

VOL. 3

NO. 83

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

2:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1978

June 8, 1978

Tape 4106

EC - 1

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present
a petition on behalf of 280 residents of the communities
of Burlington and Smith's Harbour.

The prayer of the petition,
Mr. Speaker, is outlined on the first page and I will
read it. It is very much to the point. It says:

" Since 1973, two petitions have been sent from the
three communities in this area - the third one not named
in the present petition, of course, is Middle Arm - to
our district representative for presentation to the
House of Assembly, requesting that the road from Burlington
to the Baie Verte Highway, roads connecting our communities,
and the local roads, be upgraded. In the last petition,
three specific requests were made. They were as follows:
1) remove brush from the edge of the Burlington - Baie Verte
Highway road; 2) straighten and upgrade the road from the
Baie Verte Highway to the three communities, including the
local roads; and 3) pave all roads mentioned not later than
1976. In response to the two petitions, the brush was cut,
some gravel put here and there, and a little ditching done.
Our roads now are in a much worse state of deterioration
and with a goodly portion of the Burlington - Baie Verte
Highway road being used considerable by huge wood trucks,
it is bound to worsen.

"We, the residents of Burlington
and Smith's Harbour are fully aware of the present economic

MR. RIDEOUT: end. So their request, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the House, is very, very reasonable. They are not asking for a lot of pavement, they are asking that the road be put in some sort of half decent shape - that some gravel be placed on the top of it so it can be graded and that some of the worst turns be taken out of the road so it will be made a little safer, that some guardrail be put in - all very reasonable. And they are not expecting that it all be done at one time, but they are expecting - and I think rightly so and justifiably so - that some start be made. All that was done three or four years ago was that there were a few places straightened out, a little bit of gravel put on here and there, and some brush cut away from the side of the road. That needs to be done again now, Mr. Speaker, because the road has worsened since that time.

They also point out in the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, and again, rightly so, that this road is used by a great deal of heavy traffic. Bowaters and private operators are - I suppose twenty-five or thirty truckloads of wood a day are hauled over the length of the Burlington Road up to the Baie Verte access road and on out to Sandy Lake for transportation to the Bowaters mill. So in addition to serving the three communities, of course, it has the economic impact that a lot of people are using it for the transportation of wood to the mill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the prayer of the petition. I do hope that the Minister of Transportation will give it

Mr. Rideout: the serious consideration it deserves, that the reasonable request, a very reasonable request, no demands, just a request that something be done to improve it. They are not even asking for payment, and it is a rare day here that you do not get a petition here asking for pavement, but they are asking that it be put in reasonable shape. I think, that reasonable request ought to be given priority by the minister, and I would hope that he could direct his maintenance crews in the area to do something with that road this year.

Mr. Speaker, I table the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman who one time represented the area of Burlington's-Smith's Harbour-Middle Arm, having been in Burlington and Smith's Harbour last weekend, I wish to rise to support whole-heartedly the petition just presented so ably by the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay. The highway, in question, is a very important highway now. It is much more important now than it was eight or ten years ago. It gained importance because of the fairly active amount of woods work that is now presently going on in the area. There is a fairly major sawmill just established there in the last six months which is going to be producing around 4.5 million board feet of lumber in this present year. And there is also a number of woods contractors who are now active in the area for Bowaters, and who are going to be escalating their efforts in the next couple of weeks and months. There are also several new sawmill operations about to begin, and all and all therefore from an industrial economic point of view the road needs to be kept in fairly good shape to allow transportation of the pulp wood and the lumber product from the area for market, primarily to Corner Brook, and also to Central Newfoundland.

As the hon. member has pointed out it is a very reasonable request. The people in the Burlington area are very reasonable people. There was a fair amount of work done on the road several years on topping the road, and as the hon. member pointed out

Mr. Peckford: some brush clearing and so on, turns, some of the most dangerous curves on the road are on the Burlington end of it, near the settlements, as one gets closer the Baie Verte Highway the road is straighter. I drove over the road last Friday, and the road is not in that bad a shape with the topping, but it is narrow in places, there needs to be more brush clearing.

As far as the part of the prayer of the petition dealing with pavement through the communities I do not know if that is really realistic because to do it just for the communities there would be very expensive. But some dust control could be used in the communities no doubt and would help a lot because the main road runs right through the communities, especially through Burlington, Middle Arm is to a lesser extent, but Burlington especially is very dusty in the Summertime. It is a very reasonable request, and the area has become extremely important over the last number of years economically from a woods point of. And I support the prayer of the petition hoping that the forces in the area, the maintenance forces in the area can at least accede to a number of the requests contained therein to improve, to top up the road a bit, and to take out some of the most dangerous turns. So I fully support the petition and the hon. member in his desire to have it done.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to support the petition presented by my colleague from Baie Verte-White Bay, endorsed, signed by 280 people in Burlington and Smith's Harbour. I know the area fairly well having been involved in the educational district which covers those two communities. The Minister of Mines just told us he was down to Burlington last weekend, he was there, of course, attending the official opening of a Canada Works project, another good federal project. I fully expect my colleague from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) if he follows the procedure in this case to write a nasty letter to the editor objecting the minister of being in his district, and that kind of thing. The fact is we are not so sensitive here, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Simmons: on this side. We are glad that the minister did get a chance to get in and see the road. And, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, because he knows the condition of the road because he used to be the member for that part of the coast, and especially, Mr. Speaker, especially,

MR. SIMMONS: because it is a tremendous opportunity for the Minister of Mines and Energy, through his colleagues in Cabinet, to do the people of the Baie Verte Peninsula a service, to undo some of the harm he did earlier, an opportunity for him to be a bit contrite, a bit penitent in compensation for his vicious poison pen letter to Mr. Dwyer. Perhaps this would be an opportunity for the minister -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out to the hon. gentleman that while speaking on the petition, references, disagreements of opinion or that between an hon. gentleman and the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy would be peripheral to the petition and as a matter of fact one could even say irrelevant.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, I meant it Mr. Speaker, to be just a passing reference and I thought it a good opportunity for the minister to make some amends and to get the road upgraded, the road from Burlington up to the highway. It needs to be straightened up a bit. It does need some culverts as I remember it. It does need to be upgraded.

MR. NEARY: What is the -

MR. SIMMONS: They have been the victim of some washouts and I hope the minister would be as compassionate as he was in the case of the Rattling Brook situation, albeit very belatedly compassionate down there. It took two washouts. Indeed it took them four days to get down there although he was twenty miles up the road in South Brook over Christmas. But he did eventually do something about the Rattling Brook situation and to avoid washouts on this road we would hope he and his colleagues would do something substantial on that particular road too, the Burlington to Baie Verte Highway road, also the road between the communities concerned, and also of course the matter

MR. SIMMONS: of paving in the communities concerned.
Now I do not want to hear anything else about restraint, Mr. Speaker, because it is a term that is dragged in very conveniently. The member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) today in his announcements did not mention restraint very much when he was talking about paving roads in his district. So I say to the Minister of Transportation that he should talk to his colleague behind him and find out where he is getting the money and then put some into this very worthy cause here, the paving of the roads in a couple of communities, and certainly a worthy cause in Bonavista North, Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a worthy cause and a very worthy cause in Burlington and Smith's Harbour and I hope that if restraint is to be applied it would be applied fairly judiciously all over the Province, if restraint is the term for it.

Mr. Speaker, so much can be said about a petition like this because it not only draws attention to a very particular local need, it also draws attention to the government's overall discriminatory policy insofar as road construction and upgrading is concerned. And I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the situation in Bonavista North and the situation in Rattling Brook and Green Bay, and they are very different. The treatment they are getting is very different from the people of Smith's Harbour and Burlington are getting. I only wish the Premier, the leader of the government were here to hear this, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps on a nice day like today we could come up with a gesture that would please everybody. Why do we not move the House down to the Bally Haly golf course, Mr. Speaker, so the Premier can hear this debate on petitions and perhaps he will do something about the Burlington road.

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of the petition so capably presented by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and so ably and responsibly supported by the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford). I think that the requests in the petition are very reasonable indeed, Sir, and I will certainly take the matters referred to in the petition to the attention of the officials of the department and hopefully we can accede with at least some of the requests and hopefully many of the requests that are in the petition. They are certainly not unreasonable and at any time, particularly at this time.

I should point out that it has been mentioned here that the restraint is a word we should not mention because the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) made an announcement today of some consequence to the people of Bonavista North. I am delighted to hear that. I did not hear the announcement. There was also, Sir, I might mention for the sake of members of the House, that there was a tender call in the paper this morning, I noticed, asking for people to tender

MR. DOODY:

on the construction of a road to St. Julien's, a community on the Northern Peninsula in the district of the Straits, I think, a community that has been literally without communication for the past twenty some years of Confederation. I see no partisanship there, Sir. I also know there was a tender called in the paper, I think, today for constructions of a road to Monkstown. I do not believe that that is in part of our district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: May I have the courtesy, Sir, of the same sort of attention that hon. members opposite had?

I simply want to point out that we cannot discard the idea of restraint despite the fact that the finance critic on the opposite side of the House seems to think that that would be something that he does not want to hear about any more. I simply want to say that there are many areas of this Province which have never been treated fairly irrespective of their representation, and I think that it is time, and I think that we have demonstrated by today's paper if nothing else, that we are paying attention to some of these areas just as we will try to pay some attention to the areas mentioned in the petition so ably presented here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if there are no more supporters on the petition already being tabled, I would like to table another petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the hon. member, I would like to welcome on behalf of all members forty-three

MR. SPEAKER: (Young) students from St. Clare's High School in Carbonear, Grade IX, accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Brian Mahoney.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. MORGAN: This is my third time now.

AN HON. MEMBER: He would not give you leave yesterday.

MR. MORGAN: I could not get leave yesterday, Mr. Speaker, but I do not need leave today.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is from 195 residents in the community of Sweet Bay in Bonavista South district and the petition is requesting that the government consider this year the upgrading of the road from Sweet Bay to Charleston, approximately four miles of gravel road. Last year the main road to the community of Sweet Bay was paved; however, the road linking Sweet Bay to Charleston is an important section of road because many of the residents of Sweet Bay are employed at the fish plant operation at Charleston; in fact, I think last year that around sixty employees of the Charleston fish plant were from Sweet Bay, so therefore, the road is important to these people who travel back and forth each and every day. Also there is the fact that it is a very important school bus route. All the children have to leave Sweet Bay to travel outside that community to attend school. So the request is to have the road upgraded this year, hopefully, in preparation for paving. Then it would mean that the road from the Cabot Highway down to the end of Sweet Bay would be all paved based on the fact that the road through Charleston is now paved down to the fish plant, and the main road in the community of Sweet Bay was paved last year.

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table this petition and to have the petition referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: (Young) The hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: I rise very briefly to support the petition, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of, I would think, members on this side, because obviously, it is badly needed, the work referred to by the hon. the minister. But particularly do I rise because again, we have a minister of the Crown who has demonstrated that he, too, is not prepared to take the wise, sage advice of one of his fellows who has maintained consistently both publicly and here in this House that petitions are a waste of time. Now I doubt very much if the people of Sweet Bay feel that way, otherwise they would not have asked the hon. gentleman to present it. So we do support the petition and we have nothing but scorn for those who abuse the public intelligence by attempting to infer that petitions that come before the House are a waste of time, because if they are then we should have some different methodology, perhaps, to make it more worthwhile so that people will not be deceived.

I am pleased to see that the minister has brought in the petition - badly needed too,

MR. J. NOLAN: and a very, very well done one and for him to demonstrate that he indicates very clearly that he believes petitions do serve a useful purpose and what is more that it his duty to do so, a duty which he honored today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise also to support this petition very briefly. The people of Sweet Bay certainly need a road.. This was very recently brought to my attention too when we had an activity within our party involving people having to go to a nearby settlement to cast their vote for the Liberal nominee in the federal election and they found that going to that nearby settlement was a hardship because of the rough roads.

AN HON. MEMBER: So, I said at the earliest opportunity I would bring this to the attention of the House and I would like to thank the minister for the opportunity of giving me to support this petition. Thank you.

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I really feel that this is a petition that is very worthy of support and one that I will be delighted to bring to the attention of the department and I have no doubt that most of the officials in the department are probably aware of it by now I have no doubt that the predecessor has already advocated the case. Any doubt that I may have had about the legitimacy and the urgency of the petition has been put to rest by the support of the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) as I can find five Liberals anywhere to go to any meeting I will be delighted to do everything that I can to help.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour and Manpower is not in his seat. I wonder if he is within hearing range, Sir, if he would not mind - is he gone?

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. S. NEARY: Put it to the Minister of Health.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well maybe I can put it to the Minister of Health, Sir, I am concerned -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is coming.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Okay, either he or the Minister of Health can answer the question. Here he is, Sir, just finishing his lunch off now. Hard working minister, Sir, that is the kind of ministers we like to see. Luckily he is not following the example of his boss.

MR. S. NEARY: He would down to Bally Halv today if he did.

MR. W.N. ROWE: That is right. He is a hard working minister.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has risen.

MR. W.N. ROWE: What is this?

MR. HICKMAN: Just to correct the record, the hon. gentlemen again are wholly, totally, 100 per cent wrong. The hon. the Premier is departing at this moment to keep a speaking engagement outside the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Oh, yes!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I should point out to

hon. members that the -

MR. S. NEARY:

Where is he now?

MR. SPEAKER:

- whereabouts of the hon.

Premier or any other member -

MR. S. NEARY:

Is there a salmon river down

there or what?

MR. SPEAKER:

- in my opinion is irrelevant

unless a specific question is based on it.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

We will ask tomorrow where the

Premier is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY:

Yes, we have some good stuff

for him.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

It seems very secret. I would

like to ask a genuine question to the Minister of Labour and

Manpower or the Minister of Health -

MR. S. NEARY:

When he gets back.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

- depending on who feels

like answering it, Sir, it concerns the lab and X-ray technicians

and the fact that they are having these rotating strikes. And

as I understand it, Sir, of all groups dealing with our hospitals

the most potentially harmful, I suppose in terms of health care

the absence of any group that could be most potentially harmful

would be the X-ray and lab technicians. So would the minister -

I have one or two supplementaries for him but first of all

would the minister answer this question: What now is the main

point or points of dispute between the treasury board and

the lab and X-ray technicians? What are the major points

now which both parties are at logger-heads on?

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: There are two issues, Mr. Speaker, one is the issue of callback or standby duty and the other one is the issue of service credits. I do not know what the details of them are but these are the two main headings of dispute, service credits and callback or standby pay.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W.N. ROWE: May I ask either the Minister of Labour and Manpower or the Minister of Health, Sir, in the event that there is a full-fledged walk out, a legal strike by this bargaining unit throughout the Province what measures have been taken by the Minister of Health if any to protect the welfare of the public in this field, this very important field, Mr. Speaker. Have any measures been taken to make sure that the jobs ordinarily done by the X-ray and lab technicians and done very well can be carried on in some makeshift fashion until the strike might be over.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the larger hospitals the actions which have been taken so far

MR. COLLINS: are not inhibiting too much the question of the hospital in terms of servicing the health needs of the people. At the larger hospitals there are management people available who can take up the slack of the work and in terms of the smaller hospitals where management people generally speaking are not in place to be able to do this work it can present some problems for us however there is always the possibility there of course of referrals from the smaller centers the larger centers.

The question which the hon. leader asked is what would happen if everybody goes out on strike. That is a hypothetical question but I would say that in terms of the manner in which the workers are now withdrawing their services we can live with that for some small period of time but if it is continued it will create some difficulties. The hospitals always have contingency plans in place, they do in this particular case. If all of the lab and X-ray technicians withdraw their services then of course we will have a bit of a calamity on our hands and we will not know what to do with that until the times comes.

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: The Minister of Manpower did not seem to know the details of the dispute at the moment, he knew generally the stand-by and so on. Can the Minister of Health elucidate to the House in any greater detail what exactly is the problem? One reads news reports but one is never sure whether in fact they have zeroed in on the actual problem. Can the Minister of Health as the Minister of Health, Sir, and concerned about the health of our people, can he tell us what is the problem? What is the dispute at the moment? How close are the parties together or how far are the parties apart? Exactly what is the situation between the lab and X-ray technicians bargaining unit on the one hand and the government's Treasury Board on the other?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I know the details of the two issues but I do not

MR. ROUSSEAU: think it is in the best interest to make them public. There is a difference between what a person receives when they are on stand-by or call-back - how much they get for that. For example they may not be at work especially in the smaller cottage hospitals around the Province which have four or less people on staff they get so much per year and the larger hospitals they get so much per shift, in the ones five and over. There is some question about how much this should be, whether they should all be the same or not, that is one cause without being detailed. The other one is the question of service credits, steps in the progression of what salaries they should have and the reason why, I do not want to be that specific in it obviously as I mentioned yesterday in reply to a question from the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), yesterday or Tuesday, I forget which it was, that we are in contact with the both parties, we anticipate now that we will be talking to the union possibly sometime today or tomorrow. I have met with the negotiating officer for unit, Mr. Jim Ryan last week and my deputy also has met with Mr. Locking the general manager. We have been talking to Treasury Board trying to find some resolve obviously because the two issues are that far apart and the union declared strike action was necessary. There are some strong feelings on both sides but what we are attempting to do now in our mediation process - the Department of Labour is to find some common ground where we can find some compromise between Treasury Board and the Hospital Association on the one side and the union on the other in order to resolve the dispute. We anticipate possibly sometime today or tomorrow we will be talking to the union and hopefully by talking to both sides we may find that area of what we hope will be common compromise, that will bring about a resolution to the dispute.

MR. W. ROWE: One final supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, I disagree with the minister. I am not asking the minister to negotiate in public or in this House naturally and he should not do that but what I am asking for is a small amount of detail on what

MR. W. ROWE: the present positions of both parties are so that the public, I included will know what the relative positions of the party are and also be in a position to judge as to who is being reasonable or unreasonable in this particular case. The may not have, I understand this, he is involved in hundreds of various negotiations in the run of a year, the minister may not have the details of it; if he does have the details of it in his mind now would he please tell us what the present positions are and not what the bargaining or the negotiations might be in the next day or so but the present positions of each of the parties. If he does not have it will he undertake to get himself briefed on the matter and give the House some information on it tomorrow? I for one would like to know what the present positions of what the three parties really are on this matter?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I certainly will. There is obviously, you know, a dollar difference between them which I know, But the reason I do not want to give these specific details now is we would rather have this proposed meeting that I am suggesting will take place which is just a matter of the discussions we have a follow through after meetings with Treasury Board, which is the Department of Labour's function. Mr. Blanchard may anticipate some time today or tomorrow a meeting and I would want to see what, if any, reaction the union would have to any suggestions that might be made by the mediator as a result of his meeting with Treasury Board. If that occurs today, I will tomorrow, if it does not occur until tomorrow, I will on Monday give the details as best I can.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have got a couple of questions for the Minister of Justice, Sir, in connection with that slanderous and libelous statement that was suppose to be made by the Premier of this Province last night on NBC Television at 6:30 that had to be cancelled.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!--

I believe that in asking the question these statements of opinion which are of an argumentative nature are better left out of the question. There may well be a time in which these matters could be debated, but I think they should be left out of the question.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, is it correct, could I ask the minister, if it is correct that the programme had to be cancelled because of four cases, incidents of slander and libel, smear tactics and character assassination in this statement? Is that why it had to be cancelled?

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, that question certainly would be more properly addressed to the hon. the Premier.

MR. NOLAN: Did a lawyer in the Minister of the Crown's office advise him?

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

MR. HICKMAN: In any event, Mr. Speaker, why the Newfoundland Broadcasting Corporation, bearing in mind their responsibilities under the Canadian Broadcast regulations would, if that is correct, as the hon. gentleman said is correct, would refuse to carry a statement from the hon. the Premier, I would suggest, is a matter between the Newfoundland Broadcasting Corporation and the Premier and the CRTC.

MR. W. ROWE: Government lawyers involved.

MR. HICKMAN: Certainly I would not be in a position nor should I comment on why the Premier was not allowed to make factual statements to the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. minister, Sir, as Minister of Justice who gives legal advice to the ministers and to the Premier and to the Crown, would the minister indicate whether he or any of the solicitors in his department looked over the statement and advised the Premier against it in indicating that it was slanderous and libelous?

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

MR. HICKMAN: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to him.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Justice, Sir, who gives advice to the Crown, legal advice, and the Minister of Finance, would the minister indicate who was paying for this political telecast? Was it being paid for by the taxpayers of this Province out of the Public Treasury or was it being paid for by the Tory Party?

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, that would appear to be quite a hypothetical question, in view of the fact, that this House has been advised by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that the broadcast is not going to take place. And I would assume that the

Mr. Hickman: answer to that question -

MR. NOLAN: He booked the time. He could be held libel for it.

MR. WHITE: Who booked the time?

MR. NOLAN: You have to pay for it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is there a question?

MR. HICKMAN: What I would suggest is that the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) if the rules could be weighed would direct his question through his colleagues opposite, because they obviously know all of the answers, and if they know all of the answers I cannot see any conceivable reason why the time of the House should be wasted with this line of questioning. I have given the House all I know. What else can I do?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate to the House, Sir, who booked the time, whether it was the government's public relations people or the people in the Premier's office or in the Minister of Justice's office or in the Minister of Finance's office? Or was it officials of the Tory Party? Who booked the time? What arrangement was made to pay for - there was a contract, I understand, and the contract, as my hon. friend pointed out, the government could be held to the contract. But was it being paid for by the Tory Party if it had gone on? What arrangement had been made for payment from the Minister's chest?

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it was - Sir, it was only because of the legal advice that was given that it did not go on. The Premier could have very easily today found himself in an embarrassing position of having a half a dozen or more libel suits slapped on him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The Premier told us some time ago he was going to take libel action against Mr. Davidson. He has not done it yet. He was going to do it immediately and up to last night it had not been done. Now the hon. Minister of Justice looks at me. It has not been done to this day. Ten days ago it was urgent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
I am going to ask the hon. gentleman to proceed to a question.

MR. NEARY: Well if the minister will answer that, Sir, I have one more supplementary and then that will end it.

MR. HICKMAN: Why not ask me the other one now before I get up.

MR. NEARY: Well I will ask the hon. gentleman, Sir - No, well I have to get the answer to that question first before I can ask the next question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I, as I said, have advised the House of all the knowledge that I am privy to. But there are two parts to the question put by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that I can answer with absolute certainty. Number one, the Minister of Justice and/or officials in the Department of Justice, did not book, pay for, time for the hon. the Premier on any station, television or otherwise, in this Province. Secondly, the same answer applies with respect to the Department of Finance.

The other comments were more in the line of factual information allegedly on the part of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and I certainly cannot answer these and I guess it will have to rest until the hon. the -

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell the House, Sir, if the government has now hammered out a new policy, Sir, now adopted

MR. NEARY: a new policy that the head of the administration, the Premier, can take to the airwaves in paid political telecasts that will be paid for out of the public treasury? Is this the new policy of the administration?

MR. HICKMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I can say without consulting with my colleagues on this side of the House; I can say that there is no policy on the part of this administration, which would in any way allow or make it possible for the hon. the Premier to make a paid political broadcast, or any other member, and it being paid for by public funds. If it is a paid political broadcast it will be paid for by the Progressive Conservative Party of Newfoundland. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, one of the onerous responsibilities of the Premier of any province in order to meet the insatiable and understandable demands of the people of Newfoundland to have information as to their welfare and the conduct of the government made known to them -

MR. NEARY: I know about that.

MR. HICKMAN: - is the responsibility of the hon. the Premier and when he discharges that responsibility within the course -

MR. NEARY: Why do they not do it here in the House?

MR. HICKMAN: - in his employment.

MR. NEARY: Why was it cancelled then?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, you know as I say, if the hon. gentleman would give notice of a motion to amend the rules so that he then can ask his colleagues these questions on the other side because obviously they are privy to -

MR. NEARY: Do not be hedging, boy. Do not be hedging.

MR. HICKMAN: - they are privy to information that I am not aware of.

MR. NEARY: It is a good thing you are getting out of politics.

MR. HICKMAN: But the tenor of the question seems to be, that the hon. the Premier of this Province, has some very factual information that he wanted to make known to the people of this Province and that for some strange reason -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

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

MR. HICKMAN: - for some strange reason, Mr. Speaker, this is the tenor of the questioning I get for some reason. I suspect that the - unprecedented in the broadcasting and television history of this Province, he has been precluded from so doing.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, he should be ashamed - ashamed to sit where you are.

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

I must point out to hon. gentlemen that the question period becomes almost impossible to conduct sensibly if there are such interruptions from both or either side.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, have I answered this question as well as I can and despite the interruptions because I am sure Your Honour would like me to repeat the concern that I am sure is in the breasts of every Newfoundlander, that their Premier wanted to bring facts to them last night and apparently was precluded from so doing. But as this Legislature does not have any jurisdiction over the Canadian Broadcasting regulations then I guess that is a matter for another forum.

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated that that would be the last supplementary and there are a number of hon. members, I can only infer that they wish to ask questions on different subjects. It does not preclude hon. members from coming back to this. I had indicated I would recognize the hon. member for Terra Nova next, following him the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower. Today on the news media an official made some serious allegations against the government. The official had said that the government was guilty of unfair labour practices and that the labour relations with the government was in a state of chaos.

MR. LUSH: The member was referring particularly to the negotiations as they relate to the hospital support workers, and I think his remarks were brought about by an incident at Burin in the hospital there with the strike situation there, and he finished by saying that the government had broken off negotiations with this group. So I wonder if the minister can comment on this - why negotiations were broken off with the hospital support workers?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the news broadcast, obviously. I am - you know, surprised. I have been meeting with the Federation of Labour and with NAPE and with CUPE and everybody else for the past two Fridays, which is the only uninterrupted time you appear to have for long, detailed discussions. Obviously, every labour union has a problem when it comes to the government, and management too, for that matter, in certain instances, but I would be very surprised if government or the hospital association broke off talks, because our job in the Department of Labour would be to make sure that the talks continue, because no strike or no dispute is going to be settled as long as both sides are not talking. I doubt very much - it may take a little while with one or the other sides to get them back to the table to discuss meaningfully again to bring about a conclusion, but, you know, if there were a break off in talks which happens, by the way from both sides at any time, the conciliation officer is then going to work on both sides to try to get them back to the table.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Fisheries.

Sir, in view of the fact that the minister has telexed the federal Minister of Fisheries protesting the issuing of six shrimp licences to Mainland firms in beds off the coast of Labrador and Northeastern Newfoundland, would the minister indicate to the House, Sir, what initiative he has taken himself to insure that all the shrimp licences be issued to Labrador and Newfoundland firms before the actual decision was made?

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

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the House yesterday that we did support the proposal put forward by Fishery Products Limited to establish a shrimp processing plant in St. Anthony which would more than likely have taken care of at least four, maybe five such licences. About the most we could have done would be to have made representation supporting their request. At that time they were the only Newfoundland company showing any interest in developing the processing capability required to handle the shrimp recently discovered off the East coast of Labrador. That action has been taken and as I said in the telegram yesterday, it is regrettable that Ottawa saw fit to ignore the request of Fishery Products for licences; consequently, the plant that was planned will not be going in there this year.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate whether he has had any correspondence or telephone conversations with the federal Minister of Fisheries,

MR. F. ROWE: Romeo LeBlanc, regarding the issuing of shrimp licences in the last say, in the last half year - six months or so?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, we have made numerous representations to Ottawa with respect to licences - I am not sure exactly how many letters or telegrams or telephone calls - but certainly I will find out and I will be very happy to table correspondence we have had with Ottawa, or in fact, for that matter, anybody else, concerning the shrimp stocks off Labrador and the issuance of licences to harvest that stock.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. F. ROWE: Final? Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that the minister has had correspondence and sent telexes to the federal Minister of Fisheries regarding the issuing of shrimp licences in this particular instance which he referred to yesterday in his telegram? And would the minister, since he was given notice of this yesterday, be prepared to table that correspondence and any telexes in the House today, Sir?

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

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to table that correspondence today. First of all, our deputy minister is on holidays. I do not have time to get the correspondence out, but he will have to take my word for it -

MR. F. ROWE: No.

MR. W. CARTER: - that we have supported every way possible the application of Fishery Products Limited for shrimp licences to operate a fish processing plant in St. Anthony to process the shrimp that is out there to be caught and should be caught by Newfoundlanders.

June 8, 1978

Tape 4114

EC - 4

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice, Sir, that I wish to debate this under Standing Order No. 31(g).

MR. McNEIL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. McNEIL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

During the official opening of the Bay St. George Community College on April 26th the minister indicated that he would look at the proposal of Stephenville Development to renovate building No. 360 for the college. Has the minister had the opportunity to view the proposal, and if so, will he support the proposal put forward by Stephenville Development?

Mr. Hickman: What the hon. gentleman says is required but there is some elaboration required as you will recall. Mr. Frederick Stagg, who is a very strong community leader in Stephenville and, as I know the hon. gentleman will agree is doing an excellent job as Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Bay St. George Community College. In his address to the very large and enthusiastic audience in Stephenville on the night of the official opening he indicated that there is another building in the Harmon Complex which he feels could be converted for use by the Bay St. George Community College and if converted for the use intended would save the Government of Newfoundland money. And I stated then categorically that if the Board of Governors of the Community College of Bay St. George through their strong Chairman, Mr. Frederick Stagg would make his submission to me and that submission following examination by the officials in the Department of Finance prove beyond reasonable doubt that there was indeed funds to be saved by the Province then he would have a most enthusiastic supporter for that concept in Newfoundland.

