, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize this, that the government is not responsible even though by this juxtaposition of people being able to take diametric opposite views from time to time is coming about, and it will come about unless really the government defends itself properly, but the government is not responsible for Come By Chance, for Stephenville, for problems at Long Harbour, or

MR. MARSHALL: what have you.

When this government came into power it had all it could do to cope with the immediate problems that were cast upon it as a result of the policies, primarily the economic development policies, of the previous administration.

MR. NEARY: You had four years to get re-elected.

MR. MARSHALL: Within twenty-four hours, Mr. Speaker, of the assumption of power, within twenty-four hours of assumption of power, the fiasco of the Melville Pulp and Paper and Mr. Doyle were upon the government and so on.

So all this government had to do for a long period of time was to cope with the problems or attempt to cope with the problems with which it was faced.

MR. NEARY: You have had three or four years. Now what are you going to do yourself?

MR. MARSHALL: The three or four years, Mr. Speaker, that they had were spent with this, and their major thrust in economic development, Mr. Speaker, has been the Gull Island project. When you talk about the Lower Churchill, now that is where I would differentiate and that is where this government then went on its own and adopted its own initiative. It could not before because it is being strangled by the financial constraints.

MR. NEARY: And goofed! There is where they goofed!

MR. MARSHALL: What I have to say, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Gull Island, and because of the Gull Island thing, as I think it is a matter of records, that

MR. MARSHALL:

I am not sure of, really, government's approach to economic development, what exactly is the government's approach to economic development. I would certainly appreciate and I think that it should be defined. Certainly insofar as this approach with respect to the Gull Island is enunciated, I am myself, as I say, far, far from satisfied with respect to the thrust of economic development in this area. While we are on Gull Island, Mr. Speaker, - and this is not for me but I think it is a matter of public interest for the public to know and I raised these issues before. I have written about them in the paper and I speak about them again now. I think that it is vitally necessary to the public of this Province that the information be supplied in respect of this and all other economic developments periodically.

I would like the answers to the questions publicly, as I know they can be given, as to whether or not the necessary financing from the federal government has been obtained, what progress has been made with Hydro-Quebec with respect to the delivery of the power. I would like to know how much of the \$55 million gamble has been spent to date and generally what work has been really completed. So those are particular -

MR. NEARY: And if you do not get the answers?

MR. MARSHALL: It is not a case of if I do not get the answers. I am asking that these answers be supplied for public consumption. I tell you I would rather sup with people who it is possible to prevail upon and to talk to and to exchange ideas -

MR. NEARY: You are.

MR. MARSHALL: - than to go near, let alone walk over to the hon. gentlemen there opposite. I have seen the way the hon. gentlemen there opposite operate -

MR. NEARY: You are going to receive the Royal Order of the Boot.

MR. MARSHALL: - and I guarantee the hon. gentlemen opposite ought not to hold their breath and wait for me to go over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I speak in this House as a private member.

MR. NEARY: No, you do not.

MR. MARSHALL: Oh yes indeed.

MR. NEARY: No, the hon. member does not.

MR. MARSHALL: Listen, the hon. member -

MR. NEARY: You speak as a member of a party.

MR. MARSHALL: He says, the hon. member does not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: No, you do not.

MR. MARSHALL: Not by his definition, not by the definition -

MR. NEARY: You have your orders written on your back.

MR. MARSHALL: Not by the definition, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman operated when he was a private member up here because if he opened his mouth, he would be swat.

MR. NEARY: That is what you should be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: With respect to the Gull Island, Mr. Speaker - if I may continue without interruptions from the left bleachers, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Take a stand, boy. Do not be so cowardly.

MR. MARSHALL: With respect to this resolution and because of the development approach of this Province and also in view of the fact that the Techmont feasibility study report figures in its computation of the feasibility of the project, it mentions such projects, on page 10, as a cement plant, a chlorine caustic soda plant, an oil refinery, a petrochemical complex, a pulp and paper plant and an aluminum reduction plant in its computations of the feasibility, I would like to know to what degree these industries, particularly the oil refinery, the petrochemical plants and the aluminum reduction plant, figure in the plans of government with respect to the delivery of Gull Island. Because if they are using Gull Island for the purpose of these industries I say, and I say this now, that in my opinion this is not the best approach of economic development in this Province.

