

VOL.3

NO. 88

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 1978

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ooo

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the House's attention to the fact that yesterday a very distinguished Newfoundland public servant in the person of Mr. Malcolm Mercer died.

He served for many, many years with the Commission of Government in the Department of Customs, subsequently joined Canada Customs in Newfoundland and then was promoted in his latter years to a very senior position outside the Province.

The late Mr. Mercer was a native of Upper Island Cove. Hon. gentlemen will recall that his son, Mr. Keith Mercer, served for several years as Law Clerk of this House and presently is Assistant Deputy Minister of Justice.

I am sure hon. gentlemen would wish to join with me in extending our condolences to the widow and family of the late Malcolm Mercer.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House join with the Government House Leader and the members on the government side in extending our deep sympathy and sincere condolences to the family of the late Malcolm Mercer, especially the gentleman who sat in this House with us for a short while. I believe he is now Assistant Deputy Minister in the minister's department, the Minister of Justice.

We would also, Sir, like to extend our deepest sympathy to the family of the late Mr. Mercer.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to announce today in conjunction with the Honourable Marcel Lessard, Federal Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, a one year extension to the Canada/Newfoundland Subsidiary Agreement of Forestry, an extension until March 31, 1979. This extension to the original five-year agreement will permit the expenditure of approximately \$8.4 million in this fiscal year under the joint agreement. This amount represents the balance of \$54.9 million that was agreed to be spent by both governments on the development of the Province's forest resources.

All programmes under the agreement, with the exception of the land acquisition project, are cost-shared 90 per cent by the federal government and 10 per cent by the provincial government. The land acquisition programme involved the purchase of some 500,000 acres of underutilized freehold land and was cost-shared 50/50 by the federal government and the Province.

The remaining funds which have been allocated by the Federal/Provincial Management Committee of the Forest Subsidiary Agreement will cover expenditures in the following programmes:

Forest Management \$90,000; Harvesting and utilization techniques \$449,000; Access roads \$3,052,000; Forest inventory \$831,000; Forest protection \$550,000; Forest improvement \$1,505,000; Administration \$1.9 million for a total of \$8,431,000.

In forest management the bulk of expenditure will be on the area of Management Plans and Surveys where temporary personnel will be hired to carry out timber cruises in order to better define the timber volume to be

MR. MAYNARD: cut in order to maximize utilization. In addition regeneration surveys will be carried out.

In the area of Wood Harvesting and Utilization, the programme of trials for removal of timber from steep slopes using cable logging technology will continue. The objective of the programme is to adapt this logging technology in Newfoundland conditions.

MR. MAYNARD:

There will be two machines used which are described in the statement.

Crews to use the machines will be trained in May-or have been trained in May. Operations are expected to start this month and a forestry engineer has been assigned to each machine.

The programme of integrated logging will be continued this year. The objective of this programme is to more fully utilize the forest resource by ensuring that the larger trees are used for sawlogs and smaller for pulpwood production. This programme will increase the level of forest utilization and the availability of sawlogs to the sawmilling industry but at the same time ensuring the continued economic supply of pulpwood to the pulp and paper industry.

Studies are also planned to determine the optimum size for sawmills in the Province, as well as to examine marketing problems and potentials for the sawmillers. Studies on improving the sawmill designs to suit the local conditions will also be continued.

Trials on Whole Tree Chipping, which is concerned with the utilization of the entire tree above the stump, will be carried out to establish the costs and productivity levels and to determine the use of chips produced by this method.

The trials during 1978-79 will be conducted on converting the hardwood into chips which will be used to produce energy to replace imported oil for steam generation into pulp and paper industry. The same concept can be extended for using the hardwood and softwood whole tree chips as raw material for the manufacture of pulp and paper.

The Forest Resource Road Programme will continue in order to provide access into timber resources of the Province. This will primarily involve continuation and some expansion of the salvage road programme under the Agreement,

MR. MAYNARD: as well as providing access into some of the currently remote timber stands in localities removed from areas in need of salvage but which require access to timber.

This year's work will consist of the completion of 32 projects started previously, the commencement and completion of 13 new road projects as well as a major effort to upgrade or replace approximately twenty bridges to bring them up to heavy industrial or commercial traffic standards. Most of the new road projects will be in the Clarendville, Lewisporte, Baie Verte, Northern Peninsula areas of the Province. These new projects will total some 28 miles of road construction.

Under forest inventory, the funding will permit the continuation of the Management Inventory programme. Nine thousand line kilometers of colour aerial photography of Western and Central Newfoundland will be acquired during 1978 for the appraisal of timber stands. In addition, 3,000 line kilometers of special infrared photography will be flown for assessing budworm killed timber. During the coming Summer field surveys will be carried out in Central Newfoundland to collect field data and to assist in the preparing of forest type maps. In collaboration with the pulp and paper industry, a start will be made on the establishment of a network of permanent sample plots to monitor tree growth on a Province-wide basis.

In Forest Protection, funds have been provided to complete the purchase of the Province's seventh water-bomber. Provision is also made to complete the installation of the island-wide VHF radio telephone system for forest fire protection and suppression. This will give adequate communication to all productive forest areas.

In Labrador, the programme will provide an aircraft for aerial surveillance for forest fire detection which will give adequate protection to that part of the Province.

MR. MAYNARD:

In addition to efforts in Forest Protection, there will be significant effort made towards the problem created by major insect and disease pests of the forest. In particular, funds will be available to enable the Province to keep constant liaison with the Canadian Forestry Service and the forest industry to monitor outbreaks, assess tree conditions and damage. This information will then be used to develop large scale salvage programmes and plans for major control strategies.

In the area of forest improvement, several activities will be undertaken and these include: Reforestation, Pre-commercial Thinning, Site Reclamation, Christmas Tree Demonstration Trials and Control Burning.

\$575,000 has been allocated to the Reforestation Programme in '78-'79. During this period, development of the Wooddale Nursery will be largely completed and additional land areas will be cleared for growing seedlings. At present, there are approximately 10 million tree seedlings at Wooddale with 5 million scheduled for outplanting during the 1981 field season. The Mount Pearl Greenhouse Nursery is scheduled to produce approximately 250,000 container tree seedlings this year,

MR. MAYNARD: while a smaller size greenhouse nursery will be completed at Goose Bay. In addition, two pieces of scarification equipment will be tested at various locations throughout the Province.

The precommercial thinning programme that began in 1971 will be continued and expanded in 1978. This programme is aimed at reducing the number of trees per hectare so as to increase the growth rate on the remaining better quality trees. Approximately 3,200 hectares will be treated in this manner and the total cost of the programme is \$600,000.

The Site Reclamation programme was designed to bring back into production those areas currently occupied by undesirable or non-merchantable trees will be continued. Approximately 243 hectares will be made ready for planting in 1978-79 for a total cost of \$300,000.

A project to demonstrate the feasibility of producing good quality Christmas trees from young balsam fir stands will be concluded this year. In addition, trials will be conducted to assess the practicality of using Controlled Burning to reduce the slash content on cutovers to facilitate planting. The total cost of these projects is \$8,500.

Both of us, the hon. Mr. Lessard and myself, were very pleased to be able to announce the extension to this agreement and I would say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, that we are already into very active negotiations for a second five-year forestry agreement which hopefully will be able to conclude by the time that this extension runs out in 1979. Thank you.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaking on behalf of Her Majesty's Opposition, we on this side certainly welcome the statement made by the minister.



MR. FLIGHT: It points out again, Of course, the dependency we have on Ottawa, \$8 million, ninety to ten.

MR. NEARY: It is a joint statement made by the minister.

MR. FLIGHT: It is a joint statement and, of course, the minister is defending and bragging about the 10 per cent that the Province put into this \$8 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that Ottawa puts in the money but the provincial Department of Forestry decides how they are going to spend it. I am going to take a second, if I may, to whip through this, Mr. Speaker. I have noticed that in forest management - I do not know if the minister can answer or not but I am wondering if any of the funds designated for forest management under this programme, this \$8 million programme, is going to be spend on Price limits or Bowater limits? I am wondering if in the theory of putting all saw-log materials to sawmills as opposed to going to the mills, if this province has started discussions with Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters for that kind of a programme, a programme that would see all our saw-log materials go to the mills, lumber mills and the surplus, which would be more than the paper companies would require anyway, the surplus going to the pulp mills?

It has been talked about long enough, Mr. Speaker. Most of the sawmills in Newfoundland today are down, shut down, and the reason they are shut down, there is no other reason in the world except the timber is not available to sustain their operations and Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters refuse to allow them access to their timber limits. And until the minister takes a position on that with Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters, that they will indeed relinquish limits to support our sawmills, then he can spend all the money he wants coming from Ottawa and he will

MR. FLIGHT: not solve the problems of the sawmill industry in this Province.

There is some reference to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the papermill companies are now talking about, and this may be a new theory, talking about using hardwoods for steam generation. In other words, oil is getting so expensive they are looking at generating steam and providing all their heating requirements with hardwood. Well, let me ask, why do they not do it with softwood? Why do they not go into the stands that are dead now, moribund or dead, the five or six million cords we are talking about, and salvage that and use it - we may find a market two years down the road for our hardwoods - it is dead anyway, it is on their limits, why do they not burn that instead of cutting our hardwoods and using it for steam generation? It is a possibility if they are so interested in salvaging the budworm killed timber.

The access roads, Mr. Speaker. I would like, and there is another situation with access roads, most access roads built on company limits the contract goes normally to the paper companies, why is that? Any access roads built by a contractor in this Province creates jobs, access roads built by the paper companies on their limits do not create a new job. I am not convinced that they are subject to any type

MR. FLIGHT: I am not convinced that they are subject to a type of inspection. The only people who abuse the roads anyway are the paper companies that are building them, and I am not too sure, Sir, Price (Nfld.) or Bowaters do not bid on the Trans-Canada Highway. He will not get any bids from Price or Bowaters on the Bonavista Loop Road or the Great Northern Peninsula Road or the Trans-Canada, so why should we accept bids from them on forest access roads? And, Mr. Speaker, we are building access roads. We built access roads last year and there is no indication that the access roads we built last year are going to be used for the purpose of salvaging timber or harvesting timber this year. So, Mr. Speaker, on this forest access road situation, I think the whole area needs to be taken a look at. Price (Nfld.) loves to brag about the fact that the Province has never funded access roads. Well, we started funding them on Price limits last year, and there is no evidence at this stage that that road we funded to the tune of three or four million dollars is going to be used for the purpose of cutting this year. It may indeed, but there is no evidence right now it will be, and that presumably was a road built to salvage budworm infested. Now, Mr. Speaker, \$54 million have been spent under this agreement, so that means that Ottawa funded about \$48 million over the past four years. We knew about the budworm problem in this Province. In 1971 the infestation became very apparent. The signs were there that we would be in for an epidemic. One could wonder what would have happened if the hon. Minister of Forestry had decided that I am going to use the bulk of that \$54 million - never mind the administration, never the mind the Christmas tree special, never mind experimenting with cutting timber off of slopes. Price and Bowaters in this Province have been cutting for fifty years and they have not worried about salvaging the timber on the various slopes. If it is not economical to cut, they are not going to cut it. And the minister can bring in what forestry equipment he wants and run tests on cutting timber on slopes of rivers or on steep land, if it is not economic for Price or Bowaters, they are not going to take advantage of it anyway. So, I do not know what purpose it really serves unless the minister can stand up and that he has got a commitment from Price or Bowaters that they will use

MR. FLIGHT: that equipment if the government proves it is a good investment. Right now the Newfoundland government is too free with the easily accessible timber with Bowaters and Price for Bowaters and Price to even be concerned about getting into the timber that is far removed from the mills or that is in any way inaccessible. They will never go in Lloyd's River, Lloyd's River valley, those kind of areas. Price (Nfld.) is not going to go in and cut that wood while we are prepared to let them keep the choice limits in this Province; so that could well be a waste of money unless the minister is prepared to tell us that Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters have agreed to use that kind of logging equipment if it pans out. So, Mr. Speaker, given the state that our forests are in right now, given the total, absolute lack of forest management being practised on Bowater and Price limits, some of the programs listed in this that have been approved by Provincial Government is a waste of money and is not recognized in the priorities. Better to have taken the whole \$54 million on recognizing that we were about to be faced with the kind of a problem we got right and now and to have spent it in preparing our forests and protecting our forests against the kind of budworm infestation, the kind of an epidemic we are facing right now. So, Mr. Speaker, one can go on and on. I notice that some of the \$8 million will be spent on funding of a water bomber. I wonder was Ottawa aware of the kind of shenanigans that went on with the purchase of that water bomber? There is an old saying in Newfoundland: 'Whoever pays the fiddler, calls the tune.'

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed that they pay 90 per cent.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, but I wonder have they been aware up to now about the shenanigans that went on in buying it. Maybe someone needs, Mr. Speaker, maybe someone needs to make Ottawa aware of the way their money is being handled in the purchasing of water bombers and that kind of thing. They may have been able to save themselves half a million dollars, and that with another half a million dollars we would have had to build access roads or kill some budworms. Now, Mr. Speaker, in forest

June 13, 1978

Tape 4308

GH-3

MR. FLIGHT: improvement - here is a direct question for the minister. It says "In the area of forest improvements, several activities will be undertaken and these include: reforestation, pre-commercial thinning, site reclamation- and never mind the Christmas tree demonstration, that is just junks and controlled burning. Will any of that activity take place on Price and Bowaters limits?"

MR. FLIGHT:

That is the only question, Mr. Speaker, that is important to the forestry in this Province, because if this is going to take place on Crown limits, forget it. Most of the sawmills that are shut down, certainly in my area of Newfoundland, are shut down because there is not enough timber to sustain their operation. In other words, we have cut ourselves out. The Crown land limits around the Central Newfoundland area been cut over, the cut is in, there are no logs left. So what is the point of talking about forest management, thinning, reforestation, site reclamation, on Crown lands in this Province when the bulk of the timber producing area of Newfoundland is either in one way or the other owned by Price (Nfld.) and controlled either by freehold grant, by licence or by timber limits?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out to the hon. gentleman that if our procedures under Ministerial Statements are to remain clear and not become ambiguous or clouded, one of the requirements is brevity, and that an hon. member replying may make brief comments. I am certainly not going to define 'brief'. The sensible approach there is that it has to be in comparison with the length of the statement. I usually understood that to be that the reply should certainly not exceed half the length of the statement - certainly should not exceed the length of the statement. We are now at the point where it equals the length of the statement. So I think certainly it should be less long than the statement to which it is a reply.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will wind up very quickly now. What I have said has been said many a time. My problem is that we are having a hard time getting through to the minister.

MR. FLIGHT: And maybe Ottawa in funding these projects 90/10 should have a little more to say since it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, in view of the mess the forests are in in this Province, that up to this point we have done nothing only dance to the jig of the paper companies. There is absolutely a total lack of forest management. totally and absolutely on the paper companies' limits. All the timber in Newfoundland that we are talking about is on their limits, so spending \$54 million in the last five years should have been directed to correcting that situation. And in responding to the minister I would suggest to him that the next agreement he signs with Ottawa for monies to be spent on the forestry, that the problem that we are talking about, the problem on the paper companies' limits, the problem that we have to spend our money in the way that will improve and protect the forestry of this Province, because up to now it has not been done. We are grateful for the \$8 million, Mr. Speaker, and we would hope that the minister would use a little more discretion in the way he spends the next \$8 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions. Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have leave to revert to petitions? Agreed!

#### PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I rise, Sir, to present a petition, probably one of the biggest petitions presented in this session in the House of Assembly, and it is in connection with the spray programme. It is a petition that comes from the Gander area, and although it was on very short notice, I want to tell the House that I did notify the member for Gander, the hon. minister, that I was

MR. FLIGHT: going to present a petition.

And, Mr. Speaker, I will read the prayer of the petition. It says - and this petition, by the way, is signed by 3,400 plus people -

AN HON. MEMBER: How many?

MR. FLIGHT: - 3,400 plus - "Because the spray programme will not wipe out the spruce budworm and there is evidence that the budworm will be controlled by natural means, and there is a lack of research on the environment and health effects of the chemical, matacil, that is being used, we, the very concerned citizens of Newfoundland, urge the government to reconsider its decision to spray the spruce budworm with matacil until more research has been done concerning the effects on human health."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in rising to table this petition and to support it, it has become very clear now, the issue of the budworm in the Province is broken into two areas; one is the concern whether or not spraying will indeed have an adverse effect on the budworm, whether indeed it will do anything to counter the infestation and protect our forests. And we only have again, as has been said so often, to look at other provinces that have had a spray programme for twenty-five years and they are worse off now than when they started. So that is one area. But then there is another area, and probably a more important one. People are becoming afraid of the long-term or short-term effect that the chemical, matacil, will have on their well-being and on their health. And every day, Mr. Speaker, there are things being publicized, new facts are coming out that add to that concern. And I would think the basis of this particular petition, Mr. Speaker, is that particular fear. I cannot understand the government being so adamant.



MR. FLIGHT

They have decided to spray water supplies. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, and the minister knows it, that you can spray within two miles of Gander Lake and not have some of the spray under drift situations land in Gander Lake or on town of Gander itself. I do not understand, if a spray programme is absolutely and totally necessary, why it is they are so headstrong and adamant and will not concede to responsible requests that, "You do not spray our towns and you do not spray our water systems." And, Mr. Speaker, this is the basis of this particular petition.

Another fear is coming in here, Mr. Speaker, and that great statement that the minister just gave is a fear that we are going to spray this year; there is no evidence that the Government is looking at anything else other than a spray programme. We may become dependant on a spray programme. There is no evidence that they are going to institute forest management programmes or things that will allow Newfoundland to withdraw from the spray programme. There is a very great danger that the paper companies and the Government will see spraying as a panacea and will go on. If the Government is in a position next year to say that the egg count is down, whether it goes down naturally or as a result of the spray programme they will claim success and we could go on into another spray programme, and another spray programme, and locked in, and become dependent upon a spray programme.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact and it cannot be denied, the directions on the can - Listen to this and would it not frighten you to death, Mr. Speaker? - "Do not breathe". Now these are the directions on the can at Gander Airport, "Do not breathe vapours or spray mist. Keep all unprotected persons out of the operating area or where there is any danger of drift." Now, Mr. Speaker, you cannot spray in this Province within two or three miles of a town and be sure there are not people unprotected in that area. We are spraying with a chemical we know nothing of. We will all know two or three years from now. We

MR. FLIGHT: are being guinea pigs. The people of Newfoundland cannot understand that and they are going to petition the Government by the thousands to stop that spray programme or, select a chemical that at least we know of the dangers that lie in using it.

Mr. Speaker, time is running out and I implore Government to consider some of the prayers of the petition, some of the wishes of the people of Newfoundland. By way of the people who signed this petition - this is very interesting to note Glenwood is totally, as the minister knows, dependent on the forestry of this Province, and the only people in Glenwood who refused to sign that petition were company management people, the only people who refused to sign the petition.

So, Mr. Speaker, my time has run out. I support the prayer of the petition and lay it on the table to the minister to whom it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague, our spokesman on Forestry and Agriculture, Sir, on behalf of 3,400 constituents in the Community of Gander and surrounding area. I congratulate the hon. gentleman, Sir, for bringing the petition before the House.

This is the crucial week, Mr. Speaker, as far as the spray programme is concerned. As soon as the minister gets favourable weather conditions, we understand that the poisonous chemical, matacil, will be squirted around various part so of the Province, and the minister says that his political life is on the line. Well, Sir, I would rather go to bat for the lives of 525,000 Newfoundlanders than I would for the hon. gentleman's political life. I would say to that, "Wogwash" and "So what?" Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has been making a

MR. NEARY: contradictory statement wherever he goes in this Province saying that they will not spray when the wind is over five miles an hour, and the people who are doing the spraying say anywhere from four to twelve miles an hour. And I want to draw to the attention of the Minister of Justice that his colleague, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, is breaking the Provincial Pesticide Control Act, and the minister should do something about it, that states that every person who keeps, stores or transports a pesticide, or herbicide, shall do so in a manner that ensures that the special precautions, or warnings, on the label of a pesticide, or a herbicide, package, which is marked 'poison', or with the symbol of the skull and crossbones, comply with their own laws and publish the warnings in full. And here, Mr. Speaker, on that barrel is a skull and crossbones, and this is a Xerox copy of the label that I have in my hand, a skull and crossbones, marked, 'Danger - Poison' and that is contrary

MR. NEARY: to the new provincial Pesticide Control Act, unless the Minister advises every citizen of this Province to dangers of that chemical and the dangers of some of them were just outlined by my hon. colleague there. The dangers are harmful if swallowed, inhaled or absorbed through the skin, do not get in eyes, on skin or in clothing, do not breath vapours or spray mist. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman tells us that there is no danger involved in matacil, and this is taken right off the barrel and a xeroxed copy of the label on the barrel - the warning being put out by the chemical company - do not get in eyes; if spilled on skin, wash immediately with soap and warm water. Well, if you are out in the country, if your kids are out camping and they are going on a little hike, Cubs, Guides, 4-Hers, all over this Province now, ready to go this week, next week, to go out in the country. How are they going to get the warning that the spray plane is overhead or three or four or five miles away and the spray is going to drift in over their little bodies? Mr. Speaker, I think it is a crime against the people of this Province. And I think the minister should stop it immediately, Sir, stop it now, before it is too late. I want to congratulate, Sir, I want to congratulate the anti-spray groups of Gander, Glenwood, Springdale, St. John's, Stephenville, Grand Falls, Corner Brook, Conne River and other communities affected by the spray program that have put out a little information piece today, put out this warning to the people, and if the people of the Province want to get a copy of this they can write their M.H.A., they can write me or telephone me or write any M.H.A. on this side of the House. I suppose if they got in touch with the minister's office they might even get a copy of this. But I want to congratulate these groups here for putting out the only piece of information, the only informational piece that is available to the people of this Province. The rest of it is all propoganda and jargon that is put out by the minister's department. At the bottom it says, "Please write or phone your M.H.A. or the Minister of Forestry today and demand this information. The life you save may be your own". I ask hon. gentlemen to think about that before they go ahead with their spray program tomorrow or next day.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Conception South (Mr. J. Nolan) followed by hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. T. Lush).

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my hon. friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. G. Flight). We are now in a situation whereby we are about to start - when does it start, incidentally, exactly?

AN HON. MEMBER: It was supposed to start Sunday but it did not get favourable weather conditions.

MR. NOLAN: Alright, so it might be spraying today then?

AN HON. MEMBER: It could be spraying anytime.

MR. NOLAN: It could be spraying now.

MR. NEARY: They have got these big bombers -

MR. NOLAN: Now, we are supposed to be on this side politically ambitious but we are not so politically ambitious that we want the minister removed because he louses this program up - that he endangers the lives of young people and so on - not likely. That is the kind of altar of sacrifice he intends to go on. You know, he is not forestry's answer to Joan of Arc, I will guarantee you. This situation now, as I understand it, is one that could have horrendous results, and I suggest to you that the minister with the officialdom at his disposal has no guarantee that he provide to anyone in this Province as of this moment that the young lives of the young children who will now be going on holidays and out into the various camps and so on around this Province will not be endangered. The unfortunate part about it is this that the damage could be such physically that down the road it may take two or three more years before the real problem is discovered. But let it be a matter of record, Mr. Speaker, and this is important to remember and people will, that to the best of my knowledge only one member opposite has even risen once to indicate his concern and his caution and the call upon his colleagues to take another look, and for that he almost got the order of the royal boot. But he took a chance and he got nothing but a slap in the face for it from what I can hear, if that is parliamentary, Mr. Speaker, figuratively speaking. This situation now is one that many earnest people without

MR. NOLAN:

any - they are not in the pay of anyone in government or any political party, they are not involved or in the pockets of the paper companies, they are genuinely concerned people - parents, people in universities, loggers, hospital workers, labourers. In almost every field they are crying out, "Do you know what you are doing?", and the fact that the minister is prepared to sacrifice himself on the political altar is not good enough. It is too late.

MR. NOLAN: and it is not the remedy, it is not the antidote.

Now the Minister of Justice is also going to be very, very, very much on the carpet if this thing goes through, because he has, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this petition, abused the House in the past with refusing to provide proper information. Well, he cannot wipe his hands clean like a political Pontius Pilate on this one, because the law is clear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I must point out to the hon. gentleman that he is now, in my opinion, entering quite directly into an area of debate.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe Pilate said the same thing. But anyway, this is a situation now where if it is the law of the land, the Queen's First Minister looking after the justice affairs of this Province cannot stand idly by and pretend he does not know, it is not within his area of jurisdiction and so on. So what do we have? We have the Minister of Forestry directly responsible because he is the man who is obviously the one who convinced his colleagues in Cabinet that this should be done. He had to sell the programme to Cabinet and had to sell it to the Treasury Board; secondly, the Minister of Health, most directly involved, but let us look at the other side of it and that is that without the approval of the Minister of Justice or action on his behalf it could not have happened in the first place. And this is what Newfoundlanders will remember. Not only that, but from the information we have, the food that is necessary for thousands and thousands of birds in this Province will be removed, will be ruined and they, too, will be gone. The terrible part about it

MR. NOLAN: is we understand - and I am subject to correction on this - that as a result of former spraying that certain soil was taken, I believe, from different parts of this Province, sent to Ontario, and has not been returned, or at least we do not have the information from the minister. This is a very, very serious matter. It is not a partisan political issue as the Minister of Tourism, I am sure, will testify, but it is one that we are all responsible to some degree for, and every man who remains silent on this issue will be judged accordingly. I certainly support the petition.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition. This aerial spray has become one of the biggest issues, the biggest public issue in this Province today. People are concerned, disturbed and frustrated. Mr. Speaker, I presented one of the first petitions from the residents of Port Blandford who were concerned because this spray was going to be poured over an area very close to their community, within a half mile and within the watershed area. I presented that petition. So far we have not been hearing too much from the people of Port Blandford since that petition because they have not been organized like the people in Gander, but I can assure this hon. House that they are concerned about it and worried and frustrated. It is strange that the government can be so insensitive to the wishes and the desires of its people, knowing that the vast majority of the people of this Province do not want the forests sprayed particularly when it is close to residential areas and close to water supply areas and watershed areas. And it is strange, Mr. Speaker, that the government will go ahead with this



MR. LUSH: spraying programme knowing that it is ineffective, that the results show that spraying is ineffective in controlling the spruce budworm.

Mr. Speaker, we have the spruce budworm because of neglect of our forests and because of exploitation - that is why we have the spruce budworm. And the only way that we can control the spruce budworm is through a good forest management programme, and that is what we are lacking. The companies, the big pulp and paper companies, have not been forced by this government to carry on a forest management programme, allowed them to cut out the economical wood and left the kind of wood, the kind of forest, the kind of timber on which the spruce budworm thrives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: And that is where we have made the mistake, Mr. Speaker. The only solution to the spruce budworm is forest management, and what we should be concerned about right now for the preservation of our forests and for the preservation of jobs for our people in the future is prevention. The minister, himself, has indicated this is only a short-term solution. Mr. Speaker, I say it is not a short-term solution, it is just a stopgap measure.

AN HON. MEMBER: It will make it worse.

MR. LUSH: And what we have to get going on, Mr. Speaker, is a good, scientific forest management programme. And the Budget of this year will indicate, the priorities of the government will indicate how seriously they are viewing this matter. For example,

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, the 1978-1979 budget is up just about \$3,000,000 over last year's budget. Insect control has increased by \$1,720,000, just about \$2,000,000, while forest management is reduced by almost the same amount, \$1,691,600. Now, get this again, that for insect control, for the aerial spray this year, the budget has increased by \$1,720,000, just about \$2,000,000, whilst for forest management it has almost decreased by the same amount. So, we can see what is happening is that the forest management has become subservient to spraying. The Government is putting more emphasis on spraying. The money that the Government is using for spraying this year has been reduced from what they should be spending for forest management. The only cure, the only solution, the only long-term solution to cure the spruce budworm, to get rid of the spruce budworm, and this is what we have, a Government that is taking the money from forest management and putting it into insecticide spraying when we know that it is not effective when, indeed, it can make the situation worse.

Mr. Speaker, that is a terrible situation when we know that the evidence is there, when we know the cure for the spruce budworm, and we are going in the reserve situation, taking money to spray that could be used for forest management, reducing the money spent on forest management by \$2,000,000 and putting that into a spray programme against the wishes of the people, and I think that is a terrible move and I would hope that the minister would reverse his decision immediately.

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. NOBLE:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). I think with regard to the spraying programme the Government is playing a cat-and-mouse game with the general public as regarding the information that they are entitled to have. For example, when the Government's own regulations state that they should strictly adhere to the instructions

MR. MCNEIL: on the container, and the instructions on the container state that the contents, the chemical, is dangerous and poisonous, and it should follow special procedures. Just to give you an example, Sir, of what is required of an individual if he is caught in a spray area, the instructions on the container would say, "Do not breathe the vapour or the spray mist." So, if you are a fisherman on some lake, or nearby, or just travelling in the woods, and the aircraft comes over and sprays, they are asking you to stop breathing. Now, that is ridiculous. Also, on the container there is a notice to the seller. It says, "Seller's guarantee shall be limited to the term set out on the label and subject thereto the buyer assumes the risk to persons or properties arising from the use or handling of this product and accepts the product on that condition."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the cards were changed, if it was an individual spraying his own lots and infected some other area nearby, the outcry from this Government would be so loud that I am sure it would take the top off this building.

AN HON. MEMBER: It would never spray in St. John's. Never!

MR. MCNEIL: And this is another point. When you look at the whole Island they are spraying over on the western part of the Island where from all indications, the egg count masses are down and it is below the critical level; in Central Newfoundland it is on the borderline; but over here on the East Coast, on the Avalon Peninsula, where it is still at the dangerous level, they are spraying. Why? If they are not spraying in this part of the Island where the budworm is very serious, why spray in Central Newfoundland? Why spray in Western Newfoundland? Is it because the major part of the population is in this area and they control the votes, they are the 'in' crowd? But for the little people, the people farther away, the smaller numbers of people, it does not make any difference.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

MR. MCNEIL: That is terrible, Mr. Speaker. When our Government is doing things on strictly a numbers basis, it is ridiculous. They have no faith in the individual, in the human aspect of man.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Justice will have to answer.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Government to reconsider this whole spraying programme and to stop immediately and not take the position that this chemical matacil is innocent until proven guilty. It is poisonous, it is guilty until proven innocent.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: No response.

MR. NEARY: Not a sound from over there?

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Nobody at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that the member for Gander?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have some brief comments to make

MR. HODDER: on this petition which was so ably presented by my colleague from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight). The one thing that has struck me since this whole issue has come to the forefront in the past, perhaps, six months, is that there is all sorts of information coming across, I suppose, all members' desks on the problems with the spray but yet the Department of Forestry and Agriculture has not seen fit to give information as why they should spray. It seems to be a one-sided affair.

In my estimation the government have not made a case for spraying in this Province in any way, shape or form and more importantly, they have not made a case for the chemical aminocarb or matacil. Now the history of spraying, as it has been done in New Brunswick and in other areas of the country, is to spray first and ask questions afterwards. The history has been that first they just spray on the chemical and when people notice disastrous consequences and disastrous effects, then they start asking questions and then the governments concerned decide to change the spray with a new one and then the whole process starts over again. I believe in the Province of New Brunswick this has happened on four separate occasions. No, I believe five different types of chemical have been used.

Now we have one which is totally unknown, no one knows anything about it, it is the latest unknown of the chemical sprays, matacil, aminocarb.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: Now, last year New Brunswick sprayed 1.5 million acres, that was in 1977, with matacil. At this time, at this particular time there are no studies that have been done to show the effects that it has had on the Province's forests; there have been no studies, no

MR. HODDER: reports on the damage it has done on the chain of life in New Brunswick's forest.

Now, I refer hon. members to an article which was in the Canadian Journal of Science and Technology, published June 1976, volume 9, number 3, and the final conclusion was this, and they were talking about the New Brunswick spray programme which is the only one we can look at; it said, "Spraying is an energy intensive attempt to bend nature to conform to the forest industry's narrow concept of how a forest should behave. The operation is unstable in the long-term since it only increases the chances of occurrence of what it was originally intended to prevent."

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: Now, Mr. Speaker, the spraying that we are doing in this Province, even while the budworm count is lower and lower and lower, and I was told this morning by one of the chief foresters, that the larvae count on the West coast was even lower than was expected -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: The Premier or the minister, I am not sure which, but one of those gentlemen said in this House that they would - I believe it was the Premier who was reported as saying that they would reconsider if the count was down.

MR. NEARY: The minister is so stubborn now he does not want to admit defeat.

