

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

House of Assembly

For the period:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

February 23, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Twillingate.

// MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege. I do it not in anger but with genuine personal regret. Last night on Here And Now on the local CBC, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) was interviewed and he devoted virtually all of his time to what was in fact an attack on me. Now the attack on me was in connection with speeches that I had made here in the full hearing of the House, speeches that are in Hansard and nothing secret about them. Mr. Speaker, in those speeches I have talked about party funds, contributions to political party funds, election campaign funds and other party funds, and the way in which the contributors, the donors of those funds recouped their contributions, namely, through contracts and the sale of supplies and materials to the government. I said that this has gone on ever since Confederation up to the present moment, I said in my speech. Up to the present moment it has not ceased. But it also went on before Confederation and it also went on all across Canada and continues to go on all across Canada.

I made it abundantly clear it was not Liberal, it was not Tory, it was not NDP, it was just straight party funds. I said that today - not referring to twenty-five or twenty-eight years ago - but today, I said, it could run to \$8 million or \$10 million a year out of the public chest as the contribution made back to the contributors. The hon. member last night having fancied, having imagined some figure of \$400 million - not \$4 million, not \$40 million but \$400 million - as having, according to me - he said, "According to Smallwood having been passed out to the contractors not in payment for the work they did, but excess payment, \$400 million." His whole statement was to the effect that what I had said I had said only about the twenty-three years during which I was the Premier of the Province, that I was dealing only with my term in office. Whereas in fact the whole House understood, and Hansard will show, that I was talking about parties

MR. SMALLWOOD:

and politicians and elections in general right up to date.

And Your Honour may remember, because when I said it I said it with a certain amount of fear and trembling, Your Honour may remember my saying that every hon. member of this House, not excluding Your Honour, is in here because of secret and private financial contributions to the political parties. I went on to say that even an hon. member, who as a candidate went out to election and paid his own expenses out of his own pocket, even he benefited from those contributions that were made to the party because the general overall effort and propaganda of the party benefited each candidate, even those who might have defrayed their own immediate personal expenses out of their own personal pocket.

It was so non-partisan that it was with the deepest regret I heard the hon. gentleman make those astounding statements last night, because I thought that he and I, more than any two members of the House, were in intellectual agreement since I came back into this Chamber. I have grown to respect him. I am sorry he is not here. I have to do it today according to the rules of the House, or I lose my opportunity. So I have to do it now. But it so happens he is not here. I am sorry about that. I had come to admire him and respect him. And last night on the air every last scrap of respect I had just disappeared, went down the drain. It is astounding. I do not propose to move any motion or anything, but I must repudiate absolutely, categorically, virtually everything the hon. member said on television last night. Because if I do not repudiate it, then I am admitting the truth of what he said. And what he said was absolutely untrue.

MR. NEARY: It was low.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It might or might not have been low, With made me sad and disappointed, and still does to this moment, is the difference, the contrast between the statesmanlike position he has taken here while I was here, and the unstatesmanlike, rather cowardly position he took last night when I was not there to answer. And I feel very sorry about that, very sorry indeed.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I have two statements. First of all I would like to ask this House to unanimously go on record in congratulating our Prime Minister for the position he so ably put forward before the American Congress.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

PREMIER MOORES: The speech by the Prime Minister was a thoughtful and inspiring message to both the people of Canada and to the people of the United States. At a time when the unity of our country is being threatened, I, and I know every member of this House, feel that partisan politics should be put to one side.

Yesterday's speech by the Prime Minister capably dealt with the separatist issue in Quebec. I agree entirely with his analysis and assessment and I, as I am sure are all other members of the House, am determined in any way that we can to keep Canada united and are proud of the manner in which the Prime Minister presented this position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

PREMIER MOORES: It is critical that the separatist element in Canada be given no credibility by politicians in Canada when the aim of that group is to destroy the very country which means so much to so many of the people in our country.

In my opinion, Sir, the Prime Minister's speech to

PREMIER MOORES: the American Congress was one of the great speeches. I agree wholeheartedly with the Prime Minister's stand on a united Canada and I have no hesitation in saying so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I might, the Premier said he had two statements, perhaps he could make the second one and I might then be allowed to reply to both, Sir, in the normal way.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, As Premier and on behalf of the government I would like to take this opportunity as well to offer our sincere congratulations to Mrs. Edith Mary Manuel who was selected last night as the St. John's citizen of the year. She is indeed a very gracious lady, and I know I express the feelings of both sides of the House when I say that the St. John's JC's could not have made a better choice.

Edith Mary Manuel made a tremendous contribution to education in our Province during her years as a teacher. I understand that some three books of geography are to her credit, and I understand she is working on the history of her native Twillingate now. And she is an example to, I would suggest, Sir, all the citizens of this Province when it comes to sacrifice, dedication and a good citizenary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, by gracious permission of the Leader of this Party I am privileged to reply to what the Premier has said, and to say that his words were gracious, and generous and true and that all of us who are in any way associated

MR. SMALLWOOD: with the great, beautiful and historic district of Twillingate are grateful to him for what he has said and I speak for everyone on this side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my friend from Twillingate has spoken with eloquence of Miss Manuel and I should say personally he has spoken for our group. It is a distinct pleasure to second the Premier's words and I would hope that a letter or resolution will go forth from the Clerk in the normal way.

On a personal note I could add that among Miss Manuel's many pupils was my wife, and I think my wife spoke for all the ladies or women who have gone through Spencer when they say that Miss Manuel's influence at Bishop Spencer College was immense and beneficial.

With respect to the Premier's first statement, Sir, I think I could take the words used by the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), it was a gracious statement. I know it was one from the heart. I think it is one that we all would endorse happily and strongly. The separatist government of Quebec, and it is a separatist government in Quebec, Sir, is the Government of Quebec. They have won office by the rules, but Sir, their main policy must be anathema to all of us who care about Canada, all of us who love Canada, and all of us who believe that Canada is a great country and can be a greater country but that, Sir, to be Canada, Quebec must be a part of that country.

I, as is well known, have recently met with the Premier of Quebec and at a proper time I will have more to say about it. But, Sir, let me

MR. ROBERTS: say that there is a threat, M. Levesque, a very able man, committed to an idea in which he believes strongly. I think it is incumbent, Sir, upon all of us who believe in Canada to take a stand and to do what is right and proper to insure that Canada survives and that Canada prospers and that Canada becomes the country we want her to become and that she can become. Sir, I think the Prime Minister's speech yesterday in Washington was a brilliant performance, an absolutely brilliant performance, Sir, and I know he spoke for each and every Canadian, and not only do I want to agree with the Premier but I want to congratulate him. The Premier and the Prime Minister are of different political parties. They may not have agreed from time to time on major issues, they do agree on this one, Sir, and I think it is both gracious of the Premier and I think entirely proper, Sir, as Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador that he should move that motion and I for one, Sir, on behalf of all my colleagues, heartily second it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor made reference in the Speech from the Throne earlier this month to government's intention to introduce a Mineral Acreage Tax Bill. The purpose of the proposed new legislation would be to encourage mineral exproation in areas of the province to which mineral rights are held in perpetuity or for long periods of time. I am pleased to say that a draft of the bill, which is intitled "The Mineral Holdings Impost Bill", has been completed, and in keeping with government's commitment to make it available to all interested parties, it is now ready for viewing.

I am therefore tabling herewith a copy of the draft bill so that the hon. members of the House may have an opportunity to examine it.

MR. PECKFORD: It is our intention to follow the procedure that is customary in the case of a white paper. Copies of the draft are available immediately to all persons who hold mineral rights that will be affected. They will be invited to submit their comments to me in writing not later than March 23, 1977. In addition, an announcement will be carried in the provincial news media informing the general public of the availability of the draft, stating the deadline for response.

As soon as possible after the March 23rd deadline, a final draft of the bill will be prepared and I expect to introduce the final draft in the House in time for passage during the current session. I hereby table this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, there is not a great deal that I need to say at this time because, of course, the minister has not made a substantive statement in that he has tabled a bill, and the bill itself is a substantive matter and we do not know what is in it. I can say two things, Sir; first of all that we welcome the government's initiative in acting on this matter. It is an important matter and one that cuts very deeply to the very heart of the question of the mineral resources of this province, because as is well known there are large areas of this province that are held in various forms of tenure that are not, I think it is fair to say, being developed at sufficient speed. And if the bill will help to achieve that desirable goal, then, Sir, we shall welcome it.

Secondly, Sir, I think the minister should be congratulated for his - and the government, the minister is acting on behalf of government, for tabling the bill because it will enable all concerned to look on it, and to study it, and not only to provide the minister and the government with reactions and advice, which may very well be helpful, but also, Sir,

MR. ROBERTS:

we on this side will be , as a result, a little better prepared for the public debate. Because as so often happens, Mr. Speaker, the members of the House by and large are not expert in a great deal of the business that comes before the House. I do not think we have any mining engineers in the House at present, or anybody particularly knowledgable , unless he happens to have served as minister—indeed , all the previous ministers of Mines and Energy have met a fate of one sort or another, as a result they are no longer in the House—and being able to get outside input of this nature in this way is I think a very, very valuable thing.

I hope , Sir, that the minister is expressing a new policy of the administration and that the Minister of Health will shortly be tabling a draft of the denturists legislation, where I think, Sir, exactly the same principal will apply and I think , Sir, that the public input there will be just as welcome as it will be in the case of the bill which the minister has today tabled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is my turn today to present a petition from my district. I would like, Sir, to table a petition signed by 530 residents, citizens of the area along the St. Barbe Coast in my district of the Straits of Belle Isle. This petition, Sir, was sent to me last week, I got it on Friday, and of course I was absent from the House yesterday and Monday, and thus this is the first chance which I have had to present it. My sparring mate, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, I have sent him a copy of the petition. I propose, of course, to table the original. The minister I hope will say a word or two on it, but in any event I have sent it to him as I believe that is the wish of the petitioners.

Sir, the prayer of the petition is quite long. I think I can sum it up succinctly by saying that the petitioners, and, Sir, this is a very large proportion of the people who live between the communities of Blue Cove and Anchor Point in the Southern part of the St. Barbe area, and the community of Cook's Harbour and the nearby communities of Wild Bight and North Boat Harbour in the Northern part of the area concerned. Sir, the prayer of the petition is that these people ask the government not to relocate the main road, the Northern Peninsula Highway, or alternately, if the government wish to relocate it, as in fact has been done, the prayer of the petition is that the present road, which we know now as the Northern Peninsula Highway, that that road be maintained, upgraded and, in fact, paved.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into the discussion as to whether the road should be relocated or not. The minister has taken that decision, and I may say, Sir, he did so only after exhaustive consultation with people in the area; his decision was not necessarily the one which many of them wanted, although many of them did want it, but the minister, very much to his credit, Sir, did come to Cook's Harbour and heard the people concerned. They stated their case, and in due course the minister made his decision, taking into account the factors and the information which he had.

Mr. Roberts:

The prayer of this petition, Sir, does not necessarily criticize that decision, so much as it asks the minister to make the further decision to maintain the road and to upgrade it. The people concerned, Sir, feel that there are many points in favour of this, and I think they have some very good points. They talk about the fact that the community of Big Brook will be completely without publicly maintained road connections, and I believe the result of that will be that most of the people of Big Brook will be offered the opportunity to move with the government, in effect, buying their houses at, I hope, true market value, enabling the people to settle in new homes elsewhere. The people of Big Brook, Sir, a small but a viable community, they do not want to leave, Sir.

In addition, there is the fact that this particular stretch of road, Sir, about thirty or forty miles between Eddies Cove East and the Cook's Harbour junction, a little to the East of the Cook's Harbour junction, that this particular stretch of road, Mr. Speaker, is used extensively in the Summer by people from the Eddies Cove area who use it for fishing. There is also the fact that the petitioners believe the government will not save a great deal of money by relocating the road, and they also feel that the present road is more attractive to the tourist industry in that it runs along the shore instead of going inland to the bottom of Hare Bay and then Northwest to come back into the Northern Peninsula Road by the airport and Pistolet Bay.

And then finally, Sir, the petitioners give it as their view that the proposed route will have a drastic effect on the ecology of the whole area.

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition, and I do so whole-heartedly. The minister, in my view, made the best decision - or made what he believed to be the best decision, and I do not quarrel with it, on the information which he had, and I do not think at this stage

Mr. Roberts:

we can change that decision. Indeed I believe the minister has already called tenders for some stretches of the new route of the road. And I do not quarrel with the minister's decision, I have not quarrelled with it here in the House, nor have I quarrelled with it in my district or elsewhere in the Province. I do feel though that if the prayer of the petition could be granted as an addition to the road it would be a very valuable thing. I do not know if we could get the road paved at this point, Sir, but certainly if that road—the stretch of road, it is now there, it is the main road, it has been used since the early 1960s, it is the main highway of the Northern Peninsula - if that road can be continued to be maintained and made driveable, and if it can be perhaps not upgraded significantly at this point, but if it could be given the care and the attention it needs to make it a motorable road that, Sir, would be a very great benefit to people of the area.