Mr. Stagg and his Board have now prepared and submitted a very detailed proposal to me designed to meet that challenge. And in accordance with my undertaking to the Board and to the Chairman of the Board, and indeed to the multitude gathered there that evening that proposal is now being studied very assiduously and very carefully by the accountants and the economists in the Department of Finance. And I certainly hope that at the end of their study of that proposal that they will arrive at the conclusion made by Mr. Stagg when he made that very fine address at the official opening of the Bay St. George Community College which is another, by the way, gem in the Crown of the Progressive Conservative Administration.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in the remarks of the hon. minister. Is the minister saying that the only proposal that has been put forward for this development has been the proposal put forward by the Trustees, the Board Trustees. Because from my

Mr. MCNEIL: understanding that proposal for this development has been submitted to the government well over a year, and the government has been sitting on it. Is this the first time that that proposal has been put forward?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. HICKMAN: I can only say it is the first time that that proposal came to the government or to me to my knowledge. Now there may have been a proposal to the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services, by the hon. Minister of Education, or some other hon. minister I do not know. But the proposal that was put to me when I was in Stephenville about six weeks ago was, by Mr. Stagg, that he advanced the opinion that if this building -

MR. MCNEIL: That proposal was done over a year and a half ago.

MR. HICKMAN: -that if this building, what is the number of it? I have forgotten the number of it now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 360.

MR. HICKMAN: If Building No. 360. was renovated along the lines suggested by the college for use by the college that it would save the Government of Newfoundland money, and I said - which left me with the distinct understanding that whatever submissions that come into government before dealt with the physical changes and the accommodation that this would provide for instruction and for the work of the college.

The challenge that was thrown out to me in my capacity as Minister of Finance in the hope that I too would be very supportive of the idea on the grounds that money would be saved. So I said if the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: I am being harassed, and I apologize to the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) for the behaviour of his colleagues to the right of Mr. Speaker.

MR. MCNEIL: That is okay.

MR. HICKMAN: Because obviously he and I are the only two that have any real interest in this monumental task.

AN HON. MEMBER: Carry on!

MR. HICKMAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may finish answering the question.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the Minister of Education? What about the Minister of -

MR. HICKMAN: The challenge that was put to me was that they could prove that we would save money, and it is along these lines that the submission to me was made by Mr. Frederick Stagg on behalf of his Board.

MR. MCNEIL: Can we take it then that construction will start this Summer?

MR. HICKMAN: You can take it from me -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NOLAN: You are not in court just to place final -

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: I suppose we will start somewhere (inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, you know, life is not worth living if one is going to be harassed like I am being harassed right now particularly from hon. members on this side of the House. May I conclude my answer, Mr. Speaker, by saying and repeating that the appropriate officials in the Department of Finance are very assiduously studying the proposal of Mr. Stagg.

MR. PECKFORD: No, no, no. That is not right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Justice so enjoys answering questions let him answer this one, Mr. Speaker. Let him give as long an answer as he wants but factual. Mr. Speaker, we have been given to understand for a number of years now that this administration would very much like to have Mr. John C. Doyle back in the Province to face fraud charges in connection with the operation of the Labrador Linerboard Mill. It is my understanding that notwithstanding the government's stated eagerness to have him back in the Province it is my understanding that up until a month ago this Province, the government of this Province, had not made any request to Ottawa to have Mr. Doyle extradited to face charges here. Is that correct?

MR. HICKMAN: I can tell the House that the hon. gentleman's understanding is incorrect.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister could elaborate a little more because one of his colleagues in Cabinet, namely the Minister of Transportation has given the contrary impression to the press a month or so ago. And if that is not correct would the minister indicate when that request was made and what the result of the request has been.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. SIMMONS: That was a question by the way.

MR. HICKMAN: Since my name has been mentioned on this thing.

I was asked by -

MR. SIMMONS: I mentioned Doyle's. Can he answer the question too?

MR. HICKMAN: - the press if it was true that the only thing that was necessary to bring Mr. Doyle back to Newfoundland was that the Government of Newfoundland make the necessary request to Ottawa. I said at that time that I was not aware that this was the case. I would check it out with officials in the Department of Justice. Certainly if the only thing that was keeping Mr. Doyle from returning to Newfoundland was an official invitation from this Province I would be only too happy to extend such an invitation on behalf of the people. That is exactly the answer that I gave at that time and that is the answer as I understand it. If he wants to come home we would be delighted to see him. We would put him up with free board and lodging indefinitely.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I understood the Minister of Justice intended to answer the question. He does not want to answer the question? See what I mean.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 10.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance, to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973", carried. (Bill No. 60)

On motion bill no. 60 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 11.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Social Services, to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Registration Of Qualified Social Workers", carried. (Bill No. 61)

On motion bill no. 61 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 12.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment, to introduce a bill, "An Act To Facilitate Metric Conversion", carried. (Bill No. 62)

On motion bill no. 62 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 13.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Forestry And Agriculture, to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Protection Of Plants And The Prevention Of The Spread Of Pests And Diseases Destructive To Vegetation", carried. (Bill No. 55)

On motion Bill No. 55 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Protection Of Animals," carried. (Bill No. 63).

On motion, Bill No. 63 read a first time
ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 15.

Motion, the hon. the President of the Treasury Board to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The War Service (Pensions) Act, 1975," (Bill no. 59).

On motion, Bill No. 59 read a first time,
Ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 1.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, the adjourned debate on the sub-amendment to the Address in Reply.

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, it has been two or three weeks ago, I believe, since we were on this particular order, the time we had the Thursday morning massacre. So it has been a long time since we had the sub-amendment. I am not even sure what it says now.

MR. SIMMONS: Let the record show that it was the Premier who got massacred.

MR. RIDEOUT: I remember that I made a few brief introductory remarks that day, Mr. Speaker, so I want to get into the meat of the subject this afternoon. If I remember correctly we put down a sub-amendment at that time, Sir, detailing some of the areas where we thought the government had fallen such as; record unemployment, the cost of electricity, the cost of living, fishery policy, development of the Lower Churchill, the Nordsea proposal, the re-opening of the Linerboard mill at Stephenville, occupational health and safety legislation and covering full disclosure of all election expenses and donations. I believe I dealt with one or two of those in the little

Mr. Rideout.

while I was speaking the other day, but there are some of them that I do want to have a few more words to say on, Mr. Speaker, before I clue up my remarks. Before I do that though there are a few, since we are speaking in the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, there are a few district problems that I want to bring to the attention of the House. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that you can do this year after year and it is customary, I understand, in the Address in Reply for members to make what is commonly referred to as a district speech when you bring the problems of your district before the House of Assembly, air them so that the government, even though they are aware of them, can become aware once again, and will hopefully do something about them. Mr. Speaker, it would give me great pleasure if I could stand here today and say that all the problems of my district that I referred to in the Address in Reply last year or even half of them or even a quarter of them that some solution had been sought to them, some attention had been paid to them by the government of this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, for the third year in a row speaking in the Address in Reply debate, I have no choice but to say that there has been no effort whatsoever on the part of this government to deal with the problems that I have outlined three years successively now, three years in succession, faced by the people in the district of Baie Verte - White Bay. If I could stand here and say that the government had made some progress, then I would be glad to do that. I would be glad, Sir, to give credit where credit is due.

But as I said last year and I said the year before and I will say again this year, it seems to me that decisions made by this government are in the main based on political expediency and not on sharing the wealth philosophy that they should prevail when it comes to decision making in this Province. I have outlined year after year community by community, right from Roddickton in the North to LaScie in the South, I have

Mr. Rideout.

outlined the problems facing that district three years in a row here under this particular motion, the Address in Reply. And I have seen no progress, Mr. Speaker, whatsoever, absolutely none. I see the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing walking down. I am not aware of any progress in the field of the development of municipal services although I have talked about it for three years in a row in this particular debate. I remember saying, when I came into this House first, that certain consulting engineering firms in this Province ought to be hauled over the coals by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. And, of course, the minister agreed with me.

MR. J. CARTER: Some of them are.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well maybe they are, but we do not see any evidence of it.

MR. J. CARTER: In the courts.

MR. RIDEOUT: In the courts, that is good. Is Gorman Butler one of them? They

MR. RIDEOUT:

ought to be if they are not. They are are they? Good. The Minister agreed with me then and apparently he still agrees because he has taken some concrete action in that direction and I say bravo for the Minister. The last time I mentioned it, Mr. Speaker, the member from Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) viciously jumped to his feet and ran down my throat for having such audacity as to even question the consulting engineers, so we know now who the defender of the consulting engineers is. I am not lumping them all into one basket just as you would not lump teachers into one basket or lump lawyers into one basket. Those who have done wrong, Mr. Speaker, deserve to be punished and there are communities in my district, Mr. Speaker, that ought to have water flowing through pipes years and years ago, where barrels and barrels of money have been spent and there has yet to be a drop of water go through that system. The Minister is fully aware of the problem in Coachman's Cove for example, where almost a half a million dollars, Mr. Speaker, has been put in the ground and you have yet to get one glass of water run through those pipes. It is not the fault of the people of Coachman's Cove Mr. Speaker, it is certainly not their fault, Gorman and Butler was the consulting engineer. They are the ones who are suffering, those people and the province because the province is not getting any return yet on the money that they have invested in Coachman's Cove and obviously cannot expect any until the system is working. Mr. Speaker, Gorman and Butler were the consulting engineers, Gorman and Butler were the professional people, they ought to have known whether the system could work or whether it could not, in fact, they ought to be responsible, I would say to the Minister, to be forced in there when a half a million dollars is spent to make sure that that system works. Pardon?

AN.HON. MEMBER:

We payed enough for it.

MR. RIDEOUT:

We payed enough for it, that is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: They get something like twenty percent off the top, I understand, or something close to that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Seven percent to twenty five percent.

MR. RIDEOUT: There you are, I guess they are close to the top. The other thing, Mr. Speaker, about the whole matter of communities who have gotten in trouble by the actions of consulting engineers in this province. The other, pardon,

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. RIDEOUT: Oh yes, there is half a dozen I know but I will just keep to those. The other thing is Mr. Speaker is where the - I do not know if it is on the advise of the professional staff the engineering staff of the Department of Municipal Affairs or not but where they continue to pour money into a system when they know that there is no chance of that system working. Again I will use the example of Coachman's Cove; they went into Coachman's Cove with the advise of Gorman and Butler and built a dam across a brook that runs right along by the side of the road, that I would suggest to the Minister is probably contaminated anyway, but one thing that I do know for sure that there is not enough water backs up behind that dam in July and August and September to supply the community of Coachman's Cove and any fool can go down there in the middle of summer and see that, Mr. Speaker. I know it, I drive out there almost every other day, it is close by where I live. People from Coachman's Cove know it and the department knows it but what did they do last summer, they spent another \$50,000. dollars on the same system in by the dam trying to get the system working instead of getting somebody to go in there that have some sort of click in their head and rearranging or finding a new source. There are dozens of new sources available. It is going to take some money to them but Mr. Speaker, as I said, there is a half million dollars in

MR. RIDEOUT: the ground now so you may as well invest another few thousand dollars to get the system working. If you are going to do that Mr. Speaker, for goodness sake have the good sense to make sure that the system is going to work when you are finished with it, not like the \$50,000. that was spent there last summer, I would say to the Minister another \$50,000. wasted on top of the \$310,000. that already went down the drain or that is down the drain yet, hopefully it can be salvaged, hopefully something can be done with it. So it should be a priority, Mr. Speaker, in the Ministers department to engage some reputable engineering firms, some reputable consulting firms and send them down to those places who have just as much right to expect a good water and sewer system as does any other community in the province, but who also need the professional expertise if it going to be done properly. So I do hope that the Minister, this is not being critical of the Minister, but I hope that he will take that advise and do it.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the same can be said of dozens of other communities. We have to look at some different method of providing an adequate water system in a lot of our smaller communities than those million dollar Cadillac systems. I think the Minister would do well if he would look at alternatives. Maybe an artesian well system properly hooked up might be the answer. Maybe some method of running pipes on top of the ground with the proper insulation on them would be the answer. But, something has to be done where we can provide an adequate water system to our smaller communities but at the same time not having it cost \$1,000,000 or \$1,500,000 because, Mr. Speaker, once it is in there those communities cannot even generate from their own resources enough revenue to maintain the system let alone pay off the capital debt. So, we have to come to grips with the problem, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that the Minister does something about it and does something tangible so that we can see it.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks a couple of weeks ago I made reference to the economic situation facing the communities in the northern portion of my riding, particularly Roddickton area. At that time I told the House that the Town Council of Roddickton had been so concerned about the economic situation of that town, brought about by the closedown of Labrador Linerboard - People might think that funny but there was a lot more than the Stephenville and Goose Bay/Happy Valley area hit by the closedown of Labrador Linerboard and Roddickton happened to be one of the hardest hit on the Northern Peninsula because the Canada Bay Lumber Company which has a sawlog operation now finds that it cannot continue to operate unless it has some market to sell its pulpwood and the problem that exists is the transportation cost from Roddickton to Corner Brook. We have made effort after effort - and I am sorry the Minister of Forestry is not in his seat today but he was here when I mentioned it before, I believe - We have made continuous efforts to try to convince the Government that they would be money in if they would come up with some sort of transportation subsidy to transport wood up

MR. RIDEOUT: the Northern Peninsula to the paper mill in Corner Brook. Now, we are not talking very much money, Mr. Speaker. We know for a fact that Bowaters would be quite prepared to take 30,000 cords of wood off the Northern Peninsula. We know that. They have told us; guaranteed us that they would be delighted to take it. We know that there is no problem with the private operators in cutting it but we also know that with the price per cord that Bowaters will offer and of course they will not offer anymore further down the Northern Peninsula than they will offer up around Corner Brook - They are going to pay the same price for their wood, try to get it as cheap as they can, that is understandable - But the price per cord that they are offering it is not economically feasible to transport that wood from Roddickton to Corner Brook, and that is the whole problem. We have proposed that the Government initiate some sort of transportation subsidy so that it will be feasible to do it but you may be talking about twenty-five or fifty cents a cord, I believe. Spread over 30,000 cords, as you know, Sir, it is not a great deal of money but it would mean that the 2,500 people living in Roddickton would have a livelihood or a means of making a living for themselves and their families. It would mean the same thing for Main Brook which is not in my riding but in the district of my colleague, the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). It would mean that people in Conche, Englee, Boyd Arm, all those people who are so dependent on the Forestry, Mr. Speaker, would have a chance to survive. They would not be dependent on the Government as many of them are now and many more of them will be, Mr. Speaker, when their unemployment insurance runs out in a few months time because there is no fishery whatsoever worth talking about in Roddickton, never was, and I do not know if there ever will be. Roddickton is too far in the bay, it is too far to get out for fishermen to make it commercially viable. So, Roddickton is totally on the woods operations, Mr. Speaker, and unless something is done, unless the Government takes some action

MR. RIDEOUT: to alleviate the situation down there you are going to have an economically dead town on your hands, and the Government ought to know that for the sake of \$15,000 the transportation subsidy would be, I think the Government would be in money if they would give some thought to instituting that type of policy. We have not heard any response from the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture on it yet, yet I believe it was in January that we first made the presentation to him.

So, Mr. Speaker, time is running out.

MR. RIDEOUT: If Labrador Linerboard gets back on the rails, well, then the subsidization program could be done away with again, but in the meantime, Sir, in the interim, the livelihood of 2,500 people in Roddickton that I know of, and I cannot speak for the other communities around like Main Brook and Conche because I am not so familiar with them - they are not in my district - but the livelihood of that particular community and a half dozen others around is at stake, Sir, and the government so far is doing nothing to assist them even though the community made such reasonable proposals - an excellent brief they presented to the minister when he was down there to listen to it and nothing has happened since. Mr. Speaker, in the area of fisheries I am disappointed in the Minister of Fisheries in some ways, especially as far as the fisheries go in Englee. You would think, Mr. Speaker, that Englee did not exist as far as this Minister of Fisheries is concerned. Now, he goes to La Scie and I am delighted with that - a great fishing community it is and will continue to be, but that is one end of it. The other end of it a similar situation exists and that is in Englee, and I do not know if the Minister of Fisheries has ever been in Englee since he used to be the Liberal member for the old White Bay seat - I do not suppose he has; but he has come close to it, Mr. Speaker, he has come as far as Plum Point, but you got to drive over 52 miles of dirt road to get from Plum Point to Englee. And Englee -

AN HON. MEMBER: Whose district is Plum Point?

MR. RIDEOUT: Plum Point is in the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture's district, I believe, or pretty close to the strip there between himself and Roberts. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, Englee is one of the most thriving fishing communities along the northeast coast but it needs some help

MR. RIDEOUT: it needs some assistance. The company that operates the fish plant down there have done a marvellous job in many cases, but, Mr. Speaker, the fish plant that is in Englee, I have not got a clue how old it is but it must be at least forty years old, it is a very old, run-down operation, and the miracle of it all is that the company - the Lake Group - have been able to keep it going. That is the real miracle of it all, and with Englee then one of the most striving fishing communities on the northeast coast I simply cannot understand why the Minister of Fisheries, having gone everywhere around the Province to talk to the fishermen and to seek their advice and those great numbers of meetings last year and the year before, how the Minister of Fisheries could overlook Englee. I just do not understand it. I asked him to come to Englee. I asked him here in this House how come he has not gone to Englee. I do not know if he has got anything against the community - I do not know what the problem is, but I do know that since he has been Minister of Fisheries he has yet to go in there -

MR. W. CARTER: There are at least a half dozen other places I have not been to in the Province.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, are they as striving and important a fishing community as -

MR. W. CARTER: No.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, how come the Minister has not been there? Because of what? I mean the Minister went on a great, a great campaign, I suppose you could call it, around the Province last year and the year before visiting all the major fishing centres, and rightly so, I think he did the right thing but the Minister should visit them all. Certainly he has had time now. He has been Minister of Fisheries for three years.

AN HON. MEMBER: You would need three twin brothers.

MR. RIDEOUT: You would not need three - not to pick out the major centres, Mr. Speaker, like Twillingate and La Scie and St. Anthony and, you know, all those places around where you have the major fishing centres of the Province and major processing centres in the Province. The Minister would not need three twin brothers to go around and do the likes of that, but I suggest to him that he should do it because I think the government has a role to play in the development of the fishery in the Englee area and I am afraid that unless - if you leave it all, Mr. Speaker, to the initiative of the company, you know, I think we got to be in there pushing them to further develop the fishery in the Englee area and I am disappointed - totally disappointed - that the Minister has not seen fit to visit that fishing community yet where there is a couple of thousand people dependent totally on the fishery. It is the nub of the fishery along the northeast coast from St. Anthony up and in between La Scie - one of the most important fishing centres on the northeast coast. But the Minister of Fisheries has been flirting around to hither and yon and has yet to see fit to dart in to Englee so he can see the problems facing the fishery down there. I have mentioned them in this House on numerous occasions. I have done so again today. I would hope that if the Minister is going to continue, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister is going to continue his trips around the Province this year I would beg him to put Englee on his itinerary. I would hope that he could put Englee on his schedule and get in there sometime or other before he is finished his job as Minister of Fisheries. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to belabor the subject but I want to make brief mention before I finish again of the road situation

MR. RIDEOUT: on the Baie Verte Peninsula. If there is anything that I have talked about enough that hon. members should be sick of it in this House it is the problem that faces people on the Baie Verte Peninsula with regard to road reconstruction and paving. Now, we are finally, I suppose, going to get some work done. Oh, yes, the former Minister of Transportation committed himself and then tried to back off but the present Minister has committed - and the present Minister has not been doing any backing off, I must say that for him. He made his commitment and it appears as if he is going to live by it. Now, I agree with him trying to get some sort of help from Ottawa because it is a major problem. In fact, the road from Baie Verte on to Coachman's Cove and Fleur-de-Lys is the finish of Highway 410 which was done under FREE anyway, so it does not finish at Advocate Mines, it finishes at Fleur-de-Lys sixteen miles further down the road. So, it should have been done under the original FREE agreement, whosever oversight that was I do not know, but all I know, it was not done. So, I think it is right and proper for him to seek some assistance from the Federal Government and I am very pleased to learn from the Minister that he expects to have some sort of agreement signed with them in the next week or so.

The other thing is, Mr. Speaker, we have to look at the major upgrading programme of every road on the Baie Verte Peninsula. I think the sooner that the Minister - and I am glad the Minister is nodding his head because the sooner that is accepted by Government, the better. Now, nobody expects that it can be done in a two or three year period, it may be five or six year period, but we have to accept the responsibility that something has to be done because it has a problem that is unique, I would suggest, to any other part of the Province and that is where you have - Nobody in his right mind anymore is going to even attempt, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that asbestos dust is not a problem. It is a problem. It has been proven beyond any

MR. RIDEOUT:

doubt and we have the means to control it to some extent. You might never make it perfect, you might never make the mining operation perfect but our goal ought to be to make it as technologically safe as possible. That is all anybody has been saying. That is all I have been saying for the past three years and it is all I will continue to say. You cannot do the impossible but we ought to do what we can do within the technological capabilities that we have. I think, if we do that then people are not going to be disappointed. But the road situation on the Baie Verte Peninsula has to be faced. I am hopeful that something will be started this year and that progress will be made. If we can get some sort of agreement with the Federal Government then that will be great. But, that aside, it is the Province that is responsible for roads and the Province has to accept that responsibility. If we can get some help from the Feds, like I say, fine, but we cannot say we cannot do it because the Federal Government would not participate. It is not their jurisdiction anyway. Whether they participate, or not, the Province has to get in there and tackle the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one quick word on the spruce budworm situation before I sit down. I think it was adequately debated in this House the other day, but there is something which has come to my attention recently that bothers me about the attitudes of the companies. I am talking basically about Bowaters because that is the one I know best. They operate on the Baie Verte Peninsula portion of my district. The thing that bothers me about those companies was brought to my attention a few days ago. We have fishermen going in the woods, Mr. Speaker, cutting twenty-five or thirty wharf sticks to repair their wharves and so on, going home and coming back the next morning to find that the Bowaters truck has been around and picked up the logs and carted them off to Sandy or wherever they chop them up into smaller pieces for pulpwood. Now, if this is the company,

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, that is so concerned about the spruce budworm infestation and if this is the company that is suggesting to the Government that the only answer is to spray, then is this company looking at other alternative methods. Bowaters have not harvested very much wood - well, they were gone for ten or twelve years off the Baie Verte Peninsula, this last four or five years they have been coming back mostly through private operators but they do operate one camp on the Baie Verte Road themselves - If they had treated the forest right on the Baie Verte Peninsula a lot of this over-mature timber would have been cut. The particular area I am talking about, for example, is 28 Ridge off Fleur-de-Lys Road

MR. RIDEOUT:

which has not seen a Bowater nose except to pick those logs, I suppose, in ten or twelve years since the old camp was closed down on 28 Ridge. There have been some private operators there on Crown land but on Bowaters land Bowaters has not been there themselves probably for the last ten or twelve years. Yet you will get a poor old fisherman who will go to the forestry officer, and I blame part of the problem on the Department of Forestry too, Mr. Speaker because if I go to the Department of Forestry and ask for a permit to cut and they ask me where I am going to cut and I tell them they should be if they know anything about their job at all, they should be able to tell me whether that is Crown land, Bowaters land or Reid land, whoever in heavens name might own the land. But anyway that is beside the point. They will give people and have given - I have had three cases now where they have given people a Crown permit to cut and Bowaters found out that it was on their land. And when 100 or a couple of hundred logs had been cut along comes Bowaters with their truck after the men have gone home in two of the three cases and carted off the timber.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is the way a company that is so concerned about the spruce budworm investation is going to act then I would have second thoughts about that company because, as I said to Your Honour and as I am saying to this House they have not harvested on 28 Ridge and there may be 10,000 28 Ridges around this Province as far as I know. But they have not harvested on 28 Ridge in ten or twelve years. The timber is old. It is over matured. It is infested with the spruce budworm. And what is the company's answer to the whole problem? If a fisherman wants to go cut a few wharf sticks or cut a few logs to build a piece on his house, when he gets them cut down take them away from him.

Now I know it is their land. I am not making a legal argument. I am making a moral argument, Mr. Speaker, that if this company is concerned about the infestation of the spruce budworm in this Province then should they not have developed and should they not develop now some particular policy on their own timber blocks

MR. RIDEOUT:

where they will allow the ordinary individual to cut and if they have no plans to cut there immediately. Why not allow the ordinary individual, give him a permit if they want to, to come in and cut a few of those logs off. You know if a lot of people - it may not be the overall answer to the problem but I think it would be a show of good faith on the part of the companies rather than coming around almost like thieves in the night and swiping, not swiping just taking their own, but swiping the labour certainly of those particular individuals and marching off with it and the poor fellow goes back in the woods the next morning and finds there is not a log left that he had cut two or three days previously. I do not think it is good enough on the part of Bowaters. I do not know if Price does it or not. If they do then I think they are equally as guilty.

I would hope that the Minister of Forestry although he is not in his seat today - I know his officials are aware of it because I have certainly brought it to their attention and I would hope that they would take it up with those companies, Mr. Speaker, take it up with them and put it to them. If you have infested timber on your blocks, on your timber claims and that if you cannot cut it and there are residents who want to cut it for their own use or even for sawmilling, Mr. Speaker - maybe some residents might want to set up a sawmill operation on Bowaters block and if it is in an infested areas why cannot they be encouraged to do so rather than let the timber rot on the stump. I believe, and I can only speak as I find, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this particular company, Bowaters would rather let their timber rot on the stump, that is what it appears, they would rather let their timber rot on the stump than allow local residents to cut it for their own use. And I think that is a sad state of affairs. I do not think the government should allow it to continue. I think they ought to use their influence as a government. Maybe the government should try to get some more exchange blocks with Bowaters. They certainly need it on the Baie

MR. RIDEOUT:

Verte Peninsula because they are running out of Crown timber rights. You know Bowaters has a lot of it tied up and they are not cutting it themselves.

MR. WELLS: (Inaudible)

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes well unless you go get a permit from the company they take it too. You know you will go and cut your logs, if you go get a permit from them okay. But if you go to the Department of Forestry and get a Crown permit and you think you are on Crown land, Forestry thinks you are on Crown land - this has happened in three cases - and they go and cut a couple of hundred logs and Bowaters come out and take it. And they have done it. They have done it this Winter in three particular cases in my district.

MR. WELLS: Not a good spirit.

MR. RIDEOUT: No it is not a good spirit. And another problem, Mr. Speaker, their claims are not adequately mark. You can drive the Fleur de Lys Road and you are told by Bowaters that going down to Fleur de Lys all the land on the right belongs to Bowaters but you do not see any signs saying Bowaters Timber Land, you are not allowed to cut. No such thing as that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Has it ever been surveyed?

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not know if it has ever been surveyed.

Mr. Rideout.

But yet those people will come and take the timber after you cut it. I think it is a desperate state of affairs, and I think the government should take it under advisement, Mr. Speaker, and attempt to do something about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that basically brings to a close the remarks that I wanted to make in the Address in Reply on the sub-amendment that I put down. I will just close by saying that I do hope that the Minister of Justice gets his Oscar. He was making the theatrical presentation again today. He does it very well. He did it very well during the presentation of his budget. I made some reference to it in the few remarks that I made a couple of weeks ago. And I do hope that before this session is over the Minister of Justice gets his Oscar, because he certainly deserves it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: - it seems a long time since the House opened and the Throne Speech was read. Two of our distinguished members had the distinction of moving and seconding the Address in Reply, and I want, Mr. Speaker, at the outset to extend to both hon. members, the member for Ferryland district (Mr. Power) and for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) my sincere congratulations on two excellent speeches, excellent in content and equally excellent in delivery. Both hon. members, Mr. Speaker, are distinguishing themselves in the House, and I am sure that views put forward in their speeches reflect pretty well the feelings and the hopes and aspirations of their constituents and indeed I would suggest to you, probably most of the people of this Province.

Mr. W. Carter.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak at length, but I want to say a few words mainly about the fisheries and maybe other matters that I view of some concern to the Province and to the people living in the Province.