MR. HODDER: Here we have a situation where once we spray these forests we can never know what will happen afterwards.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: Because we will have killed off possibly birds, we do not know. I was told this morning that the stone fly on which the trout feed, this particular spray will kill that. Now, what will be the long-range effects? What will be the long-range effects on the chain

MR. HODDER: of life in the Newfoundland forests? We are told there will be no effects but we have been given no reasons why.

I have also been told that matacil, which is registered in Canada only, the background effects are not released, that people cannot get these particular studies, those that have been done. All we have is what is on the back of the matacil can which says that in spray areas people are not supposed to breathe the mist. Well, if you cannot breathe the mist!

Another question that I asked here in this House not so very long ago was, "Will the minister be informing the public of precise times when areas will be sprayed?"

MR. HODDER: The minister did not answer this question and I understand that the people will not know. A friend of mine, I will tell the minister, told me that he will pay an all-expense trip into the spray are for the minister with all the amenities, if the minister will come in, when it is being sprayed, himself. If the minister wants to take me up on that I will certainly look after it.

The thing about this particular spray, matacil, is that only after a comprehensive environment impact study, a most comprehensive study can the effects of this particular chemical be ascertained. No such extensive study has been undertaken ever. This is a new chemical and until such a study we should not touch it until the chemical is proven safe by the government. It should not be sprayed, we should not follow the experience of the New Brunswick government where you spray first and ask questions afterwards and that is what is happening in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MCISSAC: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George's.

MRS. MCISSAC: I just want to have a few words on the topic. I certainly do not want to see matacil sprayed in Newfoundland this year. I do not think that we have enough information on it. We can go ahead and spray this year but we do not know what the results are going to be next year or the year after. I do not think that it is worth the chance. Maybe it is a last attempt. I do not know, maybe it is a last attempt and it may be a good thing if we sprayed this year, the government sprayed this year and it turned out to be a wonderful thing and there was no eggmass next year. It may be a good election issue but I would hate to look at it that way.



MRS. MCISSAC: I cannot see why we should take chances on poisoning the people of the Province or injuring their health in any way by spraying something that we know nothing or very, very little about. Now, if we know so much about it, I would like for the minister to put out - I mean, he is always sending out statements by the minister. Why does the minister not give us all the information, all the detailed information he has and all the confirmation he has that matacil is a safe spray, a safe chemical to spray?

From the evidence that we have on this side of the House it is not safe, it has not been proven. It is not registered in the U.S., it is not registered in Great Britain, we are taking a chance on using it. We have to look at the wildlife as well as human life. We have fishermen in the woods this time of year. The woods are full of fishermen, campers and everything else. Here they are in there, they do not know when the spray is coming on anymore than I do. They could be out spraying today, those people do not have any idea they are there and they are sprayed. Now, is the minister satisfied to go into the middle of the environment, into the centre and be sprayed? I certainly would not want to be.

To get back to the water supply, I think that the minister should take a second look at this. I think that this is something that is going to destroy the government, and do not ever forget it. The government is not doing themselves any good by going ahead and forcing this down the throats of the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MCISSAC: This is something that people are against. While I do not stand here with petitions with thousands of names on them, I still get the flack when I go in my area. I know what the feelings of the people in my

MRS. MCISSAC: district are; they do not want the spray, they want to know and want to be sure that it is safe. If they do not get it directly they can get it indirectly, they can get it through the wildlife, they can get it through fish, they can get it through water supplies. There is just no way that people are satisfied, they are very, very concerned and very unhappy about it.

I think the minister would do well to just take a little bit of time out and think about what he is doing. Go to the people, let the people decide whether or not they want a spray programme. Give them a chance. Those people do not want their children poisoned.

MR. FLIGHT: Windsor Lake. Try Windsor Lake, two miles of Windsor Lake.

MRS. MCISSAC: One of the ministers, or one of the members mentioned that it is no worse than alcohol. Well, we have a choice if we want alcohol. If I want to go out and fill up with alcohol I have a choice. But if I am standing here and there is a plane going over spraying me, I do not have much say in that, not a bit. Then, what about the leakage? There was leakage in Stephenville, there was leakage in Gander, do you mean to tell me that that is a well controlled programme? I think the minister should be ashamed of himself to call that matacil spray programme a well controlled programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: Resign! Resign!

MRS. McISAAC: I think if he goes ahead with the like of this the way that he is going about it, without the knowledge that is necessary and without knowing that this is a safe chemical, I think that he should resign. But it is too late for the minister to resign when half the people in the Province are poisoned and the natural predators are destroyed. And from what I understand, on the West Coast, in my area - I have talked to the forestry people out there - they do not say anything. I believe that they are not allowed to say anything. But I know that the egg mass is down about 50 per cent in my area. I was home from Wednesday until Sunday. I took the time out to go through the different areas of my Province and go in the forests and just take a look at what is going on. The students who are out there now who are doing this survey are having a difficult time to find spruce budworm, and I think that the egg count is down. Now if the minister is so concerned about the forests, why is he allowing the wood that was cut by Newfoundland and Labrador Linerboard that was turned over to Bowaters left on the Southwest Brock road - why is the minister allowing that wood now to be buried by a contractor if there is a shortage of wood in this Province? I think there are a lot of things the minister should take a look at before he starts trying to poison the people of this Province, not directly but indirectly. And the natural predators are something that in 1968 - and the minister was not responsible for that and neither was this administration. But in 1968 or 1969 there was a spray programme done that destroyed the birds and all you could see was a crow or a gull, and all the natural predators were destroyed. And it is only in the last year or so that you will see those little birds coming back again. And as far as I am concerned, the birds

MRS. McISAAC: are what could destroy the spruce budworm and save the forests. And I think that what you are going to have to do is probably concentrate on forest access roads and get out the wood and chip it if necessary, at Linerboard, and store it. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. H. COLLINS: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that I stand in this House to either present a petition or to support a petition. In fact, in the eleven years in which I have represented the district of Gander, I have never been asked to present a petition. There has never been any reason for me to present a petition. In this present session, Mr. Speaker, there have been two. The first one was presented about a month ago by my friend, the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) with regard to the Crown lands policy in regard to cabins. He presented a petition containing, I think, around sixty-eight or seventy names - I have not seen a copy of it - supposed to be from the people of Gander. After the petition was tabled I did get up and have a look at it and there was no Gander resident's name on the petition; there were several from Glovertown, there were several from Frederickton, there were several from Carmanville and so on and so forth. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I would like to make clear today. This particular petition which has been tabled here today, at least the member who tabled it did say that the petition was from the Gander area and I believe that a lot of the names were collected in the shopping mall in Gander at a desk which was established by a couple of doctor friends out there, and I think it is fair to say that a great number of people

MR. H. COLLINS: who frequent that mall are not exactly the people from Metcalfe Street and MacDonald Drive and Cotten Avenue and Cowan's Avenue and other places, they are, a lot of them, from the outlying areas. However, after having made that point, Mr. Speaker, what we are considering here today has become a very emotional issue in Newfoundland. And it is very difficult to deal with issues based on the emotions of the people. Add a little ingredient called politics to that and then, of course, it becomes almost impossible to deal with. Now we have seen the political element at work here. It is not without coincidence that the gentleman who presented the petition today happened to be the campaign manager for Mr. Doug Sheppard, who is the Mayor of Gander, who is the second mayor to have run against me out there. So you can always put two and two together, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. NEARY: I would submit, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is entering into the realm of debate, but apart from that, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is according to our Standing Rules that a member can only stand in his place and indicate that he is supporting a petition, and an hon. gentleman

Mr. Neary.

cannot get up and speak against the petition. If you rise in your place you have to support it. I would like for Your Honour to enforce the Standing Orders of this House, the rules of this House.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, this is not a point of order. I have heard hon. members opposite, in a preamble to a question or a preamble to what they are going to say about a petition, go on and on for days and get away with it, because we are the kind over here that we never draw attention to it. Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I would like to continue.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order, the Chair will rule. Obviously an hon. member when speaking is assumed to support a petition and in speaking may only support a petition. I am not aware that the hon. gentleman is speaking against the petition. I would point out that hon. members may not enter into the area of debate.

The hon. minister.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, after having said that, I should say this, that as the Minister of Health for this Province, I have received the best advice that I can get from the federal authorities, including the Health Protection Branch of the Federal Department of Health and Welfare, from the Food and Drug Directorate of the Department of Health and Welfare, from Agriculture Canada and other places and other agencies. And to the best of my knowledge the best advice I can get there is no inherent health danger in the use of matacil as a spraying material. Now the Minister of Forestry -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. COLLINS: - will no doubt be having some words to say as well. But I can understand the concerns expressed by the people,

Mr. Collins.

not only of Gander but of other areas of the Province. I do not believe that the right message has been getting through to them. And when the Medical Association of this Province comes out in support of a programme outlining to the people that there is no danger to the health of the people, then I think, Mr. Speaker, those people should listen.

MR. NEARY: They did not say that. I have members of the Newfoundland Medical Association on record as saying that they are against this.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir followed by the hon. gentleman for Bay of Islands.

MR. RIDEOUT: The Minister of Health spoke for five minutes and said nothing.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to go on record as being in favour of the petition. I think it is important that I say that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: It is important that I say that because we just saw the Minister of Health stand up and make history in this House by being against the petition and use the guise of support to be able to stand and say a few words, to take political cracks at people who were the campaign managers for various people and that kind of thing. What a disgraceful show, Mr. Speaker. Thirty-four hundred people - we got a lot of Liberal support in this Province, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you that. It is growing every day. But I would venture to say that many of those 3,400 are not necessarily Liberals. They happen to be people who signed a petition out of a general concern, divorced from politics, Mr. Speaker, a genuine concern. And to have the member for Gander, in whose district many of these people live, slander those people today and insult them, Mr. Speaker, by suggesting that they were politically motivated in

Mr. Simmons.

signing a petition, well he should also give us credit ther for a very well oiled machine if he thinks that generally -

MR. LUSH: Outrageous.

MR. SIMMONS: - that we could get 3,400 people, all with political motivations, to sign this kind of petition.

What a warped mind, Mr. Speaker, what a warped mind.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us talk about another minister who I had great admiration for last week when he talked about the spruce budworm problem, the Minister of Tourism. Now he undertook to do something, Mr. Speaker. He undertook to ask his Cabinet colleagues to review this issue. He undertook to ask his Cabinet colleagues to review this issue.

MR. NEARY: They ignored it.

MR. SIMMONS: No, no! Let us hear him first of all.

This is a beautiful opportunity for the minister, Mr. Speaker, unless he has changed his mind about this matter since last time he spoke, this is a beautiful opportunity for the Minister of Tourism now to report back to the House on what Cabinet did once he went to them and asked Cabinet to review the matter. Let him now give a progress report. The last time we had a petition like this he undertook to do something for the House, for the people of Newfoundland. What is the result of that, Mr. Speaker, will he now tell the House? Will he now tell the House what Cabinet did? We know the Premier's version of what he did. He slapped the minister on the knuckles. But what did Cabinet do? What did the full-time part of this administration do? What did Cabinet do, Mr. Speaker, after the minister took his request - and we cannot doubt that he took it, because we have his word on that, that he would take it to Cabinet for a review. Now what kind of a hearing did he get in Cabinet without divulging Cabinet secrets? Did he get a hearing? What it raised at all? Did he get an undertaking from Cabinet? Or did they slap him on the knuckles like his Premier did? Let the Minister of Tourism report to us now, Mr. Speaker. A word for the Minister of Forestry if he is listening.



MR. SIMONS:

I understand now that this spray programme, be it safe or unsafe, is almost useless at this particular time, that the moment in time has been lost, that it is past the critical stage now. There are many of us getting the impression - Quite apart from the safety aspect which has been covered here very well by my colleagues today and with which I want to identify, I raise the other equally practical question of whether any point is served. I know there is a contract ongoing and they are going to have a lot of matabacil on their hands if they do not spray it all over the people and that kind of stuff, but otherwise, is there any point served now in controlling the spruce budworm, I ask the Minister of Forestry. It is my understanding at this point in time, in calendar time, we are either at the point where the whole thing is useless or will be within a few days. We are almost past the critical stage now in terms of it having any effect on the control of the budworm. Now, that is a fair question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister of Forestry indicate to us whether any purpose is to be served now, or have we lost the opportunity, if that is the word that can be applied to a homicide mission - Have we lost the moment in time when this should have been done? I understand it is a bit late and perhaps the minister can respond to that. I also understand, Mr. Speaker, from Forestry officials - The member for St. George's (Mrs. McIsaac) says they are not talking, well they are talking to some people - Officials of the minister's own department tell me that the egg mass count is down substantially, and they have figures and documentation to show that it is down substantially. Indeed, the crisis is past, I am told and the spruce budworm is about to take care of itself.

One other point, Mr. Speaker, the area to be sprayed, I think it is very significant if you look at the makeup of the Cabinet. St. John's Centre is hardly a great forestry district: the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman) is not involved; the member for Labrador West is not involved; the Premier is not involved. It is a political decision, Mr. Speaker, a political decision. The majority -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(inaudible)

MR. SIMONS: No, no, no. Hold on now! Do not be so dumb. Do not be such dunces. Do not be so stunned, Jim, as the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy).

It is a political decision, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Forestry himself said on T.V. the other day, "Even if we had a real problem in the Avalon, we would not spray here because we are too close to people."

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMONS: What is so different about the people out around Corner Brook, Mr. Speaker, or the people around Gander, or Springdale, or those places? Are they lesser beings for some reason? It was a political decision. They knew they could not get away with it here, Mr. Speaker, because of the sheer numbers involved against them. They hoped to brazen it through. The opposition is there. It is kind of dissipated in that some is in Conne River, and some is in Springdale, and some is in Corner Brook. It is somewhat dissipated, not as concentrated as it would be here on the Avalon. They know they would have lost none of their political scalps, but perhaps their scalps otherwise, had they tried it in here. And the minister is at least a bit honest when he goes on television, C.B.C., and tells them, "We could not have it here because we are too close to people." I will have him know he is pretty close to people out there including 3,400 who signed this petition, some others who have signed the petition we will have ready for tomorrow, and other petitions we will have a few days from now. The point will be made, Mr. Speaker. It might take a little longer because the people happen to live out in the sticks instead of in the Avalon, but we will get the message through eventually. If they thought this was a sound political decision they are going to be doing some second thinking on this within a few days if they are not too stunned to think about it altogether.

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

June 13, 1978

Tape No. 4328

RT-3

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER:

- the great forestry of -

MR. MURPHY:

(inaudible)

MR. WOODROW:

In rising to support on this -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. WOODROW:

In rising to make some remarks on this

petition, Mr. Speaker, first of all I think we all have to realize that this is, at the present time, an extremely controversial topic and in listening to the speakers from the opposite side of the House I heard the words used, "I think", not the words, "I know". Now, Mr. Speaker, I am certainly concerned about the spraying because after all the livelihood of Central and Western Newfoundland depends upon our forests. I went last year twice, once with several members from the Opposition - We went, we would say, from Corner Brook

MR. WOODROW: out to Stephenville and I flew over the Serpentine back to Stephenville over the Port au Port area again, and I certainly was deeply depressed to see how the forests had been destroyed by the spruce budworm. But I understand, Mr. Speaker, that there were no ill effects from the spray that took place last year. In fact, if I read the thing correctly, I understand that it helped our forests.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is very serious. The unfortunate thing about this topic is that we are tossing this around in the political arena and it is going to have a terrible effect. This could have a devastating effect upon the lives of half of our Newfoundlanders. So I am trying to look at it this way, Mr. Speaker: We have had scientists - let us place it in the political arena for a while - we have had scientists from the Opposition side and from the government side of the House: we have got the advice from both of them. Surely, in fact, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture is not doing this, for example, just to suit himself - he has already placed his seat on the line. I heard him say that out in Stephenville on Sunday. So surely to goodness, in fact, he is taking this with the administration and with those who are directing him. In other words, is he a fool, Mr. Speaker? Are all the members on this side of the House fools or crazy? I hope to goodness they are not.

Mr. Speaker, I had one letter from Corner Brook on this. And I asked the gentleman - he was a teacher at the trade school. I received this letter about six weeks ago. And I said to him, 'Now listen, the best thing for you to do is to get a petition taken up and I will present that petition in the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: But will you support it?

MR. WOODROW: Of course, I will support it.

I will support anything that is good for the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you supporting this one?

MR. WOODROW: I am not finished yet, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WOODROW: I would say, if the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, were serious about it they would keep it out of the political arena and put it to a non-political committee. Now I would also, Mr. Speaker, have to support the minister for the stand he has taken.

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

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the member for Gander, now the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) is really chopping away, eating away at a very important tradition in this House, namely, that when there is a petition there is opportunity for the person presenting the petition on behalf of certain people and then for others who speak to rise and express their support of the petition. I have listened to the member for some time and I was getting the drift of what he was saying, basically that he was in favour of the government's stand, which, Mr. Speaker, if you read the prayer of the petition - I tried to read it, but it is not on the table at the moment, it is now being scrutinized by the member for Gander (Mr. H. Collins) to see if the people on it are first class citizens or second class citizens -

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, right.

MR. SIMMONS: - so I am not sure of the exact prayer. But as I understand the prayer, it asks the government not to spray, very specifically not to spray for health reasons - that is the prayer of the petition.

MR. SIMMONS: Now the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) is saying he supports the minister, and of course, we know what the minister's position is, that he is in favour of the spray programme. So the member cannot have it both ways, either he is for the petition or he is against the petition. Now I am not trying to deny him the right to speak, but if he is against the petition I will just say to him in all kindness, this is not the place to let his views be known. He can do it in the Throne Speech Debate or in some other place, but he cannot stand and use the guise of supporting a petition to mount arguments which are in direct contradiction of the prayer of the petition, itself or the objective which the petitioners would achieve. He is speaking now in direct violation of that stated objective in the prayer of the petition. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, not wanting to cut him off because there are other opportunities in the Throne Speech Debate for him to speak, but it is not the place for him to record his contrary views to this particular petition.

June 13, 1978

Tape no. 4320 Page 1 - ms

MR. NEARY:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will hear the hon. gentleman to my left first.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman admits that he has not seen the prayer of the petition for a good reason. I took it off the table a minute ago.

MR. NEARY:

Put it back on the table. Put it back where it should be, on the table of this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

Mr. Speaker, would you ask - Mr. Speaker, is there any way that a member can stand on his feet without being abused by those two characters across the way, Sir? If there is, Sir, I would ask that you ask these gentlemen to keep their remarks to themselves until I finish my point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that there has been a breach, Sir, of the privileges of this House inasmuch as a member has taken a petition that was presented to the House about a half an hour ago, Sir, by the member for Buchans. The member, Sir, asked Your Honour leave of the House to put the petition on the table of the House and be referred to the department to which it relates. It is my opinion, Sir, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) is not the department to which it relates. The petition has been stolen off the table of the House, Sir. It is now being circulated amongst the members on the government benches, Sir, and I ask Your Honour to instruct the Sergeant-at-Arms to go and seize the petition and put it back on the table of the House where it belongs until it is dealt with by members on both sides of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On that question of privilege, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: I do submit that the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is shockingly abusing the point of privilege and the question of privilege of this House. Beauchesne says very clearly that points of privilege are matters that should be very seldom raised. Anyone knows, a child of ten would know, that anything that is tabled in this House so long as it is within the environs and confines of this House is accessible to any hon. member thereof.

MR. NEARY: After tabling it.

MR. HICKMAN: And to make a suggestion, to make an accusation in a most unparliamentary manner, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is an abuse of the privileges of this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, on that question of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On the point of privilege which I think can now be disposed of. I do not regard that there is a point of privilege as such. It is, I think, better procedure when a document is tabled, and there is only one of them for that document to be left on the table. And for any hon. member who then wishes to see it may go and see it or read it or refer to it. If an hon. member feels that he wants a copy of it, then certainly arrangements will be made for a photostatic copy of it.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: But as long as there is only one copy then it certainly is preferable that that copy remain at the table. For example, a couple of weeks ago, there was some material tabled which was quite voluminous and there the procedure was that it would not be distributed until at least some copies were made. So it certainly is preferable, unless and until there are copies available, that one copy rest at the table which will then give an opportunity to any member to read it at the table or to examine it or to scrutinize it. So I think that will look after that matter. The petition actually should be returned to the table.



MR. SPEAKER:

Now the point of order which preceded that -

MR. NEARY:

How do we know it is all there?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

- was with respect to the methodology of speaking to petitions. There was no doubt that an hon. member is not allowed to speak against a petition. The Chair assumes, when it recognizes an hon. member, that he is speaking to it, that he is supporting it. If an hon. member is to state that he is opposed to the petition or speaking against it, then he would be out of order. I suppose there is a spectrum of intensity of support. A person could support it very strongly and then perhaps a person could support it quite nominally perhaps -

MR. WOODROW : "Lukely."

MR. SPEAKER: - yes, "Lukely" a person could support it, if there is such an adverb.

MR. WOODROW : Mr. Speaker, to a point of -

MR. SPEAKER: But unless and until a person has clearly shown that he is speaking against it, then I think the Chair must assume that he is speaking for it anywhere within that spectrum of voiciferously to "Lukely."

June 13, 1973

Tape No. 4321

RT-1

MR. WOODROW: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

When I was interrupted by the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I regret to inform the hon. gentleman  
the five minutes has expired.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. WOODROW: When I was interrupted by the hon. member  
from - Not the hon. crowd, I would not use that word as it is often  
used - When I was interrupted, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the minister  
has taken a stand and I congratulate him for taking a stand. It shows  
that he has guts. Mr. Speaker, to show how controversial this topic  
is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Order on  
both sides!

I realize that the hon. gentleman does  
wish to add some remarks to his previous submission and that his time has  
expired and that he, himself, has not -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

He, himself, has not used personally his entire five minutes but the rules  
are such that if the five minutes is expired, it is expired, and it would  
be improper for me to allow him now to continue under the guise of a  
point of order. The only way the hon. gentleman can continue as can any  
hon. member is, of course, by unanimous consent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, please! Does the hon. gentleman  
have consent? No, he does not.

MR. WOODROW: In the political field

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WOODROW:

saying.

- which shows as nonsense what you are

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. J. COLLINS:

Rising in support of this petition I would like to make a few points in regard to that support. The first point in regard to the support, I think that any petition that comes in here clearly means that there is a concern on the part of a number of citizens, and this is clearly set out in this petition. In that regard I certainly support the petition. Secondly, I would support it if the spray programme is to be a single operation against the spruce budworm. If this is not to be just an opening gambit, in other words, some means of just getting initial control and thereafter go on to a fuller control programme, I would be against the spray programme. If, on the other hand, this is to be a means of getting on top of an acute emergency situation almost, and then bringing up the other forces, I feel that I can support the concerns of the citizens expressed in this petition, but I would be reassured by such a method. The third point I have there is this that I understand the concerns really related to health, and I think it should be clearly, as clearly as we can, set out what the health hazards are here. If there are no health hazards, then clearly the petitioners can be reassured. They still have the right to petition but they would then be petitioning without full knowledge. I would like, therefore, to just give the information available to me, personally, in regard to the health hazards in terms of this spray programme and the chemical being used. As I mentioned in the House a little while ago, the information that I have is that if you put all this spray material that is being used in the Gander area directly into Gander Lake it still would not get above the safety level set out by the Federal Government.

In addition to that, I took the opportunity of looking through the Index Medicus for 1977 in regard to the latest research work in Reye's syndrome. Reye's syndrome is the particular

DR. J. COLLINS: disease process that comes to the fore when ones talks of a forest spraying. Just before going into that, Mr. Speaker, I might mention that recently I got a piece of literature from Wayne University which is the centre for Reye's syndrome research, and this outlined the programmes that they follow in conducting their researches. In none of the items set out there was the forest spraying one of the areas being looked into. And this is confirmed by - In the Index Medicus even though this is quite a rare disease, Reye's syndrome, in children, there were something like thirty-five to forty articles in the world literature, and not one of these articles - They covered many areas but not one of these articles dealt with chemical spraying.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

DR. J. COLLINS: So, the information I have is that the health hazards, even though the spraying of anything, I would suggest, is undesirable

DR. COLLINS: unless there is come counter-  
vailing benefit the health hazards from the spraying are  
of such an order that I would not have thought that they  
would be a big consideration considering the risks to  
the economy of this Province if the forest management  
situation got out of hand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY: Very nicely said. It is good  
to hear from someone who knows what they are talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Labour  
and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have another petition that I  
would like to present to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Does anybody want to speak?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: I will decide when I want to  
speak in the House. I do not have to be told by the  
Opposition when to speak in the House.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. MORGAN: I will decide when to speak,  
I do not need 'Steve Neary' to tell me to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

The hon. the minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: This is the second petition I  
have received from my district within a couple of weeks.  
I received it today so I am not going to sit on it and I  
am not going to leave it until tomorrow which is Wednesday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh, you got yours, did you?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We got ours the day before  
yesterday.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well, it might have come in  
yesterday. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I must say that the hon.  
member from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) did mention that he

MR. ROUSSEAU: had some calls on it, and I had a number of calls on it besides the names on the petition. It is a very serious petition to the people of Labrador West in that it is a petition signed by some 500 or 600 people who are protesting the possibility of the establishment of a batch plant at the intersection which leaves the Labrador City - Wabush road to Fermont down to Dooley Lake. I would like to read the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

"That we the residents of Dooley Lake, Summer cottage area, vigorously protest the proposed operation of a batch plant on the Inlet River at the North end of Dooley Lake.

The prevailing winds Northerly winds in Western Labrador would ultimately cause the entire provincial park and cottage to be blanketed with the same sort of dust pollution that envelops Labrador City - Wabush, the discomforts from which we sought to escape within this non-industrial environment.

Additionally, the river alongside the proposed plant location, the banks of which offer choice camping sites, empties into Dooley Lake and drainage from a cement operation would pollute both the river and the lake in the immediate vicinity of the provincial park, golf club and our cottage area, all of which is situated at the North end of the lake or along the Northwestern shore near such inlet.

For someone to suggest that there would be no pollution from such an industrial installation is grossly irresponsible and comparable to utterances that the tailings discoloured Wabush and Shabogamo watershed is not polluted. We question that these same environmental experts would be prepared to fish or swim in the muddy, red hued filth which is all that remains of the once crystal clear forty miles stretch of

MR. ROUSSEAU: wilderness water let alone  
drink from it.

To permit a similar fate in respect of Dooley Lake and its rivers would be inexcusable and intolerable and we must insist that action be taken immediately to protect this recreational area by prohibiting the operation of a batch plant or any other industrial undertaking within pollution spewing range of our air or water."

My name appears on it enthusiastically as a supporter of the petition, Mr. Speaker. As I say, in this area the people in Labrador West, landlocked as they are, for the most part have a problem in respect to recreation. This is probably, per capita, one of the highest used recreational areas in the Province during the Summertime for those young people who do not have the seniority, or other people who cannot get out because of the great cost. They use this to quite an extent. I have taken the matter up already with the officials of the department, yesterday, because, as I have said, I have received other phone calls and letters on it, and today with the minister, and they are holding it up to take another look at it.

I think it is a question where somebody says it is a mile from the park. It is a mile from the park but it is almost at the intersection of going down to the park. This is one of the areas in our wilderness in Lanrador and I think the same thing applies to the Island of Newfoundland, we do not want to see this sort of thing. I sweat over four years to have included in the Labrador - DREE agreement an industrial park. I took a lot of flack for it until we finally got it, and we got it. Mr. Lessard called it Rousseau's dream, and it was, it was the only part of the DREE agreement we got. That is the place where a batch plant should go, in that industrial area, and not in a

MR. ROUSSEAU: recreational area that means so much to the people of Western Labrador.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible) why do they want it?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have no idea why. I cannot fathom a reason why because there is now an industrial park there and they can do it there, why put it out there? But apparently there was a pit that was used there prior to the park being put there.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, it is - well, referrals have gone out to the various departments. It is a permit under Crown lands that they have applied for. I have asked them to hold it up and it is up to the minister. I would hope that every sympathetic consideration would be given to it. I do not want to inconvenience the company that is providing jobs up there but there are other opportunities in other areas to do that. It is a very, very important item for the people of Western Labrador



MR. ROUSSEAU: and like I said, per capita, I would think that more people use that park than any other park in the Province.

I would heartily endorse this petition. I would ask the very sympathetic consideration and understanding of the department of Forestry and Agriculture, the Crown Lands Division, and the minister to make certain that such a thing will not happen to one of the very few wilderness areas that we have in Labrador, in Western Labrador especially.

As many people know, the companies own most of the area up there and there is very little opportunity for the people to have their own recreational area. I fully and enthusiastically support the petition, I ask that it be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates, the Crown Lands Division of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture.

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, as I have said we have copies, I think. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has a copy of the petition. I am glad the minister presented the petition. It was very timely. I heartily endorse the prayer of the petition. We have received a number of calls over the last week concerning this problem. The people of Labrador City and Wabush have very little opportunity to get out during the working year, out from Labrador West and so the Dooley Lake area and the whole wilderness area around there is very important to these people. The question of building a batching plant very close to their site of recreation and enjoyment, pollution free enjoyment, is very important.

I support the petition. I believe that in Labrador West where 15,000 or 17,000 people are living with a great deal of pollution around them,

MR. STRACHAN: pollution from the iron ore mines, the dust. Also the Southern Lake area, the Wabush Shabogamo Lake area, which is red, absolutely red with tailings, an area which should be investigated as well because it is extremely polluted.

I think there are two problems in the West as far as pollution is concerned, one is the dust from the problem and the other is the tailings emptying into this forty mile watershed which is absolutely red. I think the only area left to the people there is the Dooley Lake area and now a batching plant is going to be situated there for convenience sake. I do not think there was any other reason, just pure convenience sake. I think it is very timely that this should be stopped before they proceed too far. I agree with the minister here, that the industrial park there was created for that purpose and why they did not locate there, or why they did not look at a site there I do not know. I do not understand the reason for it, but I think the people are very right in getting up very quickly and very angry about it since it is the only recreational area they have left.

I support the prayer of the petition and hope that others will feel that this question is a very serious one and will also look into other areas of pollution in Labrador West which I think should be looked into because it is a serious situation, as I have said, especially the watershed area which was once a crystal clear lake and river system but is now filthy. Although experts, again some say government experts, have indicated there is nothing wrong with it, I am sure that no member in this House of Assembly would either fish or swim in it let alone drink the water from it and I think that area needs to be looked into. I support the prayer of the petition.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I fully support the petition from the residents of Labrador City and Wabush in relation to the possible pollution of both the water and the dust and the camping rounds in Dooley Lake. The park there is a provincial park operated by the Parks Division of my department. In fact, I will go so far as to say, Mr. Speaker, I would like in the future for the minister responsible for Crown lands and Crown land permits, that whenever an application is made by companies concerned in setting as in this case, a batch plant, or any kind of a plant that is going to affect the recreation areas, that the Crown Lands Committee must and should refer the application to the Parks Division, Department of Tourism so we can have our say. In most cases, I would imagine, our say would be negative, we would not approve any kind of a facility to be established in an area that is going to affect a recreation area, and in particular, a provincial park.

So I would like to make the recommendation, in supporting the petition, that in future applications made of that nature, before they are approved by the Department of Health and the Crown Lands Committee in the Department of Forestry and Agriculture and other departments, that also the Parks Division of the Tourism Department be involved as well so we can put a stop to this kind of thing in the future. I support the petition fully.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the sponsors of this petition, Sir, were good enough to send me along a copy and my colleague and I discussed it a couple of days ago. We received our copies the day before yesterday. So we discussed it and we decided to hold off until today. Today was the deadline and either my colleague or myself was going to table the petition because we felt that the hon.

Mr. Neary.

gentleman had it going on three days the same as we did. Well maybe there was a delay in the mail.

AN HON. MEMBER: Outside the building.

MR. NEARY: Outside the building. That is why we gave the minister a jump on it. We did not want to come in and try to upstage the minister. So I support the petition, Sir, although the hon. gentleman mentioned in his support of the minister, the hon. minister, that he thought it should be put in the Industrial Park. Well now, Sir, I do not know if that is the kind of an industry that should go in the industrial park. Would that be the place to put it? You are still going to get these smokestacks spewing out dust and smoke and fumes out in the Industrial Park. I think it is the kind of an industry that should be put off somewhere by itself, because in the Industrial Park you are going to have - it is going to be fairly clean, I presume, a clean area, the Industrial Parks that I have seen around, like Donovans Industrial Park and the one we have outside Port aux Basques there. Certainly, I would not want to see that kind of an industry go in there. All it will do is mess up the place.