And so I

Mr. Roberts.

say to the Minister of Transportation, whom I hope will say a word or two on this petition, Sir, that I support the prayer of the petition. And in so doing I would say to him that I interpret the real point of the petition as being not to abandon the new route, which I think is now - fait accompli, for right or for wrong, but instead, Mr. Speaker, to say that the government will do what needs to be done to ensure that the present route of the road is maintained and continued in use as a motorable road and one which will continue to serve the people of the area. I think there is a very real need for it, Sir. I think the case is justified, and I hope, Sir, that the government, speaking through the minister, will commit themselves to do that. I support the petition, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I feel I have to say a few words on this petition. First of all, I am wondering where the petitioners are residing. It does not say in the petition. I have a copy of it here. The last year when the decision was made to relocate the main highway on the Northern Peninsula, prior to that decision being made there was considerable consultation with the people in the area by means of writing to all of the councils in the area, and the citizens' groups and committees, and indeed prominent citizens as well of these communities asking their views with regards to the proposed location as outlined by the engineering staff of the Department of Transportation and Communications, and this was being done, the proposed route in consultation with the Federal/Provincial DREE Committee, because the funds for the building of that new section of road is mainly from that source of funding, from DREE.

Also, I travelled to the area, accompanied by the member for the area, and we met with the citizens of the Boat Harbour, Cook Harbour area, at a public meeting, and outlined the position of the department and also obtaining the views from the people. So upon these methods of consultation a decision was finally made by myself

Mr. Morgan.

as the minister responsible, a decision was to reroute the road by means of a new construction across the Northern Peninsula, from Eddies Cove across towards the St. Anthony airport, just South of the airport location. That decision is a final one. It was approved by the Federal/Provincial Committee, and tenders have been called for the new construction, at least sections of that new construction, across the peninsula.

With regards to the concern of the people of Big Brook, which is mainly the only community directly affected by the change - I say, directly affected - the community of Big Brook is located between Eddies Cove and on the road towards Cooks Harbour and Boat Harbour. There are approximately, I think, fourteen families residing there. So what will be done is that after the new construction is completed, the matter will be assessed by means of negotiations between the officials of the Department of Transportation and the residents of the area with regards to possibly relocation. And if this is not acceptable or satisfactory, we will then reassess the situation, looking at the possibility - and I repeat, the possibility - of keeping that old section of road open as well. But I would like to mention one thing: it was brought to the attention of the House yesterday, the hon. House of Assembly, by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who rightly or wrongly so brought forward the worries and concerns of people in the hon. Leader of the Opposition's district with regards to the problems of snow ploughing that same section of old road, that old section. The section in the Anchor Point, Big Brook area, is a section of road that is open to the environmental conditions as on the coast. There is a very severe problem in keeping that section of road open in Winter, and we feel that this problem will be overcome by means of the new road being built across the peninsula away from the coastline, and will offset the problems as put forward yesterday by the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

So taking all these factors into consideration, Mr. Speaker, the situation will be assessed after the new construction

Mr. Morgan.

is completed, and then a decision will be made by the department concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of a number of residents and property owners in the community of Mud Lake, which is a part of the district of Naskaupi. There are fifty-three signatures on the petition, Mr. Speaker. It is a joint petition, more or less, I suppose, since the elementary school got involved in this one as well. There are fifteen additional signatures from that school.

MR. GOUDIE: And to explain, anyone who is familiar, particularly the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), who is familiar with the community of Mud Lake will realize that out of a total population of about ninety-four or ninety-five people, fifty-three signatures would seem to be a little out of ratio, but as they indicate in the prayer, which I am about to read in just a moment, it involves residents and property owners in Mud Lake.

 The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is that, "The following residents and property owners of Mud Lake, in the district of Naskaupi, hereby declare that they are united in opposing any national park development in this area. We have used and respected the land without need of boundaries for generations and we will not support any development plans which threaten the traditional use of this land."

 The other part of the petition from the elementary school, "We the students of Mud Lake heard that you might place a park here in Mud Lake. We protest strongly against having a park here. We do not mind as much if you just put it in the Mealey Mountains as long as it does not interfere with us in our living, homes and hunting." I might add that this is an elementary school. Most of the students who are involved in their part of this petition are very young children and perhaps they do not have the proper concept of where the park may go, but they wish to express their opinions. That is a total of sixty-eight signatures from the community of Mud Lake.

 Just speaking in support of the petition, a bit of brief background: Last Fall, in November I believe, a gentleman was contracted by Parks Canada to come in to several communities in Labrador to get feedback from the people on their feelings about the idea of a national park. Two areas had been selected, two geographic areas had been selected in Labrador for national parks, one is the Torngat

MR. GOUDIE: Mountain area in Northern Labrador and the one which is concerned here, the Mealey Mountains.

A number of questions were raised by the communities and individuals. They had asked for feedback in written form and to be given a month to deliberate on that information so that they could sit down with Parks Canada and, I would assume, Provincial Parks people as well, to discuss the implications of a park. To my knowledge, that information has not been forthcoming and that I would suspect is why the residents of Mud Lake have taken this stand at this time. So I just wish to add my support to the petition, Mr. Speaker, and ask that it be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I have no question in supporting the prayer of the petition by the people of Mud Lake as presented by the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie). I have had a good deal of experience in the last four or five years with the National Parks of Canada in their attempt to create national parks within Labrador. I may say there is no issue in Labrador which gets so close to the people as the issue of land and hunting rights.

The people there, as witnessed by this petition here in which even children take part in the petition and will be prepared to give their comments on it, the people there will not often pass comment or remarks on economic development or developments of many sorts, but when it comes to the use of the land, the traditional use and rights, then they very often become very emotional and become very often hardheaded, as the Minister of Tourism has often witnessed.

I feel in this petition there is the very basis in Labrador, which we have been trying to bring up for a number of years, the question of economic versus social values. It may seem strange to some people that

MR. STRACHAN: people will turn down a park which may economically benefit them, But the people in Labrador, many people whom we know, are questioning economic value. They question the values that a great number of tourists would bring in to the area, they question that they themselves may change. They are in a cash economy and no one is arguing any foolishness of being anything else but a cash economy, but they are concerned about trying to preserve a little of what they have left.

We are living in North America, and the great North America is encroaching at a great pace, and people in Labrador are concerned that what we are going to set aside are very small areas, because that is what these national parks would be, very small areas, and all other areas in Labrador would therefore be open for development, mineral development or any other form of development. The people are very suspicious. I have expressed to National Parks that we would fight the idea of the park, initially on the basis that if there was a park ever created the people must have their traditional rights protected. That was a very big step compared to the Gros Morne National Park where people did not have these rights protected at all.

Later the

MR. STRACHAN:

people have opposed this, I think the second park in the Torngat Mountains may see the same reaction. I will not state here that I am prepared to say that that is what people will do around the Nain and Davis Inlet area. But certainly the people feel that way, that they do not wish to see such national parks, that they are concerned with tourists being dumped on them in large numbers and creating a difference in the way of life, and exploitation they feel.

I have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting the prayer of this petition. I do not wish to add a sour note, but I must state that the member for Naskaupi must feel sometimes very pained to hear his minister and his government, the Minister of Tourism, state some of his feelings in what can only be regarded as a very hardheaded 19th century Tory attitude about people's rights.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must ask the hon. gentleman and require that he stick to the allegation of the petition.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, if I can only say then, there must be some real problem in trying to resolve the situation within government circles as to how you are going to handle the situation, how you are going to value the people's rights. And I hope that in future negotiations with the federal government that the ministers and the government will take a strong attitude and defend the rights of the people of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there is a little information I should provide on this matter. I want to say first of all that the people of Mud Lake, their views are appreciated. I think it might well be said that their concerns are probably a bit premature inasmuch as one gets the impression, not so much from the petition but from the releases to the media, that the people of Mud Lake and indeed many other people in Labrador area are of the opinion that the decision with regards to national park development in Labrador is all but taken.

MR. HICKEY:

Now I want to clearly state today on behalf of the government that this situation is not necessarily correct, that no decision has been made with regards to national park development in Labrador. That the statement also with regards to the gentleman who went to Labrador representing Parks Canada and that no one heard from him, I find that a little bit hard to understand because I have in my possession a report which was completed by this gentleman which was released to the media on his trip and all that went with that, and views and feelings of the people as expressed so as to indeed not only request involvement but to provide the vehicle or facility, as it were, to see that total public involvement was maintained.

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the policy of this administration insofar as the development of those two potential parks is a complete departure from the past. We have taken the position that the people of Labrador should have input and should be involved and should have an opportunity to express their views as to the land use and what is best for themselves and the people in the Province generally. I can say further in closing that I hope that this report has reached the people in Labrador. If not, I would certainly be glad to make it available. I want to say further that my colleagues have been consulted on this matter. I can say too that there is a long way to go before any final decision is taken, before this government will pass over to Parks Canada and through them to the federal government one inch of land for park development. And furthermore that only when it is clearly stated that it is in the best interests of the people of Labrador will that kind of decision be made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Livestock Health Amendment Regulations, 1976; Blueberry Regulations; Livestock Insurance Regulations, 1976; and as well the Report of the Farm Development Loan Board as done by the Auditor General for the year -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up.

MR. SIMMONS: I am sure what the minister is saying is immensely interesting, but we cannot hear a word. I do not know if his mike is not on or if he is a bit shy but if we could hear, have the benefit of his wisdom, we would be most appreciative.

MR. MAYNARD: The mike probably was not on.

AN HON. MEMBER: The light is on.

MR. MAYNARD: The light is on, so that is all I know about it.

MR. SIMMONS: We would like to hear you. Speak up.

MR. MAYNARD: It is not very heavy reading and I am sure you will get a chance to have a look at it, Mr. Speaker.

The reports of the Farm Development Loan Board for the year ending March 31st., 1975, and for the year ending March 31st., 1976.

AN HON. MEMBER: Heavy stuff that is.

MR. MAYNARD: It will keep you up all night.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to give a reply to a question placed orally in the House of Assembly a few days ago by the hon. gentleman from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). He was enquiring of whether or not the Buchans Mining Company had intentions or plans to divert their shipments of ore from rail onto the road.

The situation is presently that the mining company ships from Buchans to Millertown Junction by means of their own rail facilities, and from Millertown Junction to Bishop's Falls they use the CNR rail facilities, and from Bishop's Falls to Botwood they are using the facilities owned by Price (Nfld.) Limited.

This is of a major concern to us, the Department of Transportation, in fact to the provincial government, because so far over the past couple of years bulk shipments have seemed to be going from rail onto the road. We see pulpwood now shipped from the Glenwood area all the way to Corner Brook by road and prior to now was going by rail. And the asphalt manufactured in Clarendville is now going onto the road instead of rail. And gas and oil, for example, landed in Lewisporte normally went by rail is now going by road. Gypsum manufactured in St. George's is going by road instead of rail. These bulk shipments are naturally having a very serious and deteriorating effect on the Trans-Canada Highway because it means more heavy vehicle type traffic on the highway. So that the answer to the question is we will be contacting the company concerned at Buchans to determine what their plans are, and hopefully arranging a meeting with the CNR to arrange a rate which they can find economical to them as a mining company and retain their present means of shipping their ore on rail instead of going to road.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier.

Sir, it is with reference to Mr., I am not sure if it is Weber or Veber, Mr. Franz Veber or Weber, the gentleman from I believe it is Switzerland, who is, I gather, coming to Newfoundland tonight. And yesterday in the House of Assembly the Minister of Fisheries in reply to a question said that he had declined to meet with Mr Weber, I think I am quoting the minister correctly, it is what Hansard says - and I received a similar invitation this morning which I declined. I mean I think the man is a fanatic and half-cracked and we should not pay any attention to him. But my question is this, Sir; Mr. Webber's lawyer informed my staff that he had arranged meeting with either a member of the government i.e., a political member, a minister, or a public official, and my question to the Premier, Sir, is whether he is aware of any such meetings having been arranged and if so whether he will take - if I may, I know you can only ask one question but they are all you know, one slice of the applies - if so whether steps will be taken to forbid such a meeting, and alternately if no such meeting has been arranged to the Premier's knowledge, will he issue instructions, only the Premier can do it, that no public official and no minister of the government will meet with this gentleman? I think the best way to treat him, Sir, is just to ignore him, and show him what we think of him.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, there is no question whatsoever about the ignoring of Mr. Weber, or whatever his name is. The fact is that the man, in my opinion, is an opportunist, out to look after himself as opposed to the seals; and I think the man is playing a publicity campaign, that we have seen done by others

PREMIER MOORES: in the past. I think he is doing nothing but a disservice to the Province and the traditions that have gone before. As far as I am concerned myself, I will not be meeting with Mr. Weber under any circumstances. I suggest that none of the ministers will be as well, And certainly our officials will be advised accordingly because, Sir, I could not agree more with the Leader of the Opposition nor could this side of the House. People like Mr. Weber are most undesirable to have in this Province at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. gentleman for Terra Nova.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Premier. Would the Premier tell the House now what is happening, as far as this Province is concerned, in connection with wage and price controls?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: At the present time, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge - and I think it is correct - that we are going along with the federal position that we have supported from the beginning, and we intend to support it until the phase out period comes. And when that comes, we will be looking at it and establishing our position then.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. Premier aware that meetings have taken place in Ottawa this week in connection with phasing out the wage and price control programme? Ministers of Labour, I think, from all across Canada have been at these meetings. Does the Premier know anything about the formula that is going to be used? And if so, would the Premier tell the House just how they plan on doing it.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, there has been no date set to our knowledge, and I know that there has not been a date set, as to when the post control period will be entered into. I can also say that the method of how the post controls will be regulated or adopted has not been decided. Of course, there has to be ongoing meetings between Ministers of Labour and other people regarding the various ideas that people have as to which way it should be done. It is going to be a very difficult period, but a very important period. But there have been no firm decisions made as to when or the exact procedure.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Will the hon. Premier indicate whether or not his government will go along with the plan to terminate wage and price

Mr. Neary.

controls for various groups as their union contract expires?