Well let me start off, Mr. Speaker, at the outset by talking about the much heralded \$900 million fishery development plan to which we were a party and was presented to Ottawa on December 20, 1977. And I want to set the record straight, Mr. Speaker, as to the contents of that proposal and to dispel the suggestion that has been made by a number of people, including the Federal Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa, that the provinces were looking for this massive infusion of federal money to at least commence the construction of ships the morning after the proposal was submitted. Mr. Speaker, that is anything but the truth. The fact of the matter is that the Atlantic Provinces, particularly Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, had numerous discussions on the matter of fleet replacements, the matter of projected increases in the fish stocks over the next five, seven, ten years and the need for action to replace a substantial number of the existing fleets and where possible, where necessary, to add new vessels and new technology to the fleet. Our plan, Mr. Speaker, to Ottawa envisaged the planning of a substantial number of ships over the next ten years and the reason, of course, being that during that period a number of the vessels presently in service in the Atlantic Provinces, particularly in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia,

MR. CARTER: will have reached the retirement age and unless we are prepared to defer to foreign effort and to forfeit our right to the resource that by that time, we hope, it will gain on the advise of experts in the field, will be rebuilt unless we gear up now to catch that fish then it stands that within a few years we are not going to have harvesting capability to harvest the regenerated stocks, consequently we will have to defer to foreign countries, who I am sure will be more than pleased to gain access to that resource. In Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, and Newfoundland is not unlike the other Atlantic Provinces, particularly Nova Scotia, we have an ageing offshore fishing capability. We have approximately eighty five deep sea ships, about twenty of which are side trawlers, and I would submit most of them should have been probably retired from service maybe a couple of years ago. These twenty side trawlers are redundant, obsolete, should be retired from service, uneconomic, both from the owners point of view and from the people who serve on the ships. The average age of our side trawler fleet, Mr. Speaker is at this point in time, fifteen years, which means of course that as I have said in most cases they have outlived their usefulness. Then we have the remaining fleet which is made up of stern trawlers, sixty five or approximately sixty five in number, many of which are now coming to the age of retirement, all of them getting older. Indeed the average age of the stern trawler fleet is nine and one half to ten years, which means of course that given another four or five years, at most five or six years, all of these ships will have to be replaced as well. The other factor, Mr. Speaker, which is equally important, is the fact that these ships are old, they are in many respects light years

MR. CARTER: behing ships owned and operated by other countries within our two hundred mile limit and in the absence of new and more sophisticated technology these ships, I submit, are unable to compete with the more modern and more sophisticated ships operated within our two hundred mile limit and with whom we have to compete alone by foreign countries. So Mr. Speaker to sum up with respect to that much criticized so called \$900,000,000. fleet replacement program, unless the provinces, especially Newfoundland, start now to plan for the replacement of that ageing, deep sea fishing fleet, then I submit that within ten years, maybe less, the stocks will be rebuilt to where they should be and where we want them to be, but we will not be able to benefit from the regenerated stock because our ships by that time will be obsolete, out of service and those that continue in service will be noncompetitive because of their redundancies and the fact that they have not kept abreast of new technology and new more sophisticated means of harvesting fish. So, I cannot Mr. Speaker impress upon the House too strongly the need for some kind of an ongoing ship replacement program. I am not suggesting that we should start tomorrow morning to lay the (audit) for a hundred ships, it would be ludicrous it would not make sense to even give a thought to that kind of a program. We all know that the condition of the fish stocks are not yet restored to a vibrancy or to such a healthy state as to justify building large numbers of additional ships to fish within the areas where we traditionally fish for traditional species of fish. We must recognize the fact that to build ships is not an easy proposition. There is no such thing as an instant boat building program, there is no such thing as an stir and trawler to build ships and I would submit that if the Minister in Ottawa were to send us

June 8, 1978

Tape No. 4124

CW - 2

MR. CARTER: a cheque now for one billion dollars and
tell us to start construction of a hundred ships, I submit Mr. Speaker,
that even with all of the haste that we could

MR. W. CARTER:

proceed - with which we could proceed - but it probably would be three or four years before there would be a ship into the water as a result of that program. It takes a long time. It takes years in fact to properly design ships, to investigate, to seek out new technology, to seek out new and more sophisticated means of harvesting fish and, of course, it takes months and I suppose more than a year to do the actual construction on that ship. So any plans that the first - my hon. colleague across the way from Burin peninsula (Mr. P. Canning) has reminded me that the first ship that we built would probably be obsolete before it would hit the water with today's changing and advancing technology, Mr. Speaker. That statement, I would submit, has a lot of truth in it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. minister - he has unlimited time - a moment to welcome to the House on behalf of hon. members 37 students from Grade 8 at Fatima Central High, St. Bride's, in the company of Florence Coffey and Sister Ellen Whitty. They are most welcome and I hope they enjoy their stay. Hon. minister.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, it is not enough for the federal government to ignore our request and to try and discredit the authors of the report. That, I submit, is what is happening, but the fact of the matter is, and the hard cold fact of the matter is that there is a day of reckoning - that the time will come in the not too distance future when we must give some thought to replacing the deepsea fleet: because, like I said, if we do not well then we will forfeit our right to that fish and if that is the case well then we deserve to forfeit our right to it. Newfoundland is not unlike Nova Scotia, not unlike the other Atlantic Provinces. They too recognize the need for an early start on the

MR. W. CARTER: planning, the designing and the construction of offshore ships to replace their aging offshore fleet as well. Then, Mr. Speaker, the \$900-million program to which I am referring also contains an element dealing with the construction and replacement of an aging inshore fishing fleet. As hon. members might know, in Newfoundland today we have approximately 700 longliners, longliners, of course, being a fishing vessel anywhere from 36' in length to a maximum of 65'. And, of course, 65' is the legal limit as required by federal regulations, because once you exceed the 65' limit then you would - there are certain regulations that would prevent that ship from being operated and being used within a certain distance of our shores. So, by virtue of these regulations, we are required to keep the maximum limit, the maximum length of an inshore, midwater longliner to that of 65' or less. So there are in the Province today approximately 700 vessels from 36' in length to a maximum of 65'. These vessels are leaving the service at the rate of 10% per year. In other words, 70 boats a year approximately are leaving the fishing fleet, the inshore fleet, for a variety of reasons; and unless a start is made now to replace that fleet or at least to build 50 or 60 or 70 vessels a year, well then we are slipping behind. We are not keeping up to date or the fleet itself is not being kept up to its present strength. At this point in time when we talk about rebuilding the stocks, about the new interest being shown in fisheries, about the new and exciting attitude that is emerging on the part of our fishermen especially, fish processors and governments, it would not make sense to allow our fishing fleet to deplete to the point where the harvesting of the regenerated stock again would be left up to foreign fishing efforts.

MR. H. COLLINS:

We need 70 just to keep -

MR. W. CARTER:

We need - the Minister of Health has reminded me we need approximately 70 longliners a year to keep abreast of the existing longliner fleet, and I regret to inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that that number is

MR. W. CARTER:

not being built. We are in no way building seventy longliners a year. In fact I submit that I doubt very much if we are building a third of that number. As a matter of fact at the present time the only real interest, real activity, in the building of the longliner fleets is evidenced by the provincial government's own programme of building twenty boats a year for the next five years. And in 1978 there will soon be twenty boats launched that have been built under the provincial government's boat building programme with no federal participation whatever, all provincial funds. These boats will be completely we hope within a few months and will then find their way into the hands of qualified fishermen and of course in time will enter the fishing fleet in the harvesting of the resource.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is an ongoing problem, the problem of finding adequate harvesting capability both in the offshore and inshore to keep abreast of the regenerated fish stocks as the building of boats that are keeping abreast of new technology, new and more sophisticated ways and means of processing or at least of harvesting the resource. So the much talked about and I might add, much criticized \$900 million plan, Mr. Speaker, I believe was a very essential, a very important plan and it is certainly one that should not be ignored by the powers that be in Ottawa because without that kind of an organized approach to the replacement of our fleet well then I submit that Newfoundland, indeed the Atlantic Provinces in general, will miss a golden opportunity to real capitalize on a regenerated fishery as in fact it will be within anywhere from seven to ten years.

Scientists, Mr. Speaker, biologists have advised the federal government whose responsibility it is to establish the allowable catches of various species in various areas, scientists and biologists have advised their federal employers and the federal minister and others that by 1985 cod stocks within our so called Northern Waters, that is the area between Cape Chidley in the North

MR. W. CARTER:

to off Cape St. Mary's in the South, that our cod stocks will increase from 135,000 tons in 1977 to approximately 300,000 tons in 1985, more than a doubling of the resource that will be there in the next seven years. I believe it is incumbent on us as a government and our federal counterparts and the industry to gear up and to use every device at our disposal to ensure that our fishermen are given every possible chance to benefit from that renewed and regenerated resource. AND if we do not do it then, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have failed our fishermen and all others who depend on the fishery for a livelihood.

I again, Mr. Speaker, through this House plead with Ottawa to take seriously the plan presented to them by the Atlantic Provinces on December 20 in which we have asked not for a cheque for \$900 million, not for a blank cheque to go out and to irresponsibly start building ships without regard for the resource but we ask for a statement of their policy. To what extent, for example, can the private sector expect assistance from Ottawa for the replacement of our aging fleet both inshore and offshore? What is their policy? Are they going to reinstate, for example, the subsidy that has been paid on longliners,

Mr. W. Carter.

on ships from forty-five to sixty-five feet in length. Are they going to increase and in fact, at least, to continue and maybe increase their assistance for the building of trawlers or deep-sea trawlers? These are questions that we believe must be answered, and we believe that the private sector whose responsibility it is to appoint, to build ships, and to ensure that the fish and raw material is kept in their plants to keep the plants operating, we believe that they are entitled to answers to these questions, because in the absence of answers in a firm and definitive statement of the federal government's policy in that respect, well then we are groping, heading off in all directions without any meaningful plan as to how we are going to tackle the problems that will confront us within the next five or ten years.

Mr. Speaker, we have been accused by the Opposition and others in this Province of not having any fishery development plan. Now I am a little leery of fishery development plans. In fact I sometimes feel a little embarrassed talking about plans and surveys and studies and what have you, because, I suppose, there is not an industry in Canada that has been more studied than the fishing industry. It is literally studied to death and for that reason I am a little reluctant to disclose our planning to a certain extent, to disclosing too much detail the planning that is now taking place with respect to the fisheries. I would prefer to wait until the plans have been completed and until we are reasonably sure that the recommendations contained therein, certainly those that are feasible, can in fact be implemented.

Well let me, Mr. Speaker, today touch on a few of the things that we are doing right now within the Department of Fisheries and government in general. As hon. members know last

Mr. W. Carter.

year we commissioned a study into the feasibility of establishing a central distribution port in the Province. A well-known and highly reputable and competent Canadian consulting engineering firm, Kellogg's Limited, was commissioned by the government to undertake a comprehensive study into the possibility of establishing somewhere within the Province a central landing and distribution port that could in fact assist in the distribution of fish landed by offshore vessels to our otherwise under utilized inshore fish plants. That study, Mr. Speaker, has now been completed, and it is being studied by a committee of Cabinet, a committee working with people from the public service, qualified people from the public service, and once that study has been completed then we will be making our plans known in that regard. But, Mr. Speaker, the concept itself, I think, is a very exciting one, extremely exciting. We recognize the need for more through puts of raw material in our fish plants. In Newfoundland today we have 115 fish processing plants scattered around the Island, dotting the coastline of our Province, 115 plants. About 100 of them are seasonable plants operating at less than thirty-five per cent capacity. The others are concentrated, of course, on the south coast of the Province. I suppose the most northerly year round plant is the one over here, National Sea on the Southside of St. John's Harbour. The rest as, as hon. members know - oh, yes, Catalina. I am sorry. Catalina would be the most northerly year round fish plant operating in the Province. Everything north of Catalina and northwest of Catalina can be called, a seasonable operation, a plant that would be operating anywhere from

MR. W. CARTER:

twenty to thirty-five percent capacity from three, four, five months of the year and then, of course, once the inshore fishery ceases to function in October and November these seasonal plants are forced to close their doors and pay off the workers who were employed. In my own riding in St. Bride's from where there are students, I believe, today visiting, there is a seasonal fish plant that is operating from May until September-October, a plant that I believe is quite capable of a year-round operation. With certain modifications, certain improvements, that plant as well as others around the Province could be made year-round operations when, in fact, now they are very uneconomic. Any business whether it is a fish plant, service station, supermarket, drug store, any business that has its doors closed to the public sixty-five and seventy percent of its time cannot, I submit, Mr. Speaker, make any worthwhile contribution to the people that are employed in that plant or to the community in which it is situated, or to the Province.

Most of our plants are uneconomic for that reason, as would, indeed, any business operating at thirty-five percent capacity. Because of their uneconomics, the uneconomic nature of the operations, they are unable to pay fishermen the price to which, I believe, they are entitled for their fish and unable to become the type of corporate citizens that we would and, indeed, should expect from businesses operating within our communities and within our Province.

How can a fish plant, Mr. Speaker, operating in Valleyfield, Newfoundland; Fogo Island; or in St. Bride's; Branch; La Scie; St. Anthony; anywhere - how can they hope to be able to make any meaningful contribution to their respective communities and to their province, to the people that work for them, when they are operating at about thirty-five percent capacity?

So, I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that the answer is to find ways and means to increase the productivity of these plants where possible and as much as possible and

MR. W. CARTER: by whatever means possible. If we are going to sit back, Mr. Speaker, and wait for the inshore fishery to develop to the point where these plants, these otherwise seasonal plants, can be operated on a year-round basis, then I submit to you that we are going to be waiting for a long time because it does not matter if we build boats with gold-plated bottoms, the most sophisticated, modern inshore fleet in the world, they small boats will not be able to operate at certain times of the year. I would not want, Mr. Speaker, to encourage our fishermen to brave the North Atlantic, say, off Fogo Island, in the middle of the winter. Of course, with ice conditions as they are and other climatic conditions as they are, that would be absolutely impossible. So, I repeat that if we are going to hang our hats, as it were, on the inshore fishery to provide enough raw material to keep our hundred inshore fish plants operating on a year-round basis, well, then, I think we are going to be waiting for a long time. In fact, I do not think it will ever happen. In fact, bearing in mind the hazards involved and the dangers, weather and other problems facing fishermen at that time of the year, I do not think I would want to encourage it.

So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, we must then make up our minds. What are the alternatives? Having Newfoundlanders - Having the vast majority of our fellow Newfoundlanders that are employed in the processing as well as the harvesting sector of the industry employed on a part-time basis for four or five months and then being forced on unemployment insurance, or maybe even worse, welfare, for six or seven months of the year, to me is not acceptable.

MR. W. CARTER:

I do not accept the proposition that Newfoundlanders must be relegated to the status of being welfare recipients for seven or eight months of the year for the rest of their lives. In fact I do not think it is a healthy situation. It is demeaning. It is demoralizing and in fact it does very little for the image of our people as portrayed in other provinces.

The ideal situation of course, Mr. Speaker, would be to find ways and means of keeping our fish processors working for as long as possible and as close to year around as possible and of course to keep our fishermen occupied for as long as possible as well in any given year. Like I said that cannot be done if we are going to become totally reliant on the inshore fishery. So the answer, Mr. Speaker, therefore is obvious. The only alternative is obvious. We must find ways and means of supplying these plants, these hundred seasonal plants, those that are capable of being serviced and operated year around, we must find ways and means of keeping these plants operating for as long as possible, if possible year around but certainly for as long as possible on raw material landed other than by the inshore fleet.

Of course the only option that is open to us therefore is to develop an offshore fleet one way or the other by whatever means at our disposal where fish can be harvested by these vessels, landed at a given point or landed in a number of areas, held in cold storage for distribution to these seasonal plants once the inshore fishery ceases for the year. And I have taken the long way around, Mr. Speaker, describing why we are now actively involved in the very, very important study, a study that I believe could in fact revolutionize the Newfoundland way of life, in fact even more importantly a study that could have the effect, I submit will have the effect of ensuring that the Newfoundland way of life, that the rural Newfoundland way of life will continue and will be allowed to thrive and to prosper and to provide for the people who are

MR. W. CARTER:

living in our Newfoundland outports, the dignity and the self respect that comes from being able to involve in gainful employment and to make a worthwhile contribution to their families, to their community and to their Province.

The idea, Mr. Speaker, of a central port like I said is to provide the necessary infrastructure which is the new word, I suppose, for facilities, a place where the necessary facilities will be provided, unloading facilities, for example, other facilities that are essential for the unloading and for the serving of large ships, cold storage holding facilities, fish meal processing facilities, other facilities like I said that are essential for the operation of a fishing fleet such as gear repair facilities, maybe in time a gear manufacturing capability, facilities for crew members of these ships, as crews are changed to give them shore leave. But a port, Mr. Speaker, in the Province, an ice free port, a port that is as accessible as possible by road and by other means, accessible to the small otherwise seasonal plants being operated around our coast and of course a port that is capable of giving access to large numbers of large offshore fishing ships and other ships that will be directly related to the fishing industry such as oil tankers, I suppose, and bulk carriers and other type ships.

That is what the study is all about, to identify first of all the area in the Province where that kind of a port can be designated and then having done that then

Mr. W. Carter.

the planning of the necessary facilities that I have just outlined to the House. The Province, Mr. Speaker, we have now pretty well decided where that port can and in fact should be located. I am not prepared now to reveal the location of that port, but I can tell you that our decision has been made with respect to its location. I am excited by the concept, because it is one that has been adopted by other countries. In fact most of the world's progressive fishing countries - and I could name a few, England, Germany, Poland, Norway, Portugal, Spain - most of these countries have just that type of a facility, a centralized landing and distribution area from where fish can be first of all held in storage and later distributed to the various plants for final processing.

I predict, Mr. Speaker, that within five years, five, six, seven years, that type of a facility will be established in our Province and like I said I believe that it will be a very important link in the future prospects of our fishing industry and the continuation of our much loved and much envied Newfoundland way of life, because the fishing industry in this Province, unlike, I suppose, any other industry, unlike any other industry, our fishing industry is the most vital link to a continuation of our Newfoundland outport life. Without the fishing industry, I suppose, there are at least 200 or 300, 250 Newfoundland communities viable, beautiful communities - these communities would not exist. In fact, I suppose, they would not have been there in the first place without the fishing industry. And, of course, if these communities are allowed to die, if they are allowed to be resettled, if they are forced to be resettled, then, of course, if they die, with it will die a way of life that we have enjoyed in this Province now for almost 500 years. And I believe that that is why it is so important, so very important that we make the right decisions now with respect to the development of our fisheries because there is more than just the livelihood of

Mr. W. Carter.

that we make the right decisions now with respect to the development of our fisheries because there is more than just the livelihood of 7,000 or 8,000 fishermen depending on the fisheries, that which depends on the development of our fishery, Mr. Speaker, is the culture, is the real Newfoundland culture or at least the way of life that made Newfoundlanders envied by most Canadians, certainly most landlocked upper Canadians living within this country.

Mr. Speaker, while I am talking about the importance of the fishing industry to our Newfoundland way of life, maybe it would be appropriate for me to make reference now to our relations with Ottawa and to our determination in this Province that the Provincial Government and the private sector and indeed the fishermen themselves be allowed to have a greater say, be given a greater input into the decision making processes that take place 1,500 miles inland, on the banks of the Rideau Canal in Ottawa, decisions that have such far-reaching effects on the lives of our people and the lives of generations yet unborn. Now I am not content as one Newfoundlander, and I believe I echo the sentiments of all Newfoundlanders - I was going to say ninety-nine per cent, but I would say all Newfoundlanders - when I say that we do have a right to have a say in the shaping of our destiny. We do have a right to be able to have some input into the planning of our future and to as much extent as possible, at least to as much as possible to assist in or at least to be party to the planning of our fishing industry and to be the architects of our own destiny. That is something, Mr. Speaker, that we are not getting now. I have said this before and I will say it again, and I will continue to say it

MR. W. CARTER:

until somebody up there recognizes the logic of what I am saying, that Newfoundlanders must unite. We must challenge the authority of Ottawa when in fact we believe that their decisions are not in the best interests of our Province and our future prospects especially in such critical areas as the fishing industry. I believe we have a duty, a responsibility, to do all we can and to use every device at our disposal to ensure that our voices are heard and that we are given a chance to help shape the future development of our Province and to be the architects of our own destiny. And to this point in time, Mr. Speaker, that privilege has not been accorded this Province or indeed any of the Atlantic Provinces insofar as fishery development is concerned.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, am not prepared to accept colonial status. We did not forsake the status of being colonials for centuries, colonials of Britain only to become colonials of Ottawa. Newfoundlanders should not be prepared to be relegated to the status of being Canadian colonials. And I, for one, would prefer not to be a Canadian. I would prefer not to be a Canadian if it means that I have to be a Canadian colonial. I believe that Newfoundlanders have earned the right to first class status in this country and unless and until we are given that status, unless our rights are recognized to that status then I contend that Confederation has failed. There is no other area of activity within our economy, there is no other area within the provincial economy where that is more evident, Mr. Speaker, that in fisheries development.

We have a bureaucracy in Ottawa that are jealously guarding every single prerogative that they have. My comments yesterday in the House with respect to the method employed by Ottawa in the issuing of scrimp licenses for example is a good example of the way in which they are hugging to their chest, jealously guarding the prerogatives that they have been given under the British North America Act, some of which could quite easily be relinquished and

MR. W. CARTER:

and designated or delegated to the provinces without causing too much trouble or certainly without amended that act. We have a situation, Mr. Speaker, where licenses are being issued or being denied to provinces including Newfoundland, licenses that would mean the difference between have and have not, between prosperity and poverty, between first and second class citizenship for many of our people, licenses that are being issued arbitrarily by people occupying offices 1,500 miles away without even a reference to the provinces concerned. These shrimp licenses that were issued by Ottawa where issued without any reference whatever to this Province or I am told to any other Atlantic Province. One person can arbitrarily and paternalistically if he wants to decide the fate of the whole people or at least people living in an entire region of this Province or this country without giving those people the right to appeal that decision or to appear before a tribunal or any kind of a board and make representation in their own behalf.

Mr. Speaker, it is the most ludicrous, it is the most unfair dictatorial system that I believe was ever devised by a government or by man certainly in this 20th century. To think that today if you want to apply for a radio license, for a television license, for a license to operate a taxi car, a truck, a boarding house, beer parlor or almost anything you have a right to file an application, you have a right to appear before a board to make representation in your behalf or if you have reason to oppose any such application then

MR: W. CARTER:

you have the right to make an intervention in that respect as well. That is as it should be. That is democracy in action. But, where is democracy, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to issuing licences to our fishermen or licences to companies who want to operate ships to harvest our own resource? The word "democracy" does not exist, Mr. Speaker, in the structure that is being established by Ottawa in the way that licences are issued in that regard. A licence today or, at least, whether or not a fisherman gets a licence to operate his boat to take part in the Fishery can mean the difference to that person between almost starvation or being able to make a decent living. Yet, that decision is arbitrarily made and that fisherman is not given a chance to make any appeal and is denied any opportunity whatever of redress, and I contend, Mr. Speaker, that is wrong.

The licences that are being issued with respect to our shrimp stocks off the east coast of Labrador and the northeast coast of Newfoundland are a prime example, that area of our Province, part of the Canadian continental shelf, a very important part of our shelf, that we brought to Confederation in 1949. Newfoundlanders can take credit, Mr. Speaker, for giving Canada the image that it has by virtue of the fact that we do have a very important eastern continental shelf. Newfoundlanders can take credit for the fact that eighty percent of that shelf or thereabouts was brought to Confederation when we joined Canada in 1949 and I am not going to allow them to forget that fact. I believe, by virtue of that fact, that we do have a special case, maybe not a legal case under the British North America act, maybe not; but, Mr. Speaker, I contend that Newfoundlanders have a moral right to be given preferential treatment, preferential rights to the stocks, to fish that are harvest or, at least, designated to be harvested in areas where we have traditionally and historically fished. I respect the rights of Nova Scotians to have first crack at the scallops on the Georges Bank. I respect their rights to that and I do not think that

MR. W. CARTER:

I would want to encourage our fishing companies here to gear up, to go down and to displace Nova Scotian ships when they fish for scallops on Georges Bank. It do not think I would be justified to do that even though I might have a legal right to, but morally I accept the Nova Scotians' rights to have first crack at that resource. I respect the rights of the fishermen in the Bay of Fundy to have first right, preferential right, again maybe not legal right, but certainly moral rights to the herring and mackeral stocks that congregate in the Bay of Fundy. I recognize their moral rights to these stocks. I recognize the rights to Quebec and other provinces to have certain preferential treatment when it comes to other fish stocks in areas to which they have had traditional and historic rights. Now, surely, are we asking too much in this Province to expect Ottawa and our sister provinces in Atlantic Canada to respect our rights when it comes to harvesting the resource in areas to which we have traditional and historic rights as, in fact, we do off the coast of Labrador? My forefathers were fishing on that shelf, that part of the continental shelf, I suppose, when the buffalo were running wild over Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario. Therefore, I believe that we do have some special moral rights when it comes to the allocation of quotas of different species in that area. Those rights, Mr. Speaker, only this past week have been completely and absolutely and arbitrarily ignored. Even without a by your leave to the Province, without any reference

MR. W. CARTER: whatever. Ottawa again arbitrarily decided that of the eleven licences that would be issued for shrimp that congregates in that area, notwithstanding our historic rights to it, that six of the eight active licences that will be issued to harvest that resource will go to other than Newfoundland companies. I do not accept that position and I think if there was ever a time when this House stood together on an issue that this is the one on which we should stand together. I believe that all Newfoundlanders, forgetting the various political affiliations, various self interests, I believe that this is one issue on which we should stand up because it is not only, Mr. Speaker, a matter of the two or three or four hundred people who will be denied employment in our Province because the shrimp plant planned for St. Anthony will not now materialize, because of these restrictions, that is not the big issue, even though it is an important one. But the principle, Mr. Speaker, is the issue. Do we in fact have any rights as a Province? Is Canada going to ignore the argument that was advanced by this country and other coastal states at the Law of the Sea Conference - the compelling argument used by Canada in our desire - in our anxiety to get a 200-mile limit, and that argument being that the coastal community, the coastal communities in the coastal states would be given special and preferential treatment insofar as the disposition of fish stocks in the general area of these communities was concerned? We used that argument when it suited our purposes internationally and, Mr. Speaker; the other 150 member nations of the Law of the Sea Conferences accepted that proposition, but in fact the coastal state and the coastal communities within that state do in fact have special rights, and that any allocation of resources should be tilted towards the development - the social and economic development - of these

MR. W. CARTER: communities. That is the foundation on which the 200-mile limit was declared, and, I might add, the foundation that was laid in part by the Canadian government. Mr. Speaker, now they are ignoring that principle. They have completely ignored that argument because it might have suited them to advance that argument internationally, but obviously it does not suit them now politically or domestically in this country. And, of course, the matter of the shrimp licences and the fact that six were issued to provinces other than to Newfoundland speaks for itself. Newfoundlanders, Labradorians have every right to be given first crack at that shrimp resource, and the fact that we are not being given first crack at that resource then I contend, Mr. Speaker, is a violation of our rights. In fact, it is a violation of the, like I said, the fundamental - the foundation of the declaration of the 200-mile limit and the arguments advanced by the coastal states in having them accepted and subsequently declared. The same, Mr. Speaker, can be said for the disposition of resources in other areas. I should maybe take a moment or two to remind the House of the terms and conditions under which the 200-mile limit was declared. The 200-mile limit was declared, it being, of course, the proposition that the coastal states would have first right to the resource within the confines of its 200-mile limit. In the case of Canada, its 200-mile limit; in the case of Iceland, it was 50 miles. That is the basic principle, Mr. Speaker, on which the 200-mile limit was declared. But first of all, the allowable catch would be determined by the coastal state, based on the best biological and scientific information available,

MR. CARTER: that the allowable catch would be established for various species of fish and then to that country would have first call and would be given preferential rights to that total of a catch. The second most important rule or call it what you want, proposition, I suppose, enshrined in the two hundred mile declaration is the right to the coastal state having first of all established the total of a catch, secondly having determined its own catching effort, thirdly, of course, declaring any balance as a surplus then the second most important right given our coastal state, including Canada, was the right to attach economically motivated conditions to any and all surpluses deemed to be sold, given certain facts and given the fact of course that subtracting the coastal states requirements its ability to catch against the allowable catch and any surplus would then be given to foreign countries on terms and conditions as layed down by the coastal state. Let us take an example, Mr. Speaker. In 1977 and 1978, the present year, scientists, biologists decided the basis I presume, the best information available to them, decided that there would be a total allowable catch in 1978 of one hundred and thirty five thousand tons of cod fish in the ICNAF areas that I defined earlier between say Cape Chisley in the north and off Cape St. Mary's in the south, one hundred and thirty five thousand tons. It was decided by the federal authorities that the Canadian fishing effort would be one hundred thousand tons. So, therefore, if you subtract one hundred thousand tons from one hundred and thirty five thousand tons you would end up with a thirty five thousand ton surplus. Canada of course being a member of the global village in which we are living, being a responsible member of that village, global village, could possibly adopt the dog in the manger attitude of if we cannot catch it or until we can catch it nobody else will get it. I do not think Canada would win many friends or gain much

MR. CARTER: respect in the international world if it were to adopt that kind of a selfish attitude. Canada does have an obligation to allow other countries to harvest any fish deemed to be surplus to our own catching effort. In fact in 1978, this present year, thirty five thousand tons will be allocated or at least have been allocated to foreign countries. Thirty five thousand tons, seventy million pounds, enough fish to keep, I suppose, three or four large plants the size of the plant on the southside of the harbor. Enough fish, Mr. Speaker, that thirty five thousand tons, seventy million pounds, enough fish to keep three or four large year round fish plants operating will this year be allocated to foreign countries for which Canada will not get one cent in economic return despite the fact that the second most important right of the law to sea conference gives to coastal state that right, the right to attach economically motivated conditions to any and all surpluses given foreign countries. The other day I wired the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa and I made the Newfoundland governments position well known with respect to the 1979 fishery. In 1979 I am told there will be an increase in the allowable catch, an increase of probably twenty five or thirty thousand tons. Our position Mr. Speaker was that first of all we, as a province, and our sister provinces should be given every opportunity to increase our catching effort by whatever means possible to enable us to catch as much as that allowable catch as

Mr. W. Carter.

possible. Secondly, I said that if in fact it is found that there is a small surplus and indeed on the basis of the figures we submitted, the surplus would be less than 12,000 tons which in fact is nothing, I said any such surplus should be held, should not be given away immediately to any other country unless and until certain conditions can be extracted from those countries in return for that fish. That is the position taken by this government and one that I can defend quite easily, because what we are saying in effect is that given certain facts, the Newfoundland/Canadian fishery is now capable, is pretty well harvesting the entire projected total allowable catch for 1979. I am told that the allowable catch in 1979 will more than likely be in the order of 162,000 tons - 162,000 tons, that is cod, as opposed to 135,000 in 1978. We have demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, our ability to harvest along with our sister provinces at least 150,000 tons of that fish.