MR. STRACHAN:

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not know. It does not make any difference. If you put it in the middle of an Industrial Park, you are still going to have one heck of a mess on your hands. And the 500 or 600 people, Sir, who signed the petition - I presume this is motivated by the people who have the summer cottages down there -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Everybody in the area signed it.

MR. NEARY: - everybody in the area. Well, I know, but it was motivated by them, and I agree with that, Sir. I think that this area should be reserved for the people who live in Wabush and Labrador City

Mr. Neary.

that they should not allow themselves to become blanketed with dust and pollution in the river and this plant spewing out dust and muck and dirt. Most of the people in Labrador West, Sir, like the outdoors. It is probably one of the better forms of recreation that they have, the wildlife, the outdoors, camping and that sort of thing, skiing. And I think it would be a shame, Sir, to destroy the place where they camp and where they have their summer cottages. So I support the prayer of the petition, Sir, and I hope that before the hon. minister who is responsible for the environment passes in his resignation, Sir, that one of his last acts will be to put a stop to that plant from going in that area.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in standing to support the petition which was presented by my colleague from Menihek, the Minister of Labour and Manpower, signed by 500 or 600 people, I believe, and it relates to a batching plant - I think was the name of the unit that is being installed there - which I understand, at least, is used for the manufacture, if you will, of asphalt. We have one in the Otter Creek area of Goose Bay, Mr. Speaker, and I can tell you that the environment is suffering as a result of it with the tar and the pitch and everything else that is lying around the area. But this petition, I believe, draws attention to a couple of items as they relate to Labrador, number one, the environment which - we have a vast part of the country up there and the possibility of polluting that environment through this sort of an effort and you compound the situation in Menihek district when you think of the iron ore dust and the tailings which the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) referred to. And then you consider that there is so much space in the area where this sort of a plant could be erected, it seems a little ludicrous to me that anyone would want to install such a batching plant in what has been classified as a recreation area.

Mr. Goudie.

I support the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, and would hope that the appropriate minister will take action.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Just a brief word in support of the petition. The Dooley Lake area is one that I know somewhat having done some cross-country skiing there and ski-dooing and also some summertime activities as well. It is a delightful area, and I know that the people in Labrador City - Wabush enjoy it particularly, because it is one of the few areas that they can go really.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is the only one.

MR. SIMMONS: It is the only recreational area. That is right, exactly. And I only spent, myself, two or three months in the Wabush area some years ago. But every time I go there I get the distinct impression that people would like to have some place to go outside the immediate environs of the two towns concerned, and this is an absolutely delightful spot. With the landmass we have, certainly around Labrador City, there is no need, Mr. Speaker, even if there only a two and one-half per cent chance of any pollution or dust problem, there is no need, with the land availability we have, to put that plant anywhere near a recreation area. There is no need at all. It is just that simple. Now I understood from an exchange in the House a moment ago that the environmental people have approved that and that kind of

Mr. Simmons. - needs

MR. MURPHY: On reference from Crown Lands.

MR. SIMMONS: From Crown Lands, yes.

MR. MURPHY: Environmentally, it does not affect anything -  
and whatever Crown Lands decide to do, you know.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, yes, okay. Well perhaps that clarifies it somewhat. I cannot understand how it could be approved but then again I do not understand what a batch plant is. It is some kind of a cement bulk plant or something of that nature as I understand it. And from the ones I have seen there is a fair amount of dust emanating from it. I do not care what the environmental controls are. Dust is dust. And I say, Mr. Speaker - perhaps the best way of characterizing this - I say that any man who spends eight hours a day in the pellet plant in Labrador City, eating the dust, should not have to go out and eat the dust with his supper out in Dooley Lake in the evening or on a Sunday. It is just too much -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: That is right, exactly, exactly, and that is the issue, Mr. Speaker, that if there is any kind of a risk here at all - and it seems to me that there is - that the last place it should go is in a campsite or summer cottage. It is a beautiful spot out there, and those who have not been to Labrador City should make it a point when you go of seeing this particular area. It is a choice location. It is a delightful spot for a provincial park which is operating there and for the cottage area and an all year recreation spot is what it is - a year round recreation spot, I think it is fair to put it that way. And this must be preserved, and I certainly support the prayer of the petition presented by my friend from Menihek.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide For Change Of Name." (Bill No. 64).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Teacher (Collective Bargaining) Act, 1973." (Bill No. 66).

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) is in the environs of the House. I suppose that I might give the answer on record and maybe his colleagues - he brought up the question yesterday about the ILO and the banning of asbestos mining, and I undertook to check it out for him, and I have a note here, because I wanted to check and make sure what the situation was before I said anything. Some three weeks ago I was advised by the Inter-provincial Relations Division of the Canada Department of Labour of the possibility of such a resolution being put on the floor of the current ILO conference in Geneva by the chairman of the workers' group, the ex-president of CLC, Mr. Joe Morris. I was told that it was not definite that the resolution would be put there, but in the event that it was, I was asked what our reaction would be. I informed my counterpart that we would have strong objection to such a resolution since it would mean the possible loss of a large number of jobs in this Province. We would join in efforts to make asbestos production safer for workmen rather than further erode the possibility of employment. After hearing the matter raised in the House yesterday, I again contacted the Inter-provincial Affairs Secretariat for explicit information on the resolution. They are



Mr. Rousseau.

still uncertain whether the resolution has been or will in fact be introduced during this year's conference. They do know that the workers' delegate, Mr. Joe Morris, intended to deposit the resolution with the Resolution's Committee at the beginning of the conference. If the resolution is favourably considered by the Resolution's Committee of the ILO, it would have to be debated on the floor of the conference and would in all probability be opposed by employer groups and by government groups. In any event it could not be considered as a subject of a convention of the ILO which Canada as a member nation would be asked to ratify until at least a year from now. There is no doubt that we will have adequate opportunity to express our views if the resolution does receive favour during the current session of the ILO in Geneva.

In the meantime and to make sure that there is no mistake in the position of this government, the Inter-provincial Relations Division are in the process of sending a telex to the Canadian delegation in Geneva to determine what the current status of the resolution may be. And just to be sure that we do not get our wires mixed, I sent a telex to the Minister of Labour in Ottawa expressing our concern over the matter with a suggestion that the rights of the workers could be better served by ensuring safety in the work place rather than eliminating their means of earning a livelihood. So in all likelihood if this is a resolution, it will be debated, and if it meets favour, it will not get on until next year in which we will have an opportunity to go on record as a government. But in the meantime I have to inform my counterpart in Ottawa, the hon. John Monroe that we would be opposing this situation. Our feeling is that we would like to have this asbestos operation in this Province continue, and that we would continue to support the asbestos industry in this Province and hope that we could by making it the safest operation in Canada and continue its existence. We will express that in any meetings we have with the federal government in respect to any positions they take at the ILO meetings next year.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: Opposition House Leader.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Government House Leader, Sir. In view of the mounting protest, the savage protest over Bill 50 and the passing of Bill 50 in this session of the House, is the Government House Leader now willing to admit that because of the representations that are being made and the mounting opposition of this bill that it will be left over until the Fall session or the next sitting of the House of Assembly and the government not rush into passing this bill and implementing its clauses until the people have a chance to study the bill and make their feelings known to the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, obviously I cannot indicate to the House what government's intention is with respect to the bill other than the intention that was indicated as a result of introducing the bill, that government feels that it is good legislation and hopes that it will commend it and that the legislation will seek the approval of this House. I do draw to the hon. gentleman's attention and the House that it is not correct to say that residents in the area involved have not had an opportunity to react to the bill and the proposal. Firstly, a bill quite similar to this bill was introduced during the last session of the House last June and was scheduled to come on for debate on or about June 12 of last year and it was suggested that it be left over, and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing indeed more than suggested, asked that it be held over for a year for people to be given an opportunity to react to it. Over and above that, it is my understanding that that bill to a very large extent is based upon the report and recommendations contained in the Henley Commission and numerous citizens of this area appeared before and made representation to the Henley Commission.

Mr. Hickman.

I have not seen the savage opposition as described by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I have seen requests and heard requests through the media of people wanting some further explanation on particular clauses contained therein, and I believe that my colleague, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing has been ready, willing and able to furnish such explanations and has furnished them in the main to the satisfaction of those who enquired.

MR. NEARY: No!

MR. HICKMAN: Those who were fortunate enough to see the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing on a recent programme on CBC would certainly, I think, be struck by the tremendous benefits that would accrue to people in this area when once that bill becomes law. Other than that my colleague, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing will, I believe, be in his place on tomorrow, if not on tomorrow, certainly on Thursday, and it is not the intention to call that bill on Thursday so hon. gentlemen will once again have an opportunity to ask or to enquire of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing as to any other matters that may be concerning them with respect to this legislation.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to wait for the hon. gentleman. We have no faith at all in the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Sir. We feel, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the mounting protests that the bill should be deferred and I am going to ask the minister to reconsider Bill 50, regional government, and lay the bill on the table of the House until the people have an opportunity to have some input in it which they have not had so far. And the minister can tell the House all he wants that this is so. It is not so. It is only now that the people are getting interested in it. And,

Mr. Neary.

Mr. Speaker, what they are mainly concerned about in the early stages of this regional government, Sir, is the appointment -

MR. HICKMAN: What is the question?

MR. NEARY: I am coming to it, Sir.

- is the appointment of members of the board. Now is the government going to reconsider this matter? This seems to be one of the parts that the people are violently protesting. Will the minister consider this aspect of it and allow the councils around the greater St. John's area and the City of St. John's itself to elect their members to this board rather than have them appointed that is if the government insist on going ahead with this bill?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, firstly for the record, Bill No. 50, being a bill, "An Act To Establish The Northeast Avalon Urban Region has been on the table of

MR. HICKMAN: - this hon. House for quite some time and has been made public for quite some time, and there have been very meaningful discussions between the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and interested groups going on for a long, long time.

With respect to the other comment of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) with respect to particular provisions of the bill, that surely is the subject matter for debate on second reading. We hear that this is a debating forum and surely that is the time to debate that, and whilst, I am sure, if my colleague was here he would not object to a debate during Question Period it seems to me that it is somewhat in violation of the rules.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary. Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate to the House that before this bill is rammed through and shoved down the throats of the people who live in the greater St. John's area, the people themselves who live in the outskirts of St. John's, in the communities that are involved, if they will be given a chance by secret ballot in a referendum or a plebiscite to vote whether or not they want the type of regional government that is spelled out in this bill? Will they be given an opportunity to express their views by secret ballot before we debate the matter here in this House?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister.

MR. HICKMAN: I am on very ticklish ground now, Mr. Speaker, because I am going to have to evolve a strong principle of the Liberal Party as laid down by their leader, the Right Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau when he was asked last year, or the year before last, to hold a secret ballot, across Canada before implementing controls. He said that a government that governs by secret ballot is not governing at all and that it would be an insult to Parliament to even suggest, as he puts it, that there should be plebiscites on matters that fall within the legislative

MR. HICKMAN: responsibility of Parliament. So, what I have said has to be somewhat without prejudice but, again, I am prepared to rely on that well-established Liberal dogma and doctrine.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: I most definitely would not see any reason why that course of action should be followed. There will be good debate, I hope, in this House, responsible debate in this House -

MR. NEARY: Do not worry. You will get it.

MR. HICKMAN: - on this bill. I know we will get debate but I was emphasizing the word, 'responsible'. Responsible debate. And I have no doubt -

MR. NEARY: You will get more responsible debate than we get responses to fire investigations.

MR. HICKMAN: - And I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman opposite will pay particular heed to the hon. members representing this area, as I know I will, who have had very close liaison with their people -

MR. NEARY: They are out of touch.

MR. HICKMAN: - on this very vital matter and I would be prepared to take a calculated risk and suggest that, indeed, they are not out of - The hon. gentlemen who represent the areas of St. John's and Ferryland and Conception Bay South and Harbour Main-Bell Island are, indeed, very much in touch.

MR. NEARY: You are looking at it from a vantage point on Dennis Mill Road.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans to be followed by the hon. gentleman from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier and the Minister of Energy, I want to direct this question to the Minister of Finance and, obviously, he may have been the minister who should have been asked the question in the first place, I am not sure.

I would want the minister to indicate whether or not Collavino Brothers' tender is still being considered by Hydro,

MR. FLIGHT: whether or not Collavino are going to be given the right to withdraw their tender and increase the amount tendered by around \$4,500,000 on the Kinds Lake project, whether or not Collavino is going to get the right to withdraw their tender and increase the amount asked in that tender by \$4,500,000?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that Collavino were given the right to withdraw their tender.

MR. FLIGHT: That is what I am asking. Are they? That is the question. Are they going to be given that right?

MR. HICKMAN: To my knowledge they are not going to be given the right to withdraw their tender.

MR. FLIGHT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Could the Minister of Finance tell the House whether or not Collavino is considered a local company for the purpose of a ten percent leeway in the tendered price? We know that with the local contracting firms it is Government policy to allow them a ten percent differential in tendered price.

MR. FLIGHT: It does not apply to Collavino Brothers when they are tendering in opposition to local contractors.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge Collavino Brothers are not a Newfoundland company. But I say that, to my knowledge, because the practice has grown across Canada for large national companies to incorporate local companies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HICKMAN: For instance, Mr. Speaker, if I may -

MR. NEARY: They are involved in a scandal (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: I take it the hon. gentleman from Buchans would like some factual answers.

MR. FLIGHT: I have a few supplementaries too.

MR. HICKMAN: Right.  
If Collavino have incorporated a local company -

MR. NEARY: Collavino.

MR. HICKMAN: Collavino - under the provisions of the Newfoundland Companies Act, then I would assume they are a local company. Because one of the main reasons for the policy which is not peculiar to Newfoundland of giving local preference is that if it is a company incorporated in, say, this Province, then the corporation tax that is collected by the federal government a certain amount is rebated to the Province. Insofar as employment is concerned, well, it makes very little difference because they presumably employ Newfoundlanders, and that is written into the contract anyway. It is a question of the profits and a question of the taxes,



MR. HICKMAN: but I do not know. If Collavino is not incorporated in the Province of Newfoundland, if it is not a Newfoundland company, if as is being inferred that it is from outside the Province then obviously, the preference that is provided Newfoundland companies is not available here.

If on the other hand it is a Newfoundland company then there is no question about it it would have to apply.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this topic is a very serious situation, there is a lot of money involved according to what we read and what we hear. I have had some fairly decent sources tell me that there is a very ticklish situation existing. Does Hydro, a Crown corporation, I ask the minister, does Hydro, A crown corporation have the same regulations apply to them? The Province when accepting tenders allows a 10 per cent overrun, or 10 per cent higher to local contractors as opposed to mainland contractors or companies not involved in Newfoundland or not incorporated. Now, as a Crown corporation does that rule also apply to Hydro? Do they permit a contractor to be 10 per cent over a local firm?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I really cannot answer that question. I do not know the answer to it. The question, if it could be asked on tomorrow to my colleague the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services, because I do not know.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Did he say final or second final?

AN HON. MEMBER: Second final.

MR. SPEAKER: Final final.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate to the House - now he has indicated in his first answer that Collavino would not be permitted to withdraw the tender. Collavino have admitted publicly and in writing that they made a manual error of \$4.5 million and have asked to withdraw their tender and increase it by that amount. The minister has indicated that they are not going to be permitted. Would the minister indicate to the House whether or not Collavino is going to have to lose, give up their bid bond which in this case would be \$1.6 million?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: That question, Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer. But I suggest that the way the hon. gentleman is putting it the question is an oversimplification. If, for instance, Collavino's bid was substantially below, and the indication I saw in the press suggests that it was, then, obviously, it would not be in the best interest of the taxpayers of this Province to rely on a technicality and say we will go to number 2, say, \$12 million higher. That would be silly and I am sure that the hon. gentleman from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) would not suggest we do that.

If the company withdrew and the bail bond was availed of that still would put the taxpayers of Newfoundland many millions of dollars behind the eighth ball. I would think, and from what I understand, is that there is not a question of a withdrawal of the bid by Collavino, but the matter is -

MR. NEARY: Was it done deliberately?

MR. HICKMAN: I have no idea. I am never prepared to say anyone does anything deliberately if I have no proof thereof.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated I would recognize

MR. SPEAKER: the hon. gentleman from  
Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir next.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question for  
the Minister of Tourism.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you picking on the  
minister?

MR. SIMMONS: No, I am not picking on him.  
We know we can get information from this minister, Mr.  
Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the question of the Heritage Village. Perhaps the minister has been in the portfolio long enough now to be familiar with it. The Heritage Village has been kicking around for a number of years, the concept. I understand that the Government of Canada offered to this Province, I think, \$1 million, I think was the figure and it has never been taken up. I wonder if it is a dead issue now. Is it a dead issue or are there ongoing considerations as to a location for the Heritage Village? Perhaps I will hold it there and I will have another for the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Heritage Village concept came forward from the federal government in the course of discussions with the government here three years ago. This government took a look at the proposal from Ottawa but based on the fact that there was only \$1 million available for that kind of concept to establish a Heritage Village and that it would cost in most cases a substantial amount more than \$1 million - for example it would cost more like \$10 million to establish the kind of concept the federal government wanted to establish in the Heritage Village concept in regards to services, etc. and restoration. The government's policy last year and in fact now is that looking at our priorities we cannot allocate that kind of funds, looking at \$6 million or \$7 million to go on top of the \$1 million from Ottawa to establish a Heritage Village.

However the concept is not dropped entirely because I intend to pursue the matter further with Ottawa to look at the possibility - there are a number of proposals in, one I can think of is Sandy Point here in the St. George's area and others as well putting forward a suggestion that maybe if they got the \$1 million they would not want any input from the provincial level and they could get the funds from Ottawa to look at the possibility of developing the Heritage Village in their own energy, sort of thing, their own initiative. Now whether or not the federal government will agree to that I do not know but it is worth pursuing. But at this time we have decided as a

This page is missing from the original copy.

MR. MORGAN:

there is very minimal, approximately fifteen jobs. And even after the work is completed there will be still very few jobs available in the community. It is going to be a major tourist attraction and will hopefully draw some revenue into the area but not in the means of jobs.

So looking at these two points I am not sure what the federal government will do but I do intend to pursue the matter and for the interest of the members from the Bay St. George area, I also intend to pursue the idea of looking at the possibility of what we can do for them hopefully from the same federal funds.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) followed by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan).

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to ask this question of the Premier but in his absence I will ask it to the Minister of Labour and Manpower. As the minister knows

MR. LUSH: Statistics Canada issued its monthly statistics again with respect to the labour force for the month of May and again it shows our rate to be excessively high, disgracefully so, actually. and before I get involved in asking a question related to that - Some weeks ago the minister indicated that he would undertake to look into whether or not there was a flow chart related to the Government's 40,000 jobs.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: The question I asked was whether there was some time frame on this as to how many jobs - The programme was over five years and my question was: How many jobs would be created this year and the next year or whether, indeed, all the jobs were going to be created in the fifth year of the programme; was there a flow chart on this to indicate -

AN HON. MEMBER: No flow chart; it must be the River Shannon.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I did not undertake to get a flow chart, Mr. Speaker, but I indicated I would check on the 40,000 over the time span, and to be quite frank, I had forgotten it which is not a very good defence. I will undertake again to jot my memory and try to get it as soon as possible.

MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary.

MR. LUSH: In view of the fact the House is going to close shortly, and as I have said before, the labour force statistics indicate that our unemployment rate is still outrageously high, would the minister take it upon himself to suggest to his Cabinet that maybe we would form a select committee of the House to work over the summer to look at unemployment, particularly in view of the fact now that the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour have presented their report on unemployment. So, I am wondering if the minister would undertake to suggest to his colleagues that we set up a select committee of the

MR. LUSH: House to look into the unemployment situation, to review this report, maybe to meet with Federal Government officials so that we can report back in the Fall session with some suggestions to improve the unemployment in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, we had a very good meeting, one of the better meetings that I have attended, this morning with the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour. The Premier and several Cabinet ministers met with the Federation. They saw a half an hour film and met for two and a half hours and talked about this specific problem of unemployment. The Premier indicated to the President, Mr. Mayo, this morning that we would be getting together in two or three weeks to take about specifics because this morning's conversation obviously was of a general nature in which we discussed mainly the problem of unemployment as it flowed from the Task Force report. We will be dealing with the Federation of Labour, I assume, when the House closes within two or three weeks and talk of more specific details. The brief this morning actually did not have any specific details but there were philosophies and goals and objectives that Government and labour and management and the Province, indeed, should go and we intend to pursue these on a more specific basis. In respect to the Federal effort, we will continue again as soon as the House closes to talk again with our counterpart in Ottawa. I would hope that the other three Atlantic ministers again would join with me and talk about job creation in the resource based areas, not the Canada Works welfare type programmes, in which there will be jobs to do now and jobs which would flow from the projects that are undertaken. We will continue to pursue that. Mr. Cullen gave an indication that in this year's budget some of the money for Public Works would be allotted to that sort of thing. We have not heard any details yet but we certainly will be looking forward to it.



MR. LUSH:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Final supplementary.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, the minister did not address himself to the main part of the question which was would he take it upon himself, or probably put another way, what does he think of the idea of setting up a select committee of the House, at least to show the Government's concern for this matter set up a select committee of the House involving both sides so that over the summer we can review this report put in by the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour, also to meet with Federal officials to see if we cannot present in this Fall session with some immediate and effective steps to solve our unemployment problem.

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU:

Mr. Speaker, as I said - I think I directed myself very specifically to the question. I said that we would be meeting with the Federation of Labour in two or three weeks. It is not a select committee of the House but the information that was given this morning was of a very, very general nature. The Federation indicated that they were not presumptuous enough to tell Government what to do because if any side goes into another side and says, "Here is what it is" - but they have specific proposals that they will make and this will probably be done over the summer. They want a spirit of dialogue and co-operation between Government and labour and we will pursue that. The question of a select committee, of course, is not one that I can give an undertaking to but right now the ongoing meetings will continue with the Federation of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated I would recognize the hon. member for Eagle River next.

MR. STRACHAN: A question for the acting Premier and the deputy Premier, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Finance, Government House Leader, the member who knows more about the House than the Premier does. Could he tell us whether there is any real consideration to a Fall session of the House of Assembly?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: I would want to use another phrase but every time I use it the hon. gentleman makes fun of me so I will not use that. Most definitely.

MR. STRACHAN: If there is a Fall session of the House of Assembly could the acting Premier or deputy Premier tell me whether there will be consideration given to having the House of Assembly held in Labrador somewhere this Fall rather than be held here in St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly cannot give that assurance. I have not any idea as to cost. Someone told me that this hon. House cost \$100,000 a day when it is open. I mean I just do not know and I would suspect that there are all kinds of considerations that would be very relevant to that sort of decision.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the acting Premier tell me whether the cost of not holding the House of Assembly in Labrador would outweigh the actual fiscal costs and financial costs of going there. I think that as I understand it there is little legal reason for not going there. It is very simple to go there and have a House of Assembly for a short period of time and a Fall session would surely suit the situation. And furthermore that the cost of not holding at some time or other the House of Assembly in two-thirds of this Province then the future, the economic future of this Province is surely going to outweigh the cost of continuing to hold the House of

MR. STRACHAN:

Assembly in St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, you know, the question asked by the hon. member for Eagle River is like, have you stopped beating your wife. It is not a question of cost of having the House of Assembly meet outside the capital city, vis-a-vis, the tremendous contribution that Labrador makes as a part of this Province. The question is whether or not it is feasible and to uphold -

MR. STRACHAN: Would it not be very unlikely for some members to be in Labrador?

MR. HICKMAN: It would not be very likely. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, it would -

MR. STRACHAN: Maybe the member for St. John's North -

MR. HICKMAN: - be the greatest disfavour we could do to the people of Labrador to have them see this House in action because I am sure of one thing that they would not have found many of the sessions since March of this year very enlightening and would not be too proud at times of the behavior of hon. members.

But, you know, the question of whether or not this House should sit in Labrador or as an Assembly or whether it should sit in Grand Falls or Corner Brook or whether it should sit in Grand Bank is a matter that certainly I am not prepared to make any commitment as one minister today. But I want to assure the hon. member for Eagle River that whilst in our own modest way we have been attempting since the Moores Administration came into power to bring government closer to Labrador as is evidenced by the fact that for the first time there has been a meeting, a Cabinet meeting in Labrador and committees of Cabinet ministers have visited very frequently Labrador, an unprecedented act I might say, all of this is designed to bring Labrador within and keep them within the main stream of Newfoundland and Labrador life. But I certainly cannot give that commitment but I would not want the hon. member for Eagle River

MR. HICKMAN:

to think in any way that this government is not very sensitive towards the needs and ambitions of the people who reside in that part of our Province.

DR. KITCHEN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for St. John's West.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. House leader could undertake to check with the Premier on this matter and also if the other members of his caucus on that side to ask them their feelings on the matter and that we could check with our members here and then some arrangement might be made in that direction.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. CALLAN: I have a supplementary, very important.

MR. HICKMAN: I was going to say yes or not but I am apprehensive now as there is a threatened supplementary from the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). So I have to say to the hon. gentleman for St. John's West that he made the point very loud and clear here two nights ago or one night last week, last night, when he contributed so well and so responsibly to the debate on the Speech From the Throne. And I would think that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House as well as hon. gentlemen opposite will pay heed to his suggestions. But it is not proper for a minister of the Crown to say what he will or will not do with respect to the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, the adjourned debate, the Address in Reply, The hon. member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. G. CROSS: Mr. Speaker, right at the beginning of what I have to say, I would like to address just a very few brief remarks toward the spray programme. Certainly my remarks will be brief but I look at it in this way - sometimes if you are sick you take a drug to be cured even though there might be adverse side effects. Certainly we were told by our environmentalist and foresters that our forest is sick and we must administer the spray to help it recover. Certainly there has been conflict on both sides but if the facts are right, Matacil has been used before and certainly it has been used to spray fruit in orchards in England, West Germany, New Zealand and Australia and certainly the proposed dosage that is permitted in the apple orchards, the concentration is much greater than it is in the spray programme that will be introduced in Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: A quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! To my count there is a quorum present. The hon. member.

MR. CROSS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I said there has been conflict on both sides. I have said that Matacil has been used in spraying and that the concentration used in other countries is far, far greater than the concentration to be used here in Newfoundland. If I am right the dosage is two ounces to the acre of Matacil in our spray programme, administered in two applications. Certainly the dosage permitted in apple orchards is forty-eight ounces per acre, twenty-four times as strong, Mr. Speaker. I am not an authority on Matacil or insecticides, so with these few remarks I will get on with other remarks that I want to make in this Address in Reply.

Certainly last night I congratulated the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply, the hon. member for Ferryland and the hon. member for Naskaupi. I want to re-echo those congratulations now. Before getting into the few remarks I wish to

MR. CROSS: make in this debate, I would also like to congratulate the member for Harbour Grace who I thought last night made a good speech. Certainly what I liked about it was that he was brief and to the point.

AN HON. MEMBER: Positive.

MR. CROSS: Positive, yes, and the tempo of his remarks showed him to be a concerned and dedicated member of this legislature and his humorous stanzas at the end, I think topped it off. I think the hon. member from Harbour Grace rivals Nish Collins in Rhymes of the Times in the Daily News.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Fogo, a man whom I have a great deal of respect for and a man whom I have known for a long time, spoke well in this debate when he spoke yesterday. I can remember, and I believe I said this before in the House, but I can certainly remember taking the mail from the Winnifred Lee on the Lower Labrador, a boat used in the 1940s to maintain a contact with the many floaters who sailed north to the Labrador fishery each year. Captain Winsor used to be the master of that boat. The hon. member in his address mentioned the resettlement programme of some years back. In his remarks he said that the people were not forced to relocate.

MR. CROSS:

I can only say that if they were not forced many of the people were pressured into resettling, and what is the difference? As I have stated before, I lived and taught school at Greenspond during resettlement days and this is what happened in that community: The fish plant which gave employment was closed, sold for \$100 and demolished. The bait depot that had served a need, the needs of the fishermen in that community, was closed. The ice making machine was dismantled and moved out, and the nurse in the community left with no great efforts made to replace her. Mr. Speaker, if the people were not forced, I am sure these were pressure tactics.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the old, historic community of Greenspond with its great culture and tradition was saved from extinction by the change in government that came about in Newfoundland in 1972. I will go a little further, Mr. Speaker, and say the whole North shore of Bonavista North was saved from resettlement by the change that came about by the change in government of that time. I say that because I lived there in the Northern part of that district and I know what was happening. As Greenspond was being resettled the same option was open to people from the mainland, and in the late 1960's there was no trouble to see houses left vacant in any of the communities from Valleyfield to Cape Freels North. It is not so today, Mr. Speaker. That area of the district is very progressive and is prosperous. Instead of seeing homes barred up and vacant, many new homes are under construction.

In the community in the district that I live in, the community of Badger's Quay, or in the

MR. CROSS:

rural district of Badger's Quay-Valleyfield-Pool's Island certainly there are twelve new houses under construction right at this point in time and a dozen or more requests have been made to council for land on which to build. In that area of my district, Mr. Speaker, land poses a serious problem. The terrain in the main is bog and rock and because there are no sewer facilities permits for building lots are being rejected. I might add if the past administration had seen fit to install sewer at the time that they did water, then we would not have that problem today.

Mr. Speaker, every community you visit in the district is showing signs of some growth and progress. Even in Greenspond itself five new homes were built in 1977. It is true, Mr. Speaker, as in many districts in Newfoundland that in some areas of the district of Bonavista North there is far too much unemployment. But if we can develop the resources that we have, which is mainly fish, blueberries and our tourist resource, that situation will improve in time.

As I have already stated, did state in the Budget debate, in the last two years we have had four make-work projects, two federal and two provincial, to develop our blueberry resource. At present, Mr. Speaker, a small fish plant is under construction in the community of Dover and I might add that the project is being financed through Canada Works, which are federal dollars, Small Craft Harbours, but also the provincial Department of Fisheries and also Rural Development. So if there are species, many species processed there certainly that little undertaking will be coloured by the finances that it has received: It will not be all federal, it will not be all provincial. But certainly



MR. CROSS: we pay the federal taxes we get. I hope we expect to get something in return.

MR. WOODROW: That is our right still, our right to get something.

MR. CROSS: Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk in this House about the cutback in teachers this year. Mr. Speaker, success in education is sometimes attributed to big schools with their highly qualified teachers and their specialists. Sometimes I think that the small school is overlooked. I believe that certainly there are two characteristics that spell success in any work in life and these two characteristics are fostered in the smaller school more than in the larger one, namely, the characteristics of industry and independence. Mr. Speaker, I would bet right now that there has been more graduates graduated from Memorial University and the trade school from the community of Greenspond in the last five or six years than have graduated from any other community its size on the Island of Newfoundland or in Labrador. I can name a few who have been graduates of university and trade school. May I add that some of these young men have made their mark and some of them are teachers back in the old, historic community of Greenspond doing a very good job. Let me name seven or eight or nine or ten. I think of one Herbert Burry, Norman Burry, George Wright, William Granter, Glenn Granter, Michael Bragg, Audrey Way, Helen Marshfield, Gordon Marshfield, Arthur Jerrett, Bert Whelan, Fred Bragg and the list goes on. And they all, in their initial graduation with grade eleven, did come from a small school.

Mr. Speaker, in this debate and others there have been speakers who questioned as to whether or not we have a surplus of fish stocks in our waters, in particular the cod. I feel that there is not a surplus and I realize, Mr. Speaker, that we have to depend on science in this matter but I do not believe we can give a deaf ear to our fisherman. I have said before and I say again that our fishermen have been experimenting for years and certainly this

MR. CROSS: is their findings, that it takes twice the nets to catch as much fish now as it did some ten or twelve years ago. I have said this before, that a longliner with eighty nets twelve years ago caught as much or more fish as the same longliner today with double the nets.

The small inshore fishing boat with twenty nets today is catching less fish than the same boat a decade ago with less than half that number of nets.

In 1965 our Labrador codfishery was very successful. Three vessels that I can think of that operated out of the area that I now represent brought bumper trips from the Labrador. And the vessels I think of are the Lydia Marie, the Zhan, and the boat called The Debbie Lee. These three vessels alone brought in excess of -

MR. NEARY: What about the Shirley Blanche?

MR. CROSS: - brought in excess of 7,500 quintals in that one year. Bumper trips, Mr. Speaker. But then we look to 1966, '67 and '68. Boats that prosecuted the Labrador fishery for the cod that year returned almost with clean keelsons. What caused the sudden failure? And I might add the Labrador fishery, the codfishery on the Labrador, has not survived or improved to any great extent

Mr. Cross: over the past number of years. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the answer is this; that you cannot catch the fish twice, and that has been said before, I say it now, if you catch it on the Hamilton Banks you cannot catch it again inshore. If our spawning grounds are raped depletion can only be the result. And, Mr. Speaker, it is not the pounds taken and processed, but the millions of pounds destroyed in the process of taking that fish which causes the greatest damage.