Is this the plan?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, there has been no decision made on that. And, as I say, these ongoing meetings that we are having with the federal government and the other provinces, evolving from those meetings will be the position that this government will study and then announce our position on it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One further supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the Premier indicate to the House then when the Premier thinks that the wage and price controls, as a result of the discussions, the wage and price controls will terminate in this Province? Could the Premier give us a ball-park idea of when they will terminate?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I have absolutely no idea, Mr. Speaker. There have been various dates mentioned, the late Fall of this year, the early Spring of next year. But at the present moment it would be totally incorrect to hazard a guess at the particular time, because I do not think anybody, including the federal authorities, know.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, I would like to direct this question to the Premier, and ask if he is in a position to be able to inform the House as to what might be the latest developments with respect to the strike in Labrador City?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: At the present time the Minister of Labour is involved in that particular dispute. And until such time as his meetings are over, and he has reported back, I think, it would wrong for me to hazard a guess as to what I hope is happening, Sir.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Tourism.

Mr. Flight.

Would the minister advise the House as to what increases in the level of either facilities or services that the public of Newfoundland can expect as a result of the dollar increase imposed last year on the daily fees in the parks? What improvement in services or facilities, as a result of that dollar per day increase, can the public of this Province expect?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, that is a rather interesting question. I do not know the exact amount of money. I would have to check that. I can tell my hon. friend that we cannot even see any light in the tunnel yet in terms of balancing out the cost of operation of provincial parks in this Province with the amount of revenue collected. Five years ago or six years ago when the last increase was affected, at that time we had something like forty-eight per cent revenue as opposed to the total cost of operation. At least we felt that we could sort of live with that situation. It dropped to something like twenty-four per cent, and the dollar that was imposed only brought us somewhere, or was projected to bring us somewhere like thirty-three to thirty-five per cent. So really the

MR. HICKEY:

increase in park fees was not affected to provide additional facilities or anything of that nature but to arrive at some kind of a reasonable situation with regards to operating expenditures and the costs that go with those.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister confirm or deny that the increase was intended to keep mainland or non-resident tourists out of our parks as indicated by the minister's statement that accompanied the increase?

MR. HICKEY: That is not what he said, Mr. Speaker. The minister's statement, as it seems to happen occasionally, was just taken out of context by a would-be member of the media who was stuck for a subject on Open Line that morning and decided that he was going to have a little fun. The minister very simply said this, in justifying the increase when asked what this was going to do to out of Province people coming in to use our parks, I simply said that the park system in this Province was developed for use first and foremost by Newfoundlanders. Now if gentlemen on the opposite side want to quarrel with that, then they are quarrelling with a policy that they themselves enunciated for some fifteen years. I do not really quarrel with it at all, because I agree with that policy, that the parks of this Province should be developed for our own people first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: We should share our resource, of course. We should share our environment with our visitors, but we should first and foremost take care of our own people, Mr. Speaker. That was the purpose of the park policy. That is still the purpose, and my remarks with regards to people out of the Province came as a result of that. And my remarks were simply this, that our parks are bursting at the seams. We have the lowest rates in any part of Canada. We are not even keeping abreast of the increases that are being affected in other parts of Canada, and we do not want to have the rates so low that it is going to

MR. HICKEY:

be a place for people to flock and destroy the environment. That is all. That is all I said.

Now any irresponsible Newfoundland member of the media who wants to take that out of context and use it, I would say is pretty cheap. I should say that he also lacks a little bit of patriotism.

He might even lack common sense.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister agree, though, that a statement saying that the increase by a dollar a day - would the minister agree that a statement made in the middle of the Summer that an increase in our park rates of a dollar a day, it was hoped that that increase would be the means of mainland and non-resident tourists not living so much in our parks, not putting that much pressure on our parks, would he admit that that in itself would hurt the tourist potential of this Province, that they would say, "To heck with you. If you do not want us in your parks, we will not come."

MR. HICKEY: No, Mr. Speaker, certainly not. And I will offer some facts to counteract that. The gentleman who used this issue as a little bit of a hot issue and got a few people upset that one day said that he went out and took a survey, and the survey showed to be very one-sided as the people being opposed to the increase. The Daily News the following day went out and did a survey - and I suggest that whoever did the survey for The Daily News asked the questions in a fair and just way and a proper way - and they came back and said that the result of the park increases, the fees, or the increase in fees, had absolutely no effect; that the people questioned, including out of Province tourists, said it was reasonable, it was to be expected, the cost of everything else was rising, why would not an increase in fees in parks be something that one should look forward to or could look forward to. So really it had no effect.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transportation

MR. RIDEOUT:

and Communications. By way of a short peramble the minister will recall that early last Summer a preliminary report from the Mount Sinai School of Medicine indicated that road dust on certain roads on the Baie Verte Peninsula may be hazardous to health, and the minister visited those roads shortly thereafter.

I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not his department has in fact carried out any dust sampling on, particularly, the Fleur de Lys-Coachman's Cove Road and Seal Cove-Wild Cove Road?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the tests that were carried out by the department upon obtaining samples from the two roads mentioned, the Seal Cove Road and the Coachman's Cove Road,

MR. MORGAN: shortly after my visit to the area these samples had been tested and the reports from these tests indicate there is no asbestos dust in the road dust. However, before making any definite decision on the matter we are awaiting the report of Dr. Selikoff, which I assume will be made to my colleague, the Minister of Health, in the very near future. So therefore, the only information we have to date, there is no concrete evidence showing that there is asbestos dust in the road dust on these two roads mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister is in a position, or if not he could probably get the information, to indicate where in particular, the exact locations that those dust samples were taken from on those two roads?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the exact location, the exact mileage or the footage in the sections of road, but the information can be obtained from the engineering staff of my department who obtained the samples, and also, I can give the information with regard to the test carried out.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance, who seems to have slipped out of his seat for a moment. Perhaps in his absence the Premier can answer it. I would like to know, Sir, to begin with, and I do have a supplementary or two, whether there are any negotiations currently underway between the Treasury Board officials on the one hand, and on the other hand representatives of the NAPE bargaining unit currently on strike at the Waterford Hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is better for the President of Treasury Board, who is not very far away, when he comes back, if the Leader of the Opposition could wait, I will get him in here to answer that question.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, if I might, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, could the Premier tell the House whether the campaign currently underway to recruit senior civil servants to go to the Waterford during their regular working hours and work there instead of at their regular duties here in Confederation Building, or wherever they may be, whether that campaign is being carried out with the knowledge and approval of the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not know of any campaign as such. I certainly know that there are some people in the service who have volunteered to go and carry on the services so that these people in this hospital who cannot help themselves, but must have assistance in keeping the hospital going, keeping it operating - there have been many volunteers, not just in the public service, but a great many citizens as well. And if people want to volunteer to help their fellowmen in this regard, yes, Sir, the government is for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware that officials of the Treasury Board have visited at least one department to invite the senior officials of that department, who were gathered together for this purpose, gathered together for the purpose of hearing the Treasury Board representatives, to invite them to go to work at the Waterford during their regular working hours? Now I am not speaking of the need, there is obviously a need for staff at the Waterford Hospital with the employees on strike, but what I want to know is the Premier, or the Minister now that he has returned to his seat, aware that what seems to be a recruiting campaign, far beyond volunteers, but a recruiting campaign saying, "We need people between seven in the morning and six in the evening.. In other

MR. ROBERTS: words, instead of coming to work at Confederation Building for the day you can go to work at Waterford because the need is there; would you do it?" That is going on, and all I ask at this stage is whether the Premier or the minister is aware of it?

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that some of the senior people in many of the departments have had discussions along that line. I know that there are volunteers from Treasury Board and from Health and from others who are doing absolutely remarkable things at the Waterford Hospital.

I know of officials who leave their beds at five o'clock in the morning to be on call in there for the early morning rises, for the six o'clock shaving and washing and breakfasting thing. These are volunteers from the departments who are willing to go in and do this sort of thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: I can only say, thank God! we have people like that in the Province of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: If one were to call this recruiting, if it means that somebody from Treasury Board has gone to a particular department and outlined the need and stated the circumstances and said that this opportunity is available, then I say, congratulations to that member of Treasury Board and I am proud to have him on my staff.

AN HON. MEMBER: You leaned on them!

MR. DOODY: I would also say that I have leaned on nobody, I will not lean on anybody. The only people who are being leaned on right now, unfortunately, are the 400 inmates of the Waterford Hospital, and thank God there are people, as I have said, in this building and in other parts of the public service who take their responsibilities seriously enough to go in and look after these people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question to the hon the Premier, Sir. As a result of the strike at the Waterford Hospital the Premier was prompted to make a public statement about having second thoughts on strikes in essential services. Would the Premier care to elaborate on that statement and tell the House what the government has in mind along these lines?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: As I said at that time, Mr. Speaker, the whole business of strikes in the essential service I think should be looked at. We have no plans to bring in any specific legislation at this time,

Premier Moores:

but certainly there has got to be something wrong, Sir, with a system where a strike is used in institutions that can not possibly help themselves. It is something that, I think, unions and management, in this case government, should be very aware that in our public duties, and everyone has a duty in this regard, that there has to be some mechanism or some method better than the confrontation process that we have at the present time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one further supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the Premier, Mr. Speaker, indicate to the House if it is wise to be making these kinds of statements at a time when there are difficulties rather than to think about it when there is industrial peace, labour peace in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the matter when these announcements should be made I think it is really academic. Surely any government worth its salt, or any people in the position of governing this Province, will make statements whether the timing is right or not if the statement is correct.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Now that the minister has returned to his seat I wonder if he could answer the original question out of which - no, the minister was not in his seat - my question was simply whether any negotiations are currently underway between the Treasury Board staff or officials on one hand, and on the other hand representatives of the NAPE bargaining unit at the Waterford Hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. W. DOODY: No, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge there are no ongoing conversations between the two groups. As I have stated on various occasions, and will state again, and I am grateful for the opportunity of stating again, that Treasury Board and the Hospital

Mr. Doody:

Association at Waterford are quite willing and anxious to sit down at any time with the unit and try to resolve the problem that is in there. There is no problem, I am sure, that cannot be ironed out by reasonable people who can sit down reasonably and try to get at the root of the problem and work it out.

I might take this occasion, Sir, to call the House's attention to the fact that while I was out of the House a minute ago I was in conversation with Mr. Wheeler of the NTA and with our Treasury Board people who tell me that they have come to a tentative agreement on the teachers' dispute. But Mr. Wheeler is bringing that tentative agreement to his executive, and hence to his Branch President, and he sounds very optimistic as though -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: - an agreement has been reached.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Eagle River.

MR. I. STRACHAN: A question for the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister tell us whether there are plans for the utilization of the Paddon Memorial Hospital at Happy Valley-Goose Bay?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, certainly there are no plans in terms of a health nature to utilize that building, because we have moved to the new USAF Hospital in Goose Bay.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I could not quite hear the answer from the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: You said there were no plans for medical reasons.

MR. SPEAKER: From our point of view there are no plans to use the building because we have moved to the new USAF - not the new, but the USAF institution at Goose Bay.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the minister tell us if there are any plans for it to be used as an old aged home, or a senior citizen home, or a home for children from the Labrador Coast who need care?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding, and this is as a result of several conversations with the member representing the area, that a move is now afoot to determine the very best way to establish a senior citizen facility in that area. I believe that some of my officials will be going into Happy Valley-Goose Bay to meet with some people there, I believe it might be the Ministerial Association, to try and determine what is the best approach to take to providing those services.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure, what the minister is saying. But -

MR. ROBERTS: Neither does the minister.

MR. STRACHAN: Nor can I hear him very well. Is the minister stating that there will be consultation with the Town Council of Happy Valley-Goose Bay, and with the Health Council on the utilization of the building in the near future, is that what he is stating?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to the need, I presume, unless I misunderstood his question, for a senior citizen's facility in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. And my response to that was that in conversation with the member for that particular region, the officials of my department will be going in there within a few days to sit down and talk with whatever groups are interested, whether it is town council, whether it is the Ministerial Association, or a combination of all of them to try to figure out the best approach to adopt in a provision of a suitable senior citizen's complex for the area.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Lewisporte followed by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. WHITE: The question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications, just as a preamble, Mr. Speaker, this is in connection with the Change Island's ferry operations. For over a year there attempts have been made to have the Federal Government construct new ferry terminals and while I realize it is their responsibility, I would like for the Minister of Transportation and Communications to tell me whether or not there are any negotiations under way at the moment between Ottawa and the provincial government with respect to responsibility for ferries.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question, first of all may I state that we have in this province, we have seven ferry services operated to remote parts of the province, mainly the island communities, looking at, for example, St Brendans in Bonavista Bay, and Greenspond, Change Islands, Fogo, across the Straits from Blanc Sablon which is really an interprovincial ferry service, and the one from Portugal Cove to Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: These seven ferry services since Confederation has been subsidized by the federal level of government, Recently, as of recent months, we have got an indirect indication - there has been no direct communications from the minister to the minister level - but indirect indication from the official level at Ottawa of the Ministry of Transport, that they intended to no longer continue these subsidies after the end of existing contracts. Five of these ferry services, one of them being Change Islands, five of these ferry service contracts with the operators, between the federal government and the operators, expire the end of March 1977. The indirect indication is that the

MR. MORGAN: federal government will not participate in these subsidies after these expiry dates. Indication was more tangibly evident in the fact that in British Columbia the federal governments policy has being put forward to the point that the ferry services have been removed in many cases because of the fact that subsidies were removed on the servicing of a number of remote communities in British Columbia.