MR. NEARY: Are you a member of that party? Do you not caucus with one another?

MR. MARSHALL: And I point to the facts, Mr. Speaker, that have already unfortunately come about, the facts that we are already patently aware of as a result of the mistakes that have been made and foisted on the people of this Province by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and his then colleagues whom he embraced so well.

MR. NEARY: Do you intend to cross the House, or what?

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, as I say, I do not want these answers. I would like these answers not for myself, but I think that these answers should be given to the general public and I think they are of value. I do not feel that that type of economic development in this Province - and I would hope that these considerations are merely ancillary to the delivery of power and the Gull Island project, but I would hope that these particular types of industries, which also involve the delivery of raw materials from points other than Newfoundland, industrialization where the source of raw materials is not here, I hope that that type of industry does not form part and parcel of the real considerations of this government because if so they are really adopting in part - and I say in part

MR. MARSHALL: and I emphasize it - the policies of the previous government and I know that they would not wish to be associated with it, and I certainly would not like to see that.

MR. NEARY: Look here are you going to leave, or are you going to wait to get the boot or what?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the next item and one final item on it that I would like to mention and emphasize, is the fact that the rural development in this Province - I think and I would agree with, I think all members would agree is essential but is to be considered not in isolation, that we must have rural development and not have industrial development where we have raw materials here, big development, you have it all together - that rural development must take the aspect of big business in this Province, and I feel that this government is the one that has taken a thrust in that area by establishing a department and I feel very confident, when we have the present Minister of Rural Development, whom I think understands rural Newfoundland certainly better than I do, and, I again say, more than most people in this House and has a feeling for it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. MARSHALL: But I say this, Mr. Speaker, and I know he will agree with me when I say this, that rural development is more than just merely supplying backhoes and tractors, that rural development is really an attitude in this Province, and an attitude that has to be developed.

MR. NOLAN: Tell us about the loans?

MR. MARSHALL: Well the loans of Rural Development, I mean I say it is more than backhoes and tractors and there are loans throughout, maybe there are loans that should not have been made, but it is an attempt for rural -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: It was an attempt, Mr. Speaker, for rural development in this Province that we never had before and these things, these programmes are necessary but what I say is in rural development we need more than that -

MR. NEARY: Sure boy.

MR. MARSHALL: - we need a change in the attitude of the people in -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On a point of order, I am trying to listen to my hon. colleague and I am reading some documentation here in the meantime, but I am really a little bit aggravated. The hon. member has made a point that rural development is an attitude as well as process, and I am embarrassed that the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) is not treating this matter with the proper respect. He is besmirching the opinions and the representations being made by the hon. gentleman. I think generally perhaps that kind of attitude at the present moment prevades the House, and I am embarrassed as the minister to have to have this attitude manifest itself when the hon. gentleman is making very pertinent remarks.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. gentleman for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: In connection with that point of order, Mr. Speaker; first of all I resent very much the implication by the hon. member that I am cynical and not at all serious and treat lightly any efforts to be made and any references by the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). I do resent it very much, and I would think that the hon. member, who caused enough disturbance in Ottawa and now he is trying to do the same thing down here, if this hon. member means business let him table the amounts of money that were loaned out, table the names of the individuals and stop hiding it. There is a time for you now to start off properly. One, where are the jobs that we need so badly right now, give us the names of the individuals, give us the names of those who have taken off without repaying them to the Province. I say, Mr. Speaker, to this gentleman, if he is really serious put up or shut up and do it now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On that same point of order, Your Honour, I certainly do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman who perhaps is getting his breath at the moment. We have already had that debate

MR. LUNDRIGAN: in the House. It is not relevant to the issue. If the hon. gentleman were to check the records and he carries on with his smirking attitude at the present moment,-

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, must he continue on that line?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, just to finish my remarks there on the point of order; the hon. gentleman if he were to check the records will find that there has been due diligence paid his own riding in applications coming forward. We treated the matter of loans the same as the attitude of the banks -

MR. NOLAN: Table the names and the amounts for all districts.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - other lending institutions, and the only reason that the hon. gentleman and a number of other hon. gentlemen across the House get on their high horses about the \$15,000 loans, where there are accusations about all kinds of corruptions, that is about the extent of their ability, They can understand \$15,000, they cannot understand the major issues.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order; I submit to Your Honour that there was really no point of order in the first place, Your Honour. It is just a matter of opinion. The member got carried away and came to the defence of the member for St. John's East and there was really no point of order at all, Your Honour, and I ask Your Honour to rule that way.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): Order, please! My understanding was that the essence of the point of order was the matter of interrupting the hon. member who had the floor of the House. I believe I understood it in those terms. The rule, of course, is that an hon. member speaking has the right to be heard in silence. We do recognize that if a member in speaking does answer remarks from other hon. members that this is allowed to pass. If the hon. member from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) feels that he is being unduly interrupted the Chair certainly will protect him.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, Your Honour.