We have asked Ottawa to put a strong position forward in Bonne at the meetings which are now ongoing that the inshore fishery be given top priority and that not less than seventy-five per cent of the total allowable catch of cod be allowed to be allocated for inshore fishermen, that the Canadian, including Newfoundland, offshore efforts be around, I think, twenty-two per cent and that the remaining six or seven per cent or 12,000 tons not be allocated immediately to foreign efforts but held in abeyance to be used maybe as a lever or certainly as a bargaining point with respect maybe to tariffs and other considerations or certainly held until we can extract from these countries some kind of economic benefit for our provinces. And that, I believe, is the right way to go. We cannot, Mr. Speaker, manipulate the allowable catches or we cannot bring in false information. It

Mr. W. Carter.

might be argued, Well, why, for example, set the allowable catch at 162,000 tons? Why not manipulate the figures? Why not say that the total allowable catch within our 200 mile limit will be only that which we can harvest, maybe 100,000, maybe 110,000 tons. But like I said I believe they can and they must be responsible. They must act in a responsible manner. And that being the case, of course, we are required to establish a realistic allowable catch, to establish a realistic Canadian effort as I think we have done and then if there is a surplus, then to ensure that whatever benefits can flow to our people from that surplus or from their allocation will be imposed on these countries. There is no reason at all why Canadians, Newfoundlanders, should give away that fish without any benefit whatever accruing to our Province.

Now the argument will be used, of course, by Ottawa that we have to give some thought to what happens beyond the 200 miles, and that is a real concern naturally. We have countries that are not prepared to respect other countries, not prepared to respect the wishes of our Canadian government that there be extreme caution exercised in the harvesting of the resource beyond the 200 miles. There are countries that are inclined to ignore these precautions, to act in an irresponsible way. In fact I am told that right at this point in time there are countries that are fishing their quotas within the 200 mile limit and then if they have not got a load, they slip beyond the 200 mile limit and load up without regard for the constant need for conservation or without respect for the

MR. W. CARTER:

wishes of the majority of countries that are prepared to abide by the terms and conditions under which the 200 mile limit has been declared.

MR. STRACHAN: (Inaudible)

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, there is a control under at one time ICNAF. Now I understand there is a new organization established called, North Atlantic, NAFA I think it is called, North Atlantic Fisheries. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not think Canada can allow itself to be forced into blackmail. I was quite surprised the other day to learn that the Canadian government had to yield to what I consider to be the blackmail of the Spaniards in insisting that they be given certain quotas or at least given a certain quota to fish within our 200 mile limit with the threat that if they were not given that quota that they would go beyond the 200 mile limit. And in fact I was quite surprised to learn that even though the fish plant in Fortune is being forced to operate with considerable down time, operate far below its actual operating capacity because it cannot get licenses to harvest sufficient fish to keep that plant operating on a steady basis, permanent basis, even though that is happening, even though they make great fuss and furor over the fact that Ocean Harvesters would dare try to enter into an arrangement with a German company to increase its catching effort, despite that I am told that Canada free gratis, without any economic return whatever, allowed the Spaniards an additional 5,000 tons of fish from our Northern stocks, from the stocks that we want to see protected. And one would think having listened to the minister in Ottawa and others that they too would want to see protected.

The fact of the matter is that 5,000 tons of fish have now been allocated to the Spaniards within the 200 mile limit, in the Northern areas in return for which they are reported to have promised that they will act in a more responsible manner beyond the 200 mile limited. Now I do not think Canada should be

MR. W. CARTER:

forced into that kind of a situation because that, Mr. Speaker, in my view smells of blackmail. Surely if a country that has enjoyed historic rights on the Canadian Continental Shelf if that country elects to act in an irresponsible manner beyond the 200 mile limit and thereby jeopardizing maybe the chances of rebuilding the stocks within our 200 mile limit, surely there are sanctions that can be imposed on that country, sanctions that would have the desired effect.

For example if Spain or any other country elects to act in an irresponsible manner beyond the 200 miles surely it is not unreasonable to expect that maybe we would consider closing our ports to the Spanish fleet. Surely we could consider serving notice on that country that if they elect to act again irresponsibly beyond the 200 miles that they will be cut off for all time or certainly for a period of years to any quotas within the 200 mile limit. You know these are just two ideas. I believe both of which have merit and would have the desired effect on Spain or in fact any country that elects to act again in an irresponsible way beyond the 200 miles and in a manner that is not in the best interests of the regeneration of our fish stocks bearing in mind of course that Canada and Canadians, Eastern Canada is so dependant on the stocks and placing so much emphasis on the rebuilding of the stocks as a means of generating the kind of activity in the Eastern provinces that will get us maybe a have status in Confederation.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to continue any longer. I think maybe I have spoken for - bearing in mind that there are other members who want to speak, but I would like to conclude by again repeating what I said a moment ago that there is obviously a need for more consultation between the provinces and between Ottawa - the need for Ottawa to maybe relinquish some of their prerogatives when it is in the best interest of the provinces concerned and in the best interest of the fishing industry and our fishermen. I do not think that is asking for too much. I believe that in the matter of licences there should be some kind of an appeals system established where fishermen or a fish company can in fact have the democratic right of making an appeal - the right to redress - the right to be heard and the right to be able to appear before a tribunal at which time it could make representation in behalf of the company or the fishermen concerned, and that is the accepted practice now and objective of most bureaucratic bodies that have been established to regulate certain areas of responsibility within our system. Mr. Speaker, 1978 I predict will be a good year for fisheries in Newfoundland. We have seen substantial increases in the freezing and cold-storage holding and processing capability in the Province from St. Anthony, for example, to Fogo Island. In 1978 there will be an additional 100,000-pound freezing capacity per eight-hour shift which represents about 300,000 pounds of roundfish that will be in addition to the existing freezing and cold-storage capability in that area. In the Cape Freels to Trepassey area, for example, there will be an additional freezing capability of 60 tons of finished product per eight-hour shift which represents again 400,000 pounds of roundfish. These added facilities

MR. W. CARTER: will mean an additional 300 seasonal jobs in the Province, not to mention, of course, the additional employment that will be provided in the Province because of the rapid expansion of a number of companies including, of course, Fishery Products who are this year planning on expanding their operations in St. Anthony, Twillingate, Catalina, Trepassey and Marystown, Burin, Harbour Breton, with the help of a government back loan. These plants owned by Fishery Products will in 1979, I predict, and 1980, 1979, provide an additional 640 jobs in the fishing industry, not to mention the increased number of jobs in the harvesting sector of the industry. Mr. Speaker, the economy of the Province, I think, is very much dependent on what happens in the fishing industry, and I am happy to say that with renewed interest being shown by fishermen by fishplant operators, this new attitude that is obviously emerging, that I believe we are in for some pretty bright days in this Province. And I predict that by 1985, if given a chance if allowed to do the things we want to do and in fact should do and can do, then I believe that the employment picture in this Province by 1985 will be much healthier, much more vibrant than what it is in 1978, and in fact I predict that within a very few years, less than ten years, within a very few years, I predict that the fishermen of our Province will enjoy a status that will place them on the upper rung of the social and economic ladder in our communities. I predict that, if given a chance to do the things that they should do and can do, that the people involved in the fishing industry will one day

Mr. W. CARTER.

occupy, like I said, the top position in our social and economic staff and that, of course, is as it should be. For too long now our fishermen are being relegated to the position of being second and third class, being forced to suffer the indignities of being indentured to our fish merchants, forced into the clutches of that certain few that occupied or inhabited their posh homes, lived in the wealthiest areas in the city while at the same time, Mr. Speaker, the people who made it all possible were treated like dirt, were treated like indentured slaves, were treated like the blacks in the South. And that, Mr. Speaker, is not good enough, and as far as I am concerned should not be allowed to continue. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in starting I would not want to hear the Minister of Fisheries - we all, I would think, enjoyed his speech - but I would not want to hear the Minister of Fisheries any more complaining about the fact that he has not had a chance to talk about the fisheries in Newfoundland. The minister has now gone on consecutively for almost two and one-half hours, forty-five minutes two days ago and almost two hours today. And the sin of it, Mr. Speaker, is that - I do not know if he was aware - not one minister decided to sit and listen to the minister's speech, the hon. Minister of Fisheries' speech, not one. And I will doubt if they will read it, Sir. So either he was talking to the Opposition or he was talking to the press. But the fishery being as important to our economy as obviously as it is, one would have thought that the ministers who will by and large make the decision and approve the recommendations

Mr. Flight.

that he is making in his speech would have had the decency to sit and listen to his speech that he obviously considered so important. And, Mr. Speaker, one other word on the minister's speech. It had a familiar ring. When I heard the Minister of Fisheries talking about how his parents or his ancestors fished certain days in Newfoundland when the buffalo were running in North America, it had a familiar ring, and it rang through - the same kind of argument that I heard hon. members on the other side making when they were trying to sell to Newfoundland the sense, when they were trying to convince Newfoundland that the best thing we could ever do was buy out BRINCO, playing on the feelings of people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that fisheries will be Newfoundland's - over the next eight or ten or fifteen years it may be the thing, the area that we have to build our economy. It may be the answer. But I can assure the Minister of Fisheries that every person who listened to his speech and every person who will read his speech will agree that fisheries has got to be developed. But I would not advise the minister to approach the fisheries in a way that the taking over of BRINCO was approached and from a patriotic point of view. As I said, Mr. Speaker, the government can go to the well once too often on that one. They have lost on the BRINCO one, and if they try to present their fishery policies only in a way that appeals to the sensitivity and appeals to the patriotism of our people, if they cannot back it up with economics and show us how it will solve the problems he referred to in the last few minutes, the problems of the fishermen being ripped off by fish merchants and living in squalor and poverty, if he cannot prove to us now that indeed his programme is going to change that and how indeed the fisheries is going to employ the majority of our people, playing on their sense of patriotism, it will not accomplish very much.

Mr. Flight.

Mr. Speaker, I have become totally turned off as I suspect that most of the people of Newfoundland have become totally turned off with the performance of this government. And today, Mr. Speaker, the Premier one thing after another - it is just a litany of actions that will turn off the people in this Province and turn off the Opposition. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, in Ottawa today, the man who wanted the Premiership worse than the present Premier, the man who wanted it worse but it was not to be so - he is in Ottawa now - one of his last actions or one of his actions while he was in the Provincial House was to attack the Supreme Court of Newfoundland.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier today because he was denied by a local T.V. station, was denied the right to go on and speak for fifteen minutes and scandalously attack the Opposition and maybe other institutions, smear the Opposition and again, as I said, maybe other institutions - because he was denied that on the possibility of what he would have said was libelous - because he was denied that, Mr. Speaker, he decided instead to attack the media and has issued a press release, a scalding press release on the media of this Province.

MR. NEARY: Who is going to be next?

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, well that is an obvious question. Who is next, Mr. Speaker? When the Premier wants to vent his frustrations when nothing is happening, he knows all the world knows nothing is happening, he does not have the ability or the desire or the imagination to tackle the problems of this Province - When the scandals, or alleged scandals keep coming in on him and when out of frustration the only thing he knows to turn to is attack, and he attacked the press today. So, Mr. Speaker, no wonder the people of this Province are turned off, no wonder they question this very institution. I would throw out now to the members of the Opposition - I do not intend to dwell on scandal here long but I will throw out to the members of the Opposition, this possibility. This House has been riddled with scandal, with alleged scandal, one accusation after another, the Scrivener affair, the Robbin affair, the Public Works scandal -

MR. NEARY: The Fisheries scandal.

MR. FLIGHT: - the Fisheries scandal -

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: That is enough. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had private conversations with members on the opposite side who are ashamed to talk about it. They say to us, "Well, why do you not talk about something else? Why do you not talk about the mining in this Province?"

MR. NEARY: The one they are ashamed of most, by the way, is the Saunders scandal.

MR. FLIGHT: - "Why do you allowing the decorum of the House to be lowered? People in Newfoundland do not want to hear that."

Well, I am going to throw out a challenge now, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. There have been cases in this country particularly where less charges - In order to substantiate the kind of charges that have been thrown around this House this session a premier of principle would say, "That is enough, I am not taking anymore of that, I will let the people of Newfoundland decide as to whether or not there is any basis to what has been said. Let them be the judge." And the members of the opposition who meet me so coyly around the environs of this building, behind the curtain, and who tell me they are ashamed; they admit there must be must be - where there is smoke there is fire - they admit for some of the scandals there are grounds there, but they do not believe that the whole House of Assembly, all the time of the House of Assembly should be taken up in it. Well, the ones who are squirming and believe that, then why do they not put pressure on the Premier to call an election. That is the way to clear the air. If the people of Newfoundland believe that the Opposition is doing nothing except muckraking, if you want to call it that, or that it is petty to bring up a deal where a friend of the Premier, if consummated would have made \$20,000,000. If the people of Newfoundland think that is petty they will say so in a general election. If the people of Newfoundland think that it is petty for this Administration to have ripped off \$15,000,000 out of Public Works through the work order system, if they think that is petty then they will tell the Opposition in an election and they will elect that Administration again. Let us put it to a test and it will be all over. You have had three sessions. There have been dozens of elections called in this country with less than three sessions.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Fisheries who goes out of his way every chance he gets to associate himself with

MR. FLIGHT: the Premier, who goes out of his way -
That would not be the first one I received from the Minister of Fisheries;
the other one is up on my wall telling me how good a speech I had made,
my first one. It is up with a little plaque around it.

PREMIER MOORES: - more about the leader of the Tory
Party - about the leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of Fisheries every chance
he gets he disassociates himself from that Administration, or from some
of that Administration; the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) who
disassociates himself in lots of cases from the scandal that is wrapped
around that Administration; the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power); the
Minister of Tourism (Mr. Morgan); the member for St. John's East (Mr.
Marshall); the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett); people who, number
one, may not at all be associated with the scandals we have talked about,
the Public Works, the Scrivener, the Dobbin, why do you not put pressure
on the Premier to say, "Let us get away from this. Let us rid ourselves
of that kind of an Opposition. Let us rid ourselves of the people who
are making life miserable for us. Let us go to the people now and let
them decide whether or not the Opposition have done proper and set the
right course of action this past session."

MR. NEARY: It is all Rowe, Neary and Simmons. They are always lowering the decorum. That is how it is.

MR. FLIGHT: Let the people of the Province decide, Mr. Speaker. Elections have been called in this country in less than three years.

MR. NEARY: A.B. Walsh is only lowering the decorum in the House.

MR. FLIGHT: The greatest issue the Premier could ever have or hope to have, the greatest issue he could ever hope to have would be to go to the people and say I have lost the confidence of the House of Assembly, I am told I have lost the confidence of the people. We are being accused. Put the Opposition in the spot to prove the accusations they have been making. That would be a great issue. Ask for a mandate to govern the Province and to on and develop the Province in an air that is not ridden with scandal.

MR. ROBERTS: A fresh mandate.

MR. FLIGHT: A fresh mandate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: And I would not be presumptuous enough, Mr. Speaker, to speak on behalf of this party, on behalf of the Opposition but I would suspect that if the Premier or his advisors would have the gall to do that, to go and look for a new mandate, that if they won the election then I doubt if you would hear any more talk of scandal from this side. That is the way to clear it. If you do not believe it, put it to the test. The Minister of Fisheries is laughing. The Minister of Fisheries may be one of the people who would survive such an election but the ones that survive will be very lonely over there.

MR. NEARY: Over here you mean.

MR. FLIGHT: Over here, switched around.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact I suppose that in our Throne Speech we tried to devote most of our speech to our districts.

This page is missing from the original copy.

MR. FLIGHT:

they had sons in school or a young family coming along, the future if there was any future must have been when that boy or girl was finished school, his future in Newfoundland when he went to work. Well, Mr. Speaker, that happened to me and it happened to hundreds of others. In 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963 when I talked about the future it was the kind of a future that my son and hundreds others of his friends in this Province would have when they graduated from high school or graduated from vocational school.

Well that future has arrived, Mr. Speaker, and my son eighteen years old and hundred of more sons eighteen years old is in Edmonton, Alberta. That is where their future was. Now the future looked pretty good then, Mr. Speaker, things were happening. When I graduated from high school, Mr. Speaker, there were thirteen people in my class. I attended a graduation the other night where the same school had thirty-eight. During the 1960's, Mr. Speaker, there was

MR. FLIGHT:

work, not because the Grade XI's were that much better educated, they might not have been, but there was work in this Province. And a Newfoundlander with Grade XI, if he so chose, if he chose not to go into university or he did not know what trade he wanted, if he chose to go into the job market, directly into the labour market, he could have done so because there was work. And then in the sixties, Mr. Speaker, the Grade XI's started to run into competition from the people - the university had established - and people were coming out of university with one or two years - people who did not go on to graduate - they were coming out with one or two years and it was becoming more and more difficult. But the work was there. Now we come to 1968, Mr. Speaker, and I have attended over this past couple of weeks three or four graduations with graduating classes 38, 40, 45. What was in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, to turn on or to give the people who are coming out of our high schools today some hope for the future in Newfoundland. The Minister of Mines and Energy talked about offshore oil. Is that our future, Mr. Speaker? - when the Minister knows that if we were to bring in a producing well today the technology to bring that oil ashore - the technology to process - to bring it ashore and process it is ten years down the road. What are the people graduating from the vocational schools in this Province today, Mr. Speaker, graduating from Grade XI supposed to do in the next eight or ten years?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: Pretty difficult to explain it to some young fellow who just graduated from Grade XI.

AN HON. MEMBER: You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. FLIGHT:

Oh, no.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, but do you know?

MR. FLIGHT:

What are we supposed to - what are they supposed to do, Mr. Speaker? Are they supposed to sit around - go to vocational school and get the - complete Grade XI.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Finish trade school.

MR. FLIGHT:

Finish trade school in three years? And then what are they supposed to do, Mr. Speaker? Are they supposed to wait eight or ten or twelve years for the technology - number one, if the offshore oil is out there in the kind of proportions we believe it is and we hope it is. Are they supposed to wait around Newfoundland until the technology is developed to bring it ashore? Or will they find jobs in Edmonton? Or in Saudi Arabia? What happens in the next ten years? Mr. Speaker, I recall very vividly and I want to mention this because it has been a pet - the Leader of the Opposition very eloquently a few days ago talked about the expenditures - the waste of this government. The reason, Mr. Speaker, there are no jobs in this Province today - the reason that we are not in a position and our young people are not in a position to wait to take advantage of the offshore oil - wait til our boat comes in - is this government has wasted callously the money that would have been needed to develop the infrastructure of this Province - the rural development. I think he mentioned a figure of \$4-5 million spent out of which we have not gained one job. The \$160 million to buy Brinco, \$200 million to buy out the Linerboard,-

AN HON. MEMBER:

\$110 million Lower Churchill.

MR. FLIGHT:

\$110 million Lower Churchill of which this Province has not benefitted by it one cent. If the government today - you cannot talk about this government's

MR. FLIGHT: ability to develop the future - to talk about the future - unless you are prepared to refer to what they did in the past. You use the past as a a thermometer. If they did not have the sense or the ability to do it in the past, why should we believe that they would have the vision to plan the future. \$160 million wasted in the Lower Churchill and the buying of Brinco. Another \$100 million wasted - that money - if you could have borrowed that money to have bought Brinco - to have nationalized Brinco - to have wasted on the Lower Churchill - then you could have borrowed it to build the roads and the social - and various social needs in this Province today and, in so doing, Mr. Speaker, not only would you have improved the way of life of Newfoundlanders socially but you would have created jobs. Nobody seems to take into account the fact, Mr. Speaker, that when we had high unemployment in the sixties in this Province that by and large it was caused and created by the fact that the Newfoundland government was spending money. When a man went to work for Lundrigan building a bridge somewhere in Central Newfoundland or building a highroad or building a hospital, he never stopped to think he was working for the government, but in effect he was; and as a result we had full employment in this Province up til the late sixties. Along came this administration and the first to jump on the bandwagon of the Anti-Inflation, the first to say that we had to cut back on public works, well the Premier

MR. FLIGHT:

must have known, anyone must have known who would want to think about what had gone on up until now and looking at what would happen that the minute you cut back on public works in this Province you had to create massive unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, there is not much hope for the young people who are coming out of school in this Province. And the only hope the Minister of Mines and Energy or the Premier holds out is the possibility of the bringing in of offshore oil and gas or the development of cheaper electricity. What do we do while we are waiting for that panacea? What do the young people in this Province do while they are waiting for the development of the Lower Churchill, of the bringing in of offshore oil and gas? They leave the Province Mr. Speaker, by the thousands. And one of the millstones around this administration's neck three years down the road will be to look and find that we have spent millions and millions of dollars on our young people, training them for the type of jobs they thought might be available here, but they will not be. They will have gone to Alberta, Manitoba, Fort Tompson, Saudi Arabia, all over the world, anywhere but Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy has got no choice, he has got to defend the way they dealt with Brinco. He has got to defend the way that his administration has spent \$3 million or \$4 million. And not only did they spend the money, Mr. Speaker, they wiped out any hopes that the Province had of borrowing that kind of money. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, right now if there had been any good fiscal lines in that government they could have looked ahead. Everyone else in the world knew whose responsibility it was to know, that we were moving into a tight money situation, that over the next three or four years it will be difficult to borrow money. They could have seen that. They should have seen it and yet they did not and they did it right at the time knowing they were going to face the worse five or six or seven years

MR. FLIGHT:

in the financial history of the Western world. Instead of saying, you know, we could have taken Churchill, we could have bought Brinco, after the oil came in. You could use that billion we are going to make on the offshore oil to have bought out Brinco.

But no, Mr. Speaker. I am not the first one to say this and I am sure it is redundant now but I will guarantee you as long I have an audience I am going to keep talking about it. Because sooner or later, and I think it is happening, sooner or later Newfoundlanders are waking up to realize that one of the reasons we are in the trouble we are in today is the decisions taken by this government over the past two or three years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: Right on.

MR. FLIGHT: Right on.

MR. NEARY: Even the member for Kilbride says.

MR. FLIGHT: Even the member for Kilbride says and the Minister of Mines and Energy has got no choice, he has got to defend it. His idol in politics was the man who brought it about and he has got no choice but to defend the decision.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about my district. I want to talk for a minute about some parts of my district. I will talk about Buchans. The scandalous unbelievable indifference and irresponsibility and callousness of this government in dealing with a town and its people that faces the kinds of problems they are facing today. Mr. Speaker, I want to explode a myth and say this to the House of Assembly and I want the attention of the House, that had there been a danger of the Buchans mines closing in 1954, had it indeed closed, then the Premier would have been right. He could have talked about Buchans as a mining town and everyone knows that when a mining town starts to die, it starts to die the day it starts to operate. But the myth

MR. FLIGHT:

is this, Mr. Speaker, we have to separate now the mine from the community. There are third and fourth year buchaneers in that town, Mr. Speaker. There are people thirty-three and thirty-four and thirty-five years old who were born in the town. Had the mine closed in 1954 there would have been a possibility that the people in Buchans, the heads of the families would have said, all right we will take our families and we will go home and home could have been anywhere from St. Anthony, Mr. Speaker, to St. John's. But there is now fourth generation buchaneers to whom Buchans is home. Where do they go, Mr. Speaker?

Now I want to try to impress on the House that it does not matter if the mine closes there are 300 or 400 families in Buchans who intend to stay there and make Buchans their home and continue to make a way of life there. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy had a chance almost two years ago. Now he came into Buchans. I do not know yet. I beginning to believe that the only reason he came is because he was wined and dined by the major companies. The only time that he showed his nose into Buchans since the trouble started, he was brought in as a guest of the companies and wined and dined.

Mr. Flight: and he has not shown his face there since.

The Minister of Tourism, Mr. Speaker, the present Minister of Tourism when he was Minister of Transportation made a commitment to the people of Buchans that he would come in and take a look at the Buchans-Howley road, fly over it, he never came, he has not shown his face in there, Mr. Speaker, not one minister of the Crown except the one who has come in and again wined and dined by the companies has made any effort to come in and familiarize themselves with the situation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they can have it either way, they can spend the dollars that is necessary now to provide an infrastructure on which the people who shows a desire who want to stay and make a living or they can accept the fact that they will spend that money through welfare programmes after the mine closes. The Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Speaker, must have a lot of sway in that Cabinet, and in that government, because I have not heard a member, it is not funny, it may be funny to him but it is not funny to the people in Buchans.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. FLIGHT: It is very funny. There are very few people whom I have not talked to on that side of the House, ministers included, that have said to me, 'Graham' keep it up, what you are saying makes sense, the Buchans Howley road does make sense. The people of Buchans should have a chance to take advantage of the Hinds Lake development. That they should be permitted to benefit from some spinoff, it is a two to three year breathing space.

I find that kind of a reaction from the ministers, backbenchers, but I find the same considerations do not extend to the Minister of Mines and Energy, who called the shot on the Hinds Lake thing. That it is not in the cards as far as he is concerned.

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, we talk about priorities. It is a little bit, you know, Mr. Speaker, it is a little bit down-heartening when you pick up a paper and you read a public tender in a paper, the Town of Rattling Brook, in the minister's district, \$200,000. They needed a bridge. But let us look at the priority, Mr. Speaker, did

Mr. Flight: needed a bridge. But let us look at the priority, Mr. Speaker, did the town of Rattling Brook - well did the bridge that was going to be replaced and the road work done was that such a priority of trying to provide a basis of an economy for a town like Buchans? The \$2.5 million that is going to be spent, the \$2.5 million now out under tender that is going to be spent in the hon. member's district of Bonavista North. The priority, Mr. Speaker, let us look at it from across, will that accomplish, do they justly need that -

MR. PECKFORD: Sure they did.

MR. FLIGHT: - input so badly, say, for instance as the Buchans area, when you are looking at 500 men, the economy of the town totalling collapsing, a town going on welfare. There is nothing left. There will be nothing left unless this government moves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the road to Howley if it were built black topped would only cost \$7 million or \$8 million. We are not asking for a black top road, we are asking for an ordinary gravel road to Howley, somewhere in the vicinity of \$2 million or \$3 million. And this government refuses, Mr. Speaker, refuses to build that road, they refuse to do anything that will make it possible for a town of 3,000 to 4,000 - well 4,000 or 5,000 livelihoods depending on that operation. You have another small town Buchans Junction next to it totally depending on the mining operation.

So, Mr. Speaker, what can one do. I do not feel like getting the Buchans Task Force and waving it around, I did that before. Up to this point in time this government has totally and callously refused to address themselves to the Buchans situation. They are waiting for the mine to close. They are waiting for a crisis situation. They are waiting for the people of Buchans to be forced on welfare.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is there now.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, Mr. Speaker, they are going on welfare because there are people in that town who do not intend to leave. There are 150 families in there who own their own homes, who have mortgages up to their ears. They will not leave. And all the services

Mr. Flight: that you are providing now, the snowclearing, the maintenance of the roads will be maintained, and also you will feed those people because once they lose their primary source of income there is nothing left. They are not in a position to go to work on the Hinds Lake project. They are not in a position to driving to Deer Lake-Corner Brook area. They are not in a position to, if they had true traffic, the type I am talking about, maybe a trans-shipment facility would be established in Buchans, and jobs created. There will be nothing there only welfare.

Mr. Flight.

Mr. Speaker, I will stand up, and it will be a very distasteful thing for me to do in the town of Buchans, it will be very distasteful for the people of Buchans to accept it, but I will stand up and say, Stay and take your welfare. We watched, Mr. Speaker, millions and millions and millions of dollars being spent in this Province on the public sector, on improving roads in communities, putting in water and sewerage systems, doing things that when you look at the priorities, when you look at - and this government talks about priorities - that is not required in any sense - the Minister of Mines and Energy talks about that we have to fund the industrial sector. We have to fund the development of this Province as opposed to the social sector. And when we fund the development of the Province, when we develop our resources, then the money will flow to provide the water and sewerage, and provide the social needs that the people of Newfoundland are clamouring for.

AN HON. MEMBER: It makes sense.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what I am suggesting to the minister now that for once he do what he has been preaching. He spent some money to develop an economy for the town of Buchans, because if he does not, he is allowing to develop in there now one of the biggest social welfare problems that this Province has ever had. It will be a total complete town, a town that has never accepted welfare in its life will suddenly be a total town depending on welfare, and they will not leave. They will not leave. This past year the people of Buchans have bought their homes from the American Smelting and Refining Company. The minister should go in and see what is happening in there. Houses are being renovated, painted, fences going up. The town is being cleaned up. They are not going. So what is happening is that the attitude of this government right now

Mr. Flight.

is guaranteeing a town completely and totally dependent on welfare by their very refusal to recognize the kinds of things that can be done to provide a way of life or to provide employment to make it possible for the people who continue to live in Buchans to stay there and to continue to contribute.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are getting down the road. It is eleven months now. If this House goes the way it went this past year, possibly before we sit another sitting of this House after its adjournment, the next time I stand up or anyone stands up to speak about Buchans, the mine could be closed, and we will have the problem on our hands that I have been talking about this past three years. You will have a town with 400 to 500 families, no economic base, no jobs and on total welfare. And if that happens, Mr. Speaker, the blame will have to lie squarely with the administration. A great deal of that blame, Mr. Speaker, will have to be shouldered by the Minister of Mines and Energy, because the Minister of Mines and Energy is probably more aware of the situation in Buchans than any other minister. He has been there. He has seen it first hand. He has had a chance to guarantee Buchans' ability to reap some of the economic spin off from the Winds Lake project. He has categorically refused. The Buchans highway road will come one day. If it is not until ten years down the road, it will come. If it were to be done now, it would probably save the town of Buchans from going into a complete total welfare situation. Now the minister has got it in his hands. His colleagues are ready to co-operate, everyone of them individually. Ministers have said, keep it up, it does not make sense. There is no justification for withholding the kind of funds that are required to build that road. But we wait and nothing happens. And then we read tenders, \$2 million spent on road construction in Bonavista North, \$200,000 in the members own district, and many, many others, many, many others. That alone would have built

Mr. Flight.

the road to Howley. And there may well be that much spent, \$500,000 in Bonavista South, more than \$500,000. I would not be proud of that if I were the minister. I would not be proud of it because I doubt if the towns that that money has been spent in, could justify the expenditure to the point to the people of Buchans could.