Mr. Speaker, we do today have more technology, more ways to find fish, to locate fish today than we ever had before. I believe we must leave the main spawning grounds alone, let the fish spawn and disperse, and then use our technology to hunt and harvest it. In that way we will ensure the replenishing of our stocks, and a supply for the future.

Mr. Speaker, just a word on the giveaway of shrimp licences to other provinces.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: This action on the part of the federal government should be of great concern to every hon. member of this hon. House. Every member of the House of Assembly should express his displeasure at what has happened. I think fifty-one telegrams from every individual member in this House should be sent to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, the hon. Romeo LeBlanc, with follow up, may I say. Mr. Speaker, it is not too late for a united stand. The issue is too great for us to play politics with. And this House should stand united to a man and tell the Federal Government that we disapprove of this decision on their part. Our employment rate will never decrease appreciably if the resources that we have are taken from us.

Mr. Speaker, the spotlight was turned on Bonavista North in the election of 1975, and, I may add, it has not been turned off yet.

MR. NEARY: It has been on ever since.

MR. CROSS: Last December in the by-election that was held in the district of Twillingate, the District of Bonavista North was taken as an example by the Liberals in their political propaganda during that

MR. CROSS: campaign.

MR. NEARY: Do not get too nasty now or we will call a quorum.

MR. CROSS: I am not going to get nasty, I do not like being nasty, and I do not intend to let the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) run me.

But I am just going to read three little paragraphs from a letter that was put into the homes of the people in Twillingate in last December.

MR. NEARY: Which party?

MR. CROSS: By the Liberal Party, and signed by the candidate who ran, the now member for Twillingate, the Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. NEARY: A good letter, boy, I saw it.

MR. CROSS: A great one.

MR. NEARY: A good letter.

MR. CROSS: But the three paragraphs that I want to read, Mr. Speaker, are these.

MR. NEARY: Table it.

MR. CROSS: I will have no use for it after today, so I will possibly lay it on the Table of the House when I am finished.

MR. NEARY: Yes, boy, get on with it.

MR. CROSS: It says, "Anyone who is tempted to vote for the P.C. candidate because the Provincial P.C. Government may be in power for another six months or a year should take a look at Bonavista North district. During the by-election there a year and a half ago the P.C. Government made definite written promises and commitments to the people of Bonavista North, The voters there elected a P.C. member. A year and a half later hardly any of the promised projects have been started let alone finished, and no one ever hears that P.C. member or any P.C. backbencher speaking out publicly on the needs of his district.

MR. S. NEARY: Right.

MR. CROSS: So, Mr. Speaker, there we have it.

MR. NEARY: Truer words were never spoken, Sir.

MR. CROSS: Mr. Speaker, my slogan in the election of 1975 that I won by a small margin as I went door to door in the district of

MR. G. CROSS:

Bonavista North in the same way that the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W.N. Rowe) did in December of 1976, my words and my slogan to the people were action will speak louder than words.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right you are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. G. CROSS:

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that

action is speaking in the district that I now have the honor

of representing and has been speaking for the past three years.

Let me in closing mention again

some of the projects that has been done and some of the projects

that are ongoing, and I will not exhaust the supply. Certainly

three new schools are under construction -

MR. S. NEARY:

Aha!

MR. G. CROSS:

- an elementary school that will

serve the communities of Gambo, Middle Brook and Dark Cove, an

elementary school in Dover and an all grade school for Greenspond.

MR. S. NEARY:

I thought the school boards

looked after the schools.

MR. G. CROSS:

Right, Sir, I agree with you

there. Thanks for reminding me, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. S. NEARY:

Right.

MR. G. CROSS:

But I can say honestly that for

two out of three, and the best two out of three is very good, that I

did work hand in hand with local committees who know that I worked

with them and that satisfies me, to get the schools that were needed.

Certainly the Provincial Government could not say, here is the new school.

The Integrated Educational Committee allocates the funds, but it is the

government who gives them the funds to build the schools.

MR. NEARY:

It is the taxpayers.

MR. G. CROSS:

Certainly water and sewer

MR. G. CROSS: is being installed in the community of Dover, nearing completion. Water and sewer is ongoing in Trinity, and water and sewer has been begun and is ongoing in the rural district of Gambo—Middle Brook—Dark Cove.

Certainly municipal paving has been completed in Centreville, the branch roads to Dover has been completed, the main road through the community of Wareham has been completed, the main road through Indian Bay has been completed.

AN HON. MEMBER: You should be ashamed.

MR. G. CROSS: I am not ashamed.  
The Bonavista North Loop Road is nearing completion.

MR. S. NEARY: Thanks to 'Uncle' Ottawa.

MR. G. CROSS: The final twenty-four miles are under contract.

MR. S. NEARY: I say thanks to the Liberal government in Ottawa.

MR. G. CROSS: I say yes, Mr. Speaker, thanks Mr. Ottawa for your 90 per cent, thanks to the Province of Newfoundland for their 10 per cent, but also say thanks to the government that did negotiate that deal that gave us the Loop Road.

MR. S. NEARY: Thank you Pierre Elliot Trudeau.

MR. G. CROSS: Presently the branch road through Valleyfield is under upgrading -

MR. S. NEARY: Thank you Mr. Trudeau.

MR. G. CROSS: - and the branch road to Newtown also is under upgrading.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell them that is not all.

MR. G. CROSS: Mr. Speaker, that is not all there are a lot of little things as well that have helped me.

MR. S. NEARY: Canada Works

MR. G. CROSS: I had not mentioned the Canada Works, Mr. Speaker, I do not want any credit for them but I will say this, and I think I could bear out what I am saying, that Canada Works are good. Certainly everyone would agree with me when I say the wages are too low.

MR. WOODROW: Right.

MR. G. CROSS: I think they would also agree with me when I say that Canada Works, although good -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) in Quebec.

MR. WOODROW: Starvation wages.

MR. G. CROSS: - are Band-aid treatments and also that Canada Works can become extremely political. I look upon, from seeing what has happened in the district in the last three years and what happened previously, I look upon the Canada Works projects as \$750,000 or \$800,000 of a slush fund that is given to Federal M.P.'s in their districts.

MR. J. CARTER: It is the biggest pork barrell in Canada.

MR. G. CROSS: and if I could bear out the facts, Mr. Speaker, and I think I would have plenty of time to do so.

MR. WOODROW: Go ahead and tell them.

MR. G. CROSS: Up until - let me express this one little fact - up until 1975 in the north end of the district, you could count on one hand the Canada Works projects that were approved, and I speak the truth when I say that I could name them.

AN HON. MEMBER: They were LIP programs.

MR. G. CROSS: LIP and Canada Works. I am thinking of. LIP is the same thing; it is only Canada Works in disguise. But since 1975 it will take both hands and one of your feet to go to work and count all of the projects.

MR. S. NEARY: What time did you start?

June 13, 1978

Tape 4336

DW - 4

MR. G. CROSS:

three years before 1975.

I know it started more than

MR. S. NEARY:

money going into the hon. gentleman's district (inaudible).

But is not all the federal



MR. NEARY: He is just giving us his Santa Claus list there of all the things that are happening that Santa Claus brought him from Ottawa. Has he got it all in that district?

MR. CROSS: No, thank God, I do not. But, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that this is great progress in a district where nothing is being done and where the member has no concern for the needs of his district.

Mr. Speaker, in closing may I say that all of us, the best are not perfect, that we are frail creatures -

MR. WOODROW: Right.

MR. CROSS: - that we all have our faults and our shortcomings. What is one man's strength is another man's weaknesses, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are all concerned for the needs of our districts and for the good of Newfoundland and Labrador in general -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: - or I do not think we would be here.

MR. NEARY: Praise the Lord!

MR. CROSS: I know if I did not have a genuine concern for the good of this, our native Province and all Newfoundlanders, I would not be here, but I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that degrading and destructive remarks are best unsaid. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking in reply to the Throne Speech I am permitted considerable latitude but rather limited time as we all know. However, with so many subjects that need to be explored, one may indeed find himself wandering a bit from the real subject matter. However, I shall try to cover as many problems that affect my district as possible without forgetting the need for some continuity or relativity.

My district, as everybody knows, is rural almost completely with fishing being the backbone of the economy of Fortune - Hermitage. All communities in my district depend on the fisheries, and to a certain degree the fisheries depend on them. However, there are other things besides fisheries.

As an opening gambit, I would like to refer rather briefly to my position as Opposition critic for Public Works. Due to rather unusual happenings or procedures in the department as outlined in the Auditor General's report for 1976 - 1977, attention was focused on it by the Public Accounts Committee so ably chaired by my friend and colleague, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. I therefore took a background position so as not to prejudice or clash in any way with the procedures of that committee. I notice that most of them are not here at the present time; however, they will hear what I have to say eventually.

Being fully aware that eventually inadequacies of control, procedures in tendering and other matters would be brought to the attention of the House, the Auditor General had delineated the need for some further attention to this department. I did, however, ask the original question regarding the possibility of police

MR. J. WINSOR: investigation into possible irregularities in Public Works, and subsequently, of course, due to the findings of the committee and the Auditor General, the RCMP were asked to conduct a very thorough investigation.

Well, the results of this investigation have culminated in certain charges being laid.

I did attend a couple of sittings of the Public Accounts Committee and I have to say it was apparent that there were undercurrents of conflict flowing between Opposition committee members, government committee members -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. J. WINSOR: - not necessarily in that direction. This was not really conducive to open, conscientious, investigative procedures so necessary for such a committee. I say this without rancour, I am certainly not trying to stir up any further animosities in that particular area. The message I would like to leave with you is this: No committee of the House will ever function properly or perform its duties as required of it unless the members act with utmost good faith in themselves and among themselves in the highest possible definition of responsibility and integrity

MR. JACK WINFOR: to this House and to the people who elected them. There is no room or need for deviation from these principles, it is a responsibility not to be trifled with. Let us hope that the lessons learned through this committee will obviate discrepancies of procedure and the possibility of fraudulent situations in the future but we can be sure the need for eternal vigilance however, is not likely to diminish. I was not able to be present here in the House when the Public Works estimates were presented, however my colleagues very ably represented the Opposition in this. A short reference to the estimates; I was here the evening the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) made reference to a lack of indepth examination of the departmental assets, I believe this is the way he put it, that the economic spokesman, my colleague the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d' Espoir (Mr. Simmons) made no reference to any particular item in the estimates. All that was done weeks ago, piece by piece, item by item. His sixteen plus hour summation of the many aspects of this governments failure to comp with the economic and social problems of the province was masterful and pertinent and I believe the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) must have been missing on some occasions when the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d' Espoir (Mr. Simmons) was covering that particular department. I was impressed with the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) in ourlining our economic status and the warning he issued on continues borrowing to stav off impending economic disaster. We are a disaster and we only survive on our ability to produce and export fisheries, forest products, minerals and power. If there was enough exportees on the government side they would not have allowed themselves in the first place to

MR. JACK WINSOR: in a deposit position on a continues and escalating basis, however, we cannot expect experts from amateurs because that is what they prove to be in the field of business management. A government is no different from a business if it is not operated in the same manner it is bound to have problems. How long can that situation go on, when do you stop adding a guesstimate increase to last years estimates and I believe that this is what is being done in the estimates, not any sensible worked out scheme of what are we going to do and how much is it going to cost, add another million or two onto this or a million or two on to that, guesstimates. A presumptuous estimate that we were x million short last year, we must assume that we have to continue to borrow. This could not happen in private industry, no way, what is so different about government methods? I should term it frantic, fiscal folly and totally irresponsible. Frantic, fiscal, folly, the three f's, no doubt about it. I share and I am sure my colleagues share with me the hon. member of St. John's East's (Mr. Marshall) concern over the financial position of this province and that is -

AN HON. MEMBER: Frantic, fiscal, folly -

MR. JACK WINSOR: Well you can add a few f's to it if you want to and it will still be the same thing, frantic and folly. The only thing that we have as a going concern really -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is hard to say; frantic, fiscal folly.

MR. JACK WINSOR: Not if you have a bayman's tongue, it is not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us hear another bayman.

MR. JACK WINSOR: We are all set. Fisheries is the only

MR. JACK WINSOR: thing that is a going concern and thank God it is. I am sort of surprised that it is only in the last year or two, since I have been sitting in the House of Assembly; that fisheries has suddenly become a very important thing in Newfoundland. It was important enough to me twenty seven years ago to leave St. John's -

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible) corner boy

MR. JACK WINSOR: I was not a corner boy, I resent that even from my name sake and hon. colleague, as he knows if your mother was chinese and your father was chinese you would not be a frenchman. So my mother was a bay woman and my father was a bayman, now I guess I am one and am pretty proud of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: You went back to the good way of life.

MR. JACK WINSOR: I went back to the good way of life and I only wish that some of the poor people that were talked about here yesterday in St. John's by the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Kitchen) who if they are out of work, they are really

MR. J. HINSOR in trouble. In the outports you have always got Uncle Joe or somebody to fall back on for a little hobble. You certainly will not go hungry and you will not go naked and you will not be forgotten about. There is always a helping hand. Thank God for the outports and they are gradually becoming the most - not gradually - they have become the most important factor in our economy, because where there is a fish plant it is an outport. St. John's is the largest outport in Newfoundland, but a lot of people seem to forget that - with none of the benefits. Well, the fisheries has come to the condition it is in now or the state that it is in our economy thanks to the efforts of private industry coupled with a great deal of assistance from the federal government and the provincial government. We cannot overlook the fact that both governments assisted industry in many ways when the struggle was great and it started a long time ago, and we can certainly thank our lucky stars, although I have heard it said several times in the last few days that the federal government should have very little to do with controlling our fisheries. I say thank God they are controlling it because it would be in the same state as our own economy, and I have to make a couple of remarks here. They are not intended to be derogatory towards the Minister of Fisheries in any way. Mr. Carter pleaded through - I am quoting, Mr. Speaker, I beg your pardon, from the June 9th Daily News so it is public property - Mr. Carter pleaded through the House with Ottawa to give serious consideration to the \$900 million proposal placed before it recently by the Atlantic Provinces for ship replacement in the Atlantic region. This thought is good - it is fine, and then another thing we have here by Mr. Blackwood in the Telegram when he was speaking to the College of Fisheries the other evening, and he said "The industry must discipline themselves to increase the earnings of those involved while keeping costs down and the markets growing. We must not embark on unnecessary expansion of vessels or processing capacity and we must not use the fishery as the employer of last resort." Now these two statements would seem to conflict very badly, but I think what the provincial Minister of Fisheries was referring to is the replacement of the old vessels we have and I am quite sure he was also thinking about Nordsee; I am not unaware of that fact. That is very possible, and he has made a lot of statements on things that he has been going to do and some of them have been done, but

MR. J. WINSOR:

I say to the Minister of Fisheries that he needs to do a great deal more. There are some refrigeration units that are missing in their sheds, their hauling runs. There are not enough baited gear holding units around the Island, especially this time of the year when men bait up and when they go to leave in the morning, it is too stormy, and the gear has got to be shackled up. That is a poor way to have things, and there is a lot of housework to be done in the fisheries portfolio. And the minister, I am sure, is well aware. He is probably not getting enough money to do the things he wants. I hope you are getting the support you need from your colleagues. Some of them are not too terribly concerned with fisheries. Most of them know very little about it. I am sure the expertise on fisheries is limited on your side as well as on ours. I do have to also say to the Minister of Fisheries (provincial) that he has shot (is the word) a lot of criticism at the federal government and I believe you catch more flies with molasses than you can with vinegar, and I am quite sure that if you used a little more 'lassy with the federal government you would find things coming your way. I would like to see your record of the phone calls and the letters that you have written tabled in the House of Assembly that were conciliatory to a point - you do not have to be subservient - you can be conciliatory; you can bargain with the federal government.



MR. J. WINSOR: I have bargained with them for a few things in my district and been very successful. I have had to take some knocks from them. I have had to take some knocks here as well in the House. I have asked for things for my district which I have not gotten like the road to Terrenceville which should be paved. It is a provincial responsibility. The minister cannot come up with that eight miles of pavement, but then I have to listen to the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. G. Cross) telling about the goodies he has got down in his area. You know I am a backbencher on this side and he is a backbencher on that side and he is getting a lot more than I am, and I suppose that is the name of the game. Well, I think it is time for that game to be tamed down a little bit and a little more attention paid to - I keep telling them, you know, favour this district or favour that district. I have got PC people in my district - some of the best people in the world, and I do not know who they are - I do not know who is PC and who is Liberal in my district, although the minister may laugh at that and a few more. I am their member; that is what counts. While I am talking about fisheries, the other evening my colleague the hon. member from Fogo (Capt. E. Winsor) outlined an insurance investment - a retirement investment scheme which he and I talked about at great length, and I do think it is workable. I do think it is time the fishermen contributed towards a scheme for themselves. I do think it is the right time to approach them on it. They are earning good money, real good money in fisheries now. People talked about the other day \$20-25,000. That is not unusual for longlinermen - two men on a boat - to earn each per annum, and if that is not good money I do not know what good money is. There are some earning much more than that. They have no protection against storm losses, damage to a boat, loss of gear, and I think - I have not heard the minister say anything about this particular scheme, but I do think that - well, we are not going to set up a scheme - we are only going to suggest that I am backing what the member for Fogo said the other evening - a half cent from the fishermen - a half cent from the buyer - the buyers are not going to like that but they are getting subsidies - the fishermen are getting a subsidy from you now - a half cent. If you give them the subsidy now, he just puts it in the pot and spends it.

MR. J. WINSOR: The scheme that we are thinking about would be something like enforced savings, sort of a retirement investment and a gear loss protection scheme for them. That would grow - they are not going to have storms like they had a few weeks ago in Fortune Bay and other places upon the west coast and lose all their lobster pots. They did not lose all their lobster pots. When it was assessed, there were so many. They got back into business again and hopefully could continue their fishing with good results. I suggest very, very strongly to the Minister of Fisheries that he use his efforts towards improving facilities for the fishermen, and in joining with me and others on this side of the House, to sweet-talk the federal government into certain things that are badly needed. I know they are not going to pay all the attention in the world to us. If we do not go to them, they might just overlook certain things. But if the minister felt he could do this, talk to us, we could get together - why not a committee of the House. There are no committees - a committee of this House on fisheries that would really get something done. I know about your other committees and your schemes outside this, but none of them would have the weight that a committee from this House would have. It could provide some badly needed improvements in communication by road to the high productivity of fishing communities. That is what is holding them back mostly now. Let us get the product out in good shape, fast and efficiently, therefore, less costly - no more holdups because tractor-trailer operators cannot get over the access roads - cannot get up over the hill in the winter and the community stage situation should be taken in hand. The federal government, as I understand it, builds community stages and they say to the provincial government "You take it over". Then you have to provide some freezing units in it and maybe scales - anything. I do not see why the provincial government could not do that and not quibble over the fact that there might be some clapboard off it or a window broken out and got lights in them. Some of them do not even have lights yet, and the men are down there two o'clock in the morning with kerosene lanterns - back to the good old days. These baited gear-holding units are most important, both as the equipment and size. Some of them are not the size they should be.

June 13, 1978

Tape 4340

GH-3

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. J. WINSOR:

Yea, well, maybe we are too late, hey?

MR. J. WINSOR:

It should have been done years ago and I think we have to put some steam behind it. I know you have to walk before you run, but I think we have been walking too long in fisheries and as is obvious, if we do not look after our fisheries we are going to be in a sorry state. I do place emphasis on that scheme; we are certainly not going to put the nuts and bolts in place for you - that is your job and I think you can match up to it. I would certainly like to hear something from you on it later on. Let us get the icemaking equipment in place to maintain quality in the fishing boats, for instance. That is a 50-50 deal. Any icemaking equipment is 50-50, and lot of boats are going out now with no ice in them and there is no blessed way that on a day like today you are going to get quality fish ashore out of a boat that has no ice in it, as he goes down there early in the morning and he does not come back til maybe four o'clock in the afternoon. By that time it is mush. You know what fish that has been in a boat now for eight or ten hours in the sun are not going to be very good. So, these are things that are most important to the fisheries - fishermen's insurance plan in co-operation with the federal government - they will also kick in, I am sure if you set up that plan, another half cent you would get from the federal government. They are talking about cutting out subsidies now, and I think if they saw that subsidy going a certain way helping the fishermen a little more than it has been doing, you would get more sympathy. I certainly recommend to the minister that you change your way a little bit. I know it is difficult for a man who is as determined as you are, and I have known you for many years and I have great respect for your ability but I think you could swing a little bit and get more co-operation - I look forward to that. As I said before, my district is totally dependent on fisheries and cannot remain silent while so much remains to be done. I am not qualified, nor do I need, to talk on forest products. My colleagues have certainly done that and I leave it to them any time. I do not think if you are fishing you should be talking about trees and budworms, even though we sympathize very much with the situation which everybody is in, and I for one certainly do not support the spray program. I saw the birds and the animals die before with DDT when the parks were just being sprayed. I certainly enjoyed being in the park without flies. I do not like flies either, but I certainly do not think it is a

MR. J. WINSOR: safe course that the government is on with spraying because you are going to get it right up the back the first time somebody gets sick or something like that happens - a water source is polluted, you have had it, not that you have not already got it. We of the fishing industry have long realized the importance of fish to balance of payments - that is a new dollar - I say right from the U.S.; and at this particular time with our Canadian dollar down, it is a big dollar. Every time the fish comes over the side of that boat, you can say you are doing something towards the balance of payments, and I am sure my financially minded friend the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. W. Marshall) would go along with that. Every dollar's worth of fish exported is a new dollar, and the dollar comes from the deep South, very deep South, the mid-West, the eastern seaboard, and to a lesser degree the western states. We do not export very much to western states. We have long been aware of the fact that improved production in plants favours the Gross Provincial Product as well as the Gross National Product; they are both tied in. Closing down industries works quite the reverse of that, as I see it. Five or six years ago the federal government had in place an insurance scheme for lobster fishermen. Less than 10%, I understand, took advantage of it. This is why I think that we in the Province, if you are anxious to have certain controls over fishing or what the fishermen do, this is the chance for you to show what you can do.

MR. JACK WINSOR: and you said on many occasions that you cannot get the cooperation of the Federal Government but I think that if you dug down into those different things you would get alot more cooperation. You said a minute ago that you tried and tried, well I would ask you to table this House your communications, verbal or written, between your department and the Federal Government, give us a record of it, even your phone calls that you had between the Federal Government, it may be a laugh we do not know, I am talking about in the last five years only, and let us see where they have not functioned because that is what I think they have not done, they have not functioned. On the insurance scheme I would say that if you could get that working, work out the nuts and bolts with the people that you have in your department that are very knowledgeable on financial matters and you could prove to the Federal Government that you can control this, I am sure that they would give you more control over lots of things. If you could you could control this or if you cannot how in the name of peace do you expect to control your fiscal policy for this government. I know the change from salt to fresh frozen fish has made many communities change rapidly to an economical, envirable status. Salt fish, of course, is only for certain places that nobody collects the fish and nobody buys it there but they are getting fewer and fewer and I am sure most of our people in most of the communities even those that are selling salt fish, are getting a darn good price for it as well. While they may not be living in the lap of luxury, they certainly are paying their own way and providing adequately for their families and paying through the

MR. JACK WINSOR: nose for power, fuel and supplies, paying for a top heavy power corporation, Newfoundland Hydro, for a handful of technicians and maintenance personnel keep production going and the brass keep playing squash. If you do not believe it, check it, I happen to know that it is true, they have to play squash or something to keep fit because they certainly do not do very hard work otherwise. Our fishermen have to pay heavily for supplies as most of it is delivered by truck over dirt roads, that are costing heavily in maintenance dollars. These trucks and tractor trailers also haul fish to the marketplace and I have seen them wait from Friday to Monday before they could get over hills on the Harbour Breton Road. It was services in a fashion; salt was thrown down on six inches of snow which turned it into slush and there was no way that these men could run these hills. As one man said to me: "I have \$80,000. in the truck and I have 80,000 pounds of fish in the truck, which costs alot of money. I cannot jump out of the darn thing if it turns over." I believe that I have heard it through the grapevine that it is possible we may get Harbour Breton Road paved this year, upgraded and paved. If that is so I think it will be a tremendous improvement for my district because if anything is holding back the total development of the place, Harbour Breton, the whole Conagra Peninsula, anywhere in my district and certainly down in the eastern end in Terranceville, English Harbour East and Grand Le Pierre not to mention Rencontre East which has not got a road and I doubt if it ever will have because of the tremendous cost of getting to that one lonely settlement. I would love to think that it could be possible that money was available for it. The only way we can help them of course, is to step up or improve the ferry service a bit. The fact that we have bad roads that cannot haul fish is one disadvantage and there are other difficulties caused by the

June 13, 1978

Tape No. 4342

CM - 3

MR. JACK WINSOR:

bad roads. Some services are un-  
available as suppliers refuse to use the rough roads. Ambulances  
with seriously ill patients

10096



MR. J. WINSOR: have a terrible time trying to get over these roads, and very often they break down because of the condition of the road, and the ambulances are all as far as I know just about brand new, but the road in some areas is in such condition that they just give out - bang - and that is it, and you have got a seriously ill patient and how do they get them out of that. It is all jolly fine when you are living on pavement and you can whip along and everything goes along fine, and I hear two or three ambulances going past my digs every night; I am living on the Kenmount Road. There is no trouble to hear an ambulance going, but if they had to go over the dirt roads they would not go as fast as they come down there. Mail deliveries - drug supplies - they also have to come over the dirt road. We have tried hard; we have had a number of petitions on transportation and we are going to get more. The people are gradually becoming more militant over these things. One time you would never get a delegation from the bottom of Fortune Bay to come in here and kick up a stink about their roads, but today they are not going to put up with that kind of nonsense any more. They see the way the ball bounces and they are going to come in and see if they cannot get it to bounce their way. We have in some instances inadequate situation and health services, especially the Grand Falls hospital, and I do not suppose two people in St. John's are in this area and in reach of my voice realize how important the Grand Falls hospital is to the southwest coast - most important. At one time I was told by people who knew that some 500 cases - unbelievable - 500 cases - were awaiting admittance to Grand Falls hospital for surgery. How long can you wait without deterioration of your condition. Just think of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. J. WINSOR: Oh yes, that has been ongoing for the past year or more. But anyway they are admitted to Grand Falls hospital they are in pretty bad shape and they need a patch job of some kind, and they have waited for weeks and weeks; and I sometimes wonder, you know, if some of us sitting here had a strangulated hernia and we had to wait for six weeks, you would not last six weeks, you would not have to worry about that because our friend from Harbour Grace (Mr. H. Young) would be carrying some of us off.

MR. J. WINSOR: Emergency survey admittedly is taken care of as soon as they can do it, but even then this helps block up the overload and puts the system right out of hock, and they must be very frantic. I do not know; I have talked to people in Grand Falls who are aware of it, and it is not only us but then you have the northeast feeding into the same hospital. The people in my district were just as perturbed when they heard that - they were first perturbed by the fact that a number of beds were taken out, and they said "Well, good God, we will never get in there now", but then when things started to block up and block up and they were taking more people from the outlying districts, then there is no expansion to the hospital allowed or permitted or going to be. It is a frantic situation. To get back to roads again, another point with the roads especially down on the Connaigre peninsula and in Fortune Bay, I have four fish plants in my district, two major operations and two smaller ones, and trawlermen are travelling from different parts of the coast back and forth, not only to the plants in my district but to the plants on the Burin peninsula, and I know it was told here to the Minister of Transportation about one party who had two cars last year - two cars - he is a trawlerman and when he has to be aboard, he gets up early in the morning and he bats over the English Harbour East road and that, in itself, is enough to finish off a car in a few trips, and I have asked for attention to be paid to it, and I am quite sure that the present Minister of Transportation will do something about it or tell me that he cannot or has not, but I believe he has some action going on there. Every place in my district, Harbour Breton, Coomb's Cove, Wreck Cove, Boxey, English Harbour West, St. Jacques, Belleoram, Pool's Cove, Rencontre, English Harbour East, Grande le Pierre, Terrenceville, St. Bernard's, Little Harbour, Harbour Mill, Little Bay East, Bay l'Argent, Jacques Fontaine -

MR. J. WINSOR: Little Harbour and Harbour Mill, Little Bay East, Bay l'Argent, Jacques Fontaine, all of them fishing communities - every one of them and all the men earning good money and paying big taxes - you better believe it. And they cannot understand why they have not got the best kind of services. If our fishermen had as bad a record of production, or our woodcutters, or our miners, or the production workers associated with the above had as dismal a record as our present government in getting things done and handling the affairs of this country, we would have gone down the drain long ago. And I say, if the government does not pull up its socks, or call an election, we may indeed go down the drain. Everybody is down their backs. Our teachers have an unimpeachable record of performance - call it production if you like. Rapid strides have been made in the field of education and now the government has applied the brakes at a most undesirable time. The situation is grim. I have a petition down on my desk now - there are two petitions - signed by hundreds of people objecting to this and what is going to happen to their kids - how they cannot get to the university this year and I do not think it is -

AN HON. MEMBER: No jobs.

MR. J. WINSOR: No jobs - I know some teachers who have lost their jobs and it was absolutely unnecessary. I do not think the cost would have been that great; and the cost of transportation program, the integrated board in my area has got to pay the full butt now for the buses. They are finding it rather difficult, but I do not know how they are going to make out and I have not had a chance to check that out recently. Then again, people here have talked about TV reception. We have TV reception of a sort - now you see it; now you do not, sort of. It could be the most important program in the world. It could be the Premier announcing the action group and taking off the interviewer, and you would lose it. Now, who would want to lose a program like that?

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is the hon. member - what is the fight?

MR. J. WINSOR: The fight? I could tell you I watched the Premier announce that program. I was up in Ramea sitting down when he announced that. I immediately called the number and got now answer.

AN HON. MEMBER: In that case there was so much repetition you could miss half the program and still not miss -

MR. J. WINSOR: If I had missed it all I would not have missed a thing. But however, my people do want to see things like Archie Bunker and a few more things like that. One thing they do want to see is Here and Now - that is most important; and frankly we can it very well if you turn antenna that way tonight and that way tomorrow night. That is no problem if you could walk up a hill in a rainstorm; but another thing which has been spoken about here before is a second station. Why should you be tied down to -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. J. WINSOR: Say again.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. J. WINSOR: Yes - 'The Two Ronnies' - I do not know. I do not think they look at that, but they really are - there are a number of educational programs that are on and I think if TV was good enough the government could save an awful lot of money, because they could put all the educational programs on TV and tell the teachers to go home. How about that?

MR. NEARY: The Minister is making deals now with McConnell - no, the minister is not - the Premier's office is making deals now with McConnell to do ten video tapes (inaudible) video. The minister knows nothing about it.

MR. J. WINSOR: About what?

MR. NEARY: About McConnell up in Montreal.

MR. J. WINSOR: For what?

MR. NEARY: For the education (inaudible) educational programs -

MR. J. WINSOR: What are you suggesting? - scenes from the House of Assembly?

MR. NEARY: A rip-off for McConnell.

MR. J. WINSOR: Has scenes from the House of Assembly, I hope?

MR. NEARY: That is the kind of (inaudible)--

MR. J. WINSOR: But seriously, you know, TV reception in this day and age should be better than it is, and -

MR. NEARY: - doing over here at the Extension Department for (inaudible). They could be done. I checked it out this morning and they told me it could be done. Well, (inaudible) same over here as Memorial University, have not done it -

MR. J. WINSOR: The hon. member is giving me a great help.

MR. NEARY: - animated video tapes - they can do them over here at the university - Extension Department - Yes, Sir! A rip-off for McConnell.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. J. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I commit no sin now.