MR. NEARY: You are welcome.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, and ably assisted by the statesman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Of all the smirching -

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker,

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, he is at it again, call order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this business of rural development, there were no backhoes, there were no tractors -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - there was no programme before we assumed office. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is this, that we need, as I say, more than that particular programme, because rural development has really to be an attitude and it has to be developed. Now there have been attempts and we say from time to time - and I do not want this to be taken out of context, either - but there have been people from time to time, all periods of time from all sources, let us put it that way, going to places like Scandinavian countries and what have you. And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, insofar as it is for rural development I do not think really there is any need to go to Scandinavian countries. Maybe there is now, but there was not at one period of time.

MR. MARSHALL: We had in this Province at Memorial University in the 1970's and 1971's and 1969, I think they still have it operating there, the Institute of Economic and Social Research at Memorial. And at that particular time we had people from the Scandinavian countries, one in particular I can think of from Norway, Mr. Kado Wadel, Mr. Otto Brocks and various other people who put out publications that are very interesting publications. I do not know how many people in this House have read them, but they are certainly, even though a bit outdated now, they are certainly very, very relevant. I think the unfortunate part about this is that people like Mr. Wadel who related extremely well - as does not always happen with respect to persons who come from away, who come from European countries and what have you - they related extremely well to our people, particularly, I believe, up around the Fogo area and up around the Northeast Coast. I think their particular thinking, while it is valuable to have the Scandinavian experience, I think it is much better to get people over here like that and inject their thoughts into the new department and Rural Development could rely on them for direction. Because, believe you me, they have a lot to contribute and they could do an awful lot for this Province.

But I think most of all, Mr. Speaker, in the area of rural development, as I say, we still have this particular attitude that has been imbued into all of us by generations before where the living was hard - certainly it was very hard in the fishing boats and in the woods and what have you - it was imbued in us by generations before, and recently by teachers to students that if you do not do well in school you are going to be out in the fishing boats or you are going to be out in the woods and what have you, and that is the type of psychology, Mr. Speaker, that we have to cure.

Now I think that these two things then could be the biggest contribution that this government could make to the Province, that is for once and for all to take up the cudgel and exercise the direction and the leadership that is going to be necessary to put

MR. MARSHALL: the lie forever and a day to the type of industrial development where the source of raw materials are not located in the Province and to concentrate on industrial development - yes, big business as big as you can get - where the source of raw materials are here. Not make the stupid, idiotic mistake, by the way, of where we have one based on raw materials, like the one in Stephenville, of having the source of materials in Labrador and the plant on the Island. You might just as well have them over in Germany somewhere.

But that, number one, is the type of development that this government should commit itself to, and, secondly, the other thing that they have to do is to realize that rural development can and should be big business. In order for it to be big business there is going to have to be a change of attitude in this Province towards it, and I think that that is the way out of our economic situation in the long run. I would like

MR. MARSHALL:

to record here again once more, that is the type of economic development that the Progressive Conservative Party was for when it was in Opposition. It is the type of development that I am for myself, and I feel that the government will, I would hope now that when the government gets its breath after cleaning up the messes, it had three or four years to clean up the messes, that it will get off in that direction itself as well.

MR. NEARY: What about the Churchill Falls takeover?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

HON. J. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this debate, Mr. Speaker, but the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks last Wednesday and the hon. member for Lewisporte today brought up many points about the Department of Forestry and Agriculture. Instead of waiting later to indicate what has been going on there for a while and certainly pertinent to the points brought up, I think maybe a few words about the department and about some of the points raised may be apropos.

First of all I want to speak from January, 1972 through March, 1976.

MR. NEARY: January 18th.