MR. ROBERTS: Iona Campagnola had something to say about that.

MR. MORGAN: A cabinet minister, Iona Campagnola, the hon. Iona Campagnola, did have something to say, I understand, but the policy still exists. And the policy exists to the point that they have removed the subsidization of these ferry service operations. In this province, our position as a government is quite firm; we feel that the federal government does have responsibility to maintain these subsidies. They have maintained them since Confederation, and we are firm that these subsidies should remain in affect and continue in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: With regards to the need for improved facilities, Change Islands being one in a desperate situation, a desperate condition.

MR. WHITE: The worse one.

MR. MORGAN: I went down and saw the conditions of these landing facilities last Fall and they are really desperate to a point, where the ferry service could very well be stopped, based on the fact that the landing facilities can no longer be used. The federal governments procrastination on calling tenders for to carry out reconstruction or repair and modification of the ferry terminals is beyond me, I do not know the reason for it, I am hoping that the federal minister will clearly indicate to this government in the very near future what the official policy is with regards to these

MR. MORGAN:

ferry services and whether or not they intend, number one, to continue the subsidies and, number two, to maintain the facilities.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of supplementaries but I am going to give notice that I want to debate it on the late show tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: A question for the Minister of Finance. I wonder if he could indicate to the House when we might expect to have the budget brought down?

MR. DOODY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the budget will be brought down just as soon as it is ready, and I would hope that that would be as quickly as it can possibly be prepared, hopefully within the next several weeks, but I certainly cannot put an exact date on it as much as I would like to, I would love to have it down yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: I did hear the minister indicate in a statement two or three weeks ago, he did then put a couple of possible dates on it. One of which, I believe, was February 24th, today, and I appreciate that he perhaps cannot nail it down to a day, but could he give us some indications as to whether it is within a couple of weeks, or is it beyond that?

MR. DOODY: I just said that I hoped that it would be within a couple of weeks but more than that I cannot say. If I try to put down a tentative date, as I did the last time, obviously I would have been perhaps wrong again.

MR. DOODY:

February 24 seems like such an admirable date, just two days short of my birthday. I thought that might be an appropriate one. Obviously that has not worked out. Ash Wednesday, Sir, that would have been an appropriate day. Perhaps Good Friday may be more appropriate. But we will do what we can. We will get it down as quickly as we can for the edification to the House and for the amusement of the kind of gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Forestry could I ask the Minister of Finance: Since the chief concern for the survival of Labrador Linerboard mill is the economic wood supply, could the hon. minister tell the House what efforts the government have made if any in trying to rationalize the wood cutting rights on the Island?

MR. RIDEOUT: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I really do not know if the minister knew that the question was supposed to be addressed to him because he was talking to his colleague, but maybe he could be so instructed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MCNEIL: Well in the absence of the minister, are you not the Chairman of the Board of Directors?

MR. DOODY: Yes. Carry on.

MR. MCNEIL: Could the hon. minister tell the House what efforts the government have made if any in trying to rationalize the wood cutting rights on the Island?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: That is a very long and involved statement and I think it could be a very debatable one. I think to give a reasonable answer to that would take quite a long period of time. I do not think the Question Period is the place for it. The Minister of Forestry, I am sure, will be only too happy to get involved in it in a large area, in a large way, and give quite a detailed answer. Certainly the Minister of Finance is not going to get into it at this point in the day's proceedings.

MR. MCNEIL: A supplementary. Could the minister tell me if any effort has been made in trying to rationalize the wood cutting rights or is it a dead issue?

MR. DOODY: Oh, no! There have been fantastic efforts made, and there have been tremendous strides in that direction accomplished. And I think that there will be further progress shown in the future. But, as I say, it is not really my area as acting minister to get involved in that at this point. You know, it is an area that is more properly handled by the minister. As the acting minister - the minister is in the building, is he not? The minister is in the building. I am not the acting minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a quickie for the hon. Minister of Finance in connection with the Linerboard mill. Is the Linerboard mill going down again on the twenty-seventh? How long will it be down? Do they have any markets now for linerboard? Just what is the situation now in connection with the immediate future of the Linerboard mill?

MR. DOODY: My indications from the management, Mr. Speaker, is that the Linerboard mill might very well be closing down shortly for at least another two week period because of the market conditions. As I have said in this House on many occasions, and outside the House when asked, the market conditions for linerboard are absolutely deplorable. The mill is doing the best it can to cope. As I understand it they are just about exhausted in their order book right now. And it was announced in the local paper today by some of the management people that the possibilities of another close-down in the imminent future for at least two weeks is a very, very real possibility.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day, the adjourned debate on motion 1. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) adjourned the debate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the House will remember that - I do not know whether they do or not - this is the third Wednesday now in a row, Sir,

MR. NEARY:

that we are debating a Private Members' resolution, a resolution moved by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) in connection with the setting up of a select committee of this hon. House to concern itself with the state and sentiment of public opinion in Labrador and realizing that this has most serious implications for the future of this Province."

Then it goes on, "Be it further resolved", "Be it further resolved", and then the last, "And be it further resolved that the Committee be authorized to sit from place to place throughout the Province, and that it be directed to sit in sufficient places in Labrador so as to enable any of the residents of Labrador to appear before it:

MR. NEARY: if they so wish without incurring expenses or inconvenience."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support my hon. friend's resolution and I am going to make in the process of supporting the resolution and making a few remarks to the House, generally about Labrador, and about the attitude of this administration, of this House towards Labrador, I have also one or two suggestions that I might throw out that may be useful to the House if it decides to set up this Labrador Select Committee.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to come down hard, I want to come down like a ton of bricks on the administration, Sir, especially two ministers in the administration and I do this to illustrate the attitude and the contempt and the arrogance of this administration towards Labrador, and towards the people of Labrador. I use this example, Sir, of an illustration, to illustrate just why we are in difficulties with the thirty or forty thousand residents of Labrador, and I speak, Mr. Speaker about the Winter Games.

The Winter Games, Sir, were carried on in Labrador City for the last several years. They did a magnificent job. They had the facilities, they had the right attitude and they carried on the Winter Games down there without any problems, without any fuss, without any great handouts from the administration. They did a magnificent job. Then all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, the people of Labrador West woke up one morning and they discovered that the Minister of Health, the member for Gander (Mr. H. Collins), and the Minister of Industrial Development, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) - these two urban centres okayed it on the Island - had taken away the Winter Games, had taken it away from Labrador West, from Labrador City, without any justifiable reason, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Without telling them.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Without telling them.

MR. NEARY: Without telling them. They heard it on the news in Labrador City.

MR. MORGAN: They did not take it away. They did not have it to take away.

MR. NEARY: They did have it, Sir. It was taken away. Mr. Speaker, it was taken away, they did have it, and I would not mind so bad, Sir, if Gander or Grand Falls had made an application for the Winter Games, but they did not.

MR. H. COLLINS: What do you have against Gander and Grand Falls?

MR. NEARY: I have nothing, Sir. I do not begrudge it to Grand Falls or Gander. I do not begrudge it and the minister can twist what I am saying all he wants, that is not the point. Grand Falls and Gander and all the other urban centres on this Island are entitled to everything they can get, but not at the expense, Sir, not at the expense of any other community, especially if you are down in Western Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the devastating effect that that had on the morale of the people in Western Labrador? And so far - I heard, I think it was the hon. minister, I am not sure if it was this minister or his colleague one morning on radio trying to weasel his way out of it, not offering any justification at all for this slap in the face to the people of Western Labrador who had worked so hard and who had done such a magnificent job on the Canada Winter Games. And that is the kind of attitude, Sir, that is the kind of contempt, the kind of arrogance that has caused all this talk about separatism in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, that is one example. Does Your Honour want me to give the House a more recent example of the kind of arrogance that this administration and people in authority show towards Labrador, and I am speaking now particularly of Western Labrador? All we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is just

MR. NEARY: look at the recent labour difficulties
in Labrador City. And, Mr. Speaker, here you had an industrial
community in Newfoundland of about 7,000 or 8,000 people in
very serious difficulties. The employees were at loggerheads,
there was a confrontation between the employees of IOC

MR. NEARY: and the company. And, Mr. Speaker, where were the negotiations, where were the talks taking place to try and resolve the difficulties in Labrador City? They were taking place right here in St. John's, in St. John's, on foreign land, foreign soil.

MR. MORGAN: They are not now.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, they are not now because I went down and dragged the minister behind me, and I laid the foundation, and me and my colleagues while we were there laid the foundation for settling that dispute.

MR. MORGAN: Are you going to settle the strike.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I had to have the time I would have settled it. But there was a little bit of politics, and I am coming to that. Mr. Mulrooney and Mr. Premier on the phone, Mr. Mulrooney who ran for the leadership of the Tory Party of Canada is Vice-President of IOC. I will come to that in a few minutes.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making is the fact that these talks and these negotiations were going on here in St. John's. And, Mr. Speaker, to add insult to injury, the member for the district was also the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, who should have better sense and who have went down to Labrador City and conducted these talks.

Mr. Speaker, I spent a weekend in Labrador City last week, well I spent Friday night and part of Saturday there with two hon. colleagues from this side of the House. We had very frank discussions with the employees of the Iron Ore Company of Canada, and although I could not arrange a face to face meeting with Mr. Brian Mulrooney, the Vice-President of Iron Ore Company of Canada, I talked to the gentleman on the phone Friday night past for one hour, and a half an hour on Saturday morning, and I came to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the basic underlying cause of the problems in Labrador City

MR. NEARY: was the poor relationship between the first level of supervision and the rank and file employees of the company. And I believe my hon. colleagues will support my assumption.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, in the first place there need not have been any disruption of work at all had the first line supervisors had any experience in supervision or handling men. Not only, Sir, were the rank and file employees of that company frustrated by the incompetence and the arrogance and the contempt that the front line supervisors, not all of them, but a good many of them, held for native Newfoundlanders by the foreman, but they were also quick to note, Mr. Speaker, the apparent discrimination against native Newfoundlanders in the apparent policy of that company to appoint outsiders, and come-from-aways to their board of directors and to the bulk of the managerial positions of that company. And I would submit to this House, Sir, that until the company changes its attitude and eliminates this policy, this apparent policy of discrimination, and gives proper training to their respective first line supervisors, and get them to change their attitude towards the workers then I am afraid that this situation is going to continue, Sir, and it will continue to smoulder and we will have periodic explosions during the months ahead.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there was a breakdown in communications between the front line supervisors and the rank and file employees, then what in the name of God did the Minister of Manpower expect to accomplish here on the Island, here in St. John's, in conducting these negotiations and these talks?

AN HON. MEMBER: Remote control.

MR. NEARY: With remote control, Would he had not been better off if he had gone to his district, gone to Labrador City man-fashion and sat down. He did not have to cross any

MR. NEARY: picket lines, _____ did not have to get involved in contempt of Court, _____ did not have to get involved in the illegal strike, but could have held informal discussions, carried on telephone diplomacy, have his picture taken because Mr. Speaker, the moment we stepped ashore, just to show you how arrogant and how vicious this company has become in Labrador West, the moment we stepped ashore, stepped off the plane, several friends of mine came out to meet us and here was this photographer hovering in the background taking pictures, not for a newspaper, taking pictures for the security people of the company, so they could get them in after and go over them and put a red circle around the faces to see who was there to meet us. And I told Mr. Mulrooney if _____

Mr. Neary.

the picture that his photographer had taken of me was not satisfactory to send him around Saturday morning, and I would pose for one, and have it autographed and send it over to him.

Mr. Speaker, these people are not living in a concentration camp, and they should not be treated like white niggers. And, Sir, if the minister had not gone down there this could have been a pretty bad situation. If the minister had gone down there, the whole thing possibly could have been avoided. I do not know if it is due to inexperience in industrial relations or just plain stupidity that caused the minister to make this gross error in judgement. And finally we went down and we got the minister on the move, and we got the government on the move, and I am hoping that as a result - the thing should have been settled yesterday! Mr. Speaker, the irony of it all, the absolutely startling part of it all, is that I talked to both sides, and there is no disagreement. Both sides agree to the formula for going back to work, both sides, one hundred per cent agreement. And yet the problem, the big problem, was that the company would not communicate this information, the formula for settling the strike, they would not communicate their feelings to the union executive either formally or informally. Up to the time that I got on the phone, and told Mr. Mulrooney off in technicolour, in good Newfoundland style, good, frank, honest talk, with no beating around the bush, and no playing games. And I think Mr. Mulrooney understood the sincerity of the words that I expressed to him. If there had been any violence, Sir - and there may still be - if there is, I know where to lay the blame. And I think my colleagues probably will too. And it is not what the employees of that company, who contrary, Sir, to that headline in The Daily News, and contrary to what the company's lawyer said down before the court - when presenting the company's case, that everybody in Labrador West was in a drunken stupor. That, Sir, was a malicious - it was malicious lies. It was an attempt to justify a court injunction.

Mr. Neary.