MR. JACK WINSOR: He will give it to me without being asked, I assume. One word on education, quote from that brief which I am sure if every member from this side has seen it, I think, concern over funds available to school boards. 'Since 1969 a miracle has occurred in education in rural Newfoundland. Children from sparsely populated and relatively isolated communities as Dark Hole, Snooks Arm, Philip's Head and Deep Bite have had a chance to obtain a fairly good education. Children from those areas now have access to well qualified teachers, just like they have at Grand Falls. They now attend schools with indoor plumbing, just like they have at Lewisporte, they now have physical education classes in real gymnasiums just like they have at Gander. Some of these children have been exposed to such programs as music, home economics, industrial arts and even had access to guidance services and library services, just like they have at St. John's. A miracle, indeed. Modern day miracles can often be explained and there is an explanation for this one. It occurred as a result of consolidation of school boards and schools and school services. In that process of consolidation there is one key element without which consolidation would not have been possible. That element was the transportation of pupils from the various small communities to a central area. Transportation of pupils is the one factor above all others which has made it possible for the children from a small isolated community to have a reasonable opportunity to be exposed to the quality and the quantity of programs that are taken for granted for the children in Urban areas.' That is only one small part of that brief and that goes on to say: 'The basic principle that must be accepted is that all children in the province must have a reasonably equal access to quality education, regardless of where they live. The first step towards

MR. JACK WINSOR: that principle is acceptance of a policy whereby the government either pays 100% of the transportation costs or devises the system whereby no board is penalized simply because it has to transport more children than another board.' One of the most common criticisms of pupil transportation is that it costs x number of dollars just to get children to the school building. The term has become derogatory as if we were talking about a waste of public funds. Is it a waste of funds to transport 30 pupils to a ten room school from a fishing community that would otherwise be entitled to two teachers. Do we not want the fishermen of that community to be satisfied that their children have access to adequate schools. Do we not want those fishermen to stay in their communities and fish in order that they can produce the primary dollars from the primary industry that ultimately supports the urban areas. Who's money are we wasting? Which gets me down to pretty near the end of my time. And on that note the fishermen's children are certainly, and I am sure that every member of this House will agree, entitled to the same benefits as those in St. John's but it is sometimes overlooked and I would say never, never overlook the fishermen because they are the saviour of your country. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Member from St. John's  
South

DR. JOHN COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me the opportunity of addressing a few remarks to the House. Before getting into the main body of my remarks I would just like to comment on a matter that the hon. member from St. John's West (Dr. Hubert Kitchen) brought up the other day, last evening I believe, and that was in regard to full-time and part-time members of the House. I think I am probably in a good position to

June 13, 1978

Tape No. 4345

CW - 3

DR. JOHN COLLINS: speak on this because I suppose I would be categorized as a part-time member and a few affirmations come to mind in this regard and I think the first one, I do not know who it is described to, goes something like this: "War is too important to important to leave to the generals." Another one is and I think it was Thoreau said this one, he said: "Being busy is not enough,



DR. JOHN COLLINS: the question is what are you busy about." It seems to me that what the hon. member from St. John's West (Dr. Hubert Kitchen) is suggesting that we should have professional politicians in this House. I would just like to comment that many citizens regard this House already as being rather removed from the realities of every day life, rather removed from the real problems of the province and I think that if we segregate the representation of the House of Assembly just to a certain group of people and this is their function and they have no other contact shall we say, no other meaningful, day by day working contact with the rest of the population I would not think that would be a very good idea and I would think that this would only enhance the view that many people have that this House does not reflect this province in very real terms. It is also in my observation that those who have been part-time are not necessarily the least affected in this House, I think that they are certainly not less affected than many who might be called full term. They are possibly less wordy but I do not think they are necessarily less affected. As a matter of fact in some regards I would go to the exact opposite that some of the so called part-time members of this House have been extremely affective and have contributed a great deal. As I said it is really not how busy you are the question is what are you busy about. The other point is that there notable precedents against this, we all know then the mother of parliaments, there is not enough seats there for every member who is a representative. So this implies that the members of the mother of parliament cannot be so called full-time, in other words the mother of parliament is designed so that people will not be full-time and I think that this is something that we should bear in mind. I was a little surprised that the hon. member from

DR. JOHN COLLINS: St. John's West (Dr. Hubert Kitchen), for whom I have a lot of regard and whom I enjoy listening to, I thought it was a little unworthy of him when he said that the Premier was more or less a part-time member but at the same time he did not but the same label the leader of the Opposition, who is frequently absent from this House. I would think that at least in this regard sauce to the goose should be sauce to the gander. I meant to leave that point but before completely leaving it I would like to make one other comment on what my hon. colleagues from the opposite of the House think about representation in this House. I do not quite understand, and this is in regard to Labrador and St. John's, the Opposition members have expressed the opinion that the Labrador representation should be greater. Labrador should have greater representation, at the present time representation is three and one half members approximately for something like thirty four or thirty six thousand people and it has also been suggested that the House should spend something like fifty percent of its time in Labrador. It has also been suggested that the representation for St. John's is too high, in other words ten members for something like 140,000 people is too high. I find this difficult to rationalize really, are we representing people or are we representing areas or are we representing material or what are we representing. It seems to me that we are representing people and if people live in Labrador or if they live in St. John's or if they live in Burgeo Bay d'Espoir or if they live in Conception Bay South, no matter where they live they are due the same representation as anywhere else, so no more no less and I would think that if we decide to increase representation for the citizens of Labrador, we should also increase the representation for the

DR. JOHN COLLINS: citizens of this province who live in St. John's. I think that the thought behind it and be some validity to this, is that the wealth of Labrador is so great, the mineral wealth is so great that this deserves greater representation. There is some validity to that but I hold the view that our greatest pride and our greatest wealth are the people of this province. The other wealths are transatory and can be very readily either done without or other materials can be used in their place and so on but it is the

DR. JOHN COLLINS: people really who are in wealth and as the hon. member who just spoke pointed out, do not forget the fisheries and the fishermen are the important part of the fisheries. I think that the island of Newfoundland should get the representation it deserves in terms of the people here and the people in Labrador should get the representation they deserve in terms of the people that are there.

Turning to the main body of my remarks, this is the Throne Speech and the Throne Speech is really a broad look at the government operations. It is not a precise plan, I suppose, but it is a general thrust of government and how they are going to manage the affairs of the province, it is a general overall look. This is rather distinct in my understanding from the budget where in the budget debate we talked about our districts by enlarge but in the Throne Speech we should range a little wider. I am a little bit disappointed because the Throne Speech is this late in the session because anything we say now, I do not know if it ever would have any influence, but it cannot have any influence now because the session is just about over whereas if the Throne Speech has been at the early part of the session at least what was said would have some general influence on the debate in the House. In discussing the general operations of government I think we have to bear a few things in mind. The first thing I suggest is that we have to bear the essential character of the Newfoundland economy in mind. We are not like New Brunswick, we are not like British Columbia and so on and so forth, we are talking about Newfoundland and we have particular characteristics in this province. Economically, our activities are designed for export to the international markets in our paper, in our iron ore, in our fish and similar economic pursuits. These are all designed for the international market, this is where our impact is. Now that sounds great,

DR. JOHN COLLINS: natural fact, but if you look at it, it is not so good. The areas who produce for the international market usually are the huers of wood and the drawers of water, in other words they are in the comodity business, they do not have highly developed economies of their own and I am afraid that is the situation in Newfoundland. We export by large bulk, unfinished products, even in the fisheries and even in paper, I mean newspaper I suppose is the lowest form of forest product in terms of paper, it is a manufactured product granted but it is the lowest type and I think that it is improtant for us to remember that to spite having had the paper companies in this province for many decades they have shown very little capacity for advancing into other forms of products. They started out as newsprint mills, they are newsprint mills and I suggest they will end up as newsprint mills. We have very little spin off from them in terms of other economic developments. Another aspect of our economy is if we export to the international market, commodity wise, we actually import from the central mainland. Our basic needs are satisfied by the central Canadian Mainland Manufacturing Complex, now this works grand when times are good, we export alot of raw materials and we import alot of finished products from mainland Canada and all works well. Where the economy declines, this is where we get into great difficulties and I suggest that as a provincial government and as a provincial people we should have some means when times turn down for us to adjust our economy so that we redirrect our needs as far as we can to local producers, that is things that come directly to mind like produce, vegetable produce and so on, agricultural produce, lumber from the forests and perhaps some other materials from the forest and generally speaking the things

DR. JOHN COLLINS: . . . that small businesses can produce. When times are good perhaps there is not much need to emphasize that part of our economy but when things turn down and we are on hard times because the international market does not want our commodities we then should have some means of turning in to some extent on ourselves so as to stimulate our own home economy. In also giving a broad look at the way our government and our province works I think we have an appreciation of the past. I think another euphemism is that he who ignores history is destined to repeat the same mistakes over and over again. I do not want to go back into the dim and distant past but I would like to make a comment or two on the '50s and '60s. This was a time when the world economy was flowering and expanding and almost exploding practically throughout the world, certainly in places like Japan, West Germany, United States, even in Russia which was coming along in their own industrial revolution and it certainly applied to Canada, the sky was the limit and there seemed no bounds to what we could achieve. This had its influence on how governments operated. Costs were not really a problem and it was felt that any short fall this year would be made up by the increasing output of the national economy in the following year so there was great government presence in everyones eyes, increasing government presence. I think if we think back to the early '50s and see how little government impinged on everyday life in those days and compared to how it is now I think we get an appreciation of this. There were large government schemes, costly schemes, but no one payed any attention to costs. The Newfoundland economy, Newfoundland government was not immune from this and we had what I would like to term government by lurch or lunge, governments lundered around, if that is the right term, or at least moved massively in one

DR. JOHN COLLINS: direction and when this did not seem to be panning out it moved masively in some other direction and so and so forth. For instance the first lunge or lurch, I would suggest, was towards industrialization, those were the days when fisheries were out, we were no longer to concentrate on fisheries this was not a worthy occupation, this was not a very productive way to live, we must downgrade fisheries, if not actively at least tend to neglect it, not stimulate it and we must get into the industrial era. This was done of course with heavy subsidization, I do not need to innumerate these were the early industries, the shoe factories, candy factories, the battery factories and so on and so forth, and these had a temporary affect but they were not the saving influence that they were supposed to be on the province. We also had other industrial pursuits and those were reletively small industrial endeavours and we got into large industrial endeavours now, none of which again panned out very well. I put Churchill Falls in that catagory, now Churchill Falls is supposed to be a success story and it is, I suppose in some respects certainly for the people of Quebec it is, but I do not think it is a great success story for the people of Newfoundland. One thing about Churchill Falls we must not forget is that Churchill Falls is essentially now gone. If Churchill Falls is never developed when it was and could now be developed in a way that gave us benefit we would be much further ahead then we are at the present time. Churchill Falls was developed, it was developed in such a way that we got minimum benifit and it can never be developed again for the good of this province. The other large industrial endeavour were Come By Chance Linerboard and so on. This was the lurch or lunge towards industrialization that did not pay out at least it did not bring the benefits it was supposed to.

Another lurch or lunge was towards

June 13, 1978

Tape No. 4348

CW - 3

DR. JOHN COLLINS: education. Now I have benefited myself and thankful that I have from a fairly long educational endeavor, I might say with no help from government to my knowledge, it is all from my own family and from my own efforts, and I am certainly not against the governments of any area paying alot of attention to education but what I do want to bring to the hon. members attention is that at that time, or let us put it this way, at a certain time education was out of the panacea, you did not need to do anything almost, just educate, educate in all directions -



Dr. J. Collins: This is the case, in all directions and you are bound to end up with tremendous benefits. So we had massive cost increases in the education with large building developments in education. We had forced growth really, and this is no where more typified than at our own University here. At one time our University was relatively modest, academically orientated institution which I attended myself in poorer times, and you know it was not be any means a world shaker and certainly it needed development. But in a few decades, something like twenty years it has grown from that sort of thing to a monstrously all pervading institution in this Province, practically beyond control and almost beyond our ability to finance. This was a change that in other places and in other jurisdictions would have taken perhaps a hundred years. Well now you might say, well this is a great thing we can compress what went on a hundred years into twenty years. But I would suggest that you can only go so far with that, if you force things too much you do not end up with a good healthy plants, I am not a horticulturist, but if I may use that simile, you would end up with a rather sickly overdeveloped plant in some respects, underdeveloped in others. In other words it is not a good healthy organization. And I suggest that this is what Memorial University is endanger of becoming if it has not become now.

Again I am more familiar with the health aspect of things, so even in Memorial University, I am more familiar with the medical school there. At one time our hospitals cost \$10 million to \$15 million that type of thing. But now we cannot get away with less than a \$100 million hospital. For instance I had occasion recently to look at the residency programme of our medical school, we have 103 residences, 57 of which are not only not Newfoundlanders, that are only not Canadians, that are not only North Americans, they are not English speaking, in Mother tongue, 57 of 103. Now this seems to me development of a residency programme for its own sake, and just the salary costs of the residency programme alone is a quarter of a million dollars coming out of this Province.

Dr. J. Collins: Now as I mentioned earlier even in the great old days when costs were no object, when the sky was the limit, and tomorrow was always going to be a better day, who cares about a quarter of a million dollars for something, these are residents,, these are trainee doctors -

AN HON. MEMBER: Coming from other jurisdictions.

DR. J. COLLINS: These are not coming from other jurisdictions, coming from other parts of the world - out of 103 residents in training, medical residents in training out of 103, 57 are not only not Newfoundlanders, they are not only not Canadians, they are not only not North Americans, their Mother tongue is not even English, these are residents. At the medical school we would have the undergraduates who have not yet qualified, then after qualification you would have the interns who are doing their early practical years before they go into practice, and then the next rate would be the residents who would be aiming for specialty practice.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where would these residents who are undergraduates come from?

DR. J. COLLINS: In Punjab, in Hungary, you name it, 57 of them at least, I do not know where the others, but 57 at least, as I say, were not English speaking in the Mother tongue.

Now I have absolutely nothing against someone from the Punjab who wants to go into residency and who wants to become a specialist, and I would not have anything against him coming to this Province, but I would suggest that 57 of his conferees out of 100 is a bit much for our Province to take on even allowing for the fact that there is a large federal input into our University. In other words these priorities, this is not good priority thinking I do not think.

We also in our medical school have very high cost, what I would call services of a prestige nature in some respects, very narrow and very doubtful benefit. For instance we have a very highly, I do not know if it is highly developed, but it is

June 13, 1978

Tape 4349 (Afternoon)

PK - 3

Dr. J. Collins: certainly highly staffed genetic service. Again a genetic service of itself is quite a good thing. But when you have a genetic service

DR. J. COLLINS:            which has so many technicians there at very good salary that they do not have enough work to do; and I have been informed very reliably that they are looking for work to do. They have so many technicians there looking for work to give them to whereas in some hospitals they are crying out for technicians for the ordinary type of work. In other words again the thrust seems to be a little askew. We do not have to even comment on the control mechanisms - the cost economic control mechanisms at the university - because as far as we are concerned there are not any. We have no way in this Province of knowing whether there is extravagance going on at the university or not, because we are not allowed to look at the budget or review the budget. I might say in contra-distinction, I went to the University of Edinburgh and every year I am just a sort of overseas alumni, every year I get a detailed administrative budget from the University of Edinburgh. It is broken down to an extent that it is absolutely of no interest to me, but from my own university here - the university in our own province, and I am an elected representative of the people, I have been told by the President of the university that he will give some information to a newspaper but he certainly will not give it to me or to my colleagues in the House. I do not understand that attitude. I think it is just a way of thinking that I cannot understand. It seems to be so much out of character with a way of operating. Now, if I may then go on to another aspect of what I might call the lurcher or lunge way of handling our economy; and that was in the somewhat later period when the Province was blanketed, and I do not think that is too small a term, with social programs, mainly I suspect to get the 50¢ federal dollar. It did not particularly matter whether these programs were particularly appropriate to our circumstance here as long as the federal government put in 50¢ we were going to match it

DR. J. COLLINS: and bring the program into effect.

I could mention the unemployment program in this regard. My understanding - my reading of the unemployment insurance program that the federal government brought into effect - this was designed really for an industrial type of people or society, most quite appropriate, say, to the Toronto area or to the Montreal area or to the Sarnia area, but quite inappropriate to our area here. If we were going to bring in an unemployment insurance program here, it would not be designed in this way at all. We had to deal with the seasonal work which was the expected here, the traditional here, the understood here, and to bring in unemployment insurance based or patterned on an industrial type of society into that situation, it was only asking for trouble and I suggest that we do not have to be looked upon as rednecked Tories to think that the unemployment insurance program has not been an unalloyed benefit to this Province. The same way the health programs here - the health programs were forced upon this Province as they were forced on some other provinces. They were designed with a concept in mind without any actual input from the local area often, and I have spoken on this already in former remarks, and I think that the health programs that were forced upon us here really by the federal scheme should now be totally revamped so that they will handle the problems that we have here and not be wasteful in terms of things that we do not need to spend money on. Now, this was I think what history teaches us, that this is the way that things have gone in the past, and I think we should learn a lesson from this. I am not saying that all these things were done without good intentions; I suggest they were done with good intention. I do not think they were all faulty either; I think there was some good out of it. By and large, it is not the answer for this Province - the sudden industrialization of the Province that government demands. This seems to me what our recent history has taught us, and I think the

DR. J. COLLINS: people also felt that because when the seventies came along they felt that we needed a new way of doing things and I suggest that is why the PC administration took over. In other words the PC was suppose to be a reform attempt at government. We were to have a team leading us in place of essentially a one-man leadership. A very forceful character and probably many - I was never a follower of the gentleman in question but I can see that he probably had certain good points but I suggest in the overall he was not good for this Province, he was a one-man operation and no one-man has all the answers so we had a team come in in place of the one-man approach. We also had an arrangement whereby there would be control and planning and restraint rather than extravagance and lunging and lurching and looking for the golden rainbow. However perhaps if I have offended members opposite perhaps my next few remarks may make amends if such be needed, however I do not think it has been adequate. If the industrial lurching and industrial approach was not the answer for this Province I do not think we can say that in the last seven or eight years that we have solved the problems in this Province. It seems to be that we still have not found the way of doing it.

Now where should we go from here? And if we cannot go by massive government input and we just cannot go by restraints and careful attention to the dollar and so on where do we go? I think we still need the radical approach because we have very deep-seated problems. I do not think a gradual, an actual gradualism is going to get us anywhere. I think we will only fall further and further behind. We do have to take a radical approach, we have to attack our problems with vigour and imagination. But how do we do this without massive government intrusion and therefore get into the troubles we got into in the 1950s and 1960s. I think the US taxpayer protest in the United States perhaps gives us a bit of a lead in this and also I think that the letters that have been increasingly written in our daily newspapers, the crime, the amount of government intrusion in lives, the amount of regulation that the average citizen has to follow and generally the weight of government and the tax load on the citizen, I think this all gives us a lead. I

DR. J. COLLINS: might say also say that hon. members in this House have also spoke in the same vein, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen), I remember distinctly have fashioned their remarks in the same vein.

So it seems to me that we have to set the people free, we have not to just throw government in a massive way into the economy, we have not just to sit back and take a very cautious approach, we have to set the people free that is by turning the main thrust of our economy over to the private citizen, over to the individual again. This is clearly I think the next way to go and I would hope it will be successful but in doing that I think we have to give him the means of being effective. It is no good saying that alright government has failed, if you want to put it in those terms, government has failed and you take over. I do not think that will do it. We must not only say we will throw the ball to you, we will cast the torch to you but we also must give you the means of doing something effective.

I do not think we on this side of the House have done this in my view adequately. I think our hearts have been in that direction, I think that we have advocated small business stimulation but this is it, I think we have tended to stimulate small business by throwing money at it, collecting taxes and throwing money at it and there is a phethora of programmes around. I remember the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) saying there are so many programmes of stimulation in this Province, government programmes that is, there are so many programmes of stimulation in this Province that he cannot keep up with them his self and he was the Minister of Industrial Development. I think in the same vein joint ventures - I am not too keen on joint ventures. I am prepared to listen to debate in a specific area and see if a joint venture is a good thing or if it is not but it seems to me that here again this is not the way to do it. This is replacing what should be local effort by something arranged by government.

DR. COLLINS: Now, how do we tackle this then? It seemed to me that the only way we can do it is to reduce the load of taxation. I have difficulty in seeing how we can go on collecting taxes at the increasing rate we have ever since, certainly the mid 1950's, and have our economy become a healthy one. Not only do I think we have to put a stop on the tax load we take from the economy, I think we actively have to reduce it, we have to turn it back.

Mr. Speaker, it is essentially six o'clock, I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has moved the adjournment of the debate.

It being six o'clock I leave the Chair until right o'clock.



VOL. 3

NO. 89

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

8:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.

TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 1978

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the member for

St. John's South.

MR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, before the House rose at 6:00 P.M., I made a few remarks which I might just summarize very quickly now and that was to say that since the Province became a Province of Canada we have looked for our economic salvation in this Province. We tried it initially through government financing of large schemes and this had limited success. We then tried it through massive input into the educational process which was good in itself really, but in actual fact it has been very expensive and has given less returns than we had hoped. And then government tried through attracting many federal dollars, fifty cent dollars by getting involved in social service programmes and therefore attracts all this extra financial assistance from the federal government into the Province, and this has caused at least as many headaches as it caused benefits.

Since the P.C.s took over they have taken the approach of trying to assist the smaller businessman and trying an approach of planning and restraint, and this also has had relatively limited success in my view. And I was putting forth the proposal that we should now take what seems to be an approach that is becoming much in favour throughout the world, and that is to try to diminish the impact of government on the people and give the people, themselves an opportunity to increase their economic output and their economic well-being mainly through diminishing the role of government and diminishing the taxation load.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have already in the debate on the Budget spoken of health, so I will not go into that in a big way, but I would just like to mention

DR. J. COLLINS: that here we can find savings in the health field. I pointed out at that time that the total health costs in this Province amounted to about 19 per cent of the provincial Budget, about 7.5 per cent of the gross provincial product, and this actually increased about 400 per cent since the early 1970s. None of these figures are out of keeping with other provinces; however, this massive amount of money expended by the public authority in the health field have really benefitted a relatively narrow segment of the population, and the federal block funding now gives us the opportunity to evolve our own health system, one designed to remove the undesirable features from the other ones which have led to unnecessary expenditures in some areas and under expenditures in others and will now allow us to direct our expenditures in the health field only where they are needed and not where they are not needed, and probably this will actually end up as a total saving in the health field, a saving that can be directed elsewhere.

We also need to change our methodology in supplying health services so as to increase the efficiency and the economy of the system.

The next area that I think we should look at in terms of increasing our economic well-being is in the fisheries. And I am certainly not personally knowledgeable in the fisheries; I certainly do not come from a fishery area, but I suggest that the majority of hon. members are in the same boat. There are only a relatively small number of hon. members in this House who are knowledgeable in the fisheries although a greater proportion do come from areas that are engaged in the fisheries. This does not inhibit me in any way from saying a few words about the fisheries.

I certainly support the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) in his remarks

DR. J. COLLINS: the other evening with regard to the provincial role in the fisheries vis-a-vis the federal role. And in my view, I think the jurisdiction for the fisheries within the 200 mile limit should be given to the provincial jurisdiction just as we are hoping to get control over the hydro carbon into the provincial jurisdiction. It has been stated that if this happened we would lose a lot of federal financing - I do not think this necessarily follows - and that also we would be in great conflict with other provinces, and again, I do not think this necessarily follows. I think that because the provinces control certain areas does not mean that the federal government does not contribute to these areas. If this were so there would be no federal contribution into health, education, social services and so on. Similarly, jurisdictional disputes and similar disputes could be settled by the appropriate interprovincial advisory committees and so on.

I am at a loss really to understand the attitude of hon. members opposite who - and I may be misreading them - but they seem to be in favour of the federal authority really controlling the fisheries in our area. In other words, they seem to feel that the destiny of our Province should be in federal hands. Because if we do have a destiny, surely it is tied up with the fisheries. And I do not think the

DR. COLLINS: Terms of Union ever envisaged that when we joined Canada we would pass out of our hands, into someone else's hands, the actual raison d'etre of this Province from the time it was discovered. This I think is quite inexplicable.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have much time left really. I would like to just say a few words about Gull Island. In my view the main interest of our Province in terms of Gull Island is to maintain control of the equity part of the financing. I think that our ownership should not be surrendered in any way by loss of significant amounts of equity. I think that we may sell any amount of non-equity holding in the enterprise but we certainly should not surrender the common shares, the common stock, the equity aspect. We have every right to look for appropriate grants from the federal authorities for this venture and it seems to me that these fall into two main categories, there is the category of grants that is due to any area which is developing a resource of national implications. And I would point to the hydro carbon and oil developments in Alberta in the early days. This attracted considerable federal support. The Syncrude development attracting massive federal support. Atomic power has been underpinned by enormous amounts of federal funding and so on. So that we have every right, because we are developing a national project, a project of national significance, we have every right to look for grants in equivalent amounts.

Now the second type of grant I think that we have every right to look for is a special one. That is that we are cut off from selling our natural resource in this particular field, that is hydro electrical generation, we are cut off by the make-up of the Canadian Constitution from selling that to good advantage. We are being forced to sell it at shall we say bargain prices to Quebec. And this could be taken issue with by the federal government. If the federal government took issue with this we would get much more benefit from the sale of any power that we felt was

DR. COLLINS:

surplus to the Gull Island.

Now if the federal government does not wish to take this stand I think that we have every right to demand that they pay for it. And I mean that literally, that if we are forced to sell power at the Quebec border at rates less than the ones that we would get if we could transmit the power, constitutionally down to the New England States and into Ontario, in that case the federal government should make up the difference in the benefits to this Province.

I understand my time has run out. I have other remarks to make but perhaps I will have an opportunity at another time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Bellevue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear,hear!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to have a few words to say on the Throne Speech debate. When I ended up the other day I was on the Budget Speech debate. I was talking about my district. I did not get very far. I started in Markland and mentioned I was forty-three years old, and then I came out to Whitbourne, passed the Boys' Home there and the Markland Hospital and I crossed along by the stadium there at Whitbourne, which I could spend an hour on but that is unnecessary. It is one of the most financially stable concerns in this Province as far as stadia is concerned.

The member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) last night talked about people jumping on the band wagon over in Conception Bay regarding stadia, or stadiums, and when the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) mentioned that if they do not want them in Conception Bay then bring one up our way, up my way, the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) I think made a rather bad remark when he said, "Where is that in Scotland?" I do not know if this is

June 13, 1978

Tape No. 4354

NM - 3

MR. CALLAN: how the member for Harbour Grace  
(Mr. Young) talks to the hon. gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey)  
because -

MR. NEARY: That is the crowd that does not  
get personal you know, no personalities.

MR. CALLAN: - because that gentleman has an accent  
and I enjoy his accent as I enjoy the accent that this gentleman has  
here. I think -

MR. NEARY: How about my hon. friend the Irish man?  
I enjoy his accent. I think it is great. I love it.

MR. CALLAN: That is right. That is right.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I went down as far as Dildo and I talked about the four or five fish plants there, a thriving community, South Dildo, Dildo and Old Shop. Even some fishermen there from Blaketown. Of course as everybody knows there were one or two people in Blaketown who are actively involved in a much more money making concern but that is all in the past now.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can go down to the area of the district where I live, as you go out the TCH there and come down to Chapel Arm, Norman's Cove and Long Cove are there together. Mr. Speaker, I find it a little bit difficult to get up and be excited about what this government is doing in my district because as I said on other occasions, the only thing that is happening there, it is nice to hear the member for Bonavista North get up and talk about some of the things that are happening in his district and I would love to be able to get up and say the same thing about mine but the unfortunate thing is, Mr. Speaker, I cannot.

MR. MORGAN: For not doing his job.

MR. NEARY: The member for -

MR. CALLAN: That is right. That is probably it.

MR. MORGAN: He is not doing his job as a member.

MR. CALLAN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: He will do it the next time round.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, there is a lovely new wharf being built there at Chapel Arm. I think this is the second phase now of a Canada Works project that is providing a combination breakwater wharf, the first time that they have ever had anything there. Not only does it provide a rather safe harbour for some of the boats there but at the same time it keeps the highway for washing away where the highway crosses the beach there at Chapel Arm.

Mr. Speaker, in Norman's Cove - Long Cove, the Rural District Council, the municipality of Norman's Cove - Long Cove, where I live, we have been looking for water and sewer there since



MR. CALLAN: 1971 I think it was incorporated, and back in 1975, in the Spring's budget or when the estimates went through in '75 in the Spring, money was allocated for water and sewer for that municipality. And then in October I think of that same year, a couple of weeks following the election it was withdrawn again. Where it went I do not know, Mr. Speaker, but I have heard some -

MR. NEARY: Bonavista North probably.

MR. CALLAN: - rather strange stories and I found out this morning that nothing in the way of water and sewer again this year.

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. CALLAN: Nothing again this year.

MR. NEARY: They do not know the feeling of a toilet flushing in that area.

MR. CALLAN: It is terrible, Mr. Speaker, the way that people have to fight and end up getting nothing. I do not know what they are being punished for. They are hard working people. They are decent people, primary producers. Some of them work at Long Harbour. Many of them are fishermen, you know carpenters who work here in St. John's.

MR. LUSH: Really industrious people.

MR. CALLAN: Some work with the CNT. You know they are all, for the most part, hard working people and why they are being punished is something that I do not know.

MR. WOODROW: There is a lot to be done under Term 29 though -

MR. NEARY: They will not be punished much longer, I will tell you. After the people get to the polls they will not be punished much longer after that.

MR. RIDEOUT: Let the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) tell you.

MR. WOODROW: Sure I am telling you.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure he did it, you were not here.

MR. NEARY:

Did what?

MR. WOODROW:

I was trying to tell him why we should convince Ottawa to get more money.

MR. CALLAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can move on through my district.

CAPTAIN WINSOR:

It was Mr. Diefendbaker who put the limit on -

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, if I move on over to Thornlea, again the people are hard working there. They have not asked for much actually. They have pavement through the community. There are a couple of gaps. There is a gap there between Long Cove and, I would say there is about a three mile gap there, a dirt road in between the two communities, Long Cove and Thornlea, and then there is another gap between Bellevue and up towards the Trans Canada. Why the gaps were left there I do not know but - Well I do know I suppose. Actually the former member for that particular part of the district which was then called Trinity South, the member came over in a public meeting in Bellevue and said, "I have \$400,000 for you for road work, where do you want the money spent?" Now we discovered of course that he did not have \$400,000 at all. That was actually the taxpayers' money that he was talking about. If he had \$400,000 and then the government had \$400,000 then that would have done the job completely. But as it happened that member was talking about what the government had allocated for it.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, because that is not the first time that that former member got up in a meeting and talked about what he had. I remember him coming to a meeting at Whitbourne when we were trying to build the stadium that I mentioned just now and

MR. CALLAN: He told us he had \$500 cheque in his pocket, a donation towards a proposed stadium, and he went back with that cheque in his pocket and we never heard tell of it since, of course.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, if I can move on

AN HON. MEMBER: ... owner over there, a fellow

MR. CALLAN: Bellevue, yes. Bellevue they are fortunate this year, as Chapel Arm is fortunate this Spring to have a Young Canada Works where they are providing sports facilities for the young people who live in these communities, ball fields and so on.

Chance Cove, Mr. Speaker, is a big fishing community, a fish plant of private concern, a fellow from Normans Cove is building a fish plant there now at considerable expense, and I believe with some help from Rural Development, I am not sure about that, but I would imagine so. Again, of course, 75-25, I think, it is the way it is broken down in federal money out of Rural Development. So, Mr. Speaker, Chance Cove is a thriving community. They have an excellent water system. No thanks to this government, although they applied through Canada Works and they hooked up several artesian well and practically every home in that community has an adequate water supply.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go way!

MR. CALLAN: The same thing happened down in Goobies as I mentioned last Fall, they did it through a \$71,000 Canada Works grant. And North Harbour the same thing happened, Garden Cove, and many communities in the district of Bellevue who gave up expecting help from the Provincial Government, and perhaps for a good reason, and I am not, you know, perhaps the government cannot afford to do all of the things, and I go along with some of the people on the government side of the House who say, that people expect perhaps too many handouts from the government, and I agree with that. You know, I have seen people one or two families who nearly nag you to death trying to get an artesian at the same time they can go and buy a \$5,000 or a \$6,000 car, but they cannot afford to go and hire, you know, some people do,

This page is missing from the original copy.

Mr. Callan: the government side of the House who is just as frustrated, just as broke, and everything else as I am, and I said that I would mention it, and he thought it was a good idea, and perhaps if more of us talked about it, and if more of us were suffering perhaps, you know, it is pretty easy for the member for St. John's South (Dr. J. Collins) to get up and say, you know, we need ten members in St. John's and, you know, we do not need full-time members and all that sort of thing. It is pretty easy for the doctors and the lawyers and the big business people to get up and say that, you know, they are earning their \$50,000 or \$60,000 in salary outside of this House of Assembly -

MR. NEARY: He has to do that to keep in touch with reality.