MR. ROUSSEAU: January 18th, whatever it is.

MR. NEARY: I will remember it as long as I live.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But in any event I would like to say a few things about what has been going on in the department. I would like to make it abundantly clear, I would like to make it abundantly clear at the beginning that anything I do say is merely something that has been started by the first minister in the department, now the Minister of Finance, the next minister, his successor, who is now the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations and my immediate predecessor, the present Minister of Health. Things that are occurring now in the department are merely things that have been initiated in these past number of years and as a result I hope will bear fruit, if you wish, within the next short term.

MR. ROUSSEAU:

First of all, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about the question of Crown lands. I think that is a point that is extremely pertinent, face to face with the people of this Province. I can appreciate hon. members on both sides of the House, and I used to always laugh at the hon. ministers who were my predecessors when they would get in caucus or when you would see them on the street and somebody would be blasting them about Crown lands. It is not something that a Minister of Forestry and Agriculture wants to hold up. Why do not want to hold up these applications. It would be a lot better and you would have a lot more peace and quiet at home in the night, and a lot more peace and quiet in the office if the question of the acquisition of titles or leases or grants to land was much easier than it is now. Now what are we trying to do, given the problem that does exist, the fact that people have to wait eighteen to twenty-four months now for a grant or lease to Crown land? Well, of course, as hon. members know there are different types of Crown land leases or grants. Of course the summer cabin one is a difficult one, because we have to look at the problems encountered by the number of cabins in a given area and the environmental impact, all due to putting too many cabins in a given area, the question of agriculture, of course, and the question of just Crown land for other uses. Recently in the restructuring the division of Crown lands which now takes, as I say, eighteen to twenty-four months to come through with your lease on your grant and that includes, Mr. Speaker, the question of the survey which a person after the actual grant is approved that has to be done. They have up to a year to do that and I know of many people who have asked for extensions who were not ready to use it. But a lot of people would like to have their grants much quicker. What we are now attempting to do, and what we hope will be in place in the next couple of months, next month to three months, we have been setting up our regional offices around the Province in four areas, Eastern, Central, Western and in Labrador. There will be somebody there responsible for Crown lands.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, what has happened is a person who applies for Crown Land would send it into the Crown Lands Division in the Building.

MR. ROUSSEAU:

The Crown Lands Division in the Building would then send it out to each of the departments in the Building. Each of the departments in the Building would then send it out to its field staff. The field staff of each department would look at the request and whether it was acceptable to Highways or Environment or Health or Municipal Affairs or whatever department. Then they would send a report back to the department. Then the department would send a report back to Crown lands and this took some period of time.

Mr. Rousseau:

You have problems in the Wintertime, for example, that when the snow is on the ground it is difficult to look at the ground, and to get all the information you need. So as a result of a programme started a year or two ago, we hope now within the next couple of months to set up our people in these regions where the crown lands official will be in the region and will be able to check with the departmental officials in the region instead of having to send it in here and go out and back and forth. The only shortcoming there would be where a given department did not have a representative in any given region, I think that would be minimal at most. By doing this when the application directly goes out from crown lands to our field staff, and he checks back, we hope you, we would hope to shorten the period of eighteen to twenty-four months to somewhere between eight months to sixteen months, somewhere in that area, hopefully, maybe less, if we could do it in two or three months that is what our aim is. Our aim is to do it in as short a period as possible. As I say, Mr. Speaker, we hope to have that set up in the next month to three months. It is going to take a little while to iron the bugs out of it, but at least, Mr. Speaker, it is a concrete and positive effort in an attempt to help the people of this Province who are attempting to acquire land. And, Mr. Speaker, we must remember that it is only in the past few years that the question of land ownership has become so important to people in this Province, And everybody now wants a piece of land, because a piece of land is something that you can keep, that appreciates in value, and it is a very valuable asset. And of course through recent years I think there have been many more applications. I know when I first went down to the department I got very upset, in a sense, that I did not think the Premier sent me down as a minister merely to sign my name, because it appeared that I had to spend, and I knew each of my predecessors had the same thing, day after day with piles and piles of crown land applications - it is a very difficult job, to give you some indication of just how many we get, we get very many.