It was deceit of the worse kind. And the lawyer, Sir, Mr. Wells, Mr. William Wells, who made that presentation before the court, should have been barred. I could have gotten 2,000 signatures of people who were prepared to come down and give evidence in court, Sir, that that was untrue.

MR. STRACHAN: Including the RCMP.

MR. NEARY: Including the RCMP.

That it was untrue. It was mischevious.

It was a blatant attempt to smear all the workers and all the people of Labrador West. And the evidence should not have been allowed to stand on the public record. The gentlemen owes the people of Labrador City an apology. And as far as I am concerned, Sir, he should have been barred. That lawyer acted in an irresponsible manner, and he should have been asked to retract. If I was in the union's place I would have taken action against him for slander and libel.

Mr. Speaker, the people in Labrador West were hurt when they saw that headline in The Daily News, statements made before Judge Mahoney or Justice Mahoney - is it? - Justice Mahoney in order to present the company's case. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if hon. members of this House are aware of it or not, but this same Mr. Wells has been involved in three major strikes in this Province in the last year. The time the trawlermen were locked out of Confederation Building, Mr. Wells was representing Fishery Products. The strike the other day with the City Council, Mr. Wells was representing the City Council. And this very same gentleman is the one who represented the Iron Ore Company of Canada in the current dispute down there. Obviously, Sir, anti-union. The gentleman is anti-union, and he should be left out of these negotiations. The man is obviously a troublemaker, and it is going to cause damage. There are going to be people hurt as a result of his

Mr. Neary.

irresponsible behaviour. And these are pretty strong words,
Sir. But if hon. members had been with me the other night
in Labrador City,

Mr. Neary:

when I talked to dozens and dozens and dozens of members of that union, both in the Union Hall and on the picket lines, and on the street, and I never met such a civilized crowd of people in my life, decent Newfoundlanders, most of them. They would have got their eyes open by these kind of wild accusations, and wild statements made by this irresponsible - but can the Minister of Justice tell me if it is ethical, moral, for a lawyer to go down before the court and try to mislead the court and the people of this Province with such irresponsible statements as everybody is in Labrador City is in a drunken stupor. Is that permitted? Is there any Code of Ethics? Is there anything that can bar that gentleman from ever again going into the courts and trying to fool the people who sit on the Bench, and the people of this Province? Is there anything against that? Can this lawyer be allowed to say what he pleases? You cannot say it in this House, Sir; you would soon be brought to task. You have to follow the rules. Are there any rules? Any standards in the courts?

MR. HICKMAN: There are.

MR. NEARY: There are. Well then, Sir, I would submit to the Minister of Justice that in the interest of honesty and decency that the minister check into that, and that this gentleman be disciplined, and if necessary barred, and apologize to the people of Labrador West for tarring everybody with the same brush and smearing their reputation and their character. That is the kind of thing, Sir, that is turning residents of Labrador against this Island part of the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, enough said about that. I do hope that the dispute will be settled today; the foundation has been laid, and I am hopeful, Sir, that the thing can be settled sometime before the day is over.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I can put my finger on anyone thing that is causing this talk now of separatism in Labrador. I can make a casual observation that it is probably a good thing that

Mr. Neary:

there is not a bigger population in Labrador; if there was we would probably have a lot of trouble. There are only 35,000 or 40,000 residents there scattered over 110,000 square miles at the present time. It is a good thing there is not a bigger population jammed in or we would have a lot of difficulties and a lot of problems.

But, Mr. Speaker, there appears to me to be a breakdown in communications between the people in authority in Labrador and the people in authority on this Island. I had an example recently, Sir, down in the Straits of Belle Isle, down in the hon. Leader of the Opposition's district, in the community of L'Anse-au-Loup, where four gentlemen were hauled into Court for shooting a wolf. They shot the wolf, Sir, with the blessing of the wildlife officer in the area. The wolf was hanging around there. It was treacherous. It had already eaten I think seven or eight sheep. It had eaten a calf and all the people were scared of from L'Anse-au-Loup to Red Bay that it was going to eat one of their children. And so they were told by various and sundry authorities to get rid of the wolf.

Well, Sir, they could not catch up with the wolf on foot, so they chased it one day on a ski-doo, that is the only way they could corner the wolf, and they cornered the wolf and they shot it. And, lo and behold, they were dragged into court for shooting a wolf from a machine. What does the law say from a -

AN HON. MEMBER: All terrain vehicle.

MR. NEARY: All terrain vehicle. I brought the matter to the attention of the Minister of Justice and unfortunately the minister took it up with the deputy minister, who is now a judge of the court, and the matter was eventually resolved. Well it just goes to show, Sir, how communications can break down. I will just read the letter from these gentlemen. I sent a copy to the

MR. NEARY: minister, and the minister answered me back, and I want to now publicly thank the minister for his co-operation and help on behalf of these gentlemen. One time I have to give the minister full marks for resolving the injustice that was being done.

"Dear Mr. Neary," they said, "Concerning this wolf that has been roaming our area since early last Fall we all know it is a wild a fierce animal."

MR. DOODY: That is not the member they are talking about.

MR. NEARY: "It was first sighted at L'Anse Amour where it

MR. NEARY: killed eight sheep belonging to one family.

On another occasion it was on a hill," and the Minister of Finance should pay attention to the last paragraph of this letter. I thought it was really put in typical Newfoundland style. The minister will see what I am coming to shortly. "Belonging to one family. On another occasion it was on a hill overlooking several children playing at Capatan Island. Many times its footprints was out among the houses and also sighted. Many people along our shore was hoping and praying that someone would kill it before it killed somebody. It was not safe to walk anywhere after dark. Children and grownups were both scared. Neither was it safe to go in the woods to cut wood.

"So one evening with my licence in my pocket I went to hunt for the dreadful enemy myself, and three others tracked the wolf and I shot it."

MR. MORGAN: A big bad wolf story.

MR. NEARY: "I was told by Constable So-and-So that I was not supposed to track it. But so far as I could see there was no other way. Some people had traps set, but a wolf is too keen, also too strong for traps. He measured six and a half feet skinned long. Not a small animal to come to your door some morning.

"So-and-So and So-and-So was not at the spot when we killed it. They saw it approximately a half to a mile distance, about ten minutes before it was shot. They were also charged \$125. In all, we have been charged \$500. I think it is downright ridiculous to be charged such a fine when one is trying to do our coast some service. I also think our magistrate and police officers should be able to use a bit of common sense in such a case. Our constable would not tell us in Court who reported us to him. We would very much like to find out." I daresay they would. "I would say

MR. NEARY: they did not have much respect for the elderly or the young either in these communities.

"I agree that our Province needs a law but we also need MEN to run it. I hope they do not get the idea that we, the people of Labrador South, are all green-horns. We definitely are not." And listen to this. Here is the punch line, the crunch. "We hope, Mr. Neary, that there is something in your power you can do for us. If so you will never be forgotten by we four men. If a wolf could eat the gingerbread man I guess he could eat me too."

So, Mr. Speaker, there is another illustration -

MR. MORGAN: Fantastic yarn.

MR. NEARY: - another illustration, Sir, of the breakdown in communications between the people of Labrador and the authorities here on the Island.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke the other day in the House about the bureaucracy, about the Vic Youngs, maybe I should not mention any names, but about the officials of Treasury Board and about the crowd that were brought over from Memorial University running this Province. They have a stranglehold, the bureaucrats run this Province, not the government, Sir. And people on the Island have a most difficult time getting their message through, getting through to bureaucracy, people who have talked the government, the administration, the ministers, into expanding their authority, branching off into all kinds of other fields. It is bad enough for the people on the Island here, Sir, to have to fight that bureaucracy, to try to get through it to get their message through, to get things done, and to air their grievances with the ministers and with the administration.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, how hard it is then for residents of Labrador who cannot come to the Island because

MR. NEARY: of the tremendous transportation costs? They have to do their business by telephone or by letter, and letters sometimes, as ministers and members know, can be left on the desks. They can be pawned off. The procrastination can go on sometimes for weeks and weeks, and the people who are trying to get through to the minister, or through to their member, or through the bureaucracy, become completely frustrated in the process.

And so, Mr. Speaker, these are just a couple of examples of why people in Labrador are getting turned off with the administration and with the bureaucracy and with the authorities here on the Island.

MR. NEARY: You know, Mr. Speaker, before this debate started I heard one hon. gentleman say, "You know, this will probably collapse this afternoon because what else can you say? Everything has been said about this matter of the problems of Labrador."

MR. H. COLLINS: No one is telling you that.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, it has not all been said. It has not all been said. It will not slow me down as far as the strike at the Waterford is concerned either, or the public debt, or the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) who stood up the other day and said we should restrict our debates to twenty minutes and we should start today. This would be a good day to start. Well that gentleman has not been in his seat yet today. That gentleman made his little - well maybe he was there for five minutes, That gentleman can make his little speech, get his name in the news and then go downtown to practice law. But I have to stay in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: He does not do that.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does do it and if the hon. gentleman was sincere why does he not volunteer his services to the Minister of Finance, instead of collecting \$10,000 or \$12,000 off of that \$50 million bond issue by signing his name. If the gentleman is so sincere and so worried about the cost, the extravagance and the waste of money in this House, why does he not say to the Minister of Finance, "I volunteer my service." Why not?

MR. DOODY: He is not working for the Minister of Finance.

MR. NEARY: Oh he is recommended by the Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: He is working for the syndicate.

MR. NEARY: Recommended by the Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: He is working for the Association of -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of sincerity that I would like to see, Sir. That is the kind of patriotism

MR. NEARY: that I would like to see. People stand up and say, "Sure, cut your speech on Labrador down to twenty minutes; cut it down to twenty minutes so we can get the House closed up." "More members would speak," that is what the hon. gentleman told us the other day.

Mr. Speaker, it does not make any difference if it is twenty minutes, thirty minutes, forty-five minutes, what is the hurry? If members want to speak they do not have to go the maximum time, the forty-five minutes, if they do not want to. But are more members going to speak if you cut it down to twenty minutes? Nonsense! Half the time the lawyers are not here anyway to speak. They are downtown practicing law, and down in the Court.

So, Sir, I am not going to restrict myself to twenty minutes. I am going to take my time because I have got a few things to say about Labrador and I think they are quite important. It has not all been said yet. If we were here until Christmas Eve you probably would not have it all said.

Mr. Speaker, these two illustrations I just gave are, I think, good, clear indications to the House of why the people in Labrador are getting turned off.

Just before I get off the IOC situation, Sir, I want to say this, and if I did not know it before I certainly had it confirmed for me over the weekend. There was a time in Wabush that the Wabush Mining Company was having far worse labour troubles than they are having right now in Labrador City. And all of a sudden the situation is reversed. You have got more labour difficulties now, more labour problems in Labrador City than in Wabush. Why?

Well, Sir, the Wabush Mining Company was smart enough

MR. NEARY: to realize that they were bringing in foremen who were arrogant, who did not understand the local psychology, who were causing all kinds of trouble because they could not communicate with the employees. And now, Sir, fifty per cent of the foremen, I would say, working for Wabush Mines are Newfoundlanders.

Well the situation just reverses itself.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Distinct from Iron Ore Company of Canada.

MR. NEARY: As distinct from Iron Ore Company of Canada.

The Iron Ore Company one time had pretty well all their supervisory people, their foremen and so forth were Newfoundlanders, but over the last few years they have gotten away from that and they brought in a crowd of come-from-aways. I have nothing against come-from-aways, Sir, but they do not understand the local psychology and until they change that attitude, Sir, and until they put a Newfoundlander or two on the Board of Directors, and until they establish a purchasing office in this Province, in Labrador, and until they do a lot of other things that they should be doing, because it is our natural resource, then I am afraid, Sir, they are on a collision course.

MR. DOODY: That is true of the union as well as the company.

MR. NEARY: True of the - as far as I know the union president is in Labrador.

Now, Sir, we had another situation, I believe the member who introduced the resolution referred to it, about the pellet plant a few years ago. Was it the pellet plant was supposed

MR. NEARY: to be built in Newfoundland Labrador? The hon. the former Premier will remember. The hon. the former Premier took a position, took a stand, and said that that pellet plant will go to Point Noire, I think it was, over my dead body. Well I think we probably all admired and respected the hon. gentleman at the time for taking such a stand for Newfoundland, prepared to lay down his life for Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. But, Sir, the hard reality, the hard, cold facts of the matter are this; that when the vicious lobby started, when the high mucky-mucks up in Montreal, in their posh board rooms, in their skyscrapers in Montreal, the fellows that contribute and manipulate the political parties of Canada, when the big shots, the money bags got a hold of it they said, "Little Newfoundland and little Joey can go jump in Smallwood Reservoir if they want to. We are building that pellet plant in Quebec Labrador."

I do not know what transpired behind the scenes, but I must say it was a tremendous let down for me when a decision from a Montreal skyscraper, by the establishment of Canada, was crammed down our throats and we had to eat humble pie and allow that pellet plant to be built on the Quebec North Shore instead of in Newfoundland where it should have been built.

Now if I felt bad about it, if I felt miserable about it, can you imagine how the people of Labrador felt about it in Labrador West? Some day I hope that the former Premier will tell the story. I have never heard the story of why.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I?