MR. CALLAN: And I was a little bit disappointed.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit disappointed in a number of people on the government side of the House. I am a little disappointed in the member for St. John's South (Dr. J. Collins); I am a little bit disappointed in the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), you know, how that man can sit over there knowing that he does not serve nearly the time that he should in this House; and how the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) can come here periodically and stand up and make speeches and then get the press that he is looking for and so on and then disappear after perhaps earning \$1,000 or so that day, it is a little bit disillusioning, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: No, men who resign from the Cabinet or who perhaps refuse to accept a Cabinet position because it would interfere with the money that they would hope and knew they would earn in their practices, whatever that might have been.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) last night talked in glowing terms, in philosophical terms and so on. But does the member not realize that Newfoundland is not that large a Province and people are no longer stupid.

The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) the other night talked about  $737-3800$  and  $\pi r^2$ . Well, I am sure we have all heard the story about  $\pi r^2$  - you know, the student who came home from university and his poor father had worked hard to raise the money to send him to university and he was glad to do so. And the young fellow came home in the Spring, and the next morning he was eating breakfast with his father at the breakfast table and his books were there on the table, and his father said to him, 'Young man,

MR. CALLAN: I have spent a couple of thousand dollars on you; you have gone to university for a year and I am proud to do it, I have sacrificed to do it' - that was at the time, of course, when probably most of the people in a household were pretty illiterate, they had to get somebody else to fill out an income tax return for them and even an unemployment insurance form and what have you - and he said, 'Okay, my son, what have you been learning?' And he picked up one of the books that happened to be a math book, and he looked in the book and he saw this symbol, and he said to his son, 'What is that there? What are you learning in there? I have spent a couple of thousand dollars on you. Is it doing you any good? I hope it is. What is this here?' And the son said to him, 'That is  $\pi r^2$ .' And his father got a little bit angry and said, 'I have spent \$2,000, I have sent you to St. John's for a year, and now you come home and tell me pie are squared. Pie are not squared, cake are squared. Pie are round.' Well, Mr. Speaker, that day is gone, I believe. You know, the people in this Province are not illiterates any longer. The people of this Province know why the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) took the stand that he took.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, everybody knows why the member for Grand Falls really resigned. The man resigned for three reasons - and I do not want to dwell on this, but I mean, to hear the man get up last night and rattle off the philosophical nonsense that he rattled off and chastising us over here for wasting the time of the House and all that, you know, it was a little bit sickening, when here was a man who was in a Cabinet and got out.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why? Why?

MR. CALLAN: He got out for three reasons.

Well, number one, of course - and perhaps they all revolve

June 13, 1978

Tape 4357 (Night)

EC - 3

MR. CALLAN:                    around the same reason - he got out because he sees himself as Premier of this Province, a P.C. Premier some day, and so he resigned for one reason, he knew, of course, that as long as he was associated with the Premier and the moose and the partridge and so on that the people will remember this, so he had to disassociate himself from the Premier or any connections with him so that they would see him as the shining light, the man who went off



MR. CALLAN: on his own because he did not want to be - he was not a part even though some people may have thought he was a part of the moose hunting and partridge hunting expedition.

MR. NEARY: He has no pilot to take him there now since Pearcey resigned.

MR. CALLAN: And, Mr. Speaker, it was pretty easy for the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) to resign from the Cabinet and blame everything on the Premier and say the Premier has broken his promise to the people in Central Newfoundland. It was very easy for him to do that and I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, you know I think we all recognize the Premier as being not a petty man. He is not a petty man, he has never been a petty man and he is not usually a nasty man and we all admire him for that.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is changing lately though.

MR. CALLAN: Well that is true. He is changing lately and perhaps the man has good reason. When his own flock starts to turn on him you know this gives him a good reason for being nasty.

MR. PECKFORD: Make a new administration. It is a wonder there are busaries in 1979 dealing with the Bank of Canada.

MR. CALLAN: Well actually he did not want any part of the blame for that moose hunting, partridge hunting trip. He wanted to disassociate himself from that.

MR. SIMMONS: What (inaudible)

MR. CALLAN: And of course the other thing was that he did not want to take the blame even though he knew he was there. When the Premier made the promise that something would be done in year's budget.

MR. NEARY: took the blame for Pearcey.

MR. CALLAN: He was there. The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) was there and he should have accepted the blame or showed the responsibility. And of course the other reason, Mr. Speaker, is because he had served for more than two years, nearly two

MR. CALLAN: and one half years as Minister of Industrial Development and Minister of Rural Development, a dual portfolio and he saw nothing happening in Rural Development and of course what did he see in the portfolio of Industrial Development? All he saw was industries - rather than starting up he saw industries closing down, and so he said now if the people judge me on my performance as a Cabinet Minister, they know what kind of a man I am in Opposition. When I was in Ottawa I shone in Opposition criticizing and fuddle-duddling and so on but as a Cabinet Minister I am a disappointment but I will resign now, a year or six months or two years before the leadership so that the people will have forgotten all that and then that will give me another little edge when I start philosophizing and travelling around this Province after the PC leadership whenever that may come.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) must realize that we are living in a global village and he cannot have a helicopter come down to Upper Island Cove. It was only last week, Mr. Speaker, that I heard a gentleman who works out off Long Harbour at ERCO tell me a story that was told to him by somebody who lived in Upper Island Cove about how the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) - I think this took place about a year or so ago, was sitting down with his big knapsack and so on - where are you going and how are you going there? What are you waiting for? And by and by down comes a helicopter. And the fellow had a field of grass out there or hay or something and that was scattered all over God's creation when the helicopter landed in the garden. You know people who work at Long Harbour and cannot get an increase in salary and so on know those things and they remember them for a long, long time, They know what is happening.

If I may take another example, Mr. Speaker. Two weeks ago I think it was a young woman, a lady called me from Hodge's Cove telling me about a problem that her father had down in Southport and he wanted to see the member. Well I said "The House is open and I am in St. John's practically every night and I do not know

MR. CALLAN: when I can go down there." I did not tell the woman it was going to cost me ten dollars in gas. It was a bit inconvenient to take a four hour drive to see one gentleman. Anyway I said, "Okay, fine I will go down on Sunday afternoon" I will go out for a Sunday afternoon drive with the family and I will go down and see the man.

AN HON. MEMBER: The proper thing.

MR. CALLAN: The following night, Mr. Speaker - now what I could have done and perhaps what we are tempted to do sometimes is brush it off and hope that the problem will go away and that that gentleman will contact somebody else, perhaps the welfare officer or a lawyer or somebody and clue up his problem. Well anyway I did not I said I would be down on Sunday afternoon. The very next night, Mr. Speaker, I had another call from the gentleman's son who happened to

MR. CALLAN: live in Blaketown, and when I went down to Southport on Sunday afternoon to see the old gentleman I discovered in the House at the time that I went in there was his daughter and son-in-law from Arnold's Cove. So here was a family that had the tenacle so to speak reach to practically every part of my district and so you might think that you are doing something in one community and nobody knows anything about it in another, but here was a case where, as I said, you know something that I thought that an old gentleman in Southport would know about but nobody else, here I discovered that he had a daughter married in one community, a son married somewhere else, a daughter-in-law somewhere else, and Mr. Speaker, word gets around. Word gets around of what kind of act that people are trying to play or trying to put on. And the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) is putting on a fine act -

MR. NEARY: He should get the Oscar for best actor of the year.

MR. CALLAN: - coming out and saying publicly - he comes out and says publicly that presenting petitions in the House of Assembly is a waste of time. It is a waste of time, nothing is accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the man realizes what he is saying. I mean did the man just come out for the sake of making a press release to gain popularity? If he did then what he actually said was not only did the Premier and the members of this government, not only did they deceive you when they promised to do something with the hospital in Grand Falls, but they are deceiving you every day of the week when they pretend for one moment that when you go around a community and gather up 100, or 200 or 300 names on a petition for an improved road that there is nothing going to be done with it anyway. So why waste your time? This is what the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) actually said, "Do not bother to waste your time. In a democratic

MR. CALLAN: system sure you present a petition and you bring something to the attention of government, like the petition that was presented here this afternoon with 3,400 names on it.

MR. NEARY: Another one tomorrow with 2,000.

MR. CALLAN: And usually you get results, you know. Most governments listen. The government of Nova Scotia listened and one week before they were supposed to start their spray programme you know they got all the facts and in response to all the facts and a second study and a closer look at it and so on, and public opposition to it obviously, they decided that they were doing the wrong thing and so they listened. But not this government, Mr. Speaker. Or this is what the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) tells us. It is useless.

MR. NEARY: One of the most unpopular moves they ever made.

MR. CALLAN: "It is useless to present a petition," he says, "because all it will do is gather dust. You will not get any results anyway because the government has made up its mind that it is going to put pavement down in Bonavista South, or Trinity North or somewhere else. So why bother it?" Especially if you are living in a Liberal district why bother it? You will not get it anyway.

And, Mr. Speaker, I must say this, that I mentioned a couple of gentlemen that I am disappointed in. I must say I am also disappointed in the new Minister of T and C. He is known for his wit and his humour but Mr. Speaker, I think he got in over his head in this department. You would expect him to lose his wit and humour when he was Minister of Finance, you know with all the headaches that that should have brought, nearly \$3 billion in debt. But apparently not so. It was in this portfolio that the minister lost his humour and his wit. He never even had the common decency to send me a copy of a letter that he sent to various parts of my district telling them what his department

June 13, 1978

Tape No. 4359

NM - 3

MR. CALLAN: planned or did not plan to do this Summer.

MR. DOODY: Tried not to -

MR. CALLAN: Well they try it everywhere, you know. I do not know what they are trying to prove by doing these things. I do not know what they are trying to prove. I went down to the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing this morning to see you know, "Any water and sewer on the go?" "Naw, nothing." "Any announcements made yet?" "Well, the only announcements that have been made have been made by the PC members, they made them Friday. They were informed Friday what they were getting for their districts.

MR. HODDER: The Minister of Education announced about ten different projects.

MR. CALLAN: Right.

MR. NEARY: Yes, but he did not announce anything connected with Education though.

MR. HODDER: Water and sewer -

MR. NEARY: Playing a bit of politics.

MR. SIMMONS: He will need more than that.

MR. NEARY: He will need more than that to prop him up.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I mean these people over there who get up and speak from time to time offer us over here an awful lot of good advice.

AN HON. MEMBER: Everything for Deer Lake, Humber Valley.

MR. CALLAN: They tell us what we are doing wrong -

MR. NEARY: He will need more than that to save his scalp.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please!  
The Chair has difficulty in hearing the hon. member.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Callan: Various gentlemen stand up from the government side of the House and they give us all kinds of advice on what we are doing wrong, and if we are not careful we will not win the next election. What a crowd to give advice to us, Mr. Speaker. You know they realize that the people in this Province can see right through what they are doing themselves, the petty politics that they are playing.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. CALLAN: I do not know what this government, Mr. Speaker, I hate to mention this again, but I do not know what this government or somebody in the Department of T and C or Clarendville or wherever it might be, I do not know what they got against Adeytown. I do not know what they got against that poor little community. There is no unemployment there at all, Mr. Speaker, most of the people are retired citizens, most of them they live in fine homes.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) waiting to put the padlock on her.

MR. CALLAN: They live in fine homes, every second car down there is a big Chrysler and they do not have a decent road to drive on. When the calcium chloride, when the decision was made to spread that on the road I discovered in conversations with Clarendville, and Mr. George down here that Adeytown was not included. Obviously they are not going to get any pavement this year, they did not get it last year, no, no, no pavement, definitely not. What about a bit of calcium chloride? No it was not included. I do not know what somebody has against that community. I do not know. I do not know.

You see, this petty stuff, it just does not end with Adeytown. You know, it does not end there. It does not end at Clarendville or Hickman's Harbour. These things do not end there. The word gets around and people get pretty disgruntle. I talked to a gentleman this afternoon from down in Southwest Arm and I asked him, "Did you get the calcium chloride down that way yet?" "Well they are gone down passed little Heart's Ease, but we do not have it yet." Well I said, "I suppose you will get it. That is the least you can expect a bit of calcium chloride". He told me, "That

Mr. Callan: a lot of people in this Province do not want they sent in petitions of phone in and told their member, we do not want it, it is rusting our cars. "At least, I said, you will get that." "Well, he said". "You did not get any pavement again this year." He said, "No." "Well I suppose we will get it some time," he said, "Because there is nothing else left to paye is there? Everything else in this Province is paved."

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) corrupt government.

MR. CALLAN: It is terrible, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: The only party of the British Empire where you have the same man the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance. The first time it ever happened in the British Empire.

MR. FLIGHT: And House Leader.

MR. NEARY: And House Leader. He cannot even do one job.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, as I said, it is pretty disheartening and pretty disgruntling.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) their own districts.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: There is only one part of Newfoundland, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: Yes, I would love to be able to get up here and talk the way the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) talked today. I would love to be able to do it.

AN HON. MEMBER: But that was all -

MR. CALLAN: But in all sincerity, if somebody would tell me -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) all the DREE money he has talked about.

MR. CALLAN: - I have a mile and a half of reconstruction now, not I have, the people down in Southwest Arm were told a while ago and I discovered in a telephone conversation, again the minister did not have the decency to send me a copy of the letter -

MR. NEARY: What minister?



MR. CALLAN: T and C. The Minister of T and C who did not bother to send me a copy of a letter.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, yes I did.

MR. CALLAN: So I found out through a phone call that tenders will be called for a mile and a half which will complete the reconstruction down to Southport. That is the road work in the district of Bellevue for this fiscal year.

MR. FLIGHT: Not an inch in Buchans.

MR. CALLAN: Not an inch of pavement, not one inch.

MR. FLIGHT: Not an inch in Windsor-Buchans.

MR. CALLAN: Not an inch of pavement. Not one inch. A mile and a half of reconstruction. Not one water and sewer project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: Reconstruction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: Pavement. Reconstruction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: The former Minister of T and C promised us that last year -

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

MR. CALLAN: The Minister of T and C now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. CALLAN: Reconstruction that is the only bit of road work that is being done this year is the reconstruction of the last mile and a half down to Southport. That is all that is happening in the district of Bellevue I am telling you. That is all that is happening. That is what I am talking about. That is what his happening.

MR. NEARY: Uncle Ottawa is looking -

MR. CALLAN: Now the paving equipment is obviously going to be in the area. It has to be to pave out on Random Island.

AN HON. MEMBER: There you are.

MR. NEARY: Why should it not be done?

MR. CALLAN: Even the highways crew, Mr. Speaker, all I can do is speak after the people who lives down in Hillview and those places. They tell me that the regular highways crew was not even on their road last year, where was it? It was down on Random Island where it had no business to be.

MR. NEARY: Oh yes they take this -

MR. CALLAN: Well what are they doing on Random Island, down in the district of Trinity North? They were down there getting ready for paving, you know, even the highways crew who were suppose to be stationed, and maintaining and keeping up that road was not there.

AN HON. MEMBER: I think it -

MR. CALLAN: You know people who live down there told me that and I checked on it and found out, yes that is what is happening.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is very funny.

MR. CALLAN: And the civil servant says, Well boy we cannot help it. We have to go where we are sent.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. CALLAN: We know that the road down there needs to be graded up. We know that it needs to be ballasted up and graded up, but we have to go where we are sent, and that is why my crew is down on Random Island. And I have heard some other suggestions, Mr. Speaker, that I would not bother to mention here or anywhere else. I have already mentioned how water and sewer was approved for Sunnyside a few years ago, and then the next morning before a telegram could be sent out that water and sewer was removed, or the money that was allocated for it, and was put somewhere else. I already told that story.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the salaries that we are getting for all of this rigmarole that we have to go through in here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: Well, perhaps the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) is not interested or perhaps he is interested. Perhaps he is anxious to know. I have said this, too, to members before. I mean, is it fair?

MR. FLIGHT: Of course it is not fair.

MR. CALLAN: Is it fair when I - well, the minister is getting a minister's salary, he is getting \$14,275, is it, extra?

MR. FLIGHT: Plus.

MR. CALLAN: Well, I can tell you very quickly, because they are all alike, right?

I was looking through this book the other day. What tremendous salaries!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: Now \$14,245 -

AN HON. MEMBER: For Cabinet.

MR. CALLAN: - \$14,245 is the Cabinet minister's -

MR. MURPHY: That is the Cabinet minister's salary.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, that is right.

MR. FLIGHT: That is what the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) lost, was it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: What was the member - \$17,-  
(inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: Well, I do not know what it is.  
Well, I mean, we are getting a little bit -

MR. FLIGHT: Three thousand dollars for his car.

MR. CALLAN: I was out in my district the other night attending an adult education graduation and the fellow who was there presenting diplomas to the adults was very proud of the fact that he was earning more than the Minister of Education. Imagine, feeling proud of the fact that he was earning more! Well, if the Minister of Education is poor, imagine how poor we are and some of the people over there!

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a suggestion. Why cannot we in this House get together long enough - not for this purpose only, I mean, I think we should get together a lot more often for a lot more other things, you know, I agree with that, the committee system. I think we should have a lot more committees on the go, and this is another reason why I am a little bit disappointed in the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) - you know, chairman of the committee for two and one-half years and has not called it together yet! Perhaps it would not have changed the Standing Orders of the House, perhaps it would not have improved the rules. If nothing else, it would have given us an opportunity to get together, Liberals and P.C.s get to know each other better and perhaps get a few dollars out of it, you know -

AN HON. MEMBER: A bottle of wine.

MR. CALLAN: - whatever you get for being on a committee.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: Well, okay, there should be something.

MR. MURPHY: Public Accounts only (inaudible)

MR. CALLAN: The Premier knows there should be something and the Premier is in favour of committees. Why has he not set them up? I do not know.

MR. FLIGHT: You forgot the minister's car and the helicopters.

MR. NEARY: They should get 10 per cent out of every dollar they could save.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: We would make something!

MR. CALLAN: Why can we not get together, Mr. Speaker? I know the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) will not get together. If there is an increase granted in salary he will donate his to the Canadian Cancer Society or the Red Cross or something. Well, that is fine, let him go ahead and do it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: I mean, if anybody on either side of this House is afraid to increase our salaries to a decent, acceptable wage, if they are afraid because of what the media is going to say, what the people out there think - I mean, they cannot think any worse of us anyway; they cannot have a lower opinion of this House of Assembly. And the media, if they do carry it for two or three days, so what? They did the same thing last Fall, accused the Premier and accused all of us of coming in here for fifteen minutes in November to close up the House, 'and the only reason that they came in there' - it was in the media and I heard it through four or five - it was in the papers, it was on the Open Lines and everywhere - 'The reason that they are going in there is to get some money.'

MR. CALLAN: And we did not get a copper, not one copper!

PREMIER MOORES: By leave. We can keep going on this thing for a long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: Well, I do not particularly want to earn extra money by standing up here and talking about it. I think I deserve it anyway, as dozens of members deserve it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He gave up a job paying more.

MR. MURPHY: No one disagrees with it.

MR. CALLAN: Well, what is the trouble? Why can we not get together if no one disagrees?

MR. FLIGHT: There is the man!

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: Well, let me ask the member for St. John's North (Mr. W. Carter), would he go along with an increase in salary, or if not go along would he keep his mouth shut while the rest of us get a decent wage? You know, would he (inaudible)? Would he turn his back?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: It is debatable if he would go along with it. (Inaudible) go along with it to keep his mouth shut.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) full time members (inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: Well, that is something else. I mean, there is no trouble to kill this argument. If we

MR. CALLAN: want to go to the press and say,  
'Well obviously the reason this man turned his back or donated -

MR. MURPHY: I believe this is one time if you  
asked to adjourn the House for the birds in this debate you are  
liable to get it.

MR. CALLAN: Well you know perhaps that is not what we  
need.

MR. NEARY: Myself and the House Leader had a  
consultation.

MR. CALLAN: Perhaps that is not what we need.  
If we could prorogue this House now, next week sometime, and then  
open her up again in the Fall with a new session and we would get  
some money that way. But you know there must be a couple of ways  
to do it. And I am not asking, Mr. Speaker, that I be given  
the poor taxpayers' money that I do not - All I am asking for at  
least a salary on a par with what I was getting, so that I do not  
have to say to somebody, "No, Sir, I cannot come down and see you  
today down in Swift Current or North Harbour because it is going  
to cost me \$10 in gas and I have not got \$10 to buy fish and brewis,"  
you know.

MR. MORGAN: You should see Charlie Brett.

MR. CALLAN: All we are asking for I believe is  
a little bit -

MR. NEARY: Let him go on, Mr. Speaker. Let him  
go on. By leave.

MR. CALLAN: Is my time up, Mr. Speaker?

MR. NEARY: No, keep on going.

MR. CALLAN: I wish it was. It is awfully warm here.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is  
any need to dwell on this topic. I mean everybody in this House,  
except the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) knows what  
I am talking about. So let us get together on it.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

MR. CALLAN: Yes, sure, any interjection would be welcome.

MR. HICKMAN: There was a suggestion made I think, I know it was made in another provincial legislature, and my recollection is it was made by Mr. - I do not want the hon. member to read anything into this, but the last speech that Mr. Clyde Wells made in this House, it was along exactly the same lines of that now being enunciated by the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan).

MR. CALLAN: Great minds think alike.

MR. HICKMAN: But there was a suggestion that to avoid the embarrassment of legislators having to periodically vote themselves an increase in salary that the salary should be tied into some other salary that is set by some other body and the suggestion was that -

MR. CALLAN: Is that a dead body?

MR. HICKMAN: And the suggestion was that the MHAs salary should be tied into a district court judge's, and that a Cabinet Minister should be tied into a supreme court judge. Now the only risk you are running is that if Parliament never increases the salaries you are helpless to do anything about it. But for instance the Nolan Bill on -

MR. FLIGHT:

MR. HICKMAN: I use that as an example. That was a suggestion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is this a question or an excuse.

MR. HICKMAN: I am just asking the question. I would like to hear the hon. gentleman articulate his views because we have an example in this House. The bill that came in here in 1970 I think when the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) was on the government benches, the Ombudsman Bill tied the salary into that of the Chief Provincial Magistrate, the Ombudsman, so that again you do not have that embarrassing situation of getting into -



June 13, 1973

Tape No. 4362

NM - 3

MR. FLIGHT:

Are we going to get our six per cent this year?

MR. HICKMAN:

In any event I would certainly -

MR. CALLAN:

Actually what we are getting, we are getting paid six months of the year. We will get paid now next week, or whenever it is, we will get the last bit of money. We will not get anything else until the 2nd. of January. Some people say the 1st. but it is not the 1st. because there are too many hangovers after the New Year's Eve ball. It is the 2nd. of January.

MR. HICKMAN:

That is right and you endorse it right straight over to the bank manager.

MR. CALLAN:

So it is over six months, more than six months between payments.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is so small that is the only way to -

MR. MURPHY:

Well we were talking about doing it by the month but it did not work out.

MR. CALLAN:

Well even then you know -

MR. MURPHY:

You would not get any more but at least you would be -

MR. CALLAN:

No. That is right. Well anyway I mean I think in those few remarks that I made on that, I mean I am sure that we can get together. When are we going to do it?

MR. DOODY:

There are fifty-one bank managers praying for this House to close.

MR. CALLAN:

Are we going to talk about it. I mean I do not want to talk about it.

MR. MURPHY:

Would you call that a substantive motion?

PREMIER MOORES:

There is no one going to call a quorum, I will tell you that.

MR. CALLAN:

You see, Mr. Speaker, you know I could dwell on this for two or three hours if I wanted to. I mean the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) is not that bad off, he is getting at least \$3,000 more than I am, being Party Whip. The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) is getting - I do not know what he is getting, I do not know and I do not care but you know most of the people on the government side, most of them I would say are relatively happy. You know most of them are relatively happy. They are Cabinet Ministers or they are parliamentary assistants or something, or whip, or they are doctors or they are lawyers. You know the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins) I am sure is not worried about money, and he probably does not want to talk about it here. And the member for Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor) obviously I do not imagine he is too concerned. We know the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is not. But I can imagine, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Ferryland (Mr. C. Power) and one or two others. Now the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan I do not know and I do not really care. I mean the man had a good job and gave it up. But that was

MR. CALLAN: his own choice. If he wants to sacrifice for three or four years waiting for the leadership to come and look around for the Premier's job well that is his choice. Perhaps he is getting good donations to keep him alive while he is waiting for that. I do not know and do not really care. That is his own choice. But, Mr. Speaker, I was speaking to a graduation the other night out in my district and I was telling some of these grade eleven students -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I had a letter the other day - there were a bunch of students in the Gallery at that time, it was on May 18th, they were in the Gallery that night. Well what happened that night I do not know and I cannot find out because we do not have the Hansards for the night sittings. But anyway a few days after that I received a letter from one of the young men who were in the Gallery that night and the letter could have been addressed to any but since he was in my district he wrote it to me. He told me about the disgust that he had towards the House of Assembly as a result of what he watched for about one hour that night. But of course I have not answered the letter because I do not know what was happening that night but when I do answer it I will tell him that for him to judge the House of Assembly, coming in here for one hour out of thousands is like me who had never seen a hockey game before, turning on the television and seeing Jonathon and Bouchard and then switching off the television again and form an opinion about hockey in one minute of watching that particular aspect of it. We have our bad times and we have our good.

MR. NEARY: I am pretty sure -  
One of his rare appearances in this House.

MR. CALLAN: But, Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is this that people out there and students are among them, Mr. Speaker, have a rather low and a rather poor opinion of this House of Assembly and what happens here and I believe that is one of the reasons for it. Let us face it we cannot help but take out our animosities and get on each other's nerves and so on and I cannot help growling at

MR. CALLAN: somebody over there when I know he is probably around and eating steaks and so on, sporting around in a big car and here I am broke all the time. I am a lot worse off than I was before I got into this racket.

MR. MURPHY: I think you are overdoing it.

MR. CALLAN: That is a fact.

Well anyway, Mr. Speaker, when I was addressing this bunch of students the other night I was telling them about the make-up of this House of Assembly and how the House of the Assembly, the complexion is changing. I told them that we do not have the people that we used to have. The day is gone when you had doctors and lawyers and businessmen marching in for their own benefit and using it as a part time job. Out of the fifty-one of us here now eighteen are former school teachers or into education in some form or another, eighteen of us. And I would say with very few exceptions most of that eighteen had to take a cut in salary. I lost a couple of thousand dollars a year and I know other members here who lost seven or eight. The Minister of Education is one of the fortunate ones, fortunate that he is probably getting just as good a salary. I do not know if he is or not. But he is not very fortunate in that he had to be a part of that budget which cut out 120 jobs and so on. He must have a thick skin for sure.

Mr. Speaker, my time will soon be up I believe. We talk about nothing been accomplished in this House of Assembly and the message that I am trying to get across and I put it across wherever I go, to whatever group I speak, and I want to say it once one - I said it the other day and I want to say it once more, I want to say it and perhaps if I say it often enough somebody will believe it, that a number of people that I run into, not very many but some people that I run into, I have to explain to them - they say things like, What are you doing in the House of Assembly? What is it all about? You got kicked out the other day or somebody challenged you to a fight and so on. What is it all about? And I tell them number one: you cannot

June 13, 1978

Tape No. 4363 (Night)

AH-3

MR. CALLAN: judge the House of Assembly by what you hear through the media with all due respect to the media. They are sensationalists, they have to be because this is what the people out there want to hear. And I tell them that ninety-eight per cent of what goes on in the House of Assembly is never reported and all you hear is the sensational stuff. So I set their minds at ease in that respect.

MR. MURPHY: Ank Murphy falls asleep.

MR. CALLAN: Right. Exactly.

MR. NEARY: It is not the fact that he falls asleep but he falls asleep with his mouth open.

MR. CALLAN: Morgan challenged Callan to a fight. This is the kind of stuff. This is the kind of nonsense. Thirteen MHAs to be kicked out. This is the kind of stuff that people hear. I tell you what I feel like doing when - but anyway, Mr. Speaker, I try to explain to people that you are getting a warped picture and the people

Mr. Callan: who for various reasons, political and otherwise, say, why you should be creating jobs in there. I tell them that the House of Assembly is two things. There are a number of things it is not, and one of the things it is not, is the place where jobs are created. That is the government's job twelve months of the year. They have the mandate, if they fail on that mandate then they should throw in the towel, face cloth, soap and the works, and go to the people, and say, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: But anyway that is one thing that it is not a place where jobs are created. It is two things, it is a debating forum, and, of course, it is a place where bills are passed, budgets are passed and so on, so that civil servants can get their salaries and we can get the little bit that we are getting and so on. And the other thing, of course, the other thing that it is is this, it is the highest court in the land, and we as an Opposition, we on this side of this courtroom are duty bound to dig out scandal, if it exist, if we do not dig it out or if we know that it is there and do not talk about it, and do not bring it out in the public eye we are - what are we doing? We are going along, we are saying that what is happening, what the government is doing is okay. And so we on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, it is our job in this court, in this highest court in this land to try and to put on trial, the government on that side, we do it through Oral Questions, we do it through points of privilege, we do it in many other ways tabling things.

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

The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

MR. CALLAN: My time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for Mount Scio.

DR. R. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. R. WINSOR: First of all I would like to compliment the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) for an excellent speech, and certainly many of the points are supported by both sides of this House, and certainly we should have more debate on some of the things that he brought up.

After my speech the other day in the Budget debate I was left with a bunch of copious notes so I thought that tonight would be a chance to speak a little bit about my district and a short discourse on the Budget.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is hope for our Province, but we have to turn around its direction. We have to stimulate our people to be more self-sufficient, to be prouder, and also not to depend on handouts from Ottawa. This cannot be achieved without sacrifice on the part of our people. If the Opposition wants to spend more on social services, health care, abolish the school tax and so on they have to attack this Budget because once they realize the people of Newfoundland understand what is in this Budget and it is thoroughly explained to them, they will behind this government. The Opposition should put their greed for political powers aside and put the interest of this Province first in these difficult times.

The Editor of The Daily News has scorned our Budget by criticizing the fact that we have only interested our spending on resource development by 3 per cent a year is forecast over the next five years. But even, Mr. Speaker, with that amount that we have to stabilize our social services, and even by stabilizing them the cost will continue to rise as normal expenses will continue to rise.

We believe in a free society, Mr. Speaker, where individual initiative can be fulfilled and where free enterprise can prosper. We have the resources and with proper incentive by government to create the right environment for investment and development. Our people will respond and this will be one of the better places in North America in which to live.

The Opposition has scoffed at our target of reducing the unemployment level from 18 per cent Canadian Statistics

June 13, 1978

Tape 4364 (Night)

PK - 3

DR. R. WINSOR: to 10 per cent while also absorbing 31,000 new people into our labour force. I heard an excellent editorial today on Q Radio which explained from the point of view of the type of education that the young people received in the 1960s in the direction of education. And we are getting the fruits of this today where the fact that people are not prepared to earn a living in specific fields, in other words



DR. R. WINSOR: they have an education, but not sort of focused in an area where they can earn a livelihood and contribute to society. And there is a strong feeling now that education has to get back to the basics so that the individual can be fulfilled in the stimulation given by education to support himself and his family.

The creation of 40,000 new jobs by 1982 will not be easy, but it has to be done and will be done by this government. It can only be done each year by continuing to place emphasis on the development of our God-given resources.

We have finally arrived at a time in our long history where the rest of the world needs and wants our protein which is in abundance off our shores, our forest products and our oil and gas potential. We can only, Mr. Speaker, have secure social benefits when we have the revenue from developing our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, a few words about my district. I am fortunate to have, I think, probably one of the most attractive sites for a park anywhere in Canada. I am referring, of course, to the Pippy Park. The development in that park is certainly - the original standard was taken from, I think, the Regina Park, from the Regina House of Assembly and that complex around it - Do you remember the name?

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) A point of order has arisen.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman is trying to make a speech here and the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is bending over the rail and disturbing the hon. member in a way that is annoying to me.

DR. R. WINSOR: That is alright, Mr. Speaker. I can ignore the member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please! In terms of that point of order, I do not think there is anything the Chair needs to say at this point in time.

The hon. member.

DR. R. WINSOR: We must maintain a high aesthetic standard in the development of the Pippy Park. And most of the projects planned and which are now started for there certainly are of an extremely high standard. The one that certainly is very dear to my heart is the park which was available for the use of disabled citizens.

I think this year too, Mr. Speaker, that possibly with proper advertisements in the city that we can get many more of our people to make use of the facilities of Pippy Park. And certainly I think once people are exposed to the beautiful surroundings there and all the facilities for the children and for themselves to enjoy that we will find it to be much more utilized by the citizens of St. John's.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about two communities in my district. On April 22nd we had elections for local government in St. Philips and Portugal Cove. We have elected two outstanding councils and I would certainly like to go on record of expressing my congratulations to the Mayor of St. Philips, Mr. William Tucker, and of Portugal Cove, Mrs. Carl Hibbs. Both these communities have a long historical tradition and they have a very proud, independent populace, and I am very proud to be associated with these people in developing their community and in trying to improve the lifestyle of their citizens.