Mr. Rousseau:

But I mainly want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is a positive move afoot in an attempt to reduce the amount of time required to get crown land. Now tomorrow or the next day I will be making what I feel to be announcement, or a major announcement on future leases in respect to agriculture in the Province - that is not on the land freeze in St. John's specifically - and I hope tomorrow or the next day to make an announcement on that to show another step forward in respect to what government are prepared to do to look at the question of crown lands. We have made a number of changes, Mr. Speaker, and tomorrow or the next day when in the release I will make. I will attempt to give some indication of that.

So hopefully, as I say, that will be a step forward and a positive step. In crown lands as well, Mr. Speaker, we are now attempting with our photo interpretation unit to do an interpretation of the land across the Province, the whole Province, which we have never had before. We hope that these pictures and the equipment we have would enable us to make better use of the land we have. And when we talk about making better use of something, Mr. Speaker, the ill-fated trip - and I will tell you something, Mr. Speaker, it is not too often that I can get up and say something and not be a little embarrassed one way or the other, but I can say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the people of this Province that the least embarrassing thing I have done since I have been in government is to spend three and a half weeks in Europe looking at the forestry and agricultural situation over there.

As a result of that - and to get back to the point I was making - before I saw things over there that did not happen overnight, Mr. Speaker, they were many, many years, and many, many hundreds of years coming about. I hope that they will not take as long in this Province, but at least if government are prepared to take the steps, the positive steps necessary to bring about this, and it may be our children, Mr. Speaker, and maybe our children's children who will finally benefit from it. I hope that we will be able to. I am sure that each member of the

MR. ROUSSEAU:

government hopes that his department will be able to produce something that we will be able to gain from, but in the long run we are the people in the Province who have to remember that there will be many generations coming after us, and that we will have to try and make life a little better for them.

So in respect to crown lands I think there is a positive effort being made, Maybe I will have to get up here with egg on my face after this new system is introduced, it may still be eighteen to twenty-four months, If there is we will keep looking for some ways to reduce the amount of time required to acquire crown land. But remember, Mr. Speaker, another point, when people acquire land, and our older people in the Province, our older fathers, grandfathers and so on considered very important, and as those who sat behind the desk as the minister in charge of crown lands have seen people come in of forty and fifty, sixty, hundreds of years ago come in with a piece of paper in respect to land they own, and there is a problem with it, then we appreciate the fact that you have to take a little bit of time to make certain that your children's children will not have a problem in respect to the land that they thought for generations they had and which in effect in the end result they do not have.

MR. ROUSSEAU: it is important in that respect that this government is not prepared to pass land out on a come-and-get-it, first-served basis. You have to have planning. There are many departments involved and many conceptions of what these departments would like to see in given areas or regions in the future. So that is a very positive step, we believe, in attempting to cope with the question of Crown lands.

The question of forestry, Mr. Speaker, we started a couple of years ago on a detailed inventory in this Province and one of the other effects of the trip I recently took is to see the extremely important aspect of forestry that Norway, Sweden and Finland. They respect their forests. I think it is only recently that we have come to respect our forests.

I think this morning the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) was in my office with a constituent on a problem in a sawmill and met with myself and the Minister of Industrial Development and indeed this morning we had the first two drafts of the detailed inventory in two areas in Central Newfoundland come in. And this is what this land inventory that my predecessor, the hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, began and was continued by my immediate predecessor, the Minister of Health. The fruits of that are now paying off, Mr. Speaker, and we cannot continue to use - as happened in the fishery, Mr. Speaker, look at where we are in the fishery - we can ourselves if we continue to cut our wood without some experience as to what we are able to cut, our sustainable yield, what we can cut and what will grow to replace it, we are going to find ourselves in the not too distant future in the same problem in the forestry as we now have in the fishery.

This detailed land inventory we are doing is an attempt to say, no, the wood resources of this Province belong to its people and we are not going to allow indiscriminate cutting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: The people in Norway were jumping all over - you have got

MR. ROUSSEAU: wood, you have got wood over there and what would be the possibility of getting wood, sending it over to us. No! We have wood in this Province and we want it cut here and we want it manufactured here and that is what the game is all about.

These inventories, Mr. Speaker, are going to be done on Bowaters land, on Price land. They have to do the same thing and, Mr. Speaker, know the penalties in taxes for those lands that are managed or unmanaged if they do not cut them correctly. The inventories are going to come in. I can say right now the preliminary indications that we are over-cutting in the Central Newfoundland area that is going to create some problems for the people out there. But in order to preserve the resource, the timber resource of this Province, unlike the fishing resource of this Province, we have to make sure that what we are cutting is equivalent to what we are growing. In other words, we cannot cut beyond the sustainable yield.