MR. NEARY: Certainly I would yield just for a question, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The fact of the matter is that the company was situate not in Montreal but in Ontario -

MR. NEARY: Oh well, worse again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - in Hamilton, Ontario. The controlling interests were in Hamilton, Ontario. And they swore to me in meetings that we held in Ottawa, attended by Robert Winters, whom they enlisted to help in the negotiation, they swore that if they were prevented from building the pelletizing plant at Seven Islands, they would build it in the United States. They would ship the ore to the United States and there the mills that would go to consume the iron ore in pellet form, they would ship it to a point near their mills and do the pelletizing in the United States.

The choice that faced the Government of Newfoundland at that time was either to let it be built at Point Noire near Seven Island, or for Canada to lose it. We would be banishing out of Canada altogether. This of course we could not endure. We could not possibly take that responsibility on us.

Now in addition to that we got back as a gift all of NALCO, and that was something of the order of \$2.5 million, I think it was, at the time. The title of that came back to the Newfoundland Government. We really had no choice in the matter.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I thank the hon. former Premier for giving me this information. It was rather unfortunate at the time that there was such a grandstand play made because then we had to backtrack. And the same thing happened to the chip mill in Goose Bay and so, Sir, all these things just add up, and not only are the people of Labrador frustrated over these kind of decisions, but certainly the people here also on the Island of Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said I would make one or two suggestions to the House for the guidance of a select committee if the House decided to establish one, and I would suggest, Sir, that preceding any hearings or any other action of the Committee that a survey be undertaken by mail of a statistically

MR. NEARY: selected sample of people of Labrador in which geographical considerations would be reflected and in numerical proportion to the population of Labrador.

MR. NEARY: The difficulty with hearings, Mr. Speaker, is that first of all they have a tendency to be very expensive, and secondly, that they rarely secure a representation of the grass-roots people themselves. A properly conducted survey, on the other hand, can reflect grass-roots thoughts and feelings. It can show, Mr. Speaker, what people themselves consider to be the problems faced by all the communities in each and every part of Labrador with all its variations and demographic patterns.

Mr. Speaker, a survey of this nature could show what the ordinary people themselves think about legislation, government services, educational opportunities, social security, transportation and other matters that would give the House an overall and precise view of Labrador as seen by its citizens, Sir, and an indication as well to the House as to the priorities that should be followed in dealing with the problems of Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. House may remember a few months ago I did a survey - well I have done a number of surveys, but the most recent one that I did was done last Summer to determine reasons for so many resignations among municipal leaders. Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree to set up this select committee I would volunteer my services, personally, Sir, to set up a study, a survey of Labrador, of a carefully selected random sample of people of Labrador, to determine their reaction, Sir, to the problems that are confronting them.

Mr. Speaker, this survey could be done at a very minimal expense to the provincial treasury in these times, Sir, when we are told by the Minister of Finance that we should be studying every possible means of curtailing handouts to individuals and firms, most of whom, Sir, have small chance of producing the kind of information that could possibly show a true and reliable guide to any select committee

MR. NEARY: that may be set up.

Mr. Speaker, I support whole-heartedly, Sir, and endorse the resolution submitted by the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). I consider it, Mr. Speaker, to be a sound, sensible, positive approach to a situation which, if ignored and neglected, Mr. Speaker, could become as serious a problem to St. John's as Quebec now is to Ottawa. And as I said a few moments ago, Sir, as a token of my sincerity and my support, I freely offer, Sir, my services to conduct any research project, like the one that I just outlined, Sir, as a basic foundation for the deliberations and procedures of such a select committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Young): The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in saying a few words to this resolution I hope not to be too long and hopefully what I have to say to say in a period of approximately twenty minutes. I think if you cannot say something in twenty minutes you do not say it at all.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion put forward by the hon. gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) is maybe a good one and maybe not a good one. First of all, I would like to say a sincere thank you to the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution for a gift that was given to me as well, a similar gift as was given to my colleague the Minister of Tourism, a black bear skin. It was given to me when I was in Labrador and I travelled the Labrador Coast last Summer. I appreciate the hospitality shown to me by the hon. gentleman from Eagle River and particularly the hon. gentleman, my colleague, the hon. gentleman from Naskaupi.

The points made by the hon. gentlemen in their speeches - unfortunately I did not have the opportunity to listen to their speeches. I was away from the House for a few days because of illness - but I read the speeches of the two hon. gentlemen who represent parts of Labrador.

MR. MORGAN: Some of the points of information put forward were unbelievable. The hon. gentleman's information as relayed to the House of Assembly with regards to what is happening on the purchasing of goods in Western Labrador was indeed a surprise to me, and I think to most hon. members of this Assembly, whereby the purchasing for the Wabush and Labrador City operations are purchased in Quebec, through a purchasing agent in Quebec. That I think is an intolerable situation and something should be done to correct it.

The speech made by the hon. gentleman, my colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) was spoken I think more from the heart than from the mind. Being a native Labradorian I think that everything he says with respect to the Labrador part of our Province is said in a very genuine and sincere way. And these are reasons I am firmly convinced, as a member of the Cabinet, that each and every member of the Cabinet, all my colleagues, and the Premier, are going to listen very attentively to any problems put forward by these two hon. gentleman, in particular our own colleague on the government side. They are not going to be laughed at and scorned at in any way or form. They are going to be listened to very attentively and action taken. That is the key of all this debate.

There are a number of serious problems in the Labrador portion of our Province. Some of these problems are in connection with the Department of Transportation and Communications, serious problems. Before I get involved in talking about these problems and what this department intends to do, I want to talk about the section of the resolution which deal with the opinions and the viewpoints of people living in Labrador.

I found in my travels last Summer that the people I talked to were skeptical of, first of all, of my visit there, what I was doing there as a Minister of the Crown. There was a

MR. MORGAN: feeling of skepticism, of reluctance in some cases, to even discuss their problems, because they felt I was there not in a sincere way. And that feeling of skepticism has to be overcome. We have to, as a government and as politicians, whether we be on the Opposition side or on this side, we have to somehow or other regain the confidence of people living in Labrador that we are concerned about them and their problems.

Maybe it reflects the past representations. Maybe. I am not saying it does, and I am not saying it does not. But maybe it reflects the past representations in this House of Assembly of people in Labrador.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. minister yield for a moment? He says somehow we have got to restore the Labrador people's confidence in Newfoundland and in the government. Has he got any suggestions as to how that -

MR. MORGAN: Yes. If the hon. gentleman would allow me to continue my speech, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well of course, I am listening eagerly. But I hope the minister will not miss that point.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the lack of confidence in politicians in governments per se in Labrador.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, quite so, yes.

MR. MORGAN: And that is mainly, I think, mainly because of the - and it reflects largely on the past representations. For example, I recall a situation no longer than just prior to my getting involved in politics where a man could be sent down from St. John's, parachuted into Labrador, and become the official representative in this Assembly for these people. He would sit in the House of Assembly and speak up for Labrador without even visiting the area that he represented in the House of Assembly.

That went on for approximately a four year period and

MR. MORGAN: if I recall correctly, looking at the letters to the editor, etc., and the comments in the news media by various spokesmen in the Labrador area, particularly on the coast, that the hon. gentleman did not visit his district for year on end. He did not travel to the area.

Now there is a good obvious reason to me why the people are skeptical of politicians, skeptical

MR. MORGAN:

of their sincerity. So it does reflect on past representations. But I am convinced and I have to say that the hon. gentleman who put forward this resolution in my travels with him is genuinely concerned. There is no question of the sincerity of my hon. colleague on this side from Labrador, in fact both hon. colleagues. And the hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations is genuinely concerned for Labrador and the problems.

But we have to regain the confidence, - and I think in my view one way of doing it is to have them participate with us not in carrying out studies, not in going in getting surveyed by mail as the last speaker recommended. People do not want studies in Labrador any more. They want us, as politicians, they want us in this case as the administration, to prove our sincerity, to prove our concern by taking action to alleviate the existing problems in the Labrador section of our Province. That is exactly what they want. Over the past number of years that action has not been taken.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to the Opposition member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) and he made a point which said that there is a feeling of discontent, of discouragement and dissatisfaction in Labrador. And he felt it was not because of a lack of services. If I can quote him correctly, I refer to his statement, "You can spend millions even billions in Labrador to provide services and it would not alleviate the feeling that they have at the present time." I take strong exception to that statement. I think that is the main reason for the present discontent in Labrador. Over the past number of years we have not shown a genuine interest, we have not shown a genuine concern, we have not gotten them involved in their own problems. We have not gotten down to the level of talking to the councils in their own areas. We have not gotten down to the level of having them participate and make recommendations to us as an administration, and the past administration, or as politicians in making their recommendations. Not going in and studying, as the hon. gentleman for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) mentioned

MR. MORGAN:

in his speech, even the outline or the profile of their noses, down to that level; not going in and studying the habits of watching television as was studied in Nain. They do not want that kind of thing in Labrador any more. They do not want Select Committees going in asking their views on the problems. Politicians should know the views of the people on the problems. They want action to resolve them. They do not want further studies and surveys.

And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced the people of Labrador do not want special consideration. They only want consideration for their isolation with regards to transportation problems, with regards to communications problems and others. So the lack of attention is not the key issue. It is the lack of action in overcoming the problems that they have in Labrador. That is the main reason for the present discontent.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) in speaking mentioned the fact that my colleague, the Minister of Tourism, almost got into the point of talking about what we done in Labrador. Well I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we should never be ashamed - and when I say we, this administration - we should never stand and be ashamed to say what we are doing for Labrador, because we are taking more action in the past four years, we are taking more action to overcome the problems than was taken in the prior fifteen.

Mr. Speaker, the main problem area of Labrador is the Coastal area. Western Labrador enjoys a different way of life entirely from the coastal communities. I would say discontent along the Labrador Coast is primarily because of the lack of services. I am not ashamed at all, as one minister of this administration, of the department's record, the administration's record in overcoming these problems. I am wondering why the former Premier of the Province, who seems to be concerned now for Labrador, why he did not point out what was done by his administration for Labrador. Maybe it is because he is ashamed of the record of the previous administration. We should not be ashamed of our record, what we are doing.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, when I travelled last Summer, I travelled and I visited the community of Nain first of all, and the hospitality shown by the hon. gentleman's good wife was really appreciated in Nain, the hon. gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). I travelled Nain to Hopedale to Charlottetown, Makkovik, Rigolet, Mary's Harbour, Fox Harbour, travelled to these communities, talked with the councils and got their views with regards to what they felt should be done in their communities. I am convinced if every hon. gentleman on this side of the - or every hon. gentleman as colleagues of mine in the Cabinet, who are dealing with problems in Labrador, if we took that step and that approach, if we go into Labrador and sit down and get their views, not the views of what the problems are, the views as what they want done to overcome their problems.

AN HON. MEMBER: You should go down there.

MR. MORGAN: And upon the consultation of that type, then if we take the action - that is exactly what is being done. For example, I recall last Fall the prime example to me of how we can change the attitude or the feeling of people living in Labrador. Some groups in Labrador would rather call up the national press, the CP or CBC National News and go across the nation saying, "The Newfoundland Administration is ignoring us down here. We are in Cartwright and we are isolated and we cannot get our school children to school." They prefer to do that than to get on the phone and call the minister responsible, or to send a delegation in and sit down with the minister responsible accompanied by the member for the area. They prefer to go on national press or national media and complain about the isolation in Labrador, how they feel there should be a separatist movement because of the way the Newfoundland administration, Newfoundland and Labrador administration is treating them in that part of the Province. That is totally wrong and fortunately the people who have that attitude are at a minority.

The right approach is the approach that was taken, for example, by the council delegation from Rigolet. I recall quite vividly we had a

MR. MORGAN:

little problem with regards to moving equipment from Black Tickle where last year we built a new road around the community of Black Tickle. And this was an ongoing programme of building roads along the coastal communities in places where no roads exist. We have a special unit set up with a special type of equipment, a smaller type heavy equipment, and we go in there and we build up or reconstruct existing roads or build new roads. That is an ongoing programme. It is a firm commitment from this administration. It was commenced by this administration and it is a firm commitment to carry on that kind of work along the Labrador Coast.

We had a little problem with regards to moving the equipment from Black Tickle, where we had finished the job of building the , of moving it into Rigolet. And we had to use a barge which was owned by the Rural Development Department. And the skipper of the barge, etc. was of the opinion the tides were too heavy and we could not move the barge. There was a possibility of losing the barge and losing the equipment.

So a delegation from the community of Rigolet came in and sat down in my office accompanied by the MHA, the hon. gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), and we sat down and we discussed a means and ways of getting that equipment into Rigolet, because it was of major concern to them because not only were we going to reconstruct, which we are, the roads in the community of Rigolet, but we are building an airstrip in Rigolet. And when I say 'we' I must reaffirm that it is the Newfoundland provincial dollars, the taxpayers' dollars of this administration which is building that airstrip in Rigolet strictly, no funds or no assistance whatsoever from the federal level of government.

So the delegation was quite concerned about getting the equipment moved in last Fall so they can commence work on this road reconstruction job and the building of the airstrip. They came in and sat down, and with their recommendations and with our discussions, and with the initiative taken by the council and by the member, we arranged to find a means and way of getting the equipment into Rigolet and which was carried out successfully.

MR. MORGAN:

Now if the other councils, if the other organizations and organized groups in Labrador took that kind of an approach - it is a two way street.