Now one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before this House certainly in many years is Bill No. 50, Regional Government. The purpose of the bill is to establish a framework of regional

DR. R. WINSOR:

government in the Northeast Avalon region in order to provide such municipal services that are regional in nature and which can be most effectively provided by a central administration.

I must stress, Mr. Speaker, for the residents of Airport Heights and of Hogan's Pond and for other unincorporated parts of my district, that there would be no taxation of private residences until these residences - and this may be many years down the road for many of these areas - until they are provided with water and sewerage and other attending services such as street lighting and garbage collection.

There has been raised the matter of double taxation. There will be no double taxation in any of these communities surrounding St. John's. If the community decides that it needs service that this regional government can provide, they can



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

I will ask the Clerk to count the House, please!

I am informed a quorum is present.

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

DR. R. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A few remarks concerning the Public Accounts Committee. First of all, Mr. Speaker, this Committee certainly has a tradition in the British system of being an non-partisan Committee. We have finished our second year of operation with that Committee and, I think, it has been a very productive two years. And I certainly, I think, our report of this past year is an envy of many legislatures in Canada, and probably in the British system from what I have certainly seen.

I indicated the other evening the fact that the government backbenchers were not prepared to meet with the Public Accounts Committee while the House was in session, and I gave three reasons why we felt this way. And certainly to repeat them is the fact that the work of the government backbenchers, the fact that we are responsible for keeping a quorum in the House. The responsibilities of the Opposition backbenchers certainly from their attendance does not appear to be as onerous. We have many items of legislation which we as a caucus have been involved in, and the long hours of sittings as we have had since the estimates began, which have continued. We also have our district responsibilities. And of course, the other item I mentioned was the possibility or the great difficulty of the Hansard people to cope with the extended sittings of the House and to put the extra burden of meetings with the Public Accounts Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put on public record a letter I have written to Mr. Simmons and it was delivered to him yesterday afternoon.

Dear Mr. Simmons:

In reply to your letter of June 8, 1978 which was delivered to me at the opening of the House of Assembly Monday June 12 regarding a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee. It was agreed in Committee that meetings would be arranged by the

Dr. R. Winsor: subcommittee of the Vice-Chairman and Chairman. And as I have indicated to you that government members of the Committee would not be available for meetings until after the closing of the House of Assembly. This is as a result of the extended hours of the House of Assembly and the severe demands on members of the government caucus. I would also draw your attention to the difficulty of the Hansard Office in keeping up with their responsibility during those extended sessions.

I realize your concern as Chairman in starting our work for this year and thereby suggest June 28, Wednesday at 2:00 P.M. as I assume that the House of Assembly will have adjourned by that time.

Sincerely yours."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate further co-operation and certainly in our past experience over the last two years, I do not think anyone can indicate that the government members of the Public Accounts Committee have impeded the operation of the Committee itself. I think we have had two excellent years, and I fully hope that we would have this to be an excellent year.

I would also indicate to the Chairman that the government members certainly would not only be prepared to meet on the 28th. of June, but to have regular meetings every two weeks through the Summer and Fall as long as necessary until we have fully coped with the public accounts.

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

MR. SPEAKER (DR. J. COLLINS): A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I gather from my colleagues that the member has read into the record a letter which he wrote me some days ago. If it is the same letter that I received from him, I did not hear him read the letter except the closing paragraph. If it is the same letter I should correct the matter for the record, an inaccuracy in the letter which needs to be corrected so as not to mislead anybody. The letter makes reference to a subcommittee, the Vice-Chairman, the member for Mount Scio (Dr. R. Winsor) and I are a subcommittee on agenda, we meet regularly with the Auditor General on that subject. The Committee

MR. SIMMONS: has no mandate as an ongoing thing on the matter of setting meetings. We have from time to time been asked to set meetings but normally the full Committee sets the meeting, Mr. Speaker, the full Committee normally sets the meeting the day of the next meeting and where that has not been done it has been left to the call of the Chair, and that is the situation in this particular case. I should also say that I have tried the last four months in talking with the member to get a meeting, he undertook to have one as soon as the estimates were over and then for some reason changed his mind and broke his commitment to me on that very point.

So the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, for the record, is that the point in the letter about how the meetings are determined is not accurate, it is not the case at all and since I got his letter I checked the transcripts of the Committee to make sure of where I stood. The meetings are normally set by the full Committee as the Vice-Chairman knows, and in some cases on an ad hoc basis have been set by the Chairman or Vice-Chairman, but in the last case was left to the call of the Chair and I believe that means what it says. But just for the record, we have tried, I have dealt with the member since January trying to get a meeting. He made an undertaking to me to have one as soon as the estimates were over. And now the story is as soon as the House is over. Well I have called a meeting for Thursday, Mr. Speaker, I have heard from one member of the Committee, so there are six others counting myself so we still have lots for a quorum.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes, on that point of order, Mr. Speaker. Most of what the hon. member opposite says on that point of order is correct. Generally meetings are agreed to by the Committee, we adjourn each meeting we agree when the next meeting will be. But I think it is general policy, or it has been the general policy at

MR. N. WINDSOR: least in the past two years of that Committee, that when we did not set a meeting we said we will leave it to the call of the Chair and in most cases it was explicitly said, "The Chairman and the Deputy Chairman would meet and would agree." And I would submit, Sir, that if perhaps and I accept the hon. gentleman's word when he says he checked the records of the minutes of the Public Accounts Committee and at the last meeting it was left to the call of the Chair. But I would suggest that our tradition has been in that Committee that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman would agree in that particular case on the date of a meeting and even if it was not explicitly stated then it was certainly the intent of a Committee that it would be on agreement between the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): I think that clearly is an interpretation or memory or recalling of events of matters within the Committee, actually matters that happened outside the House so I do not think that the Chair can rule in this matter other than to say that it is not a point of order that needs to interfere further with the hon. member's remarks.

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

DR. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Without getting into debate on that point, it may be an honest difference of opinion between the Chairman and myself but I certainly again believe it to be as the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) indicated, that the meetings were to be called with consultation between the other two.

MR. SIMMONS: The time I mean is when the Vice-Chairman refuses to meet, you see the problem I am in.

DR. WINSOR: Well we, I felt, had a legitimate reason and we are certainly willing to meet on the 28th. and we will meet every two weeks with that Committee until necessary that we have completed our work. Now if we get into a Fall session, which will be on legislation, I do not think that the



DR. WINSOR: members will be so busy as they have been over the last two or three months and certainly during that period too, we should be able to clue up the work on the Auditor General's Report.

But also I would think that this year, it certainly seems to be a much less formidable Auditor General's Report than what we had to cope with last year. And I would think, with meetings through this Summers, two meetings a month and with the meetings in the Fall we should certainly be able to cope with any work that we undertake.

I would certainly hope that we will be able to have a productive year. I have to reiterate again that we will not, and the government members will not be attending the meeting on Thursday. But we would -

MR. SIMMONS: You are speaking for all four members.

DR. WINSOR: I have talked to -

MR. SIMMONS: You did not make that clear in your letter. Because what you are saying is all four are going to boycott Thursday's meeting despite your undertaking to meet as soon as the estimates were over.

DR. WINSOR: I do not think I gave you a definite estimate. We certainly talked about having a meeting. But when we discussed it with the other members we agreed that we were just too busy. There was no ulterior motive and I stress that again. There was no ulterior motive and we are quite prepared to meet. And I would hope that you and I can get together -

MR. SIMMONS: Four months we have tried, for four months we have tried.

DR. WINSOR: And we have had very good reason in these four months not to -

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please! I have to point out to hon. members that remarks in the House should be directed to the Chair rather than back and forth between hon. members.

The hon. member.

DR. R. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible) you are boycotting the meetings.

DR. R. WINSOR: We are boycotting - I suppose you could use that word, Mr. Speaker - on Thursday, but we are offering the Chairman to meet on Wednesday the 28th of the month at 2:00 P.M. and a meeting every two weeks afterwards if this is agreeable to the Chairman, or we are quite flexible, you know, within reason.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one final point before I sit down. I would like to have a few remarks about acupuncture.

There has been a very active committee of citizens espousing the value of acupuncture. I, myself, was on an evaluation committee a few years ago and know a little about it, although I have never used it in my practice. But I fully believe that there is a great deal to acupuncture. I realize that last year a piece of legislation through this House legalized it as a medical act, but it is still not covered under Medicare, and I think this is what the committee on acupuncture are concerned about, getting this treatment covered, although their letter sort of indicated that there was a question whether it was a medical act. It is a medical act, but it is not covered under Medicare. My suggestion would be that this government follow the example of Nova Scotia and Ontario and set up an acupuncture clinic at the university. And I would hope that the Minister of Health would have a discussion with the people at the medical school. Because at this point

DR. R. WINSOR: we only have, I think, two medical practitioners practicing acupuncture.

Having a clinic at the medical school would give an opportunity for students at our medical school and also practicing doctors here in St. John's and throughout the Island to come in and partake of visiting clinicians. And also, I would like to see that the treatment given in this environment would be covered under Medicare at this point. There is quite a difference of opinion in medical circles across Canada as to the total benefits. I, myself, feel it is very beneficial in non-infected arthritis, in migraine headaches and some other disorders where I know from personal experience that I have seen miraculous cures. There are other instances where in treatment of disease and so on, in any bacterial infection, of course, it could be dangerous unless it is used in very, very skilled hands, and this is why, I think, we should follow the example of Dalhousie University and Toronto University who have federally funded acupuncture clinics in their medical and dental schools. And I think this should be investigated as an outlet here, first of all to provide acupuncture to the people who have benefitted from it or who may in the future need the services of an acupuncturist. After two or three or four years then if conditions being equal, we find that there are many people using it in their practice under proper conditions, then possibly we could make it broad coverage throughout the Province as these people go back to their private practice.

I have seen some good results with it. I know in my own case, I had a tennis elbow that bothered me for years and with one treatment in Toronto I have not had the slightest bit of trouble in the last three years. Now there are other people who have not had the same results. And there are certain types of arthritis for which it is not helpful. But I think it certainly warrants thorough

DR. R. WINSOR: investigation. And since we have a medical school here and I think there are federal funds available for this type of investigation, we should make use of it. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. McNEIL:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but be reminded when I take up this Throne Speech, this document, I cannot help but be reminded of a catalogue which is no more than a wish book and I think this document is no more than a little wish book. The catalogue has one up on this one, at least a catalogue can be put to some other use. This one cannot because it is not enough paper in it.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech itself is trying to give a very optimistic outlook on our forecast for the future. They are trying to encourage the people in some ways to invest in this Province, trying to put the best foot forward, and when the government themselves who write this document cannot do it themselves, they have not got the belief in their own document to move forward and give the example. When I say this I am speaking in terms of an industry like Labrador Linerboard which was closed by this government because they stated last year that it was a non-profitable operation, it was not viable, that it could not make money and that it had to close down. And, Mr. Speaker, the sum that was mentioned to close it down was stated by the Minister of Finance last year, that the total cost to the Province would be roughly \$27 million. Now today we know that that is not the true figure. From this year's budget, 1978, the figure is more in the area of \$40 million but, from what I understand, the truer figure would be closer to \$60 million. Now if I may quote the minister last year when he was speaking on the Linerboard operation, he stated, and I quote, "So to close the mill down would cost nearly \$27 million, to open it would cost \$55 million." Now I say, Sir, that it had already cost this government \$55 million and proof of the pudding, Sir, is when you look at this year's budget and you look down the Department of Finance and on the Labrador section they have already spent this year, 1978, \$34,500,000. Now that is not including other expenditures in different departments related to Labrador Linerboard. So, Mr. Speaker, to close the mill has cost this Province much more financially to this government, it has cost the Province and the people of this Province much more than was anticipated through human suffering, through people having to leave the area in which they thought they would be

MR. McNEIL: able to settle down once and for all. The people in that area, in the whole Bay St. George area when the American base was there never really considered settling down because they knew it was only a temporary place in which they lived in order to seek work. But when the mill came they had new hope.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the mill needed to have closed down. Maybe it needed to change hands and I think it could have been done without closing down the total operation, without throwing the whole community out of whack. And I think the Moore's PC government did a great injustice to the people of Newfoundland by closing the operation down when their own figures as stated last year, they stated themselves it would cost \$27 million to close and now we see in the budget that they have already spent \$34,500,000, that is already spent. From all indications that I have received to date the figure is over \$55 million. And I quote again to bring it to mind, "So to close the mill down would cost nearly \$27 million," to close it, to mothball it, To keep it open would cost \$55 million , to keep it

Mr. McNeil: open. We have already spent \$55 million, and it is closed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. MCNEIL: It is closed. And many people had to leave the area because they could not find any work. They had to sell their homes, their properties, which they had put their lifetime investment into, for a reduced price, take what they could get and go.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. MCNEIL: Out of this we saw one great programme come forward. We have seen the Moores P.C. Resettlement Programme, and there was resettlement, not within Newfoundland but outside of Newfoundland, outside of Canada altogether.

Mr. Speaker, the Moores Government should not be very proud of what they have done to Western Newfoundland in particular and to the whole of Newfoundland. They have made the people of this Province believe that that mill was ill-conceived - it was ill-conceived, it was put there by a quack, it could never operate, it could never make money. That is not true, Mr. Speaker. Over the past years I have had the opportunity to browse through many documents. And during the 1950s, the government of that day were looking for a place, a proper location to put that mill. And the emphasis in that day was in the Labrador area because of its wood. But at the end of the 1950s it was decided that it was not feasible because you had a problem with a short shipping season, you had a problem with the long growth cycle of its wood as compared to the Island. And it was stated then if you put your whole operations in Labrador, and if you want to look just at the shipping area alone you would have to build a warehouse - be it in Newfoundland, or be it some place close to your market - about one and a half miles long to store six months of the product before it could be economically feasible to market the product, and they said over a fifteen year period you would have to rely on the Western part of your Province for its wood.

So at the end of the 1950s they decided it was not feasible to put the whole, total mill operation in Labrador. But I do

Mr. McNeil: believe, Mr. Speaker, that they could probably have put in the chip mill in Labrador, and they could supply maybe the chip to all three mills, because you must remember that the Labrador wood is the best fibre of any type of wood to produce any type of product. And what type of product were we producing in the Stephenville mill? We were producing linerboard, a junk product when you look in terms of maybe newsprint because you can make linerboard out of pretty near anything. And when you talk to other industries across the nation you will understand that they do not use their best fibre, their best wood, they use the older stuff, they even go as far as using a huge amount of bark and rotten wood. And this is why I mention to the hon. Minister of Forestry that possibly a lot of this infested wood, to saw up the wood that maybe the newsprint mills in this Province could not use that the Linerboard mill could have picked it up and maybe got one or two years more life out of it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that this government made a grave mistake when they decided to close the mill down when we already see the amount of money that they projected last year to keep it operating has been spent in a shutdown condition. Tell me, where is the gain when you have the massive unemployment that we have in this Province? There is no gain, Sir, there is no gain whatsoever, except more and more human misery.

And one fault that I see that sticks out foremost in my mind with this government that it cares less about the ordinary individual.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MCNEIL: There is no human face to this government whatsoever.



MR. MCNEIL: No, Sir, no human face whatsoever. They are not willing to take the chance themselves as a government. They are not willing to push forward when they put it in nice phrases in the Throne Speech that the people are our greatest resource. They are not willing to put forward through example the belief that they have in this Province. And they expect the ordinary individual, the man with a family, the man who is just struggling, the backbone of our country, to come forward and govern this Province. Mr. Speaker, this Province today has come as far as it has not because of this government but in spite of the Moores PC Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, last year when the decision was made, or when the budget was brought down and the decision was made to close the Labrador linerboard, our Premier at that time had to deliver a very grave message to a certain area of our Province. But what did he do to deliver that message? How did he deliver it? Mr. Speaker, he got on the television, province-wide, and he told the people of Newfoundland that the Stephenville mill is too costly to operate and that the other parts of the Province will suffer some other social benefits because they are pumping money into a losing proposition. They did not tell the people the truth. They told the people that the mill was in the wrong location, it should have never went in Stephenville. Again misleading the people of this Province.

MR. SIMMONS: Shame!

MR. MCNEIL: And when you speak to people in very high positions in this city and today they still say that the mill was ill-conceived and it should have never went into Stephenville, it should have never went into Stephenville, I shake my head in amazement, I either say the man is quite ignorant or he is a bigot.

Mr. Speaker, when you look back at the

MR. MCNEIL: proposal to put the mill in Stephenville, it was in the best location that could be found in Newfoundland, and I am talking about the Island of Newfoundland and the Labrador section. It was the only location. But if you talk in terms of the mill not being put in Newfoundland but being put down in the Southern US States, close to the market area, well then it is a different question because you are near the market, you are near the cheaper wood.

But when you look at our market in Canada, the Canadian market, its design, and in Newfoundland a mill when it was designed, the market was Europe and Stephenville's location is excellent.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. MCNEIL: Do you know that we are a thousand miles closer to Europe, to the European market than the city of New York? From a market location we are in a good location, if we are marketing in Europe.

Just this week I had the opportunity to talk to some newsprint executives across Canada on the phone, and I asked them the question, Where is the Canadian newsprint market? Where is it in terms of the world? And they say, Mostly in Europe. The US are now taking care of themselves and they will eventually absorb a greater per cent of the Canadian market. So if we are looking at the mill in terms of the market, the location of the mill in Stephenville is a good location. It is an excellent location. And another advantage that that mill has is that it is near, or it is on a port. The port is ice free.

MR. LUSH: Ice free port.

MR. MCNEIL: Ice free port and on the edge of the port you have a runway which is second to none in Canada,

MR. MCNEIL: a large airport.

MR. H. COLLINS: Gander.

MR. MCNEIL: I am not saying anything about Gander. Gander has a fantastic airport and it gives a lovely service and if our community, our airport can help the area of Gander, we will. For example, we are one of the designated alternates to Gander.

MR. HODDER: But no seaport.

MR. MCNEIL: But Gander does not have a seaport, right! And when you are looking in terms of the paper market with a mill in that location, where you have all in one little area within a half mile, less than half a mile, within a quarter of a mile you have the airport which is second to none in Canada, you have a seaport, you have a mill that is in the centre of a forest - nobody can tell me that the mill is in the wrong location because it is not near a wood supply. A few roads can make quite a difference.

When the Minister of Transportation and Communications puts through the industrial access road that should come right down from the Trans-Canada Highway by-passing the Stephenville Linerbaord mill - only nine miles distance as compared to twenty-three, twenty-four going the St. George's direction and the White's Road area - that will cut down the distance greatly in road transportation. It would open up the whole Southern part of our Province, the Burgeo area, and the Central area where the wood must come from.

So when you look at the area from a transportation point of view, the Stephenville location is an ideal location but there is a little bit of work that has to be done in the road area. The Minister of Forestry has commissioned a study into transportation and I hope that when that study is

MR. MCNEIL: completed that they will, again, agree with this road. It has been put forward or proposed to this government for about ten years but it has been pushed aside by this government because they say that it is not a priority with DREE,

By the same token with that same road, they have a heavy equipment school operating under the Bay St. George Community College that has started the road. It is no expense to the government because they have to provide money for training. From Stephenville to Stephenville Crossing they have completed and done a good job - not completed it in a first-class condition - they have started the work but they cannot go any further without some blasting.

With that three mile section of road the provincial government could say to the federal government, "Look, we believe in this road, we have completed this section and we are asking you to complete the extra six miles that is needed." It would be showing leadership through action not through words.

But let me get back to the site, the location of Stephenville itself. When the American base closed down the government of the day decided that they had to do something for Stephenville and after ten or fifteen years, when they were looking for a place to put a mill, they looked in Labrador but ruled it out at the end of the 1950s. In the 1960s they looked in Newfoundland for different sites and they could never settle or agree on a site. But when the Americans closed out, the American base closed, the obvious site was opened up to them, and in one of the feasibility reports - I do not remember the name of the report right now - it reads: "Our break-

MR. MCNEIL: through came in our survey for a logical site with the phase out of the Harmon Air Force Base. It is the most logical choice." The site, in looking in terms of using the Labrador wood, and I think the concept of the third mill started with the Labrador wood, it is the best wood that you can find and we must find a way to use that wood and to add great quality to our paper products that leave this Island. It is a shame to see this government not approaching the two paper companies in this Island and asking them to top off their inventories with a proper percentage of this wood in order to give their final product a good quality so that it sells well on the market.

MR. McNEIL: And, Mr. Speaker, the Linerboard mill when it was producing produced a good product. It was excellent. They had a few snags here and there but with an operation starting from zero and moving the way it did you have to give it credit. And the local people, some of the people had just come out of high school and got into the operation and at the end of three and one half years when it closed down they were equal to any other paper workers in Canada. Talking with the former executive manager of the Linerboard operation, Mr. Jack Sweeney, he stated that he would place any of his workers, the young workers that he had working at Linerboard, he would place them against, any of his former employees that he had working with him, at another plant that had twelve and thirteen years experience. Mr. Speaker, that must say an awful lot for our Newfoundland young people. The ability is there, the drive is there, the willingness is there, the technical knowledge is there if it is shown to them they can do it, if the direction is there.

Mr. Speaker, if the Province or any company looking to start up another mill or build another mill in Newfoundland during that period if you look back in history a little bit, they would have to virtually build a new town. In Stephenville at that time you had actually in a sense people moving out, you had the Americans move out lock, stock and barrel, closing the door. The floors were completely waxed, everything was left in a first class condition, everything was there waiting for them. It was a gift to this Province and the government of the day had the foresight to see that they had something to work with and if they would have moved fast enough and moved without getting involved in the political arena as much as it did, today we would see maybe the whole Bay St. George area flourish to a great extent and probably be one of the driving areas in this Province where there is some hope. The potential was there then and it is still there today. The homes were there, the whole town was there, the people were there, you had fine schools, all the reasons to attract good quality people and that is probably the reason why we did attract good quality people. But this government fell down on its commitment, they got weak-kneed. I do not blame the total government, I think the

MR. McNEIL: decision was only in the hands of a few. And during the Linerboard debate last year I was amazed at the lack of knowledge of that operation by hon. ministers and by hon. members on the other side. I could not believe it. All they could talk about was that the mill was in the wrong location, that it was ill-conceived and that it was the fault of the former administration. They did not have any vision for the future, they could not see that the mill was sick and it needed help. If an hon. minister is sick, he goes to a doctor, he takes medicine and hopefully he recovers. But with this operation they had this illusion. They decided that they would send the patient, Labrador Linerboard, they would send that patient to the undertaker, and so they did. It went to the undertaker. And as a result we are seeing today and witnessing today thousands and thousands of people in that community having their lives thrown out of whack and having a disbelief in this Province. We are still believing that they themselves were the cause of the operation failing. Mr. Speaker, that I think is the sin of this government. They themselves are demoralizing, this Moore's PC government is demoralizing every Newfoundlander with its approach.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

June 13, 1978

Tape 4375 (Night)

EC - 1

MR. McNEIL: Now I understand that they had problems on the market place to raise the money. They were talking I think it was in the vicinity of - I am just taking the figure off the top of my head - about \$38 million or more. They had to raise this money. They said that their decision hinged around that amount of money. But rather than say to the people who are operating that plant, say to the people of Newfoundland, 'We have a problem here; we are not going to put any more of the taxpayers' money into this operation; we believe it can work; we might have to change the product line; we might have to add on to the mill into a different product and the mill was designed for additions - the mill was originally designed to be larger than it is - it was designed to take on newsprint.' - rather than go in that direction and say, 'We have belief in this plant that it can work and we need to raise this amount of money. We are willing to open up shares in this operation. We want to keep this operation going regardless because we think and we believe more so than anything else that it should not close and that it can contribute a great deal to our economy.' But no, Mr. Speaker, they did not move in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, maybe the decision to close was made by only a few, but if it was made only by a few, well then it must show what this government is made of. It shows that they are not fit to govern this Province because it lies in the hands of a few hard time members, hard time ministers, etc., etc., etc. - no commitment not only to the Province but to themselves and to their children. They have lost their vision, and when you lose vision you should get out. And I think the government



MR. McNEIL: last year when they had to make a decision, they did not have to make the decision to close it down. I think if it came to that point they should have resigned.

Mr. Speaker, I think that our own polls and the C.B.C. polls that were done just recently have told us a story or two. I hope that the hon. gentlemen on the other side have got the story very clearly. The people on the West Coast are just waiting for the opportunity to give this government a political holiday, they want to get them out of office. We have had enough of this Moores P.C. Government, do-nothing government. They believe in closure of the worst kind. Close her down! Shut her up! Move them out! Throw them out!

Now, Mr. Speaker, in less than a year we have the Throne Speech and just in a short period - the importance of time - this is what I mean by the importance of having hope and driving forward, a belief in where you are going. Just less than a year we have the Throne Speech and I will quote: "My Government will continue its efforts in 1978 to find a new buyer for Labrador Linerboard mill at Stephenville. My Government is optimistic that a firm arrangement can be made in 1978 and present information suggesting that the mill can be modified to produce bleach-craft, pulp or newsprint." Now, Mr. Speaker, remember it is less than a year, and when the government set up its Advisory Board to study all the

Mr. McNeil: aspects of the mill, what alternatives did it have at its disposal? This Advisory Board was set up by the government for a political way out or an answer to their problem? I am not sure yet. I would believe that all they done was to set them up as a political tool.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MCNEIL: They were a buffer zone to keep the people off their backs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MCNEIL: They knew that that mill was going to close, they were closing it. The decision was made, and they worked like trojans, Mr. Speaker, they worked like trojans to close it down. If they had tried this effort in trying to make it work, today I would have no doubt it would still be running. And maybe today, because of some factors which we could not control, with the decline of the Canadian dollar we would have probably seen that the mill would have at least broke even, and it was not expected to break even three years down the line.

Mr. Speaker, it was said the Advisory Board of that date stated that the government had no alternative but to close it down the Advisory Board recommended closure which is not true.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not true.

MR. MCNEIL: The Advisory Board stated that it was not feasible to run the mill under its present form, under its present conditions.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. MCNEIL: The Advisory Board put forward suggestions how they could bring their fixed cost down, and with an expenditure into the operation to improve the total operation, to put in, for example, some machinery whereby they could take the secondary product, like the newsprint, the clippings that they had coming in- I think it was John Crosbie had entered into a contract to bringing these clippings- and when he knew himself, he knew or at least he should have known that the mill at that time could only take a certain amount of these used clippings

Mr. McNeil: but he entered into a long term contract to take a larger number than the mill could consume. Why? Was he and other members of this government determined to keep that operation down?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure!

MR. MCNEIL: I cannot believe that, but the thought does cross my mind.

Mr. Speaker, just installing a piece of machinery so that it could use the bark of the wood could reduce its fuel consumption by a great degree. But no, the government decided not to do it. And it was recommended in study after study at the mill to do these renovations within the mill, to bring its high fixed cost down the line. And then when we had our market in a very soft condition, we built up our wood inventory to a great degree whereby it strangled the operation itself because you had no money to operate it. Why was all of this done? Was it done so that it could get in the position whereby it would be forced to close down, and then the government would just give it away to some concern? Again, Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe it because no government could be that callous to move in that direction. No government could be that stunned, naive to move in that direction and not to be chastised by the people for it. No government could do it! But still the Moores P.C. Government did it. Why? Why?

MR. S. NEARY: They did not know where Stephenville was.

MR. MCNEIL: Maybe the hon. member is right, maybe they did not know where Stephenville was; maybe they thought it was in a foreign country, over in Iran or some other place.

MR. NEARY: Well, their buddies know where it is now and they are out buying up the real estate out there.

MR. MCNEIL: There is a little story like that going around as well.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right. They have the inside dope.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. MCNEIL: The hon. member just reminded me of something.

MR. W. McNEIL: His government was responsible for closing down the mill and in return we got a gift. You know what they gave us? A jail. "Lock them all up," he said. "Those we cannot drive out we will lock them up."

AN HON. MEMBER: Sometimes you are lucky.

MR. W. McNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. minister - and I will accompany the hon. minister if we will try out one of the cells or rooms.

MR. NEARY: They will be trying them out soon enough.

MR. W. McNEIL: Mr. Speaker, when we talk about right now, the present time, it looks like the selling agent, which is Woods Gordon, which has been employed an awful long time with this government to consult on the mill, and surely they must be making an awful lot of money off this government. I tried on different occasions to get the figure that this government has spent on this firm, Woods Gordon, and it is not available. And what I am told is that the figure is so large that it takes a while to get it. And last year during that period when the mill was going down, the Premier made a statement to the effect that we are stepping up our sales effort to sell the mill. We are stepping up our efforts, but we could not get a buyer in place at that time.

But now today because the newsprint market is moving up, moving very strongly and I think it will remain, from the information that I am getting from the people in the paper industry, it will remain strong for maybe three or more years, that the mill now is viable to be converted to a newsprint mill, But only less than a year ago it was not, and remember, your Advisory Board suggested that it was not feasible because of the high costs of renovating the operation and that the markets were uncertain. But still in the U.S. today we know that there is new capacity coming on stream within the next three years of well over a million tons in the U.S. of newsprint. Now the

MR. W. McNEIL: question is will the U.S. growth eat up that increase in production. And if we convert to newsprint and destroy the linearboard line that we have now, in three years down the line when it is converted, will we find ourselves in a similiar situation to which we are now with the linearboard. I say, Sir, that this government should tread very carefully and that when they get a buyer to take up that operation it should be a reputable company, if it is going to be a private concern, it should be reputable and it should maintain a couple of product lines. If it is going to go to newsprint it can add on, it is better to add than to destroy everything that is inside that plant now and tear out the linearboard operation. It is better to keep your linearboard operation and add on the newsprint line or bleached craft or whatever the case may be. Because we do not know. Maybe in five years down the line linearboard will be very strong and we will get a good return from it.

MR. NEARY: And then they will wish their day back.

MR. W. McNEIL: As a matter of fact, in the U.S. this past week linearboard has hit a record high. It has hit a record high in that it is the strongest demand ever seen for linearboard this past week or two in the U.S. Now that has not been translated yet in terms of a good price return on the product but it is only a matter of time and it will. So we are seeing an industry that is very cyclical Newsprint goes up one day, next day it is down; linearboard goes up one day, the next day it is down. So if we are getting that operation going again and we are putting it in the hands of private enterprise, we should demand that they have a couple of different product lines that when one is up usually the other one is down. We should go back through the history of the products and try to

MR. McNEIL: juggle it so that when paper is up, usually you got your linearboard down or vice versa, whatever line it may be. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that this government has a commitment to that area and to the whole of Western Newfoundland and to the Province to make sure when that operation opens up again, and I firmly believe that it will, that it will work. Pardon?

MR. DOODY: We are doing everything possible.

MR. McNEIL: I am not hearing you.

MR. DOODY: We are doing everything we can.

MR. MCNEIL: I am pleased to hear the minister say that they are doing everything possible. It is about time they did everything possible, after all the hurt they have caused this Province. It is about time they are waking up.

MR. S. NEARY: It is time they resigned.

MR. MCNEIL: The best gift that the Moores PC Government can do for the Province of Newfoundland is to resign, call an election tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. R. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, just to elucidate a point of order that was raised by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and responded to by the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor), I would like to put it on the public record, these are minutes of the first Public Accounts meeting, November 22, 1976, and item 9, "It was agreed that the Committee could meet at the call of the Chairman in consultation with a majority of the Committee and forty-eight hours notice." And I think, Mr. Speaker, that would clarify the point of order that was made some time ago during my address.

MR. SPEAKER: As hon. members are aware, it is not a matter in which the Chair has any decision making requirement. Is the House ready for the question on the sub-amendment. Those in favour of the sub-amendment, "Aye"; contrary minded "Nay"; in my opinion the Nays have it.

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. NEARY: Eagle River, Look, we have a Speaker to enforce the rules of the House, not the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy).

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Why do you not go up and give him a belt in the gob?

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, every time I get on my feet there seems to be dissension in the ranks opposite.

MR. S. NEARY: No, boy. Carry on.

MR. STRACHAN: I will.

MR. MURPHY: Carry on all night.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, before I get into the topic that I want to discuss here, I could not but help respond to some comments made by the member for St. John's South (Dr. John Collins) this afternoon.

MR. MURPHY: I do not want any interruptions, I will not get a chance to speak.

MR. STRACHAN: If the member wants to sleep all the time that is his business.