That is going to cause hardship on our people, Mr. Speaker, but if our people are worried about their children and their children's children then they will understand what we are attempting to do in the long run. They are not going to like it, certainly not. But it is imperative that we rationalize the cutting of our timber resource. It is a very valuable resource. And, Mr. Speaker, as a personal feeling, it is a shame, you know, that so many good saw logs are going into the pulp industry at Bowaters, Price and the linerboard mill. We have to look at that question and we are. I think the pulp companies would be more than willing to sit down and talk about this question of putting saw logs down into pulpwood when we have saw logs that could be used for a much better use, and we have already thrown that out, threw a flag up, as it were, to talk about it.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, too that the sawmill industry in this Province cannot operate economically on just lumber. They have to use the whole product. Presently we are producing about forty per cent of our timber in this Province and can produce up to eighty per cent

MR. ROUSSEAU: of it, but in order to keep the sawmills operational, viable, economical, we have to ensure that the full product is being used. There is no reason in my mind that the pulp industries, the two of them, and the Labrador linerboard mill, would not co-operate with us to take the chips or the extra wood so that the sawmill operators would indeed have some extra money coming in which might get them over those operational times.

Now my colleague, the Minister of Industrial Development, made a release last week about the government purchase of wood and in that is also involved the chips, the question of chips, and I think that these companies, if we sit down and talk to them, and I am certainly prepared to sit down and talk with them, and it is not

MR. BOUSSEAU:

going to happen overnight, again, but we are going to sit down and talk with them and we would hope that this sort of concept of the total use of the product would be used. Because it is a product, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot afford to throw away those parts that are not being used in one given specific industry like the sawmill industry. The tops of those logs, the chips, the bark is even used in Europe. They use the bark for paving over bogs. They use the bark for trails. They use the bark for race tracks. Every bit of wood is being used there. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in one place fifty-two people in a furniture factory, the gentleman who ran the factory was using the sawdust to heat his plant for six months of the year. They do not lose anything. They do not let one thing go. We have to accept that in this Province, and this is what we are trying to do in the area of forestry.

We are attempting to rationalize what we believe to be at worst our second biggest resource. The fishery is the biggest. But we can see, Mr. Speaker, this government can see this resource having the same problems as our fishing resource has now. We are not going to let that happen, under no circumstances, and that is why we are attempting to come up with our detailed land inventory and try and rationalize the supply of wood in the given regions. They are for our people and our people should have them in perpetuity and only if they are managed in the right way can this occur.

I think the sawmilling assistance that was announced by my colleague the other day is a step in the right direction. Again, to repeat it, because people may not understand what the minister said, this is not our policy, this is merely the first step in a problem we see in respect of the sawmill industry. We would hope to improve on that in the years to come.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what about all the logs floating around the shores of the lakes and the rivers? Is there any attempt to collect these logs?

MR. POUSSEAU: Beachcombers.

MR. NEADY: Yes, but is there anything -

MR. POUSSEAU: That certainly is a problem and I think the question in my mind - of course, most of the logs now are running on rubber and I would not mind to see it running on rail, by the way. It ran on rail at one time. I think now -

MR. NEADY: But there must be enough pulp around to operate a mill for a year around the shores of the lakes and the rivers and so forth.

MR. POUSSEAU: People have to face the problem or the fact now that it is not going to be for very long that we are going to allow anywhere in Canada or in the world the delivery of pulp over waters, you know, because of the environmental factor. This is going to have to be a problem that is dealt with in the very near future. Pardon?

MR. FLIGHT: You are not going to cut it out just like that!

MR. POUSSEAU: I say in the future. That is certainly an issue that is going to come up, the delivery of pulp over water, because of, of course, the environmental hazards. This is a question certainly that would have to be dealt with.

MR. WOODROW: Would the whole tree be utilized? I mean when you speak of the tree, like the branches and the sawdust and what have you, are you thinking of the root of the tree also?

MR. POUSSEAU: I do not know about the root of the tree.

MR. WOODROW: I am wondering how far down the root is.