MR. MORGAN: Why not?

MR. FLIGHT: Why not?

MR. MORGAN: The need is there.

MR. FLIGHT: The need is there. Is the need there as great as it is to maintain an economy in a town like Buchans.

MR. MORGAN: The need is there.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister would not know because he promised the people that he would come into Buchans. As a matter of fact the minister misled the people of Buchans, Mr. Speaker, maybe deliberately. There is a press release, a stated press release where he said that he was going to talk to the Minister of Mines and Energy when he was the Minister of Transportation about the

MR. FLIGHT: possibility of building the access roads into the Hinds Lake construction sites under a fifty-fifty cost sharing deal. Hydro will pay their share, Transportation will pay theirs.

The minister then went on to say that he was coming into Buchans and over fly. He told representations of the people of Buchans, he will over fly the Buchans-Howley Road and he did not show up. It is scandalous, Mr. Speaker, deceitful.

MR. MORGAN: I left the portfolio a short time after that now. Be honest now.

MR. FLIGHT: Deceitful. No, he was in the portfolio for a long time after that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and I will, you know, having sat in this House for three years, Mr. Speaker, knowing that the government have been aware of the Buchans problem, knowing they have had the Buchans Task Force in front of them, knowing that they have had all the chances in the world, it is very frustrating to stand up and go over the same thing over and over again. But, Mr. Speaker, this will probably be the last time that I will have the chance to give this kind of a speech. Because the same conditions will not exist in Buchans the next Throne Speech that is read in this House, barring a mining miracle, Mr. Speaker, barring a miracle, Mr. Speaker, barring a miracle the town of Buchans will be down flat with no future to look at other than welfare, as a result of the callous, irresponsible attitude of this administration.

There is one hope for the people of Buchans, Mr. Speaker, and the town of Buchans, and maybe a good many more towns, and the hope is this, that before the Hinds Lake project is completed, or before Buchans is forced into a total welfare situation, the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Minister of Tourism, the Premier,

MR. FLIGHT: the Minister of Justice, they might not be there to make the decisions.

Hinds Lake is a three year project, Mr. Speaker, and there is a very good chance that the Minister of Mines and Energy will not have the final say on Hinds Lake, the present Minister of Mines and Energy. There is a very good chance, since it is a three year project that the Premier will not decide whether the Buchans-Howley Road will be built. So the people of Buchans have one hope, one hope, Mr. Speaker, and that is to throw him out and have somebody there who will at least have enough sense of responsibility and enough compassion to indicate to him that they care, will have the decency to send a minister in.

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Minister of Mines and Energy something else, that there are going to be 1,000 men on the Hinds Lake project in 1979, working. There are going to be 500 who have worked all their lives in Buchans unemployed. The minister should keep a very close watch on that situation. He may find himself in a very unevitable position, after the Premier making statements that guarantees that the Hinds Lake project was moved up to accommodate the people of Buchans because he is so concerned and so aware of their problems, making statements that he guarantees that Buchans will get the priority to the jobs, with the Minister of Transportation saying that, "We are going to build the Buchans-Howley Road in conjunction with Hydro." Having listened to that kind of thing over the past three years, and seeing nothing happen and suddenly having lost their jobs without a move, I would not blame the people of Buchans, Mr. Speaker, the unemployed, the people who lost their jobs if they resented the fact that they were excluded to a point that they would go in and say, "We want jobs on that site." And that kind of action follows its own course. And if it happens the minister has set it up. The minister and his

MR. FLIGHT: colleagues will take the blame for any developments that take place on the Hinds Lake site.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is, as I say, before I get a chance to talk about Buchans or Hinds Lake again there will be a Throne Speech and the situation will have - it will be this time next year I would presume and the situation in Buchans will have changed totally. The Hinds Lake project will be going on. 500 men in Buchans will be walking around wondering where they are going to work. The whole town will be wonder. The Minister of Municipal Affairs has incorporated Buchans now, the town council. Now where does he suspect the revenue is going to come from to maintain the facilities that he talks about for the town of Buchans? Where is the revenue going to be generated? Is the Department of Welfare going to pay for the operation of all the facilities we have in Buchans right now?

Mr. Speaker, there has been a callous, irresponsible, honest deliberate, deliberate attempt to ignore the problems facing the people in that area. This government has deliberately, to this point in time, ignored totally and deliberately ignored the plight of the people of that town, and Mr. Speaker, they are going to answer for it. And they are going to answer for it more than Buchans. The people of Newfoundland are watching what is happening in Buchans. The people of Grand Falls are watching what is happening. The people of Bishop Falls are watching what is happening in Buchans. A lot of the people of Springdale are watching what is happening. They are watching this government's ability to deal with that kind of a situation. They are watching the callous attitude of this government. Wherever I go in this Province they ask me, "Well what is the situation in Buchans? What

MR. FLIGHT:

has been done about it? The people of St. John's - nothing has been done about it, and the people of this Province are watching, watching this government's ability and its imagination and its desire, and they have had four years to do the things that need to be done, that could have been done, spent \$200,000 on a task force report, bluffed the people of Newfoundland. That came as a result of appeasement - 'we have a strike on our hands - how do we get it over and get the people back to work? Get a task force and have a task force look at the situation and have the task force recommend to us what can be done in that town.' \$200,000! Better that \$200,000 was put on the Buchans - Howley Road. Not one recommendation of that Task Force report has been looked at - not one! That is the kind of a government that the hon. members opposite are prepared to support.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy - since I am on the Buchans situation and have three or four minutes, I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, that I will find some legislation somewhere - because I want to talk about Windsor, the government's lack of initiative and lack of concern for the town of Windsor; I want to talk about Badger; I want to ask the minister what he has done - last year they went through a tragic flooding, a disastrous flooding, and the Minister of Mines and Energy made all kinds of promises things would be done to make sure that the -

MR. PECKFORD: The things I promised were done.

MR. FLIGHT: Name one. Nothing was done, Mr. Speaker, not a thing. The gauge is not in place, the work on the river not done, the dams upstream not done, nothing done, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PECKFORD: Every commitment (inaudible)
(inaudible) right behind me 100 per cent.

MR. FLIGHT: The people behind that minister in Newfoundland are getting less and less every day, Mr. Speaker. He will not believe it.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. FLIGHT: Less and less every day.
And, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about this government's lack of concern for the town of Windsor, its willingness to let it stagnate. The town has as much growth potential as any other town in this Province, but its deliberate withholding of funding, the kind of funding that Windsor would need - I hear the Minister of Municipal Affairs talking about \$50 million they spent in St. John's on the regional water supply sanitation, \$1 million the town of Windsor needs and cannot get it. Their health and their need to develop and their need to expand and their ambitions in life are just as great as those of the people of St. John's. I am doubtful if St. John's needed that kind of expenditure to the same extent that the people of Windsor need it. The minister does not want to talk about that.

Mr. Speaker, forestry - I have all kinds of notes made here. I went too long on Buchans, Mr. Speaker. But what I want to hear the minister now when he - he says he is going to speak on this Throne Speech.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Oh, yes! Who?

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of Mines and Energy. I want him to tell us or delegate some other minister to tell us - the minister owes us this, he owes the people of Newfoundland this and the people of Buchans - tell us what is in store, tell us what plans that this government have to deal with the situation that is going to develop in Buchans over the next eleven months. Now the time has come, Mr. Speaker, we have gone four years, and four years they

MR. FLIGHT: have sloughed it off with task force reports, with setting up committees, and ambiguous statements. Now we have eleven months left. The bottom is going to go out of the mine, the mine is going to shut down. We have 500 people unemployed, a whole town.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister or the Premier owes it to this House and owes it to the people of Buchans to say, 'This is what is going to happen.'

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

Now what is going to happen?

What plans does the minister have in mind to institute -

AN HON. MEMBER: Zero. None.

MR. FLIGHT: - that will take up some of the slack, that will make it possible for the people who have contributed for the past fifty years to this town, non-stop contributing - now what are the plans?

AN HON. MEMBER: He is spending all his time writing letters.

MR. FLIGHT: Or are we going to just forget it and let Buchans disappear? The people after two years will get tired and they will move out. Are we just going to let it go? Now what are the minister's plans, Mr. Speaker? The people of Buchans want to know. This House of Assembly

MR. NEARY: Write them all a poison pen letter.

MR. W. ROWE: Write them all letters.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has moved the adjournment.

The hon. gentleman has three more minutes left.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can finish up right now. Again I challenge the minister, or the Premier, or some minister on that other side who feels it is in his area of responsibility, to tell the people of this Province just what their plans are for the town of Buchans, and for the town of Buchans Junction, and for the thirty people who will be laid off from Badger, who works in Buchans. What is that area? What is the total Central Newfoundland area faced with when that mine goes?

The Minister of Justice, for argument's sake, what about it? The Minister of Finance, what is the Minister of Finance proposing with regard to the town of Buchans that will be shut down totally next March, about nine months from now. 500 men out of work totally, no other way at this stage, of making a living there. No highroad through it, no access to the West Coast, forty-eight miles removed from the Trans Canada Highway. Now the minister has had five years and had task force reports, knew it was going to happen, so now we are in crisis year. Now what is the minister's plan? What are the Minister of Finance's plans? What would his plans be if it were any other town in Newfoundland?

St. Lawrence was lucky, Mr. Speaker. We do not envy St. Lawrence. There was the possibility to develop a fish plant there but the possibilities are in Central Newfoundland too. We have possibilities. All we need is a government with some compassion who will come in and look at the situation and do what has to be done. If you could build a fish plant in St. Lawrence you can build a road

MR. FLIGHT: to Howley and let the people of Buchans get through to the West Coast. Why deny them the road, it is going to come anyway. Where is the leadership? The Province is going to put the money that is required to build a fish plant in St. Lawrence. Great. The people of Buchans will support it. Some of their money will be used. Some of the money they have paid in taxes over the last fifty years will be used to help finance the fish plant in St. Lawrence.

Now I guarantee you that the people of St. Lawrence or Placentia or St. Anthony would be prepared to use some of their tax dollars to build a road from Buchans to Howley, realizing what that road will mean to the people of Buchans.

This government has not even got the decency to hold out some hope. They will not even make a statement to the effect that they want to do something, they intend to do something. They refuse to even say anything that will hold out some hope to the people of Central Newfoundland, of the Buchans area. So I will be waiting for the answers, Mr. Speaker, and with that, Sir, I adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I stand in my place to get started in this debate and by so doing I will adjourn. So I move the adjournment.

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

It being five-thirty approximately, a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. The first matter for debate, the subject of it is the marketing of produce of the sea in the European markets.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the news from Washington was not good at noon today. I have not heard any late breaking news, Sir, about whether or not the American Government are going to whack tariffs on the fish going into the United States from Newfoundland. But that possibility is there, Sir, and the possibility, Mr. Speaker, of the Newfoundland fishery losing its main traditional market in the United States in my opinion, could turn out to be a blessing in disguise. The United States market, Sir, is a very large one in metric tons but it is simply relegated throughout the years. The fishermen, the fish plant producers in this Province, they put us in the role of hewers of wood and drawers of water, and fishers of the deep. Prohibitive tariffs, Sir, threatened by the United States, have prohibited Newfoundland from getting into processing and packaging our products right here in this Province. We have been blinded, Sir, we have been blinded to the value added concept whereby processing refinements could have increased the value of our sea harvest to at least ten times its present price.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it was eight or ten years ago I had the opportunity to visit the Marystown fish plant when it first started up and saw Newfoundland fish, paid for at that time I believe it was four cents or four and a half cents a pound, being

MR. NEARY: processed and packaged at Marystown in a beautiful, up-to-date modern fish plant, I believe, 200 different labels were put on the fish and all sent into the American market where it was retailed at twenty times the price paid to our Newfoundland fishermen.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, exactly ten years ago in Newfoundland The Journal Of Commerce published a report on a survey of whose purpose it was to examine the possibility that the affects of the closing of traditional markets to the products of Newfoundland fishing industry might have and might be offset by a marketing programme directed at the consumer both in Newfoundland and on the Mainland of Canada. This survey was carried out over here at the College of Fisheries in conjunction with the College of Trades and Technology to find out if we lost our traditional market what effect it would have on the Newfoundland fishery and the Newfoundland economy? And what were the alternatives?

At that time, Mr. Speaker, ten years ago of the protein intake of Canadians only 4.9 per cent came from the seas as compared with a whopping 57 per cent for the people of Japan. The research team, Sir, also discovered that Newfoundlanders consumed almost double the daily Canadian average, although a considerable quantity of the fish they ate had been processed on the Mainland or down in the United States and shipped back to Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, that survey pointed up the very real opportunity for the sales of fish in our Canadian and Newfoundland market. But our fishing industry did not accept the challenge.

Today, Sir, it is not too late, in fact, today we must in this Province of Newfoundland immediately get to work on selling the consumers of Canada on the value of our basic product as a principal protein component in their diet. We must market fish to Canada, the Mainland of Canada to be eaten by Canadians. And simultaneously, Mr. Speaker, we should lay real plans for marketing to the European economic community and other countries who already

Mr. Neary: consider fish a staple of their diet.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Fisheries this morning was quoted on radio as being in favour of increasing our selling effort to Europe in the event that the United States - anything should happen to the United States market or they should take a turn for the worst, the minister indicated that we should take a look at the European market or they should take a turn for the worst. The minister indicated that we should take a look at the European market. The minister I do not believe mentioned the possibilities of marketing fish in Canada.

So I am going to ask the minister now, Sir, the Minister of Fisheries what firm plans he has for our fishery in terms, first, of taking advantage of the value added concept by encouraging in a practical way the sophisticated processing packaging and transportation to markets of Newfoundland fish? What plans he has for exploiting the Canadian market itself with the huge potential for missionary marketing? What specific approaches he will use to win acceptance of our product in the highly competitive European market? And exactly what he will do to win acceptance for processed and packaged fish in the United States market, so that our industry may benefit to the full use by the value added concept in its exports to our Southern neighbours instead of continuing its traditional role of providers of raw materials only.

I will be very interested, Sir, in hearing the minister's answers to these questions. These are very very important questions. They must not be sidetracked or just wishy-washy answers given. The minister, I believe, now after the House being opened for several months rapidly drawing to a close if the government can do it, I believe the minister owes it to the House and to the people of this Province to tell us now what plans the minister has to find alternative markets for our Newfoundland fish?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the matters mentioned by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) are to say the least motherhood issues in this Province. We all recognize the need for getting involved in further processing of fish. I do not think any Newfoundlander enjoys the role of being a hewer of wood and a drawer of water but there are certain facts of life, Mr. Speaker, that we must recognize. You talk about sending the finished product into the U.S. Of course, there is a tariff problem there that must be overcome before finished fish can be, or at least cooked and breaded fish can be exported into the U.S. I am not sure, I share his concern that maybe all that can be done by the

MR. W. CARTER:

private sector is being done. I sometimes think that maybe they have found themselves in a rather comfortable position, safe position and that maybe the private sector is not exploring every avenue open to them to get involved in further processing. But in fairness to them, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we can overlook certain very basic facts, one being that when you talk about the Canadian market I would submit that a fish plant, for example, like the one in Marystown owned by Fishery Products, that plant could probably produce enough fish in one week to keep the Canadian market satisfied for a whole year. Canadians are not consumers of fish. In fact the average Canadian consumes between eight and ten pounds a year. So therefore there is not a big market. Contrary to common belief there is not a big market for sea foods in Canada. And then, of course, we cannot ignore the fact that we are separated from the main market by ninety miles of very expensive travel. We must recognize the fact that other companies operating in other provinces, our sister provinces, are in a much better position to cater to the Canadian market than we are.

When you talk about the European market, we believe that therein lies probably one of the big hopes for the future of the fishing industry. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, we can accept the position that we are going to continue to be 85 per cent dependent on the U.S. market. That is a frightening position. It certainly does not do very much for my sense of well-being or security and I am sure that fishermen and people involved in the fish processing sector of the industry must at times be very concerned, very worried, very insecure, realizing that they have, in fact, put all of their eggs in one basket. And what have we done about it? Mr. Speaker, we have done

MR. W. CARTER: many things. And bearing in mind that government cannot be expected to do everything - you know, we have a reasonably aggressive private sector in fisheries. We have, I believe, done things, provided programmes that will have the effect of priming the pump, as it were, creating a healthier atmosphere wherein the private sector can maybe get involved in further processing. And I refer the House to a programme announced recently in the House wherein we outlined our policy of making very attractive loans, loans on very attractive terms, available to the small and intermediate size fish processing company who expressed a desire and interest in getting involved in secondary processing. In fact, we are now making available to the private sector loans of up to 70 per cent or \$50,000 whichever is the lesser amount, to companies that are purchasing, or at least investing money in machinery to undertake secondary processing. These loans are, as I said, on very favourable terms. The repayment, the amortization period is extended. The interest rates, I believe, are from 1/4 of 1 per cent to about 1 per cent above prime lending rate, government lending rate, plus the fact last year we made, I believe it was around \$50,000, not a big amount, but significant certainly in relation to the project undertaken. We made that money available to Fishery Products to enable them to get involved in the further processing.

So, Mr. Speaker, a lot is being done, and contrary to common belief, contrary to the impression created today by my colleague and friend opposite, all of the fish leaving our Province does not, I repeat, does not leave in a raw state. A lot of the resources of the sea that have been harvested by our people are now leaving the Province in a cooked and a prepared state. And as time goes on, as tariff conditions become more favourable, as we succeed, maybe, in scaling down tariffs as in fact other

June 8, 1978

Tape 4149 (Afternoon)

EC - 3

MR. W. CARTER: countries have done, then I am
sure that we will be able to export more fish in a
finished state as opposed to the amount that we are now
sending out of the country in a raw state.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The second matter for debate is the issuing of shrimp licenses. The hon. member for Trinity- Bay de Verde

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, approximately a year or so ago there were a number of shrimp beds discovered off the Coast of Labrador. Yesterday the Minister of Fisheries through a Ministerial Statement read a letter or telex, a protest to the Federal Fisheries Minister, Romeo LeBlanc whereby Mr. Romeo LeBlanc had issued two licenses to two Nova Scotian firms, two to New Brunswick, two to Quebec, two to Fisheries Products and three which are held in abeyance for Labrador until such time as the technology catching capacity, processing capacity is in place. Now, Sir, he read out that letter or telex of protest, an attack on the Minister of Fisheries. We agreed that there should be more Newfoundland licenses issued, Newfoundland and Labrador licenses issued and we asked the minister yesterday and again today, Sir, What initiative he and his department have taken before this announcement in order to get more Newfoundland and Labrador licenses issued? Sir, the minister skirted the question completely. Sir, I refer you to a Hansard of yesterday when we asked the minister following the Ministerial Statement what initiatives has the minister taken to make representation to the federal government and Romeo LeBlanc in this matter. Sir, and his answer is as follows; "Mr. W. Carter, We have endeavoured at every possible opportunity, we have used every device at our disposal to impress upon Ottawa the need for closer consultation, for more dialogue in the matter of determining the issuance of licenses especially with respect to the shrimp stock." That is the key part, Sir, "especially with respect to the shrimp stock." And then he carries on, Sir, until we interjected with, "Who did you make your representations to?" Sir, the minister replied, "Naturally to the minister." presumably the Minister of Fisheries, "We would not go below the minister in this." "Table the correspondence." we shouted back, Sir, "I do not have it here but we have it." Now, Sir, the minister has said that every endeavour has been used in the matter of determining the issuing of licenses especially with respect to shrimp stocks and naturally these representations have been made to the Federal

MR. F. ROWE: Minister of Fisheries. We would not go below the minister in this and we have correspondence but we do not have it here." We asked the minister, Sir, to table that today and the minister refused.

Sir, I have conducted some extensive research into this matter and, Sir, this is important, it is not a joking matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is more than a laughing matter.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, my research shows that there is absolutely no record of correspondence or telex or telephone calls from our Minister of Fisheries to the Federal Minister of Fisheries, Romeo LeBlanc since October of 1977. A total of eight months, Sir. Now, Sir, my research has turned that up. Now the only way the minister can disprove that is by tabling the correspondence or telexes.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: We hope he does.

MR. F. ROWE: I hope he does, Sir, because, Sir, we need more in this House of Assembly than a Minister of Fisheries who still has the Opposition mentality that he gained for seven years in Ottawa. Sir, as a vampire needs blood this minister needs publicity in order to survive and his way of getting publicity, Sir, is one constant attack on Ottawa and the Minister of Fisheries. So I submit, Sir, that the only way the minister can prove that he has shown a sincere interest in getting the maximum number of shrimp licenses for Newfoundland and Labrador is to table, and prove by tabling the correspondence that he has had with Romeo LeBlanc regarding

MR. F. ROWE: shrimp licences. Sir, we need a statesman for a Minister of Fisheries in this Province if we are to gain more jurisdiction and have more control over the fisheries in this Province. We would need a statesman, Sir, not a slick PR minister, a slick hatchet man who continuously attacks the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa. And, Sir, I submit that the minister should lay upon the table of this House proof that he has had correspondence and made representation to Ottawa with respect to shrimp licences.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Today I have witnessed something I never thought I would see, when a fellow Newfoundlander in his place in this House, representing as we do the people of this Province, including the people of Labrador, the Northern Peninsula, and take that kind of a position. I had a word for it, Mr. Speaker, but it would not be parliamentary, the son of a man for whom I have so much respect, Dr. Fred Rowe, a good Newfoundlander - no seriously, I mean this, to get in his place and to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: The two of them are going over there now.

MR. W. CARTER: If the hon. member does not agree that is not my problem.

MR. DOODY: The Bobsey Twins are going over there now.

MR. W. CARTER: That is not my problem.

MR. MORGAN: He is a traitor to his Province.

MR. W. CARTER: Well the issue is not -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: A point of order, Sir, I distinctly heard that hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) say that I am a traitor to the Province. Sir, I would ask Your Honour to instruct the member to withdraw that particular remark without qualification, and apologize to Your Honour and the House.

MR. HICKMAN: Traitor is a very treacherous word to interpret so I do not know what Your Honour can do about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman would withdraw the remark.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it and sincerely hope none of us are traitors to our Province, but I am sometimes doubtful.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member had better withdraw it again.

MR. DOODY: Two withdrawals in one day is something.

MR. MORGAN: Okay, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw.

MR. W. CARTER: I hope, Mr. Speaker, that is not coming out of my time. I have only three minutes.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we have made strong representation with Fishery Products, but that is not the issue, Mr. Speaker. And I will admit the fact that you cannot - if I am lying you cannot condone a lie from a member, but I am not lying. But that is not the issue. The issue, Mr. Speaker, is the principle involved that do we as Newfoundlanders have any special right to that stock. And the hon. members yesterday missed what I think was a golden opportunity where this House that has in the past few months created an image across this country of being a petty, bickering

MR. W. CARTER: type of an atmosphere, scandal mongering, rumours of scandal, that is the image that has gone across Canada. We missed a golden chance yesterday for this House to have stood up, Mr. Speaker -

MR. F. ROWE: Table it.

MR. W. CARTER: It is not a matter of tabling anything, and I do not have to table anything. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, are the actions of the minister in Ottawa in the best interest of Newfoundland or not. That is the issue. It is not whether Carter wired LaBlanc, when he wired LaBlanc, if he wrote him or telephone him. What nonsense. What kind of utter nonsense. It is disgusting, Mr. Speaker, to see Newfoundlanders acting that way. They are not worthy, Mr. Speaker, of the name. They are not worthy of the name.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: And I submit to you, Sir, that they should be less concerned about trying to prove that I am a liar, which they cannot do, but more concerned with protecting the rights of our people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: Especially the people, Mr. Speaker, who are being denied a chance to make a decent living in St. Anthony, Labrador, the Northeast Coast, because of the actions of a minister in Ottawa who is more concerned with petty politics, and do not kid yourself and that will be proven by the way, within days -

MR. MORGAN: - own district.

MR. W. CARTER: I will inform the House one of these days where these three licences for New Brunswick went. If that is the kind of a minister that you condone, and your colleagues, you can have him. He is not acting in my best interest and in the

June 8, 1978

Tape No. 4151

NM - 4

MR. W. CARTER:

'interest of our Province. But imagine trying to cloud the issue with proving that I can table the documents, when the issue is whether or not fellow Newfoundlanders living on the Northern Labrador Coast, the Southern Coast of Labrador, the Northern Peninsula, are being denied a chance to make a decent living because of the

MR. W. CARTER: actions of Ottawa. I would not take that from my own mother, Mr. Speaker. If my mother were Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa I would not defend her in that regard. And I am ashamed of my colleagues opposite, ashamed of them for being so petty, and yesterday for being so political in getting up and trying to -

AN HON. MEMBER: What did you do?

MR. W. CARTER: At least I took a stand for Newfoundland.

What have you done?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER: What have you done?

AN HON. MEMBER: Took the same as Romeo.

MR. W. CARTER: You have taken nothing, only get up and spread rumourmongering trying to prove your point by putting others down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER: And if I had to do that, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister's time has expired.

MR. W. CARTER: - to advance my position in politics I will quit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: I move that it being 6:00 o'clock the House do now adjourn until 8:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is that the House now adjourn. Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Nay".

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Nays have it. I will leave the Chair until 8:00 this evening.

VOL. 3

NO. 84

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1978

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I stand to support the sub-amendment so skillfully put together by my hon. colleague and friend for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout). Mr. Speaker, to understand and appreciate the performance of any government, to understand how well it has lived up to the commitment that it has made in various Speeches from The Throne, once you go back and review some of these Speeches and see just how the government measured up to the kinds of philosophy to which they articulated and the kinds of programme which they espoused.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to allude for the moment to the first such document produced by this government 1972, March 1, 1972, a document that ended up, in essence, being an election manifesto. Mr. Speaker, just to look at a couple of the items in this particular document, as I have said before to evaluate the performance of this administration. The first paragraph, Mr. Speaker, in that document or a sentence in the first paragraph says, "This House of Assembly opens at a time in our history where there is throughout the Province a rising expectation of a new era. Coupled with a deep concern caused by the very high level of unemployment, and the need for the creation of thousands of new permanent jobs."

Mr. Speaker, this is a government of fantasies, promises, and dreams. And I shall allude to what I think is dreams, and what is fantasies, and what is promises as I go down through.

MR. NEARY: What year is that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: 1972, March 1, 1972.

MR. NEARY: That was a two hour session that cost \$500,000.

MR. LUSH: That is right.

Mr. Lush: This, Mr. Speaker, I classify as a dream in retrospect now that we know what the situation is, and I will be alluding to that later. But, Mr. Speaker, I will read that again. "This House of Assembly opens at a time in our history when there is throughout the Province a rising expectation of a new era. Coupled with a deep concern caused by the very high level of unemployment, and the need for the creation of thousands of new permanent jobs." A dream, Mr. Speaker, a dream.

Again the last sentence on that page alludes to unemployment again. "Newfoundland need not have the highest unemployment record and the lowest per capita income of this great nation."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: "My government is planning to introduce new social and economic policies to guide effective development within the Province. My government pledges itself to the philosophy" - this is what I want hon. members to listen to.

MR. WHITE: The Domesday Book.

MR. LUSH: "My government pledges itself to the philosophy of inter-regional equity, government inter-departmental co-ordination and inter-governmental partnership."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of intergovernmental equity, that is what I would to comment on for a moment. That to me, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. ROBERTS: Those were pet words.

MR. LUSH: That to me, Mr. Speaker, means spending equally the taxpayers dollars in this Province, spending that equally in all of the regions in this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish somehow I could get my hands on the money that was spent in Bonavista South last year and the money that was spent in Trinity North -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: - on water and sewer services, and on upgrading and construction and paving of roads. I wish I could get these figures, Mr. Speaker. They are hard to come by. But by reading all of the

Mr. Lush: announcements that the two hon. members concern put in the local newspaper it would not do much, if I were to make that comparison to the district of Terra Nova, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. WHITE: It should be outlawed!

MR. LUSH: it would be - it is fantastic, fantastic if I could have that figure to know the money that was spent in Terra Nova as compared to what was spent in Bonavista South and in Trinity North on these two very important vital services of transportation and water and sewer services. It would be a scandal, Mr. Speaker. It would be a scandal, disgraceful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Well so much, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) We have three kinds of scandals, we have mini-scandals, medium scandals and major scandals. Is it a mini scandal ?

MR. LUSH: In comparison, Mr. Speaker, in comparison it would be a mini scandal. .

MR. NEARY: A mini scandal.