I would like to respond to some questions or points raised by the member concerning the role in the House and of members and our question of part-time members, full-time members and the whole attitude because I have been faced in the last year in Labrador with a great deal of dissension, and confrontation personally, as has the member opposite, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie). We face it tremendously. The Labrador has a great deal of intensity which is not prevalent in any other part of the Province, certainly not on the Island part of the Province. There is not nearly the same intensity of feeling, especially at the moment as there is in Labrador. Not intensity I mean in a method only against political people, but the whole intensity of questioning where they are going, where they are at, what is happening, what is going to be done with the resources, how the resources can be developed, representation, questioning the whole parliamentary process, questioning the attitudes of one via the other, one part of Labrador via the other part of Labrador, questioning the Labrador - Newfoundland relationships, questioning the federal/provincial relationships and I would like to respond clearly here that if we are going to



MR. STRACHAN: keep the parliamentary process functioning then what I think needs to happen is some very basic and some very radical changes in the set ups within this House and also within Labrador and Newfoundland, vis-a-vis the relationships.

I think if first of all I have entered a system which is antiquated, ancient, Victorian, it is not a modern government by any means. The method of assembly the whole process is built on, it is an honour to be here, honour relationship and I think that this must change and I think it needs some radical changes, blended at the same time with tradition. We cannot obviously wipe out much of our traditions. It is very important not to change for change sake only, but also to change and still carry with us the very being of what we are in the Province. And I think that we must change if we are going to become a streamlined modern sophisticated government handling a \$1.2 billion budget for a year within a country called Canada. I think that we have got to change this whole structure here so that a lot of the serious questions are removed from a partisan platform, and removed into very much the Committee stage where we discuss these with all the experts

MR. STRACHAN:

called in and discuss them in detail. The topic which I am going to discuss in a few minutes, which is close to my heart and I have done some work on is the topic which should be discussed I feel not here although I present it here but it should be discussed in a forum in which expertise can be called in and in which we sit down and try to blend something together. I think that the forum that we have here does not help at all towards good government and we are the only ones, ourselves here who are going to take the brunt of it. Many of us cannot afford to be full-time members because the salaries are so low they are a pittance. I do not care whether I am reported by press or what it is but the salaries are idiotic, absolutely idiotic in a modern country for people who are suppose in running government. I know from my own sake that this is the first year in nine years that I have been virtually broke. I know many members on my side and colleagues on my side whose business have gone bankrupt and who have had to leave their businesses in order to try and function in here. I do not like any attitudes from the St. John's members who can afford to maintain their practices, who can turn around and tell us that our travel allowances are far too great, who tell us that our phone bills are far too great, who try to tell us that we are better off than we were ten years ago. I am not interested in ten years ago, I am interested in 1978 and I am far more interested in 1979 than I am in 1968 or 1958. I think that what we need to do is to change this whole system to make us so that we are people on our own being paid our full value, being allowed our full travel allowances to do the job we are suppose to do and be given money so that we can have constituency offices so that we can relate to our constituents not only just because you are on the government side but also opposition of constituents. And it must be evenly shared out and we must have this kind of relationship if we are going to meet some meaningful people in this Province because what is occurring within Labrador is that our powers little as they are in Opposition but certainly I can say the member for Naskaupies (Mr. Goudie) as well and possibly the minister from Menihok (Mr. Rousseau), our powers are being wittled away and brought down. In some cases this is good

MR. STRACHAN: and to the extent that it brings us into a far more realistic position with people but they are being wittled down to the stage that we become totally irrelevant. I feel in many cases that standing here, talking for the three or four months in the House and discussing some problems that I am totally irrelevant to many of my constituents, it does not make one row of beans whether I was here or whether I was bush hunting or whether I was in caribou hunting. I think this whole thing has got to change if we are going to become meaningful people. Pay us double the salary if you have to. I do not care what it is but make it so that people can live a normal life without having to maintain additional businesses so that we have one foot - and I think this makes a very unhappy political mix, one foot in politics and one foot in business. I also feel that if we did that then we should ask people to diversify themselves of active business relationships. I do not mean diversify their businesses totally but to diversify themselves of active business relationships so that they can spend full-time doing their job because I think this is a full-time time if we are going to become a modern country.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. STRACHAN: I am talking about putting the salaries up because the only way to maintain myself as a member here is to have a little business which my wife runs in order to try and keep me and my family living while I am in here being a member. I have in recent weeks as many members know received a considerable amount of flack for instance on the Labrador Coast from groups who feel that I should be present there in the communities more often. I would like to state to the St. John's members who seem to have lost all perspective of the Province that my district has two different time zones. One part of my district is on Newfoundland time and the other part of my district is on Labrador time. My district is 800 miles long, that is from Port aux Basques to St. John's and out to the edge of the 200 mile limit and not two of the communities in my district have a road link. The only way to travel the district is by bush plane and to travel only the major communities - I missed four the last time I

June 13, 1978

Tape No. 4379 (Night)

AH-3

MR. STRACHAN:

travelled, the major communities cost  
me last time \$4,600 . On an extra allowance of \$4,000 a year to travel  
the district, as a district allowance there is no way in the world

Mr. Strachan: that I can travel. Yet the same time the groups who have attacked us or questioned us for not visiting there oftener, and I would love to visit oftener, if I had the money, the groups who attack us are many times groups who are getting considerable amount of funds, considerable amount of funds from government. Groups who have had \$1.5 million in three years from government, who are travel to Alaska, California, Paris, groups who were given just recently by the government opposite \$30,000 to travel the same Labrador Coast that I must travel for \$4,000, on a DREE proposal.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: On a DREE proposal?

MR. STRACHAN: On a DREE proposal they are given \$30,000 to travel the coast and Goose Bay in order to discuss this with people, and they can quite rightly talk to me that I cannot consult my constituents, I cannot. It is not because I do not have the willingness not to consult my constituents, it is because I do not have the funds in my first year I put \$7,000 of my own money in, I am not bleating about it, I am not looking for pity, I put it in myself, and I cannot do it any more. But I believe in what we are doing sufficiently that I am going to carry on fighting and carrying on pushing, but I think our antiquated system in this House of dealing with members, members' salaries, where we have to hide our head, be afraid of the press up above who will report us because we got a 4 per cent increase or a 2 per cent increase is foolishness. We should realize that we are a modern Province within Canada, and we should pay our members appropriately, pay them well, if their fingers are in the cookie jar throw them out and fling them out immediately. Get them out of business so they have no business interest whatsoever, that everything is in trust or in some way so that they are not in active business and that is the only way that this House will function as a House. This is the only way that this Legislature will function and it is the only way that I and others can do our job and try to maintain two

Mr. Strachan: parts of this Province as a Province. Otherwise what I suggest will happen is that the frustration elsewhere and in the North will become more and more intense. We cannot do our job. Our jobs are undermined. We are seeing - I should say we are seen oftentimes as hitch-hikers. It is amazing to me why civil servants unemployment insurance people can charter helicopters up and down the Labrador Coast, the Department of Fisheries have helicopters chartered up and down our Labrador Coast, Hydro people because of a crash three years ago will not fly Labrador Airways any more, will not fly bush planes any more, they will only fly the best helicopters there are up and down the Labrador Coast, and the member has got to sit in a community for six days, stuck in one community hitching a hike or trying to get a lift onto the next community on a Hydro chopper where they may take to drop a suitcase off.

What you are talking about is a total huge suffering of the powers or the ability of a member to do his job in a part of the Province which is questioning the very function of government, and to me that is total and absolute nonsense, total nonsense and it must change. I think that the whole relationship allows a travel allowance the same as the civil servant, allowing me to submit my claims, my receipts, and to examine them as much as you wish, question me as much as you wish on the necessity of them, then pay them. If there are extras in there which people feel exactly the same as a civil servant then we have to pay. But I feel that we must be free from this tremendous economic situation in which we cannot represent our districts in a way which we should. And I think for member for St. John's to turn around and tell me that my phone bill is too high or my travel allowance is very adequate has no preception whatsoever of the size of this Province, the size of our districts, or they have never travelled in a district and been stuck for eight or nine days or have to hitch a lift on a mail plane or a chartered plane or to sit in a harbour for four or five days in a bush plane each day

Mr. Strachan: you are paying \$400 that the plane is in the harbour. They have no conception whatsoever, and that is why I suggest that the quicker the House of Assembly is sitting in Labrador so that the fellows when they start calling home and calling onto the Island will start understanding that the greater part of this Province, and the economic future of this Province is Labrador, and in the future the economic centre of gravity will change from here to there, and we must look after Labrador now in times when times are poor, when they economically depressed, and not only look after them when Labrador in the future becomes a very rich part, in which at that time they may turn around and say, You are not my brother, you would not look after me.

MR. STRACHAN: at various times or various periods when we asked for that help and now when we are on the move I would hate for myself to turn around and say to many members there that 'We just do not care any more about you.'

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Nain in November.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, I think Nain in November would be lovely. I think Nain right now would be lovely. But I think that if you are in Nain just now you might face three weeks or four weeks of breakup in which you could not get out, and I can assure you that I have seen people driven up the wall, really driven up the wall because they have never been in a situation where every day they get up at 7:00 A.M. and look out the window and no plane arrives, go back to bed and sleep all day, play cards all night and wait until next morning. And this goes on day after day after day, and their business slows down and their wives worry about them, the family start going crazy, problems start at home, you know, and then the next thing is they are up the wall. I think it would be good. I think the Minister of Justice would appreciate it very much.

Let me get on to the other topic that I wanted to discuss in the little time left to me. This is on a totally different thing on Labrador. I could go on to a district speech, but I want to talk about a project which has been close to my heart for quite some time and I did some work on.

If economically we look at Labrador, not from a social point of view or a people point of view - and I think in recent years there has been tremendous emphasis on the social side of things, on the relationships, and I think almost the pendulum has swung too much, that it has swung away from development over to the people's side



MR. STRACHAN: a little too much and there must be a balance - but looking at it purely from an economic point of view - and I will tell you why people in Labrador are frustrated and do not feel that they are getting anything out of this relationship between the Island and Labrador. If you look at Labrador West, the provincial government does not have to put a penny into Labrador West to maintain it. There is no cost, as such, to the provincial government in Labrador West, very little cost. If you look at Churchill Falls on their old arrangement, there is very little cost to go in and maintain any structure in Churchill Falls. Economically it is self-sufficient. If you look at Happy Valley, Goose Bay, apart from Linerboard operation, for years and years there was no money went into it from the Province, it was maintained essentially by Americans as American base with all the rich money put in there by Americans at that time. If you look at the Northern Labrador Coast, over the years from 1964 when the Pearson/Smallwood agreement was signed, most of the money came from the federal government on a 90/10 relationship - 90 per cent federal government money. That is why the Northern Labrador Coast compared to the Southern Labrador Coast is extremely rich in the amount of money that has been put into it as services - not rich in development, because I think the money was put in and spent on the wrong projects, but it is rich, and it cost the Province very, very little money.

The Southern Labrador Coast which is the other half of my district has never had a penny for years and I will give the due to some members opposite, there has been money gone in in the last two years and there have been changes made, and good changes made. It is a very small start, but it is there. I think much more has to be done. But over the years the Southern Labrador Coast received not a penny. So what you are talking about essentially, apart

MR. STRACHAN: from the Straits area, is that the whole of Labrador has little relationship from a provincial point of view in drawing any monies out of the provincial Treasury, and in fact, Ottawa is of far more importance to Labrador than St. John's is. And most Labrador people have dealt far more with civil servants and politicians from the federal government than they have with politicians and civil servants from St. John's. I guarantee you, in the last two years there have been twice as many federal ministers in Labrador West and in Happy Valley - Goose Bay than there have been provincial ministers - considerable amount. They are in there now today, they were in yesterday, another one was in last week - it is considered a flow-through. Whether it is productive or not, I am not saying - whether it is productive to that level. But certainly I know on the coast that we see far more federal civil servants who have development money or who have projects than we ever see provincial civil servants. So our relationship very much is towards Ottawa and not towards the Province. The native people, for instance, deal exclusively with Ottawa. It may be a policy on their part to bypass St. John's and bypass provincial government, but they deal exclusively through Ottawa.

MR. HICKMAN: Do they bypass us?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, I know, and I have told them before. Two years ago I laid it out to them and I thought their mechanism - their strategy - was total and absolute nonsense and I will say it again that it is total and absolute nonsense to try that mechanism because it cannot work. But, however, it is a fact of life that most of the Labrador area there deals with Ottawa, gets his money from Ottawa and really very little money has been spent by the Province to maintain the level of services in Labrador. So, as

MR. STRACHAN: a result we come to this kind of frustration in Labrador that they do not feel that they get anything back from the money they are putting into the Treasury. They are not getting anything back for the resources that they are producing and providing. And that is the current cry, the very popular motherhood cry of the rape of Labrador and many many people and groups are on the bandwagon calling for it. And it is understandable at the moment that the bandwagon is moving and people are feeling this. I feel in some ways it is rather a self pitying role because it is a hard knocking role of the provincial government, rather than getting in there and saying, "We are going to make something of it." But I think that will come over the next few years.

However, I think that we must understand them, that what we have to do in Labrador is to look at the resources of Labrador and start developing the resources of Labrador within Labrador, that we have to stop getting off on Labrador with the self-pitying cry that we are being raped all the time, that St. John's is taking everything from us, because that is not correct, that everything is being milked out of us or drained out of us. But I think we have to sensibly change the whole platform of things and what I am suggesting here is that I think obviously one cannot do it here, but it could be and it could be a subject for a Committee of this House to study the utilization of the resources in Labrador, to stop looking for instance at the exportation of power, of mineral resources, but to start looking at the whole development policy as put forward earlier on and the specific example that I have, it is the utilization of the iron ore.

We are constantly looking and examining Gull Island with the idea of exporting Gull Island power, either exporting

MR. STRACHAN: it on a short-term recallable basis from Quebec, exporting it to Quebec and being able to recall it, which is an additional cost of transmission lines, which may in the future become redundant or not necessary on recall, or we are looking at a Gull Island in which our whole philosophy is to bring the power across the Straits and onto the Island part of the Province.

To me when I read on June 1977 that Japan had closed its last open hearth smelter and had gone totally to electric smelting process, then I started to do some work and looking in the whole application of converting iron ore in Labrador West into steel and there are three or four basic ingredients required. Basically what we need is iron ore obviously, which we have, power, which we have, if we go the electric smelting route. Power is fuel, hydro electric power is fuel. We need coke as a reduction process and we need slag or we need limestone, a flux, what they call a flux in the trade. But I look at it and we start looking at the dynamics of it, we look at Japan, we find that Japan has no iron ore. It brings all its iron ore. Japan brings in much of its coal for the coke process and Japan is operating its electric smelters and diesel powered generators. So obviously then if Japan can do it obviously there must be some mechanics where we have - first of all where we have iron ore in Labrador West and where we have the second ingredient fuel through Gull Island and Labrador, but if we can put the two together and add all we need to bring in then is coke and only a very small quantity of it because if we go to this electric smelting process what we are talking about in electric smelting is using large forty inch graphite electrodes which produce the carbon monoxide needed to reduce the iron into basic pig iron and from there on to steel.

So it makes great sense to me obviously, from a superficial point of view, in looking at the process that one

June 13, 1978

Tape No. 4382

CW - 3

MR. STRACHAN: can stop exporting iron ore to feed Pittsburgh, to feed central Canada and we can stop exporting electricity because exporting electricity is like sending cod fish out and around, all we are doing is exporting jobs and there is no developmental purpose to exporting electricity. Surely if we have electricity and iron ore and

Mr. Strachan: all we need to bring in is an infinitely smaller amount of coke than we ever ship out is iron ore then the process becomes feasible at least from a resource point of view. It obviously then the whole economics of it requires to be studied, and I think that if we can manage to get out of their hands and out of the grip of the large companies, out of the large consortiums who play us off continually between Bethlehem, Pittsburgh, and Hamilton who are continually playing us off one against the other, who are continually stockpiling iron ore and then deciding to force the unions to have strike the unions do not want, and then turn her around so the unions make sure that unions are blamed for having the strike, if we can get out of the grips of this kind of monopolistic situation where we become free and develop within Labrador the resources of Labrador to the fullest extent then I think we are starting to develop with this kind of proposal the Labrador that we want to see.

We can therefore move, I think, on from iron ore into basic pig iron, which is a very easy process, and from pig iron or sponge iron into basic steel. And, of course, along with that goes all the ancillary industries surrounded by it, and we must therefore start looking at a whole marketing arrangement to try to tap the European markets not to sell iron ore to Europe but to sell basic steel to Europe. I think any attempt to try to look for markets in Europe to find an alternative through Sept Isles route or to Bethlehem, Pittsburgh, Hamilton route by sending iron ore to Europe I think must be decried. To me that is not an alternative we are doing exactly the same thing of shipping out raw materials. We must look at the whole economics very carefully, get the people who are able the engineers, the cost engineers, people to look at the whole arrangement because I do not believe that it is not feasible. I think it can be done. It acquires imagination, it requires drive, and what I would like to suggest another thing on top of it, that I think we should start instead of self-crying and self-doubting ourselves that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians instead of playing themselves down in the eyes of people from

MR. STRACHAN:

elsewhere, we should start looking possibly at this kind of developmental steel mill, we should start looking at it from a consortium point of view within this Province, then we should start developing the expertise and the business people within this Province not to be 10 per cent agents of anybody else from other provinces, not 10 per centers but to develop themselves, their own resources and become equal partners in the marketplace of the world. And I think that can be done with imagination and it can be done with drive, I think, in many cases like that, in these kind of situations. It is immaterial to me whether it is Crosbie money. It is immaterial to me whoevers money it is. It is immaterial. I would rather see it being people from this Province forming that kind of consortium, to form even a small steel mill initially and to look down the road to expansion rather than to have some company from Bethlehem or Hamilton or Pittsburg or somebody else who is going to play us off in a different international marketplace coming in and taking over. And I think in that kind of issue we have got to look at something in which we stop eating our young and we start developing with enough confidence, enough courage to drive the thing through and stop being this, what I call, 10 per centers, about all we are considered as being, as being agents and taking a little bit of the cream, a 10 per cent which I am afraid is going to happen in the oil and gas industry where a lot of people in this Province are looking to become agents of engineering and oil companies from other parts of the world and representing them here just as mere brokers so that they can cream off a few hundred thousand or a few million off the work that other people do. But all they are needed for here is the birthright. The fact that they are a Newfoundland company they can use you as a front in order to be able to move in.

I think that that kind of philosophy must stop. You must start looking at it in a far more aggressive way and start building that kind of road with imagination and drive. I think that has to be done as quickly as possible. I am suggesting here that the steel mill would be an excellent example of resources there and only

MR. STRACHAN:

in that way can we get free of international companies, international unions which have got no concern whatsoever for the economics and the social life and the traditions of this Province, who are prepared to use us as a pawn, who are prepared to play us the way they want to, who are



MR. STRACHAN: prepared for instance and I see to his case to have their holdings in Seven Islands, and it is well known their holdings are in Seven Islands and here they are - and now you will see in Labrador City - chiefs in Labrador City - with all their properties and everything in Seven Islands and they funnel everything towards Seven Islands. So, it makes no difference how many bodies of inquiry we wish to have, you still cannot stop that kind of attitude because they are far too powerful - in far too powerful a position. And I think what we got to look at is look at that kind of development - involve the companies; if they want to play ball with us and get involved in that kind of development, fine, if not, let us start looking at possibly Julianne Lake deposit, but let us try to tie the resources of Labrador together, so that what we put out is the top grade product, the finest product, finished as far as we can at that particular time; and if we want to get into rolling mills, if we want to get into ancillary industries later on down the road, let it be so. But at least make a start initially to try to tie the power of Labrador through electricity with the resources of Labrador and possibly we can get into a whole other group of things down the road of considering copper - we can consider other minerals and other mineral developments, but do it in a planned way with a good cost accounting so that we can develop Labrador which will become a very, very rich part of this Province. I think only in that kind of way can we develop this whole - this Province, and I think then you will see the whole economic centre of gravity moved from St. John's - moved from the Island and moved to Labrador: and let me say that I think that when that occurs we, and all of us as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, should be prepared by doing it together that that is the way we will unite this Province: because if we do not, then what will happen is that it makes no difference whether Quebec has territorially been given Labrador or taken Labrador - it makes

MR. STRACHAN: no difference whether the line for the border is on the map - if economically they own Labrador, which is what they are trying to do, then it will make no difference whether it is the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. It is immaterial. The benefits will not come this way; it will not come to the island part of the Province. It will all flow west, and I have deep consideration that we must start that kind of route now because, if we do not, in the future the oil and gas may follow the hydro and the iron ore which is all going that way, and everything will flow to the province of Quebec, and Quebec will gain everything and all we will be left with are the meathead jobs - the jobs of hauling the stuff out and hauling it to the border, and Quebec will get all the developmental jobs and we will get nothing. I think if that occurs then Labrador, whether it wants to or not, will become part of Quebec, if not in theory certainly in economic terms because the flow will be from Labrador out as far as resources are concerned and Quebec in as far as services are concerned. I think that situation has got to be stopped and can only be stopped, not by rattling sabers at the moment, not by shouting words at Quebec at the moment, it can only be stopped by developing policies like this, having a look at them, take the boldness in our hands and drive. I think that should be done, and I would suggest to the House that this on the standing orders, I believe, we have a committee - I think 84G, is it? I think we have a committee for instance here - resource committee - 84G - 84C, sorry, of the standing orders - 'a resource committee to consist of not more than 17 members and not less than 9 members'. I would suggest that what I am arguing here tonight should be taken out of this political forum - taken out of the partisan political situation - and should be put to a committee of not more than 17 members, which gives a good cross-section of the House of Assembly, and not less than 9 members who can then call in people, whether they be business people, whether they be engineers, experts, people from outside the Province to sit down and come up with a plan which is a

MR. STRACHAN: bold plan of developing - such as I am talking about here - developing a steel mill in Labrador instead of exporting everything out of it. That can be done very easily. It can be done in the next five minutes if the Minister of Justice wants to do it, and I do not think that we should stand on our political dignities here and say that if a suggestion comes from one side or the other side I do not care who wants to move it. I do not care if it is the member from St. John's Centre (Mr. A. Murphy) who does not know much about Labrador at all who wants to move it. If he wants to move it, let him move it. But I suggest that we move it and make the committee work - put it together and I do not think that the government should be looking as though this is something that has been taken out of the hands of us in the House of Assembly and out of the Liberals' hands and placed only in the P.C. party's hands or the P.C. administration's hands - I think it is something that is greater than that - bigger than that. I know for instance in Labrador that the member for Menihek (Mr. J. Rosseau) and the member for Naskaupi (Mr. J. Goudie) and myself can get on very, very well. We probably are the friendliest outside of this House, because we relate in a different way because we realize that the problems we face in the North are far more intense and far greater than the partisan politics which we have to play and do play, and I am not ashamed of that - we have to play them within this House. So, what I am suggesting is that this resource committee be set up with a specific task in mind - given direction - told that it is a very simple object to start off with -

MR. STRACHAN: never mind giving it all grandiose things to look into - it is to look into the application of a steel mill for Labrador to utilize Labrador iron ore - Labrador hydro resources; and then we can start looking at the economics of roads or railroads; then we can start looking at the economics of Port Labrador; then we can start looking at the economics of bringing in the M.V. Arctic which has just come off the Welland docks - it is the first heavy ice-breaker and I mean heavy ice-breaker - this is a totally different idea from any other in Canada - it is bigger than the MacDonald and it utilizes an entirely different system of - not reinforced - but a heavy ice-breaker with an air-bubble system which is to be used to go to the Strathscona Sound in the Northwest Territories, right in the far North, and then to the north of Baffin Island for at least nine months of the year; and if they can go into nine months of the year into the north of Baffin Island and in through the Strathscona Sound, then surely they can come in through the Labrador for nine months of the year. And we can utilize that, therefore, we could tie this whole thing together and then we are starting to talk some kind of sense as far as a developmental policy is concerned. I would like to recommend or suggest this to members - I do not know what will come of it - but I would like to suggest it because I believe it is a good idea - it has a lot of feasibility - a lot of application. I have studied a fair bit of it and collected a great deal of material on the application of the electric smelting process to the iron ore specifically found in Labrador. There are some small problems; they are very, very small problems dealing with the cobalt and manganese levels of the iron ore. These are extremely small problems, I have been told, and they are present in almost all cases of impurities which can be removed very easily in a form of slag. I think the process has merit and I think could be an extremely good

MR. STRACHAN: developmental project and would start looking ahead there for - instead of using Gull Island power - instead of scouring the world for a market for Gull Island power which we must distribute through Quebec or through the Anglo Saxon route, then we can keep that power within Labrador, within this Province, and develop the resources of this Province. I think that the idea deserves merit and let us not all say that the Opposition when they stand all the time are full of negativity because I do not believe that.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I am able to have a few words, my hon. colleague, the member for St. John's West (Dr. H. Kitchen) was going to speak but he is not here now. Firstly, may I say to the hon. member for Eagle River that his address has been one of the better speeches we have heard during this session of the House of Assembly and I may say that the matters he raised I am sure commend themselves to the interest and affection of all members on both sides of the House. One thing - the hon. gentleman gives me far more power than I have, but in any event it will not go unnoticed. One thing I would like to mention before we close this debate is that no matter our differences may be, and no matter how justifiable our concerns are, and they are justified in many areas, let us never lose sight of the fact that no matter what manoeuvring or manipulations go on by the province of Quebec that we do enjoy something that no other two provinces enjoy, because we are the only two provinces whose border has been fixed and delineated beyond all reasonable doubt. Not only was it a decision of the judicial committee of the Privy Council but also in the terms of union it was again spelled out very definitely indeed. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the very few minutes at my disposal may I raise one other issue that I believe should be mentioned during this debate and I believe hon. members will agree that the last three or four days in particular we have seen strong debate in this House - sensible debate in this House and debate that has been moving toward some of

MR. HICKMAN: the issues facing this Province. One issue that we have not raised and an issue that I believe has tremendous significance on this Province and I am sure is troubling every hon. member of this House, and that is Canada's future as a nation. Yesterday in Parliament the Prime Minister tabled, and I believe this is the tenth attempt since 1927 -

MR. HICKMAN: by prime ministers to try and find a solution for the patriation of the constitution and for the amending of the British North America Act. To date, successive Canadian governments and provincial governments have been woefully unsuccessful. They are no closer to resolution of this problem than they were when it was first raised in the mid twenties. The closest time this nation ever came to finding a solution to the problem was with the Fulton-Favreau formula which should have been adopted but regrettably was not. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a strange thing that happens - I hate to admit this, but I believe that I have attended more constitutional conferences certainly than any Attorney General in Canada and probably any minister, and I have sat around the table - I will give an example - last year, Mr. Speaker, in Edmonton ten attorneys general had reached conclusions and satisfactory conclusions because the issues were not that difficult to overcome. One can understand why a French-speaking Canadian in Quebec is very jealous of his or her language. One can understand their being so jealous and concerned when we realize that they are surrounded in North America by another language - every time they turn on their television, every time they read the media; and this causes them concern and so it should. But they can be accommodated within the framework and spirit of this constitution. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister will be meeting with the Provinces again soon, and the question we have to ask ourselves is whether or not, in the light of the referendum that will take place in Quebec within the next eighteen months, this occasion will be the last clear chance of Canada's eleven first ministers to resolve the various issues that must be put to bed if we are going to have a constitution that is acceptable to the two founding races.

MR. HICKMAN: And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is the last clear chance. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should not fool ourselves into believing that the hon. Rene Levesque became prime minister of Quebec simply because the people in Quebec felt it was time to get rid of the Bourassa government. That would be naive; it would be silly; and it would be totally unrealistic; and even if there is some merit in that theory, let us not overlook the position that the prime minister of Quebec is taking now with the mandate that he received in that election. He is suggesting - I am not sure with justification, but that does not make much difference (he is the government and he has got a very vast majority in that assembly) - that the Quebec government, the Quebec people by electing his party to power in Quebec have said you can use public funds, government money, government propoganda for the purpose of promoting separatism - of promoting Quebec as a separate state of winning the referendum. I do not think he will win it. I do not think realistically that he will win it in the sense of getting 51% of the voting population of Quebec to say definitively that they wish to leave this nation. I do not believe for a minute he will receive it, but if there is anyone in this House or in this country who believes that a 20% vote in favour of separatism in Quebec is not a victory for Rene Levesque, he or she is crazy. If anyone believes that a vote of 20% of dedicated separatists in Quebec to leave will not cause trouble in the future, we are just not looking at what is happening in other countries where even smaller, much smaller minorities manage to disrupt the whole fabric, the political fabric of a nation. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two questions that we as legislators in this Province must ask ourselves. Number one, would it be prudent for the government and legislature of this Province at this time to start looking at alternate plans in the event, in the unlikely event, that that should happen.



June 13, 1978

Tape 4386

GH-3

MR. HICKMAN: I believe that by paying too much attention to that alternative at this time we would be giving too much credence, too much credibility to that insidious, very carefully planned campaign that is going in our sister province of Quebec.

10216

MR. HICKMAN: The second thing we have to look at, Mr. Speaker, is whether, when the first ministers meet this fall and probably when the ten premiers meet in August somewhere in the West, or not we should be prepared to do some accommodating, and I think we are going to have to do some accommodating. I think we are going to have to firstly convince the government in Ottawa, and I am not just talking about the government - the Members of Parliament in Ottawa - that while I hope no one in Canada and certainly in the far eastern provinces would want to see a weak centralist government, that one of the reasons why the band of unity is being stretched, I believe, a great deal in Canada right now is because many policy makers who are not elected to office in this nation have taken onto themselves certain powers and certain prerogatives that are not within the true spirit of confederation. And they are managing to alienate, not just the people of Quebec - you would not have to be too much of a demagogue in Atlantic Canada to get a half-decent separatist movement going down here, and certainly when you look at western Canada the big fear is that that may be happening out there right now. I believe that it is happening out there right now because the federal government, and please do not interpret what I am saying in a politically partisan nature at all because preceding governments enunciated the same views, in their anxiety to take all of the powers are not prepared to share with the provinces even a consultative process when it comes to the development of our resources. We should not be working today on the preparation of a case stated to go to the Supreme Court of Canada on offshore mineral rights. We should not have to do that, but I am sure unless there is a major change of attitude and a major change of policy in the nation's capital that we will have no alternative but to go ahead with our very well-prepared case.

MR. NFARY:

You mean you have not started it yet?

MR. HICKMAN: We have the preparation completed but the case stated for the - the case stated, Mr. Speaker, is something quite different. That is when the two parties start to work out what goes in the reference to the Supreme Court of Canada, and that is what is being worked on right now. That has nothing to do with disclosing to the other side the nature of our argument or our case, but we should not have to do that. All we are saying to the government of Canada "Will you please understand that when you are developing offshore, if we find minerals offshore, if we find oil offshore that is going to be developed and can be developed, we have some say in it because we are closer to the environmental problems, to the social problems than you are - this will not weaken your government". This will not weaken one iota the status and the stature of the government of Canada. This will not diminish your income from corporate taxes, but we ask you consult with us - you do not have to change the constitution for that-an exchange of letters between two governments is sufficient. Do that and we will not have to face action in the Supreme Court of Canada which I am sure we are going to face. And I say, Mr. Speaker, if I could -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) - unemployment.

MR. HICKMAN: The unemployment? I would shudder to think of what unemployment would be in this Province if we suddenly found ourselves as a nation or a state called 'Atlantica' cut off from Upper Canada and cut off from the West. So, Mr. Speaker, I can think of nothing more relevant in the long haul to the future of this Province than ensuring and guaranteeing that, when we as a Province negotiate, we negotiate from a position of strength. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that some of the proposals in this document which was received today entitled "A Time for Action" is

MR. HICKMAN: really, getting to the guts of the problem that is facing Canada right now as a nation.

MR. HEARY: You are dragging a red herring into it now. It is not Ottawa's problem; it is a Provincial problem. Do not attack Ottawa.

MR. HICKMAN: There is no attack on Ottawa. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that there is no Newfoundlander living today who would believe that showing some concern for constitutional changes in this Canada or who is prepared to see to it that the Government of this Province is prepared to make a commitment towards keeping this nation together, I would hope that there is no one half-witted enough to believe that this is a red herring. I would hope not, because if there is then this constitution is in danger and this nation is in danger.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question on the amendment? Those in favour of the amendment, 'aye', contrary minded, 'nay'. In my opinion the 'nays' have it.

Is the House ready for the question on the main motion? Those in favour, 'aye', contrary minded, 'nay'. In my opinion the 'ayes' have it.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 o'clock and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 14, 1978 at 3:00 P.M.