MR. POUSSEAU: No. What I have said, what I am saying is that in my estimation a sawmill industry will not be a viable unit, or an economic unit, unless every aspect of the tree is used. Right now they cut off what can be used to put in the sawmill operations. They may or may not be able to sell the rest of it to the pulp and paper companies. Last Winter, of course, with the strikes they had a problem. Sometimes they have a problem in the cost of transportation. I think it is incumbent on government to assist in some way to ensure

MR. ROUSSEAU:

that the person who cuts the tree gets every possible return financially for it. Then it becomes an industry where if it is getting operational money and its cash flow is good, it can employ many more people and certainly this would be the way we intend to have things. And we do not intend to allow people to go in and cut indiscriminately.

Many, many members of the House and many people around this Province could say a certain one cut here, he did not use all the wood, it is on the ground and so on and so forth. But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, woe to the gentleman or to the company, small or big, who goes in now into our woods and cuts indiscriminately and leave the stuff on the ground or does not clear it up. These are problems that we are trying to face in the forest industry.

We have our own people go in, and of course many people become incensed by that and they contract us but a lot of people just cut. They take the big logs. They call it high grading or selective cutting.

MR. NEARY: Are there airplanes flying around to locate these?

MR. ROUSSEAU: We have those, but we have forest unit rangers in all the areas and our forestry people normally check all the cutting. Some people go in use selective, high grade cutting and they only cut parts of it. They leave a lot of it there. Certainly right now we have a tree farm, Mr. Speaker, that we hope within two or three years we will have a couple of million trees on it. Within five to six years we will have up to 5 million trees.

Now the only tree

MR. ROUSSEAU: that we are planting in this Province right now, believe it or not, just about the only one, is by the Boy Scouts and the Cubs on their Plant-a-Tree programme. We have to find some way that we rotate our resource so that every thirty, forty or fifty years -

MR. NEARY: Where is the tree farm?

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is just here in the city, the experimental farm, is it, where is it? I do not know exactly.

MR. NEARY: Mount Pearl?

MR. NOLAN: Brookfield Road.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, Brookfield Road, But we hope to have 5 million, we are trying to grow 5 million trees there to be able to plant yearly in this Province. It has to be done in order to ensure the continued development of the Forest industry. Within the next couple of years we will probably have some amount of trees to do. This is certainly going to be a big task before us but it is something again that we are attempting to do in the forest industry.

Now maybe our problem is that we are not telling you, so nobody knows about this. That is why I am standing up here today to give an indication of some of the things that we are doing -

AN HON. MEMBER: There is another big farm in -

MR. NEARY: That is pretty good stuff so far, pretty good stuff.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, certainly.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this inspection that you say is ongoing now, that you have people going into the woods and inspecting the utilization of the trees as they are cut by the operators, does this inspection apply to the two major paper companies and if so when was it instituted?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I do not know when it was instituted, but to my knowledge it happened because I know we have had problems with, I guess with both of them but I know for certain with one of them, and it is our intention

MR. ROUSSEAU: to bring the matter to their attention. There are certain areas where we do not believe that the proper cutting procedures have been taken. Now it is only in the recent past that we have had so many forestry people, you know, the department now in the restructuring has grown into quite a few people out in the field and these people keep an eye on the private companies because even though they have the cutting rights by acts as far back as the early nineteen hundreds, they are still cutting our resources. Our intention is to see that it is utilized properly and one would hope that we would not need to tell them, but if we need to tell them we certainly will tell them, and we will send them back to do so and that matter will be taken up, has been taken up, is being taken up, and will be taken up with the companies at any time we feel that their cutting procedures are not proper.

Another problem, Mr. Speaker, that we have to face is the question of thinning. You know sometimes it is good to go in when the trees are very young and cut down two or three trees to let four or five other trees grow much better and much quicker. This is a question that we certainly have to come to grips with, the thinning. We are doing some now but we have to do it on a much larger scale because trees are growing together and competing for the nutrients in the soil and for the light from the sun. It is a problem when the trees are stacked too close together and we have to also come up and look at the question of thinning.

So, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: What about the burnt out area down around Gander?

MR. ROUSSEAU: These are areas which we are attempting now, through the use of trees in our tree farm, to cultivate in the future and this is quite a job.