MR. LUSH: In comparison, or comparatively speaking. But so much, Mr. Speaker, for inter-regional equity, another dream, another fantasy, inter-regional equity.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to skip over a lot of the promises and a lot of the fantasies, but some I want to point out. The government comes on to talk about the importance of resource developemnt. And it says, "All resource heritage areas of our Newfoundland water resources, power, mines, farmland, fisheries, minerals, both offshore and onshore, our

MR. LUSH: natural gas and petroleum reserves, tourism, in short all base resource sources will be as is our birthright, the property of the people of Newfoundland." And listen to this, Mr. Speaker, this is the important point: "Legitimate investors will be encouraged. Decent, fair partnership relationships will be established and a climate of good, healthy, honest development will be generated in which legitimate business will be encouraged to locate." Another fantasy, Mr. Speaker, another fantasy! And if one were to read the press reports made by government members -

AN HON. MEMBER: Too bad you were not (inaudible)

MR. LUSH: - at that particular time - in one week, Mr. Speaker, I remember seeing four hon. members on the government side quoting these particular sentences from this document: "Now we are going to restore honesty and integrity to the development of this Province again." Well, Mr. Speaker, what a fantasy! A fantasy and a dream!

Another fantasy, Mr. Speaker, in retrospect and by what is going on today: "Sane and sensible forest management policy must be embarked upon with due respect for the rights of established industry in order to promote and develop the orderly expansion of forest related industry." No talk of the spruce budworm then, Mr. Speaker, but I expect it was around. And at that time, talking about forest management policy, maybe if we had begun a good forest management policy at that time it would be unnecessary to spray the forests as we are going to do it today. Another fantasy, Mr. Speaker! But let me come to a promise now, Mr. Speaker. "It is the sincere and honest conviction of my government that farming should and will be an honourable way of life for many of our people. Toward the realization of this end and to aid the

MR. LUSH: small farmers already engaged in the farm industry who cannot afford to invest large sums of money in heavy equipment, my government will establish farm equipment banks in several appropriate areas of the Province." Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether that is a totally broken promise, I only know that I do not know of any such developments in the largest farming area in this Province and that is the district of Terra Nova, the largest farm area in this Province, Mr. Speaker, bar none, the largest. I know of no equipment banks in that area. I know of none. It is not any thanks to the government that it is the largest farming area in the Province - the largest, Mr. Speaker, from the point of view of acreage, the largest from the point of view of production in our three major crops excepting cabbage, the largest in potato, the largest in turnip, just beaten by a little bit by Robinsons with respect to cabbage production - but in the overall production in terms of the gross dollars and in terms of the net value, the largest farming area in the Province.

Well, I can only say that the government did not keep this promise in the district of Terra Nova. Maybe they did so in other parts of Newfoundland. A promise, Mr. Speaker, a promise.

Skipping over several pages, because I just want to make a few points - Education, Mr. Speaker. They had great plans for Education. But I am just going to read again the last sentence which says, "It is the intention of my ministers to commence consultation between representatives of the school boards, the NTA and the university authorities to work out a satisfactory long-term plan for educational needs."

Now, Mr. Speaker, is that the group who planned to have the teacher cutbacks? Was that the

MR. LUSH: group who decided that? Was this the advice they got from this group for the long-term planning of education in this Province? Was this the group who decided that they were going to charge elementary school students for workbooks? Was that the group? I hardly think so, Mr. Speaker. Was that the group, Mr. Speaker - it is not an hon. group, this is a committee the government were going to establish. Was this the group, Mr. Speaker, that raised the borrowing of university students to \$700 and in the process of doing so removed \$250 of the grant that students will get? Is this the group that is making Memorial University an elitist university? I hardly think so, Mr. Speaker. Another fantasy! Another dream!

Mr. Speaker, let us come to another area, a very important area today: "My ministers will

MR. LUSH: create an Advisory Council that will play an active role in creating close liaison between employers and employees either individually or through their organizations with a view to overcoming many of the problems which lead to major labour management relations. In 1972, Mr. Speaker, the government of the day realized that there are things wrong in labour and this Advisory Council no doubt would have done a lot to solve the labour problems that we are presently experiencing. But again it looks like a fantasy, Mr. Speaker, a dream.

Now, just to finish, Mr. Speaker, the programme of my government is a programme of action, a programme designed to attack unemployment and the many other problems facing our Province. Mr. Speaker, I want to look at that because when this document came out no doubt it was viewed by everybody to be a great document. The economy of this Province was going to start moving. We were going to have an energetic government, a government that was going to restore integrity and honesty and decency to government. And they were going to create employment, Mr. Speaker. Well we will see, Mr. Speaker. We will see how they created employment.

Mr. Speaker, it only in retrospect that we can see that this is a government with fantasies, promises and dreams. It is only now that we can see that. At the time, Mr. Speaker, this was a great document, a master plan for the economic development of this Province. But it did not materialize, it became as I said a document of fantasy, a document of promises and a document of dreams. Empty words, Mr. Speaker, empty words, meaningless words. The government could not measure up to their commitments, they could not measure up to the job of governing this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Well this docket, Mr. Speaker, was again followed by a great event in the life of this government, our first billion dollar budget. The first billion dollar budget, Mr. Speaker, and the government went on a spending spree like drunken sailors.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Waster and extravagance. The like was never known before in the history of Newfoundland. Mismanagement, Mr. Speaker, of the public funds of this Province.

MR. NEARY: There should be a enquiry.

MR. LUSH: Mismanagement, waste and extravagance. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not in character with this hon. member to talk about scandals even though this government gives a person an awful lot of opportunity to do so but it is not at all in character. But I do not have to talk about scandals to illustrate how this administration have mismanaged, wasted the money of this Province. I do not have to do that, Mr. Speaker. We can allude to other things without going into scandal.

Let us take for example the aborted attempt to get the Gull Island project off the ground. \$70 million I believe down the drain. \$70 million that will never be recovered. That could have paved a lot of roads in this Province, Mr. Speaker. That could have given a lot of water and sewer systems. That could have taken care of the district of Terra Nova with no problem - the aborted attempt to get the Gull Island project off the ground.

How about the Health Sciences Complex? Do you think we could save a few million dollars there? Do you think we could have saved a few million dollars on that one? How about the 737-3800? - a number that is about as popular as pie R squared and about as useless to the ordinary people of this Province.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: 737-3800, Mr. Speaker. That is going to cost the taxpayers of this Province a lot of money and for what?

AN HON.MEMBER: It has already cost them two or three million dollars.

MR. LUSH: Well they have relieved me off a lot of work. I used to do a lot of work that the Action Group is doing. Now when people call me I just say 737-3800 and I do not have to finish the rest. They say 3800.

June 8, 1978

Tape No. 4155 (Night)

AH-3

AN HON. MEMBER:

They call you back the next day. Right?

MR. RIDEOUT:

You did not get \$500 for doing it though

did you?

MR. LUSH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, as popular as pie R squared

and just as useless.

MR. RIDEOUT:

You did not get over \$7,000 for doing it

though.

MR. LUSH:

How about the government's publicity

machine, Mr. Speaker?

I do not know what it is called.

MR. NEARY:

We saw an example of that last night.

MR. WHITE:

You cannot even write something to get on

the air.

MR. LUSH: The government's publicity machine -
MR. RIDEOUT: They cannot even spell their. t-h-e-i-r.
MR. LUSH: - that could not tell about the government programmes. They had to get this 737-3800 on the go.

MR. NEARY: Not allowed to use four letter words on the -

MR. LUSH: The publicity machine could not take care of that, this publicity machine that is on the go to show how great hon. members on the other side are. But, Mr. Speaker, the had to set up another group, the Action Group. Well, I could talk about the Norma and Gladys, I could go on. But I think, Mr. Speaker, I have illustrated how this government have wasted millions.

MR. WHITE: That is Jimmy's boat now you know.

MR. LUSH: Yes. Right. Money going everywhere, pouring out through the seams, spending money, Sir, like drunken sailors but for the results you would not mind spending, but what are the results? Head and ears in debt, Mr. Speaker, that is what it has done for us, head and ears in debt. No jobs still, the economy still depressed, but \$2.4 billion that is our public debt, indirect and direct. \$2.4, in six years they increased the public debt by \$1.5 billion. When they took over the administration of this Province, and I think the public debt direct and indirect, it was somewhere around \$900 million, and today it is \$2.4 billion. An incredible figure, Mr. Speaker, an incredible figure. Nobody in this hon. House understands what \$1 billion is. Nobody understands it.

How much is a billion? Just to illustrate, Mr. Speaker, suppose I were to ask hon. members how many minutes have passed since the birth of Christ? What would we think? 5 billion, 6 billion, 8 billion? How many minutes since the birth of Christ? How many billions of minutes, Mr. Speaker, or how many minutes since the birth of Christ. Mr. Speaker, it would be just a little more than

MR. LUSH: a billion, just a little more than a billion minutes since the birth of Christ.

MR. MCNEIL: Since the birth of Christ.

MR. LUSH: Or a man would have to be paid \$2.50 a minute since the birth of Christ to reach \$2.25 billion. \$2.50 a minute, Mr. Speaker, that is pretty high pay per hour. I believe it works out to about \$150 an hour. \$150 an hour. That is what we would have to be paid since the birth of Christ to reach \$2.4 billion, an astronomical figure, Mr. Speaker, an astronomical debt, incomprehensible.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what they did. That is performance. \$900 million in twenty-three years and \$2.4 billion in six years.

MR. MORGAN: Never heard of inflation.

MR. LUSH: That is it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is not inflation.

MR. LUSH: I will talk about inflation too. I will talk about inflation. Well, Mr. Speaker, what is the results of this extravaganza, this tremendous waste? What are the results? Still the highest unemployment in Canada, that is the result, Mr. Speaker, that is the result, the highest unemployment in Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in reviewing all of the speeches from the Throne we find that there is a dramatic change from the first one. I am not going to review them all. But there is a change. One thing they all have in common and that is future plans, long term planning. Now, Mr. Speaker, long term planning covers up a multitude of sins. Long term planning is a great excuse for not performing, particularly during a challenging period like this, and all we say, long term planning.

Mr. Speaker

MR. LUSH:

that does nothing for the people who are unemployed right now, this long-term plan, and nobody is refuting the benefits and the advantages and the prudence of long-term planning, but, Mr. Speaker, when you use it as a crutch all the time as hon. members are doing - long-term planning - it would do hon. members good to look through the Speeches from the Throne and see how often long-term planning is mentioned, planning for the future. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder how long hon. members think they have over there? How long do they think Newfoundlanders are going to wait for action?

MR. MORGAN: Another couple of terms.

MR. NEARY: The couple of terms you are talking about are down by lake side. Twenty-one years.

MR. RIDEOUT: Twenty-one years is a mighty long time.

MR. NEARY: A couple of terms alright, a couple of five-year terms at Her Majesty's Hotel.

MR. LUSH: Long-term planning, Mr. Speaker, a great crutch used by the government.

But, Mr. Speaker, in 1975, a change comes over these Speeches from the Throne. There is a change. None of them were as elaborate as this first one. But in 1975 we sense a change. In addition to the long-term planning which covers up the lack of performance by the government, in 1975 they come up with something else that they have been using ever since, an excuse for the lack of performance - inflation. Inflation, Mr. Speaker! They would not know but inflation was a new thing. They would not know but inflation was not around us before. I suppose they did not know that when we joined Confederation in 1949 that North America and the world was faced with a severe recession economically, so much so that the

MR. LUSH: Fathers of Confederation were very, very worried about what would happen. When we joined Confederation there was deep recession right across Canada. In 1954 there was a recession; in 1960 there was a recession. But governments of the day overcame them, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Mines -

MR. LUSH: He thinks it is funny.

MR. RIDEOUT: I remember the Minister of Mines and Energy saying that the Greeks experienced -

MR. LUSH: Oh, yes, that is right.

MR. PECKFORD: On a couple of occasions (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: Anyway, governments of the day, Sir, government in 1949, government in 1954, governments in the 1960s faced inflation, but they did not use it for an excuse, they went on with programmes for development. They went on and they overcame inflation when these fellows use it as an excuse, there is nothing they can do about it. That is their official excuse, Mr. Speaker. That is one of the things that entered the Budget, that entered the Speeches from the Throne - inflation.

Something else too that they use as a crutch and as a beating boy - it was not stated officially but it became official, you could hear it on the air waves all the time and on the media - Ottawa. That was the next one they blamed. They blamed Ottawa for everything, Mr. Speaker. Everything that went wrong they blamed Ottawa. If there was anything good, of course, they tried to catch hold of that, Mr. Speaker. They blamed Ottawa for high unemployment, blamed Ottawa for inflation, Mr. Speaker, every chance they could get. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services about a couple of months ago getting on the radio and going just about berserk because he assumed that the federal government was going to close

MR. LUSH: out the Bonavista branch railway line - went berserk, calling on the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) to speak out. His big concern was that nineteen people were going to lose their jobs. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the audacity of a man, coming out criticizing the federal government because nineteen jobs were going to be lost while he was a minister who was party to closing down the Linerboard, party to closing down the Oil Refinery at Come By Chance, party to a promise that was made to his district to construct a hospital - thousands of jobs, Mr. Speaker, but went on complaining because nineteen people were going to lose their jobs -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) going to change it around. You people were responsible for closing the Linerboard putting thousands of people out of work.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: - to gain political points, Mr. Speaker, political points, Brownie points.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not one or two, but thousands.

MR. LUSH: I object, Mr. Speaker, I object to nineteen people losing their jobs. I object to the Bonavista branch railway line being closed, but the

Mr. Lush: hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, of somebody standing up who was responsible for Newfoundlanders losing thousands of jobs.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thousands and thousands and thousands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PECKFORD: That is right.

MR. LUSH: And to criticize Ottawa for nineteen jobs.

What a joke, Mr. Speaker! What a joke! What a joke! Criticizing Ottawa, using it as an excuse for their lack of performance. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Tourism, the Minister of Transportation and Communications at the time going to Ottawa criticizing our Gulf ferry services, but we had our Interprovincial ferry services here not fit for animals to use.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Imagine the Minister of Transportation and Communications going to Ottawa trying to get a better agreement for the Trans-Canada, a road that this Provincial Government never spent a nickel on roads -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: - while he was down here paving roads in Bonavista South and in Trinity North and complaining about Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, what a ridiculous situation! trying to gain political points.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: And then criticizing this member for saying something unfavourable about his department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a shame!

MR. RIDEOUT: The Premier had no choice but to move him out of it.

MR. LUSH: Imagine, Mr. Speak, the Minister of Fisheries,

MR. MCNEIL: Put him in the backbenches.

MR. LUSH: the way that that particular man criticizes Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, instead of working in a spirit of co-operation and harmony, trying to develop policies for this Province, they have a policy of confrontation, antagonism, agitation, how can we expect Ottawa -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, please.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting in my seat here this year and listening to the hon. gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) who continues to harass members on this side of the House, and it is just getting to the point, Mr. Speaker, where it is totally unbearable.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, my!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has the right to speak without interruption from either side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the Minister of Fisheries how he criticizes Ottawa, criticizes everything that happens in the fishery, and then tries to take credit whenever something looks good. If it is a good catch he takes the credit. Mr. Speaker, they blame everything on Ottawa from a migraine headache to flat feet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: And instead of, Mr. Speaker, in a spirit -

AN HON. MEMBER: What about gout?

MR. LUSH: - of co-operation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they do not talk about the real reasons for the failure of this government. They do not talk about the real reasons for the incompetency of this government. They do not talk about that. They do not talk about the real reason for the failure of this government to be able to provide jobs because of the waste and the extravagance. The way that they have misspent the public dollars of this Province, and the way they have misguided and misdirected

Mr. Lush: this Province. That is the real reason for failure Mr. Speaker. Inflation is a part. Ottawa might be a part, but these are the real reasons, the inability of this government to negotiate co-operatively, and in good faith with Ottawa. That is another reason why they are not getting all of the programmes they want confrontation, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: agitation. This is what they subscribe to.

Mr. Speaker, this last document, Mr. Speaker, 1978. That is the self-pity document. That is the self-pity document. That is the admission document. That is the admission of their failure asking the people to forgive them. We failed, it was all because of inflation, Mr. Speaker. We failed. That was the emptiest document, Mr. Speaker ever was presented in this House. This is the emptiest document. Nothing in it, Mr. Speaker. Nothing at all. Empty of content. A government acknowledging its failure. Admitting to its failure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no hope in this for the unemployed in this Province. No hope at all. No ray of light for the 37,000 Newfoundlanders unemployed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this first document it was concerned about employment creating jobs. When this administration took over the rate of unemployment was 9.9 per cent. That was in March, when they took over the administration, 9.9 per cent in March. Today in April, which should be a little better than March, from the point of view of employment because things are, as I say we are approaching the construction season, 9.9 in 1972, March when this catalogue, Eaton's Catalogue was put out, Mr. Speaker, the rate of employment then was 9.9, today 19.6 -

MR. LUSH: doubled, 19.6 today. That is performance, Mr. Speaker, that is performance. That is the government of fantasy, promises and dreams. That is performance, Mr. Speaker. That is performance. A public debt of \$2.4 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Increase the public debt by \$1.5 billion and double the unemployment rate. So much for performance, Mr. Speaker. That is performance, Mr. Speaker. Well, no hope in this document, Mr. Speaker, for the people who are unemployed.

MR. NEARY: Grin and bear it.

MR. LUSH: People who are frustrated, without hope, do not know where to go, do not know what to do. Oh they know the debilitating effects of unemployment, but they would like to know more. They would like to know when and where they are going to get a job. That is what they want to know. As an afterthought, nobody mentioned - what the government planned to do about employment was not mentioned in this document, but as an afterthought in the Budget they decided they were going to create 40,000 jobs, 40,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I could say a lot about that too, what that is going to do in terms of creating employment over a five year period. The unemployment rate at that time will be, if they create the 40,000 jobs, and if we take an average of 5,000 people entering the work force a year, new entries, that will give us an unemployment rate of 12.5 per cent, that is what that will give us at that time, 12.5 per cent. Is that what we think is a good unemployment rate? 10.5 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is only if the 40,000 jobs are created. That is only if the work force increases by 5,000. It did much better than that in the period from 1972 to 1978, indeed it increased on an average of 7,000 a year in that time, from 1972 to 1978. So if it increases at the same ratio then in the five year period we

MR. LUSH: are going to be looking at an unemployment rate of upwards of twenty per cent. That is performance, Mr. Speaker. That is performance.

MR. RIDEOUT: They will not be there to worry about it.

MR. FLIGHT: They will not be there to worry about it.

MR. MCNEIL: I hope for the people of Newfoundland they will not be.

MR. FLIGHT: They will be long gone.

MR. WHITE: They are gone now man. It is only their ghosts.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, another vital area of concern to me, and an area that is of vital concern to any government that wants to guide and direct the Province effectively, another important concern is productivity. This government has given lip service to that too, productivity, talked about it in this budget speech, wanted to increase productivity. Well, if we are going to increase productivity, one thing for sure we have to have people employed. We are going to do that. And another thing, Mr. Speaker, in order to increase productivity we have to have good labour management relations in the Province. Good employer-employee relations, good industrial relations, Mr. Speaker. And you do not have to look too far back over your shoulder to see that in this Province we do not have good labour, management relations.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that labour relations in this Province, at this moment, is in a state of chaos, a state of chaos, utter and complete chaos. Work stoppages galore, Mr. Speaker, in the past six months. The strikes in this Province in the last six months must be having a disastrous effect on the economy of this Province and on the productivity. Strikes at Baie Verte, a strike at Labrador City.

MR. RIDEOUT: Government's fault.

MR. LUSH: Strikes and wildcat strikes, walk outs the last couple of months in the Newfoundland Telephone Company, Light

MR. LUSH: and Power, truckers around this Province.

The list goes on, Mr. Speaker, of work stoppages. It must be having, as I said, a disastrous effect on the economy of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, just a figure here to look at the work stoppages in this Province last year, 1977. We had a total, Mr. Speaker, of 44 work stoppages. New Brunswick where the labour force is much larger, 30 stoppages, thirty work stoppages. Nova Scotia where the work force is larger still, just about triple that of Newfoundland, twenty-two work stoppages.

MR. LUSH: two work stoppages. In lost man days, Mr. Speaker, or in man days lost, in Newfoundland we lost a total of 128,297 days - that is what we lost - in production and terms of salary-128,297 man days lost. How did New Brunswick do? A little under 6,000. How did Nova Scotia do? 2,000 - 2,000, Mr. Speaker. Look at that figure again. Newfoundland - man days lost - 128,297. Think in terms of what that meant in production and in salary to the workers concerned. Nova Scotia - 2,000; New Brunswick - just under 6,000. Mr. Speaker, if that does not tell us that there is something wrong with labour relations in this Province, I do not know what will. There is something wrong, Mr. Speaker, with labour relations in this Province, and it is the job of the government to promote good labour relations - to promote a climate of good labour relations - to promote a climate of harmony as opposed to antagonism and agitation and conflict. Mr. Speaker, over the past few years, over the past few years, the labour relations system in this Province has been eroded. It has been eroded, Mr. Speaker, and I can give some evidence as to support why it has been eroded and been continually eroded. There has been growing public disapproval, Mr. Speaker, of the higher incidents of strikes in this Province, resulted in public inconvenience and cost. The employers are not satisfied with the conditions of the workplace, feeling that they are being underpaid, Mr. Speaker, that they are being ripped off - employees, rather, employers, sorry. And employers are mistrusting - some are mistrusting - they leave employees thinking that they are not concerned about productivity or the viability of an enterprise in which they are working. Mr. Speaker, there is no trust - no confidence - the system is being eroded. Employers - many employers not satisfied with unions - again, a situation of mistrust. Mr. Speaker, there has been unusual pressures brought on unions and employers over recent years - the pressures resulting from the slow growth in the economy - from the expectations of workers to get higher pay. All

MR. LUSH: of these things, Mr. Speaker, bringing pressure on employers and on unions, but despite that, Mr. Speaker, despite that, the institutions are still existing; but we have not prevented unions and management - they have not prevented the erosion of the system. It is still being eroded - still being eroded, Mr. Speaker. This, Mr. Speaker, has led, as I said, to public dissatisfaction with the system of labour relations and we can see this now because we are getting increased reliance on third-party settlements - third-party settlements, Mr. Speaker. Look at the settlements that were settled over the past year through conciliation, mediation, arbitration, so much so that it is putting tremendous pressure on governments - wanting the government to intervene and even come up with some system that almost makes negotiations arbitrary - a lot of pressures, Mr. Speaker. And I say that the system is eroding, but it is a responsibility of the government to ensure that the free collective bargaining system still is carried on because that is the best system we have to date. It is up to the government to see that that works. It is up to the government to see that this system works, Mr. Speaker. It is up to the government to ensure that there is a spirit of harmony in industrial relations in this Province. It is the responsibility of the government to set up the legal framework - that they have done -

MR. LUSH: to set up the legal framework. But, Mr. Speaker, they must go beyond this. They must go beyond setting up the legal framework. Now I do not have much time left to say what I think should be done, but I will just do them in point form. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have said the government sets up the legal framework and the government must ensure as well that all the rules and regulations are enforced with respect to the labour relations system, and I think there has been - I think the government has been slack in enforcing the rules and regulations that exist with respect to the labour relations system and that is a reason why it is being eroded. Mr. Speaker, in addition to setting up the legal framework for the collective bargaining system, I have said the government must do more - they must do more than this to strengthen and improve our industrial system - must do more. Mr. Speaker, point number one, they must come up with measures to improve the work environment. Now, we have made some progress in this with respect to the health and safety legislation that was passed in this present session. We hope that that will become a good bill, but as we have said before it depends upon the regulations. So, we are not in a position to say that that is going to be the kind of bill that is really going to improve the work environment until we know what the regulations are, but the Minister has this in his own hands to make this a good piece of legislation so that we can take care of the work environment. Because, Mr. Speaker, many of the labour disputes are not concerned with monetary things; they are concerned with these factors of health and safety, job satisfaction - that is what I would like to get into, Mr. Speaker - job satisfaction - because we do not have much opportunity in this Province for job satisfaction. 37,000 people unemployed - we got to take whatever we can get. There are people in this Province

This page is missing from the original copy.

MR. LUSH: to improve the overall structure of labour relations. One of the big things to improve the overall structure in addition to the things I have talked about, one of the big things, is a greater emphasis on education - labour education - labour education, Mr. Speaker, so that we can provide opportunities to assist union leaders and workers to understand the labour relations system. The minister got a thousand dollars in his budget this year for education. I do not know what he is going to do with that - a thousand dollars - I would like to know. Last year there was twenty thousand, I think, spent on labour education. Mr. Speaker, we need to spend more money on labour education, particularly the minister passed those two - the House passed those two massive labour bills last -

MR. LUSH: year. I have not seen a word about it. The workers know about it in this Province - know what their rights are under these two labour bills? Never heard a word about it - not a word. And the Minister did say he was going to do some sort of a promotional program. I have not heard anything about it - not a thing. Is this what he plans to do with that thousand dollars - to educate the labour movement of this Province with a thousand dollars, so that we can improve labour relations in this Province? Mr. Speaker, the government must promote and encourage co-operation in labour relations. They must make sure that the climate is right - that there is good effective employer-employee relations, that, Mr. Speaker, promotes the dignity of people that will give them health and safety measures, and, Mr. Speaker, the kind of system that will facilitate the resolution of labour disputes and the kind of system that is going to increase and encourage productivity in this Province - that is what we want, Mr. Speaker, this is what we want. And, Mr. Speaker, the biggest thing the government can do - the biggest thing the government can do in all of this is set the example within its own negotiations - that is the biggest thing this government can do. In addition to the things I have talked about is setting the example for good labour relations. Now, Mr. Speaker, I raised the question today that an official of NAPE made allegations that the government was guilty of unfair labour practices, and that labour relations with the government was in a state of chaos. Mr. Speaker, the situation was, as I understand it - the situation; as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, was that a group of workers - hospital support workers - honoured the strike of the x-ray and lab technicians and, because they did that, government broke off negotiating with their bargaining unit. That is what I heard today - that is what I heard today, Mr. Speaker - the government threatening - threatening the hospital workers - threatening the hospital workers - that is good labour relations,

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker - that is good labour relations - broke off negotiations with the hospital support workers because they supported - because they respected a picket line put up by another group - that is what happened - that is what happened, Mr. Speaker. That is what happened, Mr. Speaker - that is what happened. But, Mr. Speaker, that is what happened and the union - NAPE now has said that the government is guilty of unfair labour practices - what an accusation against the government of this Province that is supposed to be setting the example. Ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, ridiculous. Ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Sir, for these reasons, think of outlining, Mr. Speaker, some of the major reasons why I will be supporting this amendment - the disaster government, Mr. Speaker, the disaster government - the government, Sir, with respect to policies for developing this Province - the government with respect to having policies for the development of this Province they are intellectually and physically impoverished, Mr. Speaker - a wasteland - a barren - a void, Mr. Speaker, if anything - a colossal - a colossal calamity - this is what they are, Mr. Speaker - a government, Mr. Speaker, of fantasies, promises and dreams, Mr. Speaker. For these reasons and for other reasons too numerous to mention I support this sub-amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Bay of Islands
(Mr. L. Woodrow).

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly glad to have the opportunity to get up and have a few words to say on the Province in general and my own riding in particular, and I would like to say that I have listened to the hon. gentleman from Terra Nova (Mr. T. Lush) and I - as he went along I said to myself 'It is nice to talk when you are not sitting in the driver's seat'. You can give all the answers.

MR. WOODROW: In fact, it is like a preacher who is getting up and ballyragging - that is the best time you can give a sermon when you are getting up and ballyragging. And I think what I have listened to for the past at least forty minutes of it was known as a word that is called 'codology' which has been used in this House, in fact, I would say, in many cases, ever since the session opened. Probably I certainly think it is in order, Mr. Speaker, when you speak in the Throne Speech to offer congratulations to the new members and I do that to my friend from St. John's West (Dr. H. Kitchen), who certainly has added a lot of talent and intelligence to this House. He probably got some of it out in Alberta, maybe from Premier Lougheed, but there is only one thing wrong - he is on the wrong side - he should be sitting over here

MR. WOODROW: - should be sitting over here. And also, Mr. Speaker, to my friend from Ferryland (Mr. Power) I certainly offer him congratulations. I feel that he has a long way to go. And last, but not the least, I must congratulate the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I certainly feel that to be a leader today of government or of opposition, one has a great responsibility on his shoulders; not only is he the Leader of the Opposition but he is also the member for Twillingate. But, I am going to quote something, Sir, which is probably going to be frightening to him because I do not like to criticize but he is not leading: he is boxed in. He is boxed in and there is a lid on the box, and he cannot lead. I think, the sooner he gets out of that box then he will be showing himself as a real leader of the Opposition of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Now, Mr. Speaker, regarding the House of Assembly. As I look in the galleries at the people I say to myself, "They must think that this is just a joke." But, if they only knew the cost, the amount of money that this House is costing the people everyday!

AN HON. MEMBER: Eighteen hours a speaker

(inaudible)

MR. WOODROW: Absolutely! Then, perhaps, they would really think differently. Now, I just want to quote, Mr. Speaker, from The Evening Telegram of April the 15th, 1978 and I do not think much has changed since that time. This is what it says, "There is a lot of talent on the Opposition side of the House of Assembly. There are educated, informed members there who are good speakers skillful in the art of debate, organized and controlled it could be a formidable political weapon to keep the Government sitting on the edge of its seat. Yet, for all its political and numerical strength the Opposition is making a very poor showing in this session. It did enjoy one minor triumph by reducing a minister's salary to one dollar, but it takes more than one small local victory to show it is capable of doing a worthwhile job."

MR. WOODROW: "The main weakness of the Opposition," Mr. Speaker, the article goes on to say, "is in the Liberal leader."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: "The Liberal leader appears to be in the quality of its leadership. William Rowe seems to have lost control over the Opposition and so far has not shown he is able to co-ordinate and concentrate the efforts and energies of his colleagues."