MR. MORGAN: Maybe they are fed up with our attitude and there is room for change on our part, but on the other hand there is room for change on the part of some of these organized groups in Labrador as well. And if the other communities, organized communities, councils, organized committees, took the example that was taken by the Council of Rigolet - that one little example - we would have a far different situation in Labrador and we would have participation between two levels of government in many cases, municipal and provincial, and we would be able to overcome many of the problems that now exist; and the problems are, as I again repeat, the problems are the main cause of the present discontent in that part of our Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, transportation is a major problem in the coastal Labrador. In coastal Labrador that is one of the main problems. The second major problem is also in connection with my department, communications. The only solution to these problems, and I think every organization on the coast would agree, the only solution is a major programme of construction of airstrips.

The federal level of government has so far carried out a major study. They have now devised a major plan, in fact it is called a master plan, a master plan for coastal Labrador. That plan is to build approximately thirteen airstrips along the coast. Now we, naturally, as an administration fully endorse that plan, fully endorse it providing, of course, and with the qualification that the federal government will supply sufficient funds to build these airstrips. The programme of building airstrips was not initiated by the federal level of government, it was initiated by this administration. It was something long overdue. I am surprised that the previous administration, that the hon. the member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) who was Premier for so long, I am surprised, to be official without being partisan, the autocrats and the

MR. MORGAN: and the policy makers who sat in this building for so long, looking at Labrador down there, a Labrador Affairs Division, a Labrador Affairs Minister, that sat here so long and did not initiate some kind of a programme to overcome the major problem of transportation. I am wondering why it took this administration to recognize the major problem and take some initiative. Initiative has been taken; construction is now taking place in Cartwright of an airstrip which is going to cost well over \$1 million and the funding of that is, except for an amount of \$100,000 from the federal level of government, is strictly provincial funds.

But that is only a beginning. That is a programme that we have now devised and we are going to continue with as long as we can get the funds available and that depends on budgetary items in the budget with regard to finances etc. this year. But it is a programme that we intend to carry on with. We are looking at Nain and Makkovik and Mary's Harbour, irrespective of the great master plan in Ottawa. They can plan and plan and plan as long as they want. But I must admit that my counterpart in Ottawa has been receptive to proposals put forward to him, the hon. Otto Lang. He is receptive and I think - I have to say this as well, I have had many meetings with the hon. gentleman who represents Labrador in the House of Commons, and he is genuinely concerned. I work with him very closely although he is in the opposite camp. So hopefully by putting heads together over the next number of weeks, by the beginning of the construction season the federal government will see fit to allocate sufficient funds to commence maybe three or four of these airstrips in 1977 and carry on with a programme that we commenced.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go too long but that is a little example of what we are doing. We have spent substantial funds and there is no point in being ashamed to say it. We spent \$1.4 million in 1974 on road

MR. MORGAN: work in the Labrador portion of our Province. We spent \$2.6 million in 1975 and we spent \$1.7 million last year. We are going to spend more next year, more, more, and when I say 'we; the Department of Transportation and Communications, because we recognize the need to overcome the problems with regard to transportation in Labrador.

Also I think it reflects on the representations made by hon. gentlemen who represent the Labrador part of our Province.

Communications: Communications are the key factor. Out of all the comments that were made by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) - he talked about wolves and gingerbread men and other thengs, and surveys by mail and the Labrador West strike, which is sort of irrelevant to this debate -

MR. MORGAN: but the one thing he mentioned which was the key, and he said it in one sentence and he could have sat down, "There has been a breakdown in communications," a breakdown in communications between levels of government. Whether it is the previous administration or this one, between levels of government to government, between levels of government and politicians, individual representation or representatives, and between the local governments and local organizations and officials in the administration, lack of communication. Maybe the only way to overcome that is to decentralize government. And that is a firm plan of this administration, to decentralize government departments and have more government officials and a more obvious scene of government. In other words, a native from the Labrador coast can come into Goose and he can see government, it is there. He can see Rural Development, Social Assistance or Transportation and Communications. No matter what it may be, he can see the actual part of the government there. I think that would help the situation substantially.

It is not giving special consideration by doing that. We are doing it in the other parts of the Province. We have government to see in Corner Brook, if you wish, government to see in Grand Falls, even in Clarenville, by field men and field offices being stationed and located. So it is not giving special consideration to Labrador by taking that kind of action or that kind of a step.

Mr. Speaker, I talked to CBC officials a number of times, and I have made representations a number of times over the past year, long before this debate was considered to be brought before the House of Assembly, and I put forward one firm recommendation. I said, if you do nothing else in Labrador for communications only establish people in the Goose Bay radio stations who have the ability to programme and to broadcast in native languages, Inuit and Indian, native languages, if you do nothing else in Labrador over the next year or so

MR. MORGAN: you will be substantially improving the lack of communications between that part of our Province and the rest of the outside world, if you wish.

The more mundane part of communications, the part of improving signals, for example, CBC upon representation from this department and through what they call the accelerated coverage plan will now be bringing signals into Makkovik and Postville. The telephone companies are improving their service through a new microwave system from Goose into Nain that should improve telephone service on the coast. These are a few examples of what is being done which I sincerely hope - the people who live on the coast, in particular, I am not too familiar, and I have to say so, with Western Labrador. I do not want to talk too much about something I am not familiar with, But if the people living in Labrador could recognize the fact that these steps that we are now taking as an administration are genuine, are sincere, and if our action to participate with them in organizations, sitting down with organizations and talking with them regarding the problems, if they can recognize that as genuine, sincere attempts on our part for consideration for them and their problems, I am convinced that in less than two or three years native Labradorians, or people who move from this part of the Province to Labrador, will stand up and be proud to be part of the newest Province of Canada, Newfoundland and Labrador. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Collins); The hon. the member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, like the Minister of Transportation and Communications, I am not going to speak very long, at least I do not intend to on this particular motion. But the people that I represent in the District of Lewisporte have some connection with Labrador and I have some observations that I want to make with respect to this particular motion.

MR. WHITE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am sorry that the Minister of Tourism, the Minister of Rural Development and the Minister, today, of Transportation and Communications, have taken the attitude they did, and it is the same old attitude that we have been used to for a long time in this Province.

MR. WHITE:

And I do not want to become partisan as they have become in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to. We deliberately moved this motion with the intention that this would not be a partisan debate, it would not be a debate where we would stand and say, "You have not done this and you should do this," nor did we intend it to be a debate where the government representatives, the government ministers would stand and defend what they have done in terms of Labrador or what they are going to do. You know we know that they are going to do some good things in Labrador. We know they intend to do some things in Labrador. That is not the issue.

The issue is the growing feeling in Labrador that they have been neglected for dozens of years by governments of all stripes in this Province and this growing feeling, we have got to come to grips with it, deal with it and try to find the answers to this problem if we are to co-exist as one province, the mainland part in Labrador and the island part right here.

Now in the debate so far the Minister of Tourism has already alienated some of the people in Labrador. I saw articles in the papers - I am going to refer to some more in a moment - where they have already taken exception to statements made by ministers in this debate already. So already we have stired up more confrontation on the part of the people down there. Mr. Speaker, I just picked up today a couple of papers. They are both printed in Labrador. One is the Labradorian and one is the Aurora which is printed in Labrador West, Labrador City and the Labradorian is printed in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Labrador.

I just want to refer to a couple of things in those newspapers, just two, Mr. Speaker, two for one week out of all that are printed in Labrador. I will give you some examples of the kinds of feelings that are prevalent in Labrador today. For instance in reference to the statements by the Minister of Tourism last week already there is a statement in this paper, the Labradorian -and I am quoting - "For Tom Hickey to state that Indians and by implication Inuit have

MR. WHITE:

no special rights before he has even bothered to ask us what we think our position is reveals nothing less than prejudice, an old prejudice of Whites towards Indians and Inuit which has already violently destroyed the first Indians of Newfoundland." And he goes on to say, "He is deliberately encouraging hostility towards the attempts of Indians and Inuit in Labrador to secure a just place in Newfoundland society." Now that has already appeared in the papers -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I understand the hon. member is going to read from a number of newspapers during the course of his address. In view of that I feel it is my duty to bring to his attention the item in Beauchesne which does govern the actions of the Chair in this regard. So I will read this section for guidance if I may. This is article 157 and the part that particularly applies is sub-section 5 and sub-section 6. There are other sub-sections too but I think 5 and 6 are the main ones.

Sub-section 5 reads as follows: "It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside the House and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House."

And sub-section 6 reads as follows: "On the 17th of March, 1933, a member quoting a newspaper in debate was ruled out of order by the Deputy Speaker who said: "The rule is quite clear, that the quoting of a newspaper, an author, or a book which reflects upon debate before the House, either directly or indirectly is entirely out of order, because members are here to give their own opinions and not to quote the opinions of others." It goes on a little further.

Now as I say I am not ruling in any way that the hon. member is out of order but I just bring these points out for his guidance as he did indicate that he was going to quote from a number of newsletters.

The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Basically what I understand is that really I cannot go quoting from newspapers and so on reflecting on things that are happening in the House but that I can participate in the debate referring to things that are written in Labrador newspapers that are not necessarily reflecting on what is happening within the legislature or commenting.

MR. WHITE:

So, Mr. Speaker, in referring to that particular item a moment ago I was pointing out that already in Labrador there is a reaction to some of the speeches that have been made in this debate so far, and I might say a negative reaction at that. I did also see an article in a newspaper last week which referred, Mr. Speaker, to - it was an editorial I think - to the fact that the people in Labrador are watching this debate. They are wondering what is going to come out of it, whether or not this Select Committee will be appointed or whether or not the government will use their majority to defeat the motion as moved by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan).

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to go on in terms of what I was just starting to point out, the feeling in Labrador with respect to their attitude towards the Island part of Newfoundland and their attitude towards the government, and not necessarily this government, Mr. Speaker, because it deals with all governments that have ever been in Newfoundland, the feeling there is a confinement around themselves and it is growing daily. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to the editor in this particular paper, the Labradorian.

"Through the years we have been treated like second class people by the government of St. John's. If we let the government overrule us on this, then we deserve whatever they dish out." That kind of comment is in just about every single letter, Mr. Speaker, that is in this newspaper written by the people down there. It seems that everything that goes wrong for the people in Labrador they tend to blame it on the government of the Province, no matter what it is. They tend to lay the blame with the Newfoundland Government, again I say, whatever stripe it may be.

Another letter in the same edition, the same newspaper. "When the government says, 'Jump', you jump twice. Writing foolish little letters in this newspaper will not ever get Labrador any further ahead. Newfoundland is Newfoundland and Labrador is Labrador." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is in this newspaper which is printed in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area. It is the Labradorian and you see that the feeling there, the Minister

MR. WHITE:

of Transportation and Communications said it was confined to the Coast more so than any other part of Labrador, and we have seen here in just one issue of this particular newspaper that in almost every letter there is some reference to the far away government, and as they call it, the Government of St. John's.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can go on to the next newspaper, the Aurora which is printed in Labrador City, published in Labrador City and Wabush. In this newspaper, Mr. Speaker, there is a news item right here that I would like to refer to. This deals with the Chambers of Commerce in Labrador City and in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. Both those Chambers of Commerce have gotten together and they have planned out a major conference for March 25, 26 and 27 for Happy Valley-Goose Bay. Mr. Speaker, one of the main items on the agenda is regional government. Such a group representing all of Labrador would have their headquarters in Goose Bay. Those are the business people, Mr. Speaker, the people who have a great deal of sway with respect to public opinion in Labrador City, in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. And this kind of things demonstrates that this feeling of separatism that we talk about, that the Minister of Transportation and Communications said was confined to the Coast of Labrador, is not confined to the Coast of Labrador, Mr. Speaker, it is in all of Labrador, every single community.

I am sure the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) would agree with me on this point, that this feeling is general throughout Labrador. Mr. Speaker, let us go through the letters to the editor in this particular newspaper. The first one here is a copy of a letter that was sent in to the Premier. It says, "I do not presume to speak on behalf of Labradorians but I believe it is time someone approached you directly on the question of government attitude towards the people of Labrador. The inclination to secede from Newfoundland is not a myth, nor an idle threat, it is becoming an avalanche particularly on the Coast as you must be aware." He goes on to say, Mr. Speaker - this is the key point that we should bear in mind - "A Messiah to emerge, a charismatic saviour to lead oppressed Labradorians out of the wilderness of indifference and exploitation."

MR. WHITE:

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is in the Labrador West newspaper, the Aurora.

MR. HICKMAN: Tom Burgess column.

MR. WHITE: Exactly, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Justice just referred to the former member for Labrador West (Mr. Burgess) the kind of charismatic leader that he was in the sense that he was driving the New Labrador Party and he made some success with that. We could

MR. WHITE: face the same kind of situation again if we as a group do not come to grips with this particular issue and deal with it quickly.

There is another letter, Mr. Speaker, and it has almost nothing to do with the Province as a whole but with Labrador, yet they seem to again relate to the government as being the problem, being the source of all their ills. It is also one more illustration of why separatist sentiment is growing in Labrador and another reason why Labradorians feel that there are no benefits accruing to them from government in St. John's, only autocratic ripoffs. And again, Mr. Speaker, just those two newspapers from one week's publication, this one here was January 26th., The Aurora, and this one here February 11th., The Labradorian, we see quite plainly, and I am sure that if I took every newspaper that we have in our office from Labrador that this same thing would be in just about every letter to the editor and it is the feeling that is flowing throughout the Labrador area, the feeling that is flowing throughout the written word of people in Labrador and the feeling that is flowing throughout the spoken word of the people in Labrador.