MR. NEARY: How long before you can set a tree in a burnt out area? How long after the fire?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh, a couple of years. You know, it takes up to five years. But, you know, we would hope instead of now sixty, seventy to eighty

MR. ROUSSEAU: years, eighty years a tree should be cut. We have some trees now they are eighty to 110 years old in the Province that should be cut. This is why we have such a programme of Resource Roads which all members have received a copy of the plan this year. We have to get in and cut this stuff out because of the spruce bud worm which is a pretty big problem in the Province which we are trying to cope with.

But I would like to also say a few more words on this but I will adjourn the debate because I would like to mention a few words about agriculture as well, Mr. Speaker. So I will adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising adjourn until tomorrow at three o'clock. And I may say, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of hon. members, that whilst the House must adjourn until three, I understand that Mr. Speaker, will not be in the Chair until three-thirty, tomorrow.

MR. MURPHY: It is not tomorrow, Friday.

MR. HICKMAN: Friday,

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn, carried.

This House now stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

C O N T E N T S

March 17, 1976	Page
<u>PRESENTING PETITIONS</u>	
By Mr. Neary in behalf of 875 residents of LaPoile requesting that public meetings be held on the Government's White Paper on proposed snowmobile regulations.	3087
Spoken to by:	
Mr. Hodder	3090
Mr. Hickey	3091
Mr. Flight	3094
Mr. Rousseau	3097
Mr. W. Carter	3099
By Mr. Wells in behalf of some 100 residents of the St. John's area objecting to the land freeze.	3104
Spoken to by:	
Mr. Rowe	3104
Mr. Neary	3105
By Mr. Rideout in behalf of the Local Improvement District of Seal Cove, W.B., and the community of Roberts Arm, Green Bay, protesting any increase in electrical rates.	3105
By Mr. Flight in behalf of some 350 residents of Badger protesting increases in electrical rates.	3106
By Mr. Rowe in behalf of some 85 residents of Old Perlican protesting any increase in electrical rates.	3106
<u>ORAL QUESTIONS:</u>	
Land transaction and construction of the Aquarena. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	3107
Considerations involved in the transaction. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Wells.	3108
Status of planning of the Burin Peninsula Hospital. Mr. Rideout, Mr. H. Collins.	3109
Baie Verte water supply. Mr. Neary, Mr. Collins.	3109
Query as to whether a visit to Baie Verte by senior officials of the Health Department was routine, or took place to hold a public meeting. Mr. Neary, Mr. H. Collins.	3110
Pine Grove School. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Rousseau.	3110
Condition of scallop beds in Port au Port Bay. Mr. Hodder, Mr. W. Carter.	3111
Preferential treatment for CFLCo management personnel during the strike at Churchill Falls. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	3112
Discrimination in the distribution of gasoline at Churchill Falls during the strike. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	3112

C O N T E N T S - 2

ORAL QUESTIONS (continued)	Page
Meeting with Premier Bourassa. Mr. Rowe, Premier Moores.	3113
Proposed meeting with Premier Bourassa. Mr. Rowe, Premier Moores.	3116
Discussions with the federal Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	3116
Bay St. George Community College. Mr. Hodder, Mr. House.	3118
Additional office space for the public service. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Rousseau.	3118
Rental of the COTC building in St. John's. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	3119
Health Sciences Complex. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	3119
Meetings of the parties in the strike at Churchill Falls. Mr. Flight, Mr. Maynard.	3120
Seat belt legislation. Mr. Neary, Mr. Morgan.	3121
The <u>Norma and Gladys</u> . Mr. Nolan, Mr. Hickey.	3121
Renewal of the RCMP contract. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickman.	3123
Lie detector tests. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Hickman.	3123
Number of families on welfare living in hotels, motels or boarding houses. Mr. Neary, Mr. Brett.	3125
Establishment of a training centre at Corner Brook for the mentally retarded. Mr. Woodrow, Mr. Wells.	3126
Western Memorial Hospital. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	3128
 <u>ORDERS OF THE DAY</u>	
Private Members' Day	
That a Select Committee be established to enquire into and report upon the prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador, including the prospects for economic growth etc. (continued)	3129
Mr. Hickman (continued)	3129
Mr. White	3133
Mr. Marshall	3149
Mr. Rousseau	3172
(Adjourned the debate.)	3186
 <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>	 3186