AN HON. MEMBER: The Liberal Party knows that.

MR. WOODROW: "To make matters worse", Mr. Speaker, his House Leader, Stephen Neary, does not seem to know what his job is all about. He is supposed to be the Party's strategist in the House but he shows up more as a one-man band who sees his position as the opportunity to do all the talking for his party."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: "There are some observers who feel he is trying to take over Rowe's leadership role." Of course, that is quite obvious. "All this is very unsettling for the Liberals and it results in a lot of its talent going to waste. Then let us control and the misuse of talent mean that for all the noise and shouting in the House the Government is having a very easy ride in getting its spending programme approved. The time is being burned up in time-wasting arguments and the items of expenditure which should be examined in the greatest detail are sliding through with not one question asked. It is obvious that the Opposition does not know its business. It believes in speeches rather than questions. It shows no signs that strategy and tactics have been planned in advance of each department's estimates, and it seems to assume that a shouting match -"

MR. WOODROW: and it seems to assume that a shouting match is a good substitute for an intelligent speech with a carefully honed cutting edge to it. What a pity it is that just when we need a strong, well-organized Opposition we have this mishmash of talent no one knows how to put to work. Now, I am certain - I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that there are many members on the opposite side of the House of Assembly who agree with what I say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, please!

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, regarding unemployment - the hon. gentleman who spoke before me -

MR. ROWE: Are you finished with me now - can I go?

MR. WOODROW: No, Sir, I have a few more things yet if you would not mind waiting -

MR. ROWE: Do you want to go outside?

MR. WOODROW: I will come to it later on - I will be to it later on -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WOODROW: Good enough - fine. The hon. member seems to think that unemployment only applies to Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, there is unemployment all over Canada. In fact, there is over a million unemployed and not only in Canada, the Dominion of Canada, but all in the United States and we are a part of Canada - we are a province, and I feel really that employment should be spurred on by Ottawa. What happened - the hon. the Prime Minister of Canada a month ago - he was afraid to call an election because the polls were not good. He is not afraid now because the polls are a little bit better today. Where is his leadership? Where is his leadership? In fact, I think he should have the stamina to call an election and let the chips fall where they will. Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. WOODROW: the hon. Premier has been subjected to a lot of attack in this House, but not outside the House, if you listen to open-line programs in fact, not only in fact here in St. John's but over the Province as well - you will find that the Premier has tried and is trying to do a commendable job for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador; and I think the hon. members of the Opposition should remember that, not only theirs, of course, but our salaries were increased by the hon. the Premier. I talked with members who served on the former administration and they said they did not get enough salary, in fact, to keep - in fact they could not even pay their way back and forth to their districts. There certainly, in some cases granted, and also, Mr. Speaker, in the field of education - my glory be to God - in fact certainly a lot has been done - not enough has been done and we are getting petitions from across the House of Assembly about education, roads, and the like, and yet they say why do we have over a billion-dollar budget. If we really could - if they really fulfilled all the needs and all the petitions that they have, I think it would probably take a couple of billions. I have heard my hon. friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. G. Flight) - he is not in his seat now - I heard him today say - degrade the hon. Minister of Fisheries. Is there, Mr. Speaker, a harder working man in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador than the hon. Minister of Fisheries, and he said that he has not gone to every community in the Province - I hope he meant every fairly sized large community. Well, I suppose the man is a human being, Mr. Speaker; he is a human being, Mr. Speaker, and I do feel that he is trying desperately hard to do all he can for what is the most important industry of this Province, Mr. Speaker, the fisheries.

MR. WOODROW: And I am going to mention just some of the things that are happening in my own district if I get the time with the fisheries. In the case, Mr. Speaker, of health there has been a lot of progress made, certainly in the field of water and sewerage; in fact, I do not think there was water and sewerage in any part of the Bay of Islands - that is in the district - the present district of the Bay of Islands - before this hon. - I was going to say hon. crowd, but I do not say it, these hon. men - these hon. members got in power. And, in fact, continuing on, Mr. Speaker, in the field of recreation as well, in fact also, Mr. Speaker, a lot has been done for retarded people in this Province and, in fact, a lot more things are planned; and also in such things as care homes and also there certainly has been - I do not know how much but maybe over 150% in the welfare and the life - so what I would like to see a member do - I would like for a member to get up and be positive first of all. My glory be to God - really, I feel that something has been done and all you hear across the House is "Nothing has been done" - it is all negative. But listen, I would say if the hon. Leader of the Opposition - if he was over on this side, I think then he would be talking with a different tune. Mr. Speaker, just looking at a few things in my own district, first of all, Mr. Speaker, I speak of the rural parts of the district. There certainly has been - there has been a continual increase, Mr. Speaker, in such things as water and sewerage - a lot more remains to be done. There is also, in fact, even before I got elected there was a paved road from one part of the district to the other and, Mr. Speaker, also in the field of fire equipment which is so important - I am speaking now of the rural part of the district - only recently I was able to announce a firetruck for the community of Gillams. It was

MR. WOODROW: shared on a 50-50 basis and there is also a firetruck in Meadows and I have a few more things to say about Meadows later on. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the field of fisheries, fisheries are really becoming very important now in the Bay of Islands and I can boast, of course, of six herring plants in the Bay of Islands area and the, I think everybody knows where these plants are located, and the plant in the community of Cox's Cove is manned by probably two of the greatest Newfoundlanders that you would every want to meet and they are putting in fact a lot of their own money in it and they are processing, not only herring, but they are now buying codfish and other species of fish as well. But I am not happy, Mr. Speaker, over the fact that a herring meal plant has been closed down in the Bay of Islands - I am really very unhappy over that, and I hope that we can have this plant started up again, but I understand that one of the reasons why it is closed down is of the lack of raw materials and -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) to Rose Blanche now.

MR. WOODROW: That is one of the reasons, yes, that is right. Now, this then brings up another subject. In fact, it is causing a lot of problems with the environment

MR. WOODROW: This, then, brings up another subject: in fact, it is causing a lot of problems with the environment. I would like to see that plant opened up so the pips and everything else and the herring offal will not be going on and spoiling our beautiful beaches, and I am working desperately hard to see that plant re-opened again. I hope, now, with the 200-mile limit and the increase of longliners in the district more raw material will be available to keep the plant open.

MR. NEARY: What state is the equipment in now - Bowaters

MR. WOODROW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say to that, I suppose, after equipment is closed down for a period it certainly deteriorates but I understand that possibly \$25,000 could re-open the -

MR. NEARY: How much?

MR. WOODROW: \$25,000 we understand could have the plant re-opened. And it is a very important thing for the Bay of Islands, I can assure you. I believe I heard my hon. friend from Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) - He was alluding to fishmeal plants when he made his speech last week and I heard him mention the herring meal plant in the Bay of Islands. And apart from that, we are losing seven to nine jobs which is important for the community of York Harbour, and of course, other spinoff jobs as well such as taking the offal from the plants and the like.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. WOODROW: Well, no. In fact, in some cases it is absolutely, but it is going to the -

MR. FLIGHT: Environmental regulations.

MR. WOODROW: - I understand it is going to the dump in Corner Brook and some people have some tanks or something to hold it for a certain period and then it is dropped off either out to -

MR. BECKFORD: The point is there are two plants closed and it is an abuse of the environmental regulations.

MR. WOODROW:

Yes. Well, that is a job for the Department of the Environment to look into but I have had a lot of correspondence on this plant with the Environment, and have also corresponded with the minister over the past couple of weeks or so and I am not going to give up until I put forth every effort to see this plant re-opened again.

MR. NEARY:

Who is responsible for it now? Is it the Newfoundland Development Corporation, Dunphy's, or who?

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to answer these questions.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to say that the urban part of my district is very well looked after, as well. In fact, it is, as you know, a part of the City of Corner Brook and in almost every home I would say in the urban part of the Bay of Islands district you have water and sewerage, and employment is very good. In fact, the people who are unemployed are generally people who are unskilled. I think this applies, in fact, to a lot of people throughout the Province. I think we have to realize today that in order to get employment you must have some kind of a trade. Also, in this part of the district, we have a NIP and a RAP programme going on, spending something like - Certain, for NIP alone they are spending something like 4.4 million dollars plus what they spend in RAP, and this, of course, is a programme sponsored by the Federal, the Provincial and the municipal government. And when I hear people say - They say, you know, "That is from Ottawa." It makes me feel - Why, are we not allowed to get something from Ottawa? Are we Canadians? I think, Mr. Speaker, that we are just as entitled to get money from Ottawa as Quebec is, or as Ontario is, or any other province, but sometimes it makes me sick when I hear, "That is from Ottawa." What is wrong with that? I think we are certainly entitled. In fact, if we had to get a debate in this session on Term 29 as was suggested here by my hon. friend from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) -

June 8, 1978

Tape No. 4166

BT-3

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) - from Quebec.

MR. WOODROW:

Of course we should. I got up to speak
on a petition. My hon. friend from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) - He

MR. WOODROW: knocked me down first of all on a point of order, and he was ruled out of order, and finally he got me on what he called a quorum. I do not think that is really being a very good Canadian - a very good Newfoundlander. I understand that the eight million dollars, which it was in 1958, in today's dollars amounts to 35 billion dollars, and maybe if we had that money we could comply with a lot of the petitions on roads and on water and sewerage, etc., which the Opposition are constantly calling for; and I certainly would like to see - I would like to see this motion defeated before the House of Assembly closes. Mr. Speaker, I feel, in fact, I am trying to be sincere with my constituents, I am trying to help in every possible way. I really hate - in fact sometimes I really feel ashamed, Mr. Speaker, sometimes to see the time that is wasted in this House. Now, I know, Mr. Speaker, that we are living in a democracy, but I sometimes think - I wonder do we abuse democracy. It is the greatest form of government anybody could have, but when you abuse - I do not know whether speaking 3-1/2 days in the House like, 4-1/2 days or 18 hours - I do not know whether that is really - does that do, you say, the member any good, or does it do the Province any good? I think really that if you spoke, Mr. Speaker, one hour, in fact, or even one-half hour you could certainly in fact be more constructive than speaking maybe two or three days and going on calling to points of order and points of privilege and the like, eh. Mr. Speaker, I must say I do find it very discouraging when our people all over this Province they need so much. I would just like to read this, Mr. Speaker, just to show you what I am trying to do and I could read a lot of letters like this, eh. This is a couple of letters I got here which

MR. WOODROW: give me great courage and give me the strength to keep on plugging on. This one says "Dear Mr. Woodrow: My family and I are writing to you to thank you for everything you done for us. Through your help and consideration, my family have a decent home to live in. Our children are much happier since we moved into our new home from the little old place we lived in. With gratitude in our hearts we will always remember what you have done for us as a family." And that is signed from a family out in Lark Harbour. This one here comes from a fella I helped to get a job. "This is just a little token of thanks for all you did for me. I really enjoy the work I am doing. It is the type of job I was looking for. It is easy on me and I really like it." And that is from a gentleman over in Curling. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is wrong, Mr. Speaker, to try to help your constituents. I think that is what we are elected for. We are elected to try to help people and that is what I am doing - that is in fact what I am trying to do every day. Mr. Speaker, concerning insurance in this Province, I was over in Cox's Cove last week, and I find in many of the communities of this Province people are unable to get insurance -

AN HON. MEMBER: Unemployment insurance?

MR. WOODROW: Not unemployment - no, no, not unemployment insurance. They are unable to get insurance in rural areas. In fact, and as a result of that, in fact, they - if their property happens to burn they have to appeal to the public. In fact, we had two cases this year. We had a case this year in the community of Benoit's Cove and, in fact, where a person's house burnt down during Christmas with no insurance and we had a case later one where a house burnt down in Meadows, but I presume maybe - I do not know if the

MR. WOODROW: Meadows one has to be looked after over the past couple of weeks or not. I heard there was a big Liberal rally over there. Probably it is going to be looked after in any case. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to come back again to the Leader of the Opposition.

Now -

MR. ROWE: Be careful now - do not get

MR. WOODROW: - the Leader of the Opposition - no, no - I am stating facts -

MR. ROWE: Do not get nasty now.

MR. WOODROW: In fact, these are facts. The Leader of the Opposition was over in Corner Brook earlier in the year, about three or four weeks ago, and I happened to be over there myself, and I listened to him

MR. WOODROW: on Open-line. Now, I will say first of all I did hear him say that 'Mr. Woodrow was a gentleman', and I thank him of that, in fact, that is really constructive, of course, I am not saying he did not. But, you know, he spent and I sort of say those things even a little bit shaky sometimes - you do not want to hurt anybody - it is not for that. But, you know, during the time he was on Open-line, he continually spoke about the fact that the Liberals are going to get in power in the next election. That, Mr. Speaker, will depend upon the wishes of the people, but what amazed me, Mr. Speaker, was that the hon. Leader - he did not mention unemployment - did not mention not a word about unemployment, and yet we say, you know, what do we hear across the House - unemployment. He did not mention fisheries - he is back again, I see - very good - fine. He did not mention fisheries - he did not mention hydro. Well, at least I suppose there is one good thing is that he said that I was a gentleman - I certainly - I am glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to hear that indeed. Now, he was also over in Meadows -

MR. ROWE: Got a point of order.

MR. WOODROW: Oh, oh, I see.

MR. ROWE: Point of order, Sir, I would like to now, for the public record, to withdraw the statement which I made concerning the hon. member on that open-line program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: I really do not believe there is a point of order, but on the other hand I think that speaking on behalf of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House we commend the hon. Leader of the Opposition for his wisdom in congratulating the hon. member from time to time of Bay of Islands for the work he is doing and I implore him not to change his mind because he will be out of step with the people of the Province.

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker, oh my, oh my, is that not terrible, that is terrible, I say, it is terrible.

Mr. Speaker, I said he was also over in Meadows; in fact, Saturday night last, I understand, he had a great feed of - a great Jiggs dinner which was alright. There was nothing wrong with that, but, Mr. Speaker, I had a call from Meadows early last week. I had a call from people who are working on the Canada Works project over there and do you know what their problem is, Mr. Speaker? Their problem is that they are getting \$2.80 an hour which is starvation wages, and this is happening all over the Province where these Canada Works are. If they are going to give Canada Works, why in fact cannot they give people a decent wage? The projects are given, Mr. Speaker, in the dead of winter. You have to try to fix up a graveyard in the dead of winter or try, we say, to work on a pasture or the like, and added to that the programs are labour intensive. There is nothing left for materials, and I think these are some of the things that they Leader of the Opposition should get his teeth into. In doing that, you would be really helping the Province of Newfoundland; and as a result of that, Mr. Speaker, after I heard from the people in the Meadows area, I shot out this telegram to Joe Clark - "Many people in my district and, for that matter, throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador are upset over the starvation wage of \$2.80 per hour they are receiving on Canada Works grants.

MR. WOODROW: Secondly, money is advanced in the dead of winter and is also labour intent which means practically nothing for material. These conditions should be changed and I would appreciate if you would bring it up in the Commons to see what can be done about it.

MR. FLIGHT: (inaudible)

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very important thing in this Province.

MR. FLIGHT: Give me the answer.

MR. WOODROW: And a former - I do not have the answer yet - And a former member of Humber - St. George - St. Barbe was tired bringing this up and I also communicated with him in bringing the matter up. And I hope we say that members on both sides of the House will unite in matters like this, not in skulduggery, not in trying to destroy the great democracy that we have. How often, Mr. Speaker, did I hear people on the opposite side of the House speak about the Minister of Justice. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I have always found the Minister of Justice a gentleman and I have always received courteous, kind, and prompt replies to all my correspondence, and I do feel, in fact, hurt and upset when I hear people talking about a minister who has such a responsible position as the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the Stephenville Linerboard mill, I meant to have a word to say about that also. I have heard a lot about it over the past eighteen months, but how many facts, Mr. Speaker, did we hear?

MR. W. ROWE: All facts.

MR. WOODROW: How many of these things were facts?

MR. FLIGHT: You heard more facts from this side of the House that we heard from the other side.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, we heard a lot of suppositions, what could be done and what should be done, but the Government, they were in the driver's seat, and I am sure that they really dreaded to see the Linerboard mill close down and I think the important reason of it was that if the Government had to keep the Linerboard mill going this Province

MR. WOODROW: would have lost its capital credit rating. I do not know whether that is right, or not, hon. Minister and I do not know whether I expressed it right, or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Would the member permit a question?

MR. WOODROW: If it is about the Linerboard mill I do not know whether I could answer it, or not, but I certainly will -

MR. MCNEIL: Is the member aware that last year when the Budget was brought down the estimates that were put forward for the closing and mothballing of Labrador Linerboard was approximately \$27,000,000 and in this year's Budget it stated that it was over \$43,000,000 to close it down? So, in essence, it cost more to close it than to keep it open. Is the member aware of these facts?

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, that is again supposition. Maybe if I were on the opposite side of the House I would say the same thing but there are a lot of other things involved in this. You just cannot look at a big corporation like that - You just cannot answer that right off the bat. There are a lot of things involved and I feel certain - I am certain that this Administration would not have closed down the Labrador Linerboard mill if they had been able to keep it open, and I feel sure in the not too distant future it will be re-opened again.

MR. MCNEIL: It should have never closed and you know it.

MR. WOODROW: Well, as a West Coaster, I certainly do not want to see it closed and I can assure you of that.

Now, I also noticed in yesterday's paper, in The Western Star, that a couple of members in my district have been elected to the Board of Directors of Anti-Poverty Group, the Anti-Poverty Group. That is right. One member in Curling and the other member over in Gillams, and that is nice. It shows that people in the Bay of Islands are interested and I think it is really a good thing.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of other things I could say. I have heard the hon. member from Puchans (Mr. Flight) -

June 8, 1978

Tape No. 4169

RT-3

MR. WOODROW:

We have had the St. Lawrence mine close down. I do not know whether you can blame that on this Administration, or not, but I guarantee you that under the leadership of Father Molloy down in St. Lawrence they have a fish plant on the way. And that is what they need in

MR. WOODROW: this Province - we need good leaders. In fact, people are going to work construction. Regarding the Buchans - in conjunction with the amendment regarding the Buchans mine - is it again the cause of this administration - do you think they want to have Buchans mine closed down? I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, if they do, and I feel under the leadership of our good member over here - I have heard him in the House - I admire him because he gets up and he fights - that is what we have to do. You almost feel like jumping across the floor sometimes, and I think that is the way we got to be if we are serious about our districts. So, we have, of course, plagued and we know we all have been plagued with inflation. I remember when I got in council. The Leader is going - I am finished with him now in any case, til he finished everybody I guess. In the meantime, since 1972, since I became a member of council, all I heard in council was inflation and this we say inflation has been plaguing us - it has been plaguing us ever since and I suppose it will be plaguing. I have heard such things as the Action Line mentioned; well, if you want to know about the Action Line, you talk with Sandy Ball who has a big farm over in Curling, over on the Serpentine Road, and he will tell you what the Action Line has done and what they are trying to do for him, and I certainly have often heard the Norma and Gladys mentioned. When I hear the Norma and Gladys mentioned, I think of the late Senator Penney in Ramea. I stayed with him many times and this is what George Penney said. He says "Nobody can spend too much money on goodwill", and I think really that is what we have to do - we have to try to create goodwill. I happened to attend a concert recently over in Curling and I was so pleased to know that they had - every song was a Newfoundland song - in other words, they are keeping up our old Newfoundland heritage. I think we have a right to have some of the old ships and everything else kept up as well as the folklore

MR. WOODROW: in general of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose I could go on but I must say I am really glad - I am delighted to be a member of the House of Assembly and I do feel when I go to bed at night - I feel that I have done something to help somebody and I hope that I will continue to be positive - I do not think it is in me to be negative. In fact, even some of the things I said tonight I sort of - I just did not want to say them - to whom shall we go. In other words, what are we going to go to? Just imagine, for example, let us suppose the Opposition is in government tonight - let us name the various posts of the Cabinet. Mr. Speaker, therefore he said 'whom shall we go'. I would like to see every member responsible and doing all he can for the Province in general and for his own district. With these few words I thank members for their kind attention and I hope have enlightened them a little bit, and I thank you, Mr. Speaker, also.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Port au Port
(Mr. J. Hodder).

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to -

MR. NEARY: For your penance, you can go around the stations ten times.

MR. HODDER: I would like to congratulate the member from Bay of Islands on his speech. It was only last week that I was in his district and went through the district and visited - attended a gathering there. I find that the district is very much like mine, although I might assure the member that, while in his district, I did not say anything neither good nor bad about him, but I must thank him for -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

June 8, 1979

Tape 4170

GH-3

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker, point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member, I think- Order, please, order! The hon. member, I think, should make a more definitive withdrawal of that remark.

MR. WOODROW:

Withdraw, Mr. Speaker, with my whole heart and soul.

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. member.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I must thank the hon. member because he brought up a point in his speech which I was just listening to that is very close to my heart and one that has been bothering me about this particular Government for quite some time. The member mentioned the Canada Works projects and the fact that the Newfoundland worker is only getting \$2.80 per hour under Canada Works. I think he threw it at our side of the House that perhaps we should do something about that. Now, I do not know if the hon. member is aware, or not, but the Canada Works payments are varied from province to province, and the reason those payments vary is because the amount paid under Canada Works depends on the minimum wage which the province gives and the minimum wage, of course, is decided by the government of the province not by the Federal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: I, at this moment, would call on this Government to raise the minimum wage in this Province for two reasons: One, because of the fact that those people, who are in the low income bracket and who have to depend on the minimum wage with the cost of living as it has been escalating during the past ten years, can no longer live adequately on that type of wage. Besides that, Mr. Speaker, those people on social assistance in this Province who are really suffering at the present time, their wage as well is also geared to the minimum wage. I believe, two years ago I quoted here in the House of Assembly a statement made by the hon. the Premier in Gander, I believe it was in 1973, where he said that each year the social assistance would be raised as the cost of living went up but it would also be tied to the minimum wage. So, what is happening in this Province at the present time is that the minimum wage has not been raised for quite some time, we have people on Canada Works who are making only \$2.80 an hour and we have people on social assistance who cannot provide their families with the amenities of life. So, I would call on this Government to raise the minimum wage and ask the hon. member who made those particular statements earlier to press his Government to raise the minimum wage in this Province.

MR. HODDER: Now, Mr. Speaker, just to speak about one other thing which the hon. member mentioned. He talked about the House of Assembly at one point and he said words something to the effect that our people need so much, let us get down to work. Now, I have noticed in this House of Assembly, particularly this year, that the Government side of the House and members in the House have been criticizing the House because it does not work. I say that any statements made like that are only statements which are made to hoodwink the people of Newfoundland. -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: - because the people of Newfoundland may or may not be aware that in this particular House of Assembly, or in any House of Assembly, that we work under an adversary system. The system is that the opposition bring things to the government, they oppose the government, they try to bring out the other side of arguments, and at times it becomes rowdy but we do not create jobs in this House of Assembly. This House of Assembly has been in existence for many, many years. The democratic system has been in existence for many, many years. It has suffered worse trials than this particular House has seen at the present time and I believe that this House is functioning better this year than it has ever functioned since perhaps 1971, or earlier.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about several things as they apply to my district. I do not know if I will get a chance again to speak in the Throne Speech debate, and I think that the thing that affects my own district most, more than any other single thing even though the Fishery I would class as a close number 2, is the re-opening of Labrador Linerboard Limited. Now, we, last year in this House, tried to put across to the Government

MR. HODDER: - and to give our reasons to the people of Newfoundland why that mill should not have closed. One of the arguments which we raised is that it would cost \$50,000,000 at least in the first year in order to close that mill. Now we find ourselves in a situation where the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the Minister of Industrial Development, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, various ministers are coming to Bay St. George and making public statements that the mill will soon open.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible) - more than you do.

MR. HODDER: Well, you have made statements here in the House that you expect that the mill will soon open, or the mill will be converted, or a deal will be made. Now, one thing that bothers me about the whole situation is that one of the things we said in this House last year and we said it firmly is that the mill should not close, that the mill should be kept open until a buyer is found. At the present time, my information is that a proposal has gone - I have been told that a proposal has gone from Abitibi to the Government and that it is likely that that proposal will be turned down. Now, this is particularly what I want to say a word about because, Mr. Speaker, the people of Bay St. George and the people of my district who worked at the mill and the people of my district who worked in the woodlands operations around the mill, everyone of them wants to see that mill open. Most particularly -

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, may I stand with the hon. member's permission?

The Government has not received any proposal from Abitibi -

MR. NEARY: Abitibi Price?

MR. DOODY: Abitibi Price. But you can carry on anyway and say why it should be turned down even though we have not received it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. DOODY: I will repeat again, Sir. Obviously, I

MR. DOODY: was not understood. The Government of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has not received a bid from Abitibi Price for the linerboard mill facilities in Stephenville.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, that is information that I am glad to hear. At least we are finding out something that is going on. But I will say this that, regardless - That has nothing to do with the comments that I have to make, whether a proposal has been made. The substance of what I am saying is this - I want to say it very clearly and I say it not as knocking the minister for what he is doing at the present time in any way, shape, or form - But I want to say this, that when a proposal is made, when an agreement is made do not let this Government decide to take any proposal made by Abitibi or any proposal made by any other agency or company which may want to buy that mill. Do not do that. Do not give away the mill. The prevailing feeling in Bay St. George is, "Yes, we want that mill open - Yes, we want jobs" because the mill means more than just the 450 jobs which are concerned with the mill, or the couple of thousand jobs which are concerned with the woodlands across the Province. The mill means more than that. It means that the economy of the Bay St. George area comes up; people who work in stores, people who work in the service industries, these people will be able to go back to these types of jobs. But, what the concern is right now is that this particular mill will be - that when it is opened that it is opened to run forevermore. The people of Bay St. George, the people of my district, the people of Kippens, Port-au-Port, Stephenville, any place where there was a large group of people working at that mill - any one of those communities - none of them want an ERCO situation on their hands. None of them want to be as they were in years gone by since this Government took over that particular mill want to be feeling when they walk outside of Bay St. George that, "Oh, you people are the people that are draining the money out of this Province." Whatever deal that is made on that mill has to be made so that the future of Bay St. George is assured. I know, and the minister knows, that there is enough wood in this Province to sustain three mills.

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. member is saying that he does not want a repeat of the last performance in Stephenville.

MR. HODDER: We do not want a repeat of the last performance at Stephenville, that is correct.

AN HON. MEMBER: It should never have happened there -

MR. HODDER: But I will say one other thing and I did not intend to get into this this - But I will say that if during the last four or five years, when you look into what happened in that mill, that the things that happened with that mill should not have happened because the mill was run in the best interest of the Province, not in the best interest of that mill. And Cabinet documents and memoranda that went from the Linerboard mill to Cabinet, and Cabinet documents that I saw come back,

MR. HODDER: where they were more interested in looking after the economy of the whole Province than they were in looking after the mill. Perhaps that is why governments should never be involved in private industry, because that is the story that comes through loud and clear whenever you read the reports when you look at the reports done by the advisory board, when you look at the various Cabinet documents and whatnot that went back and forth and that we seem to get our hands on - when you look at all of those things, the one story that came through was that mill was not run in the interests of Labrador Linerboard Limited to make that thing go. It was run in the interests of the Province and that mill could still be open yet. The big thing about that mill was the woodlots and until the wood situation - when this government first came into power they said they were going to take the woodlands and they were going to shake them up and redivide and do this and that and the other thing with the wood. They did not do a thing, so the mill suffered. But the wood is here and I do hope that Abitibi does take over that mill and that they make sound proposals, but at the same time I hope the government is not washy, weak-kneed, and wishy-washy about the way that they negotiate with those companies because we want that mill to start and to continue to go and we do not want a situation where we feel that we are being subsidized by the rest of Newfoundland. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that that mill can go. We believe that that mill can be run successfully and we believe that that mill can be run at a profit. It is a 'Cadillac' mill as mills go in this world. Linerboard mills or paper mills built since that particular time are not as good as that mill. That is one of the best mills on the face of the earth. The wood supply is here on the Island. The future is assured for the area in the long run. The

MR. HODDER:

The important thing now and the important burden and responsibility on this government is to make sure that whatever deal is made with whatever company that takes an interest in that mill is a deal which will continue to see Stephenville thrive and survive and become the area which it should be. Mr. Speaker, the other thing that affects my district greatly, and which since the closure of the mill but not only because of the closure of the mill has been booming or is starting to come back in the district, is the fishery. I do not believe that it is because the mill closed. I do not know whether there were many people who used to work with Labrador Linerboard Limited who have now gone back to the boats, but I do not believe it is that the close-down of the mill precipitated people to go into the fishery in the district of Port au Port or in Bay St. George in any area. I do not think that is what precipitated a raise from about 1.7 million pounds to 4. something million pounds landed last year, not at all. I think what precipitated in the district of Port au Port - the stampede back to the fishery was the fact that the prices of fish went up and people suddenly realized that they could go out and they could make a decent living from the sea. I attended a meeting in the district about three weeks ago when the Minister of Fisheries was there as a guest speaker for the opening of - for the start - the election of a fisheries association in the district - an association of fishermen. I think that the Minister's attitude at that particular meeting, or what the Minister did at that particular meeting, is symptomatic of the problems of the fishery in the district. The Minister stood up, and remember that the district of Port au Port

MR. HODDER: is an inshore fishery, and the Minister got up and he spoke about the offshore capacity, about problems with Ottawa, brought two or three pressmen with him from St. John's and gave a federal speech, and talking about our capacity on the Hamilton Banks and the fact that we need more trawlers to go out and all that sort of thing. The group of fishermen that were sitting there listening to that particular speech did not understand what he was talking about, because we are inshore fishermen and we fish from small boats, the longliner being the biggest boat, and here were a group of people with all sorts of problems relating to trying to get into the fishery and the Minister came out, forgot all about that at all, he mentioned the road and then gave his usual, standard anti Ottawa speech. The fishermen were baffled, amazed. They said "What did he say?" - "What did he talk about?" You know, he did not mention this - he did not mention that. Now, the problem with the fishery in Port au Port basically

MR. HODDER: goes back to one thing. I have said it before in this House that we have a lack of harbours. Because we have a lack of harbours, it means that we have to rely on other methods of getting fish. You cannot bring your boat into a harbour, tie it up at the dock, moor it off, and fork your fish or net your fish up over into the stage and have the boat come. I mean that sort of things does not happen in Port au Port. At the present time, the other point about the district of Port au Port is that the fishery - that there are a lot of fish in that particular area. Boats from Port aux Basques, Harbour Le Cou, Petits, all around the southwest coast, come out and fish in that particular area. There are two major fishing grounds; one is south in the Bay St. George area, off what is known as the Gravels; the other one is to the north through Long Point and the Three Rock Cove area north in the Port au Port bay area. The major fish buyers I suppose are at Fox Island River, which is in Port au Port bay, and at Piccadilly in Port au Port bay, but most of the fishermen fish either along the straight shore, the bottom of the peninsula or up on the left hand side of Long Point. These are the prime fishing areas. Now the problem there is not the fact there is no fish. The problem is the fisherman cannot get out in good weather. And what has happened in the district of Port au Port is that a group called the Community Employment Strategy Association has been systematically taking Canada Works Grants (inaudible) monies themselves and building artificial harbours in the district. And in the Southern part of the district there are two massive breakwaters going out where a natural harbour will be built. Armour stone will go around it. They are actually building harbours there. There is another harbour being built in the Northern part of the district in the Three Rock Cove area. The third harbour is Blue Beach which is at the end of Long Point

MR. HODDER: and the fourth harbour is at Fox Island River. These are the ones that are under development at the present time. Every one of those harbours, of course, are being developed by the Small Craft Harbour people, CES and Canada Works.