The feeling is growing deeply. It is growing greater every day. I have been to just about every community in Labrador, Mr. Speaker, except a few in the Southern part of Labrador where I have not visited. I have been to Labrador City, and I worked there and Wabush, Happy Valley, Goose Bay. I have been in every community from Nain to Cartwright on the Coast and I went there last January and February with the member for Eagle River and the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir and I have to tell you that wherever I went there was always a kind of anti-me feeling against me, because I was on the Island, I came from the Island and I was down there. "Why are you here?" "I came here to have a chat, to see some of your problems and so on." And

MR. WHITE: I think, Mr. Speaker, that when I came back from that trip that I appreciated far more the problems that are confronting the people of Labrador and it is not necessarily all to do with services. It is a feeling deep down inside. It is a feeling that they should have some kind of self-determination within themselves, and I suggest that this feeling now is being spurred on by the activities that we have seen in Quebec in recent weeks and months and now the people in Labrador are asserting their own feelings, their own feelings, that they should have a destiny of their own and self-determination for themselves.

And that is why I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is important that we in this Chamber try to stay away from the partisan aspects of dealing with government and opposition. We do not want ministers to stand up and tell us what the former government did not do for Labrador and what this government is going to do for Labrador or have already done. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the people in Labrador will once again sit back and say, "Oh they are telling us what to do. They are telling us what we want. They know what we want. They know what we want them to do." Well it is not that way. Can we not as a group for once agree that this is a major problem confronting this Province and vote accordingly to set up this committee of the Legislature to go down to Labrador, to sit and to talk to the people and to visit every single community if necessary?

I mean how important is the unity of this Province? Is it important enough to once again participate in partisan debate in this Legislature and to shoot down this motion that was moved by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan)? I do not think it is, Mr. Speaker, and I think that the members opposite should consider seriously about defeating this particular motion because they have the power to defeat this motion if they want to.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, in terms of what needs to be done in Labrador, I would just like to relate a couple of things that I have been observing over the months, particularly since I represent the district of Lewisporte.

Now the district of Lewisporte, or Lewisporte town itself is the main transportation connection other than by air, with the Labrador Coast and with Happy Valley, Goose Bay. Members will recall that last Summer for the first time the William Carson, a passenger and car ferry was put on the run from St. John's to Lewisporte to Goose Bay, really it was a Lewisporte - Goose Bay operation although the vessel did come here into St. John's. Most of the freight for the Coast went out of Lewisporte.

Rupert Tingley, the General Manager of the CN Marine, as it is now called, says that that was the most successful undertaking that CN has gotten involved in in recent years. The ferry was loaded on every occasion. The passengers in many instances had to make reservations for long periods in advance. People from Labrador were coming up to Newfoundland for the first time, in a good many cases, to just take a holiday and move around and people from here were going down to

Mr. White.

Labrador, not by flying down but taking a leisurely cruise down to Labrador just to have a look around. The in-laws of the member for Naskaupí (Mr. Goudie), I understand, went down on that ferry, because they were not interested in flying down. I know the mother of the Premier went down on the ferry, because I saw her, and we talked about it, and so a lot of people went to Labrador for the first time last year, because this ferry service was in operation. And it is going to be expanded this year, and I hope that we, in the Lewisporte area, can provide the kinds of services that the people in Labrador are concerned about, and are interested in, in the service that we can provide.

In connection with that, Mr. Speaker, there is - you know, I know it is in the long-term, and I know that money has got to be made available, and today we are talking of the tight financial situation of the Province, and money not being available for this. I realize that. But let us put that aside and look at the future and what can be done in terms of the development and the bringing together of Labrador. This ferry operation from Lewisporte that goes into Labrador, takes cars in, and they come off pretty easily, and they take cars out from Goose Bay and Happy Valley. It is a leisurely trip down the coast to Lewisporte, and then they can get off there, be in Central Newfoundland and drive either way, wherever they want to go to spend a holiday or visit friends or visit relatives or parents or whatever.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the road from Churchill Falls to Labrador City is there. There is really a road there, [it needs to be upgraded. But think of the possibilities of that road being upgraded to the extent that people from Churchill Falls could come over to Goose Bay - Happy Valley and get on the ferry, and come down to Newfoundland, to the Island part of Newfoundland, and spend a vacation, and then tie into Labrador City -

MR. MURPHY: Does the hon. member mean the road to Churchill Falls, Labrador City or the road to Churchill Falls, Happy Valley - Goose Bay?

MR. WHITE: Churchill Falls to Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. WHITE: And, Mr. Speaker, it all ties in because eventually there could evolve a road system between Labrador City and Wabush and into Esker, or into Churchill Falls and over to Happy Valley - Goose Bay or directly from Labrador City to Goose Bay. I am not sure of the geography of it at the moment.

But those are the kinds of things that have got to be done. There is another thing that concerns me - as I said, I did not want to speak very long on this debate - and that is the sports scores that I have been hearing lately from Labrador. Just about every time there is a hockey game - and I understand that the major teams in Labrador City and Wabush are participating in Quebec hockey leagues, if I am right, and the major teams in Labrador South are participating in the Quebec teams, the Blanc Sablon are going over across the border, and that is the way it is happening in Labrador. There is very little inter-sports activities between Labrador and the Island part of the Province. There is very little of that. More of that has got to be encouraged. But those are the kinds of things that will drive Labradorians to feel that they are a people on to themselves, and will drive them further to look for self-determination.

There is one other item that I wanted to get involved in. The Minister of Transportation and Communications referred to television. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that more initiative has got to be taken by us, as the elected representatives of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, to bring the feelings of the Island part of the Province, and the feelings of the Labrador part of the Province together. All we have today is the CBC running a service, a television service on the Labrador Coast. Now it is a fine television service. I watched it in Nain, and I got to say that it is the best television picture that I have ever seen. But there is very little input from

Mr. White.

the Province into that television service. I think the only programme they get down there is "Here and Now." "Here and Now" is the only programme they get in Labrador which reflects the feelings of the Island part of this Province. I suggest that there has got to come a time, and I think we should try to use our influence with the CBC to bring about a better system of communications in terms of Labrador and the Island part of the Province. What I would like to see - "Here and Now" is developed to an extent in dealing with Corner Brook, where they have a cut-in, they have an interviewer in Corner Brook, and an interviewer in St. John's, and they go back and forth from one to the other, and they do this on a fairly regular basis. Now I do not know why this is not being done in terms of Labrador. Almost every single night, you could have something on television reflecting the views of the people in Labrador, and reflecting the views of the people in the Island part of the Province. I think this should be encouraged with the CBC, because I think that they are the people who can institute this particular aspect of communications and broadcasting - a network system whereby reporters can come on live from Labrador the same day, live and talk and interview. And a Cabinet Minister from the Government can go into the CBC studio and sit down,

MR. WHITE:

and answer questions from a reporter in Labrador. We on the island have not got the kind of perspective of Labrador and the problems that the people there have to deal with them here.

We do not have the feelings that the member from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) has, or the member from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), the deep down feelings. I have them for my own people that I represent, I have them for Newfoundland, but I do have the same kinds of feelings for Labrador as I do for Newfoundland, but I do not have the same kinds of feelings for the Labrador part as do the people who come from there. And I suggest that nobody in the government has those kinds of feelings either, the feeling of being in Labrador, living in Labrador, growing up in Labrador, of working in Labrador, and those kinds of feelings, Mr. Speaker, we cannot feel unless we go to Labrador and participate with the people in Labrador about this. And I think encouraging CBC to get more involved with the broadcasting aspects in Labrador and having this network kind of thing back and forth would be a good thing.

In connection with private stations, Mr. Speaker, and I know a little about this, these has been a lot of discussion recently about trying to get a private television station go into Labrador. Now that offers some problems. Number one, a private station, and I am sure members are already aware of some of the debates that have been going on with respect to the operations of private radio and television stations in the last little while.

AN HON. MEMBER: From time to time.

MR. WHITE: Yes, but one of the - yes, from time to time - problems that confronts a private network, be it any private network, and I make no distinction there, any private radio and/or television network, but in this case I am talking about television, one of the problems is that television is very expensive to install and the returns are not very great in a small area. Now I ran the T.V. station in Grand Falls for a while, and while it does make money on occasion, and can make more, it is a hard job, it is difficult, and you have all of Grand Falls and all of Gander and all of Lewisporte, and all of

Mr. White:

Notre Dame Bay and all of Green Bay and Springdale and the larger areas in Central Newfoundland to draw from in getting revenue to keep that station on the air, and to pay your employees and hopefully make a profit or even break even. Now you cannot do the same thing in terms of Labrador. The advertising revenue is not there to offset the cost. I imagine if you just went into Labrador City and Wabush and set up a private station that only broadcasts to the area there, and you sold local advertising you could probably get enough to pay the bills every month, and to put a little bit away. But I do not think you could get enough revenue in terms of advertising from the Labrador City-Wabush, Goose Bay-Happy Valley area to offset the cost of the network that would be needed to go down the Great Northern Peninsula and across to Labrador and up the Coast.

So I think that it is one area that government on the island part of this Province have to look at seriously, Mr. Speaker, seriously in terms of helping out a private television network to have an input in Labrador, to set up facilities in Labrador. Now I am not suggesting that we do this today. There are great needs in this Province that we have to look at in terms of financing and so on, but it is something that we certainly have to look at, the possibility of helping out a private television network to go into Labrador. And I think it has to be a private television network, Mr. Speaker, because I do not think that the government should necessarily get involved other than to the extent of helping out. It could keep a close check on the operations of the particular television station, not in terms of news or censoring or anything like that, but in terms of the money that is coming in and the costs that are being outpoured. Because I suggest that if we had this extra private television network going into Labrador it would be another means of giving the people in Labrador the feeling that, yes, they are a part of this Province, that we are all one. And I think

Mr. White:

this has got to evolve over a course of time. I do not particularly care, you know, which private television network the government would get involved in, if any, but I think the time has come when we have to look seriously at this particular matter, and see if there is not some way we can, not necessarily a subsidy, because there might be enough revenue down there to operate. For the operational cost, you know, the music licences, and the staff, and the tubes for it to be replaced, you know, replacing equipment, maintenance and all this kind of thing, there is probably enough revenue in Labrador to sustain that particular aspect of an operation, the operational cost, the current, but I do not think there is enough revenue in Labrador to offset a major capital undertaking, and I think this is where a provincial government might have to get involved in terms of the capital outlay of extending the network up the Great Northern Peninsula, across to Labrador, and then on down to Labrador City and Wabush.

I think it is something we should look at seriously and I would support any move that government made in that particular direction. I do not think that the government should get involved directly

MR. WHITE:

with setting up their own television station, but I think they should help out with the capital costs of getting into Labrador because the revenue to do that is just not in Labrador, it is not in Central Newfoundland, and for that matter it is hardly in Western Newfoundland. St. John's, the Avalon Peninsula is where the big bulk of the revenue for that kind of thing is.

So it is just a thought. And I heard the Minister of Transportation and Communications say it was being worked on. I hope it is, and I would be very much in favour of that kind of thing. So, Mr. Speaker, those are basically the thoughts that I have on the Labrador question. I do not think that we should stand here and defend past actions of governments. I do not think we should stand here and defend what this particular government is doing. Of course they are doing some good things. The previous government did some good things but that is not why we moved the motion that a Select Committee be established.

We moved the motion in a non-partisan fashion to stand here and each of us debate the feelings of the people in Labrador and why this feeling is occurring and why it is there, why it is happening. Is it because there is a lack of services? I do not necessarily think it is. It is more than that. It goes deeper. It is right down inside. I think this is why we have to go to Labrador, or a Select Committee, and sit down with the people because I think the people there are looking now at this motion, seeing if it is going to be defeated. If it is defeated they will be saying, "Oh they tried again but did not succeed." So I think that we should make an effort to - and I ask the members opposite to make an effort to get this motion through the House so that a Select Committee can be appointed to go down and visit Labrador.

I just saw the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development come into the Chamber. And I think I can illustrate what I am trying to say in a small way here. I remember the minister when I was in the news business a few years ago, he was talking about, I think it was - I do not recall for sure - I think it was the percentage of workers in

MR. WHITE:

Churchill Falls, the Newfoundlanders who were working there and the Mainlanders who were working there. And the minister at the time was the member of Parliament for Gander-Twillingate who was in Ottawa and he was convinced that there was a serious problem in Labrador, in Churchill Falls. So he decided - and I think with one of his colleagues, Mr. McGrath I think, I am not sure but I know he decided to go down to Labrador and to look at the situation himself and to see exactly if what people were telling them was true.

When he came back - and I remember writing an editorial that said something to the effect that the member came back with egg on his face or something to that extent - because when he came back he did say that the ideas and the feelings and the belief that he had with respect to Churchill Falls, at that particular time, was not as bad as people were making it out. And he has no qualms about going on television and radio and admitting that.

So I think this is the situation here today, that we should appoint this Select Committee, let them go down to Labrador and go to every single community if necessary and sit down with the people, in a non-partisan fashion, let them have some input into this Select Committee and then come back and see if we cannot deal with it after we find out what is wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Harbour Grace.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I wish to adjourn the debate.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, there is a contest that some hon. members will be participating in this evening, those who have undergone very critical examination by their physicians and I think that in memory of these hon. gentlemen Your Honour might wish to call it six o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It being agreed that it be regarded as six o'clock the House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at three of the clock.