To give an example of the type of input that the federal government have put into the district and the type of faith they have in the district, about two weeks ago the federal government announced \$1.2 million for the development of the harbour at Blue Beach where they go through what is a natural pond sort of thing which sort of has a beach surrounding it, they go through there - two breakwaters have already been built; I might say, Mr. Speaker, about \$800,000 has already been spent there and now they have committed another \$1.2 million to develop a harbour there. Construction will start shortly and by the time it is finished it will be a harbour, I suppose, as good as any other harbour.

Now the federal government have realized that the fishery in that district has great potential and they have put their money into the district in hopes, of course, that the district will come up and will improve itself in the future. Now I would think that there is probably more federal money gone into the district of Port au Port than any other district in the Province. And I would also say -

AN HON. MEMBER: Because of CES.

MR. HODDER: Because of CES - but you might remember that even before CES was planned the plans for Blue Beach were already developed and engineering studies were already done.

MR. PECKFORD: They were transacted. We took that course in 1972.

MR. HODDER: Right. I give credit to anybody who had anything to do with it. There were a great many people who had an awful lot to do with that.

MR. PECKFORD: Fred Stagg was one.

MR. HODDER: Well, Fred Stagg possibly -

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible) all
or none.

MR. HODDER: There have been many.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The poison pen set.

MR. HODDER: Pardon?

MR. W. N. ROWE: He usually writes this stuff.
He usually writes (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) on
paper.

MR. HODDER: The minister reminds me of a quote that I read the other day, I think it was from The Man with the Hoe, and there was a question in the poem; it says, "What breath blew out the light within this brain?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: He will soon be up with Stagg.

MR. HODDER: Anyhow, Mr. Stagg did not run in the district and I think there was good reason why he did not run. He was the member for Port au Port, and I do not know what input he had in it, but I know there were many, many people, and when the announcement was made on the small craft harbours - and you need to pick up a Western Star about that date - I came out quite frankly and said, 'I am very pleased it happened. I congratulate the Community Employment Strategy Association who took the package and put it together. I congratulate Mr. Marshall, I congratulate Mr. Stagg and I congratulate the whole works.' So the minister has no worries about the fact that I might be taking credit for the money coming into the district. Now I would tell the minister that I have not been any

June 3, 1978

Tape 4174 (Night)

EC - 4

MR. HODDER: impediment to the money coming
into the district. I would also tell the minister that
I have talked to Mr. LeBlanc on many, many occasions.
I would tell the minister that I have had great rapport
with the federal government

Mr. Hodder: that I have had great repertoire with the federal government. But when the announcement was made I gave credit too. But the point of what I am saying at this present time is that the federal government has shown that they have confidence in that particular area. They know the potential of that particular area, because they have already done something call a, it has been done in two areas of the Province where they have a resource study map of the area, and they have had people in the area looking- and because of those studies, and because of the potential in the area and because it is obviously the place where harbours are needed, and it is obviously a place of high unemployment in this Province the federal government has put their money there.

Now the point that I am making, I am praising the federal government certainly because they do not get very much praise in this House, but the point that I am making is what has the provincial government been doing? At the present time this year we had a road, there is a seven mile road running from Black Duck to Blue Beach, for about a month after the start of the fishing season the road was virtually impassible. There were half load limits on it. For days on end it was absolutely cut off. All this year I have been calling through the press in the House here calling on the Minister of Transportation and Communications and the Minister of Fisheries to decide whether it was fisheries access road or a road which belonged to the Department of Transportation and Communications. Neither one of them will agree that the road is theirs, the Fisheries Department says, we cannot afford to maintain it. The Department of Transportation and Communications says, it is not our road, it is the Fisheries access road because people do not live in Blue Beach all year around. They would live at Blue Beach all year around if there was a road going down there and they could get back and forth. But nevertheless that is the sort of dispute that has been going on. So that for a month during the fishing season the

Mr. Hodder: fishermen could not get back and forth, the trucks going down to pick up the fish could not get back and forth, and after screaming and shouting, and I am not talking about myself I am talking about the fishermen, the CES, you know, all the groups in the area of the Blue Beach Fishermen's Committee, after screaming and shouting we got \$35,000 to upgrade that road which means now that the federal government has come in with, you know, \$1.2 million and construction begins immediately. The amount of money hardly fixed up the holes, you know, and got it up during that particular period, it hardly even kept the thing, I do not think it is even up to the standard it was last year, after most of the \$35,000 is gone.

Now we have all sorts of heavy equipment going over that road and the road is going to be gone again. So we have no road. Throughout the whole district, and I am sorry that I could not get a picture developed in time, I took some pictures a couple of weeks ago and I do not have them back yet, I was going to when I made this speech to show them around to members in the House, where you have fishermen in a little cove, a little slipway down the bottom, five boats, and then these pan capstans, you know, where three or four men they get and they push the thing around, and they wince the boat up the slipway sort of thing, then they take the fish out of the boat and they carry it on their back up to a road. And representation has been made time and time and time again to the Minister of Fisheries to upgrade those roads, they sent a little request to the Department of Highways, the Department of Highways requests \$500 or \$600 and they go down and put a few loads of gravel, but really in none of those cases is the job being done properly.

You know, what is needed in that particular area is that someone needs to do an engineering design of some of those coves where the fishermen are fishing from, and to look at them in a proper way, not just a slap-jack method, because these fishermen are bringing a lot of fish in and they are working very hard at it, not through a slap-jack method. But they need to look at those particular

Mr. Hodder: places and see how best they can help the fishermen.
But that is not happening.

Another situation and this is not all of the
responsibility of the provincial government, I only mention it because
of the lack of provincial government care or concern about it, is
the Fox Island River -

MR. HODDER: another situation and this is not all the responsibility of the provincial government. I only mention it because of the lack of provincial government care or concern about it is the Fox Island River problem where the federal government has been trying to get a dredge in their for two years but it seems to me that the minister has not really taken that particular issue up. Even though it is a federal problem I have not seen any concern being shown by the Department of Fisheries as another group to sort of get on the bandwagon and try to get something done in that particular area. Since the minister has taken his seat I would say to him that I wish his officials would help out to try to convince some of the bureaucrats in the Federal Department of Public Works and whatnot to try to lend support to the efforts of the fishermen and myself in that particular area to try and get that particular problem solved.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the development of this particular area - I suppose there are probably twenty districts in the Province where fishing is a major concern, where fishing is the basis of the economy. My district I think is only symptomatic of the problems in the whole of Bay St. George, that three districts out of those twenty that one fifth of the fishing area with potential fishing would be from the Bay St. George area and Port au Port is important in the whole scheme of things. If that particular area which is one of the high unemployment areas of the Province, if that area is to prosper then certainly we are going to need the infrastructure to support the fishery. Now when I talk about the infrastructure I talk about roads - not only the fisheries access roads, but I talk about the major roads that lead to fishing areas. I talk about upgrading and paving because the district at this point is one of the worst maintained districts in the Province. It had some pavement three or four years ago but things break down before they are fixed up there. It is time that something happened there and it is time that the government looked at it and built roads proper for those big fish trucks which are now travelling over them and get some upgrading and some repaving and some paving in the district to make it comfortable for people. I believe

MR. HODDER: that the district is now on its way and it needs particular help from the provincial government. It should become a high priority area of this Province. The federal government in their small way or in their large way has made it a high priority area and now we want this crowd, this government here to look at it in the same light because now they have to put their dollar there too.

Now forgetting that particular thing I want to talk about a couple of other things that are needed in the district. When the minister was speaking at that meeting which I referred to earlier and talking about the offshore problems and knocking the federal government way one or another the group of fishermen that were there listening to him - and I told him afterwards, were having problems quite different, problems which the Department of Fisheries could help them with. I gave an example at that particular meeting of a family who were drawing Social Assistance all Winter and who bought the materials, saved on Social Assistance -if any family can do that in this Province, and bought materials and had a boat builder come in who built a boat for them and the promise to the boat builder was that when the bounty comes you get paid with the bounty. So here they were sitting with a boat -no outboard motor because an outboard motor can cost you \$1,700 or \$1,800 for a proper outboard motor, no nets. And these are the sort of people - this particular area, areas where people are trying to get into the fishery, people have shown faith that they want to get into the fishery, these are the areas where special consideration should be given. Now at the present time the Fisheries Loan Board will not give loans for outboard motors. Now I do not know the reason why and perhaps the minister could explain it sometime when he is speaking. But at the present time they will not give loans for outboard motors and this has caused a big problem in the district because it is as much as a person who is working on a Canada Works programme or working somewhere like that, it is as much as he can do to get his boat. We think that a boat does not cost much but if you are on Social Assistance and have seven children and you want to get back into the fishery then I would suggest that if

June 8, 1978

Tape No. 4176 (Night)

AH-3

MR. HODDER:

you can get the boat built than that is as far as you are going to get. I would hope that the minister, and I again ask him, would look into those situations because we do have peculiar situations when people are starting to go into the fishery.

Now I noticed the other day that

Mr. Hodder: the minister announced that there would be a fisheries officer for Goose Bay and for the Labrador Coast. And in the statement he said, that sometime in the next two or three years there would be a fishery officer in the Bay St. George area. Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that we need that fishery officer there now, because people do not know how to fill out the forms, they do not know how to vote. They will go to the Fisheries Loan Board they will probably do it in an improper way, they do not know - I had a call the other day, Where do you set a gillnet? Do you set it on the bottom? - or a lobster, I do not know, some sort of a trap or something, a codtrap, do you set it on the bottom? Do you set it ten feet up? You know, there are people that need that sort of information on a daily basis, and there is nobody there from the provincial government to give them the type of help that they need. And I would strongly suggest to the minister that he look at that particular area and put a fisheries officer there immediately, somebody whom the fishermen can go to to find out the particular programmes that the Department of Fisheries has, and to find out the type of forms and one thing and the other that must be done. And I would ask the minister if he would take a look at some of those fisheries access roads and one thing and the other where a lot of fish are being landed their, but nevertheless the people have to suffer greatly to do it.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I want to say something about the spruce budworm problem in the Province. I do know this may be a little difficult to get through, but there are a few things here that have not been said in the House, and I think they should be said. In the few minutes that I have remaining I would like to touch on a few things that I found out, and a few things that have come to light. I think that the experiences of the New Brunswick Government are the ones that perhaps we should look at in light of our own spraying programme. And one thing that has not been raised in this whole debate which I have heard

Mr. Hodder: going back and forth in this House of Assembly on the spruce budworm, and I did miss the spruce budworm debate, I was not here when that particular debate was on, but I have noticed that nobody has really talked about ecology. And what happens when you kill certain insects and birds to the forest. Now I believe it was Dr. I. W. Vardy of The Canadian Forestry Service speaking to an international conference in Buenos Aires in 1972 and he said this, he said, "The forest provides food and shelter to a richer diversity of bird life than is found in most regions of Canada", he was speaking of New Brunswick. And he says, "Birds help to maintain the integrity of the forest, echo system most as a factor in controlling insect population." And then he went on to talk about the role of predators, and he talked about the role of the songbird of birds in the overall balance in the forests.

And the report went on to say that when the sprayers attack the birds it is at a moment of great stress. It is usually at the end of a migration and it is also at the beginning of the breeding season. And there is a progress bulletin which was done by the, I believe, Canadian Wildlife Service, and there were entitled progress notes sixty-two, which concluded that in 1975 when there was a very small spray done in New Brunswick that 2.9 million songbirds were killed in that particular spray.

MR. NEARY: What kind of birds?

MR. HODDER: Songbirds.

You know, I am concerned, of course, about songbirds, but when you look at songbirds as - well perhaps I should go on and talk about what happened in New Brunswick after that particular time. Also in the spray the New Brunswick blueberry growers complained that the spray was killing bees as well, and the bees pollinate the blueberries. So they were having problems with the blueberry harvest, and the bees were being killed and, of course, those people who kept bees as well were not too pleased about the spray. But

June 8, 1978

Tape 4177

(Night)

PK - 3

Mr. Hodder: what happened after that for some reason or other
the ecology of the forest was thrown away and suddenly, not only
did they have a problem with the bees,

MR. HODDER:

but they found that the sprayers had somehow upset the ecology of the forest around the blueberry fields and suddenly the birds began descending on the fields in the thousands and eating the blueberries. The blueberry growers got permission from the Canadian Wildlife service to shoot the birds but the shortly afterwards that was stopped because they found that the birds came under a treaty, it is called the Migratory Bird Convention, which is a treaty with Argentina I believe, and the States, and some of the islands -

MR. STRACHAN: Mexico.

MR. HODDER: - Mexico, the United States and Mexico, yes are the two, and Costa Rica, Equidor, and Salvador, but anyhow birds are protected, so finally they were given permission to kill some scavengers, ones that were not protected under that particular convention, and shortly after that the permission to carry shot guns was taken away from them as well. But at that particular same time, while the Wildlife service was saying, "No, you cannot kill those birds," that particular year, the next year there was even a larger spray and the report has not been released on that to this date.

But during that time there were 2.9 million birds killed by spray, while the blueberry growers could not go out - The point I am trying to make here is the ecology of the forest was upset. The larger point that I am trying to make in the few minutes that I have left is that when we interfere with the forests, and we do something unnatural to the forests, then the results may not be what we expect.

I have a statement here by Dr. Kenneth Watt of the University of California, a Canadian, who is known for far beyond the - across the world he has written some hundred publications on ecology and he has also written a textbook known as Ecology and Resources Management, which has been

MR. HODDER: translated into Japanese and Russian, and he has also worked for Standard Oil of New Jersey and was responsible for considering much of the policy decisions as to whether the company - oh well it should invest in a fleet of tanker ships or whatnot.

But anyhow, he became familiar with the New Brunswick spruce budworm problem while working with the Canadian Federal Government roughly fifteen years ago. And that particular doctor, a highly qualified man, says without qualification that spraying is just about the worst thing that can be done against the spruce budworm. He says the spruce budworm is a perfectly natural, normal way of eliminating an over mature forest. And what people do not realize is that the budworm being an invertibrate animal, has a very low probability of survival. It has been evolved over a long period of time to withstand catastrophe. But the New Brunswick Government have made a man made catastrophe and the bud worm is very well able to withstand this and bounce back. And he went on to say that what was happening in New Brunswick, it went on to say that they were actually prolonging the growth of the spruce budworm. So that not only when Newfoundland is spraying are they - probably causing an act against humanity, but they are in my estimation, in contravention of a treaty which was entered into between the United States and Canada, and they may very well be in contravention of the Criminal Code as well in that the Criminal Code says, I do not have the correct quotation right here in front of me, it is here somewhere, but the Criminal Code says that you cannot cause harm to birds or animals and of course we are doing that.

But just before I sit down I would like to say one other thing and it concerns the Medical Association in

MR. HODDER:

New Brunswick. Now Dr. Crocker, who is a (I am starting to lose my notes here) but Dr. John Crocker, he is of the Issac Waltons Children's Hospital in Halifax, says that he told a public meeting in Sackville that his tests show that the nervous impulses of children in a mental area had abnormal characteristics. He says the enzymes of those children were abnormal part of the year after the spraying. And the spray kills budworms, birds and other creatures by effect their enzymes. And children given tests in Halifax and Toronto where no spraying was done had normal enzymes.

But the interesting thing about this was that the Nova Scotia Medical Society condemned any proposal for spraying in Nova Scotia. The New Brunswick Medical Society has been mum. They have not said a word about it. Individual doctors have come out against the spraying but they have been mum, whereas the Nova Scotia Medical Association came out squarely against the spray.

Now I must say

MR. HODDER: that I was disappointed and shocked and amazed when the Newfoundland Medical Association gave credence to the Newfoundland spray programme. Now I know that the majority of doctors in this Province are here in the city of St. John's and I also feel that if Windsor Lake were being sprayed many of those doctors would have changed their decision. But I would say this, that I do hope that the medical association in this Province in time to come, I do feel that they will regret this decision. I wonder if perhaps they did not take a step too soon and I wonder what information and how much research they did before they took that decision. Because I think it amazing, Mr. Speaker, that a medical association should come out in support of a spray with what I would consider no facts except in the statement that they had listened to what the government had said. I think it is a terrible thing and I think that in the days to come and the months to come and the years to come that they will regret that particular decision. There is an awful lot more that I could say about the spruce budworm programme but I thought that I should get those few words in about it. I did not get a chance to speak on it earlier. I notice that my time is up so I will leave at this point.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Hon. member for Naskaupj.

MR. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are addressing the sub-amendment, I believe, Mr. Speaker, introduced by the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and I would like to point out that probably the hon. members opposite would expect me to say that I am going to vote against that particular sub-amendment or at least I disagree with it. If I could just for a moment initially address a couple of remarks to the comments put forth or some comments put forth by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). He mentioned in his remarks that he did not want to see a repeat of the Labrador Linerboard mill operation as it existed prior, probably immediately prior to its closure. I would like to agree with him on these remarks and I would suggest that probably every hon. member of this House would agree with him. But I think - I do not think

MR. GOUDIE: I know, at least in my opinion the initial mistake was made on that Christmas Day a few years back when the then Premier of the Province announced that the plant would not be set up in Goose Bay as it had been originally planned but rather would be set up in the Stephenville area. At least I understand the rationale for that at that time was to try and offset the forthcoming unemployment or potential unemployment situation in the Stephenville area and I suppose the hon. gentleman is to be commended for his efforts to try and offset that occurrence from taking place. However as we all now realize in hindsight that move was an extremely bad move and subsequently ended up in double the unemployment in the Stephenville area and the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area as well when we relate the other events which took place in both areas.

MR. McNeil: You seem to think there was something the matter with the location of the mill.

MR. GOUDIE: I think there was, yes.

MR. McNEIL: No.

MR. GOUDIE: I think it should have been set up in Goose Bay. That is what I think. Well if the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) disagrees that is fine.

MR. McNEIL: The question you are asking yourself -

MR. GOUDIE: I would assume that the hon. gentleman is addressing himself to the idea that had there been a better shipping contract and better conditions under which to work and the mill operating on a purely commercial basis that it could have been a payable venture. That may very well be and that will probably when it reopens again. But with the setup we had from day one I would suggest until its closure the mill was located in the wrong place as far as I am concerned.

MR. McNEIL: No.

MR. GOUDIE: Okay that is fine.

MR. McNEIL: Are you familiar with the reports of 1950 which done the Labrador study?

June 8, 1978

Tape No. 4179 (Night)

AH-3

MR. GOUDIE:

Reports of -?

MR. McNEIL:

Reports in the 1950s.

MR. GOUDIE:

No.

MR. McNEIL:

Well they stated that Labrador

would have to rely on Western Newfoundland for its wood resources.

MR. GOUDIE:

Labrador would have to rely on the

wood resources of Western Newfoundland?

MR. McNEIL:

Yes.

MR. GOUDIE:

I do not quite follow that but perhaps the member would address himself to that when he gets up to speak so that I can get a clearer picture of what he is talking about. Anyway I am going to leave that particular topic now.

The hon. gentleman from Port au Port

(Mr. Hodder)

MR. GOUDIE: also made reference to the appointment of a fisheries officer for the coast of Labrador who would be stationed in the Happy Valley, Goose Bay area and drew attention to the need for a fisheries officer in his area and I certainly hope he is able to obtain one. I think with the work which was carried out by a gentleman from Port Hope Simpson, under contract I think, through the Provincial Department of Fisheries that many of concerns and priorities of fishermen on the Coast of Labrador have already been brought to the attention of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter) and his department and certainly with the appointment of this officer, and I understand there are going to be two people stationed there, one to travel the coast and one to act as an anchorman in the Happy Valley, Goose Bay area, that the problems and recommendations brought forth by the research in the last year and a half or so will now perhaps be better able carried out by this fisheries officer and his staff as he relates to the Department of Fisheries.

 The spruce budworm problem was addressed also by the hon. member from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and I do not really want to offer too many comments on it. I guess I am in a very easy position to be able to make that kind of a comment because Labrador is not going to be sprayed even though we do have the spruce budworm problem, particularly in the Happy Valley, Goose Bay area south of Churchill River as opposed to on the north side where all the cutting has been done by Linerboard up to the present day. Future woods projects have to rely on wood on the south side of the river because of the size of the trees, the quality of the wood and so on. So it is very easy for me to offer a comment I suppose on the proposed spraying program for the spruce budworm infestation. I do not like spraying, myself. We were exposed to spraying for years and years in the Happy Valley, Goose Bay area,

MR. COUDIE: not for the spruce budworm but rather for the misquito and the black fly. I can remember the American and Canadian Airforces travelling through the streets of their respective towns with foggers, which is the only description I can apply to them, driving through with these machines emitting this spray or this cloud of spray and houses and people being literally covered in just the same as you would find around the airport usually when a person wants to travel from the City of St. John's. That sort of a thing was not desired by people in the area and I do not know how lethal that spray was but warnings on radio and television prior to the spray taking place suggested that all residents of the area move inside their house and move all their clothing from clotheslines outside and so on so that there would be no contamination, as a matter of fact there were a number of, I think two aircraft specifically, a DC 7 in one case which crashed into the side of a hill near Happy Valley as a result of the spray operation. I do not know whether it was caused by any intoxication affects which the spray had on the pilot or not, but that did take place.

I guess this sort of an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, lends one self to bring out his shopping list for the year in terms of the requirements or needs of his district and I am not quite sure where to begin with mine. The overriding concern in the Happy Valley, Goose Bay area, North West River and Mud Lake right now which comprises the larger part of the population of my district is the current unemployment situation. I was unable to obtain any figures from Canada Manpower, they tell me that they do not release that sort of thing to M.H.A.'s although I do not quite believe that. I was told about three weeks ago that currently in the Happy Valley, Goose Bay, North West River and Mud Lake areas of my district there was something in the vicinity of 2,500 people unemployed. These three towns would have a population of probably 8,000 or 9,000 people, at the

June 3, 1978

Tape No. 4100

CW - 3

MR. GOUDIE: most, and to have 2,500 people out of that population unemployed is a rather drastic situation at this point in our history even though we are under economic restraints. I also understand that this may not be accurate but I also understand from some of the housing people in the area that there are somewhere between 300 and 400 homes in Happy Valley, Goose Bay, just this one community itself, unoccupied. When we look back a couple of years ago, and it was extremely difficult for a person to find an apartment or buy a house because of the large work force in the area and you end up with 400 or 500 housing units unemployed, that I think would serve to illustrate the drastic state that we are in right now.

MR. GOUDIE:

I think would serve to illustrate the drastic state we are in right now. I should commend the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) for his recent effort in the area, having created something like 30 or in the vicinity of 30 or 40 jobs directly in Happy Valley, Goose Bay. Agreed, they are short term, there are only eleven or twelve weeks involved but they did take social service recipients off that list and would then put them in a position where they qualify for unemployment insurance for some time and in addition to creating these jobs for the local work force, the two projects concerned particularly are making quite a valuable contribution to recreation facilities in the area but that is a very short term thing and 30 out of 2,500 is not going to really have that much of an affect on the work force, though as I say I commend the hon. minister for his efforts in that regard.

Continuing with our shopping list, Mr. Speaker, we have been looking forward to the day when we will see the road from North West River to Happy Valley, Goose Bay paved. Much attention has been brought, particularly last weekend and weeks before that to the need for a road from the Happy Valley, Goose Bay area to Wabush and hopefully that will come about before too much longer. In my district we are immediately concerned with the road from North West River to Goose Bay, there were problems during the construction, parts of the road were washing away, literally washing out to a pond which was circled by the road, but that is beginning to shape up. I think one concern we do have though, in relation to the community of North West River, there are a number of concerns but one particular one which I understand the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Peckford) is trying to make changes to and that is funding which is extended to the Indian community of North West River, which raises another problem. The community of North West River, Mr. Speaker, is divided into two parts because North West River itself runs straight

MR. GOUDIE: through the community. You have about 515 Indian people living on the south side and a like number living on the north side. However, for purposes of funding through the Federal Provincial Agreement, only one half of that community receives funding through that Federal Provincial Committee, only half of the community is designated. However, we have a town council which is dually elected in the community from residents of the community serving both sides of the river, so for the purposes of the Department of Municipal Affairs I would suggest that the community of North West River as one and for the purposes of the Department of Rural Development and the Federal Provincial Committee and the Intergovernmental Affairs Department there are two communities of North West River when you look at funding. You end up in a situation where there are back taxes, part of the community is not paying its taxes because it on, in many ways, services extended by the community although the services are provided. The problem designation itself creates other problems. The hon. member from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and I have both encountered, since we have been elected, problems with students who perhaps has a brother living on the south side and a sister living on the north side. The south side resident could qualify for assistance to get to university or some other secondary level of education but his brother or sister living on the north side could not because he was on the wrong side of the river, from the same family utilizing funds extended to native peoples, but that problem does exist and it has to be corrected. I understand that the Department of Education, the Department of Rural Development and the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs are looking at that problem to try and come to some sort of a solution. The other thing that bothers me about the whole thing and I do not know whether the hon. member from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) would agree with me or not, I do

June 8, 1978

Tape No. 4181

CW - 3

MR. GOUDIE: really know if he has this problem in his district, but funding extended to native groups, in this case the Indian Band Council of North West River, has up until now the government has not required them to account for their spending and that is a big, big problem. I also understand and I have raised the point a couple of times with the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Peckford) and he tells me that they now are looking at that problem with a view to try and solve it. When you get

MR. GOUDIE: into a situation Mr. Speaker, where 400 or 500 residents of this province are being passed out hundreds of thousands of dollars every year and submit that for the most part and probably entirely these funds are being well spent but by the same token I could not really expect the government to extend a half of a million dollars to me and my family and not have to account for that. You would not even get a loan from the rural development, I would not think, without having to account some way or other. That problem has to be dealt with but that, I think, is probably close to resolution now. There was a delegation, Mr. Speaker, in from the Community of North West River just last week and the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture (Mr. Maynard) and I met with them to go over a proposal they had in mind. I do not think it is proper for me to get into the details of it now but generally what they are trying to do is create a housing area where they would be allocated a block of land then subdivide by the Band Council which would relieve another problem we have had. Initially the housing at North West River for the Indian people was provided by, I assume, the federal government perhaps through the provincial government but you had 30 or 40 houses constructed with no insulation, a wood burning stove, three bedrooms, no water or sewer services at all and it was required of families who had traditionally led nomadic lives hunting and trapping across Labrador to move into these units, families of ten or twelve people in some cases and the first year when the Indian families moved in, this is the first time they had lived under a roof they had traditionally lived in tents, in many cases you found the walls of the building inside torn out and burnt in the wood stove where the tent had been set up inside the house. I know governments ridicule the Indians for doing that, they condemn them for doing that, the

MR. GOUDIE: public condemn them but when your tent is warmer than the house that someone built for you then I would suggest that they were justified in doing exactly what they did. What is that?

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. GOUDIE: I would not doubt that at all. So families are still living in these homes that were built ten or fifteen years ago. The homes are completely delapidated, they were given to them so in many ways there is not any great reason for the Indian families there to have any pride in what was presented, they still do not have any water and sewer system, that is changing right now but they still do not have it, they have been living under these conditions for ten or fifteen years. They are suggesting now that there is a new development taking place just outside the community limits at North West River where there are five homes already constructed with all the services that they require and they are hoping to build a new town site, as I understand it, with the services installed. What they are suggesting they are going to do is take the funds which are extended through this Federal Provincial Agreement so the families can make a downpayment on a new home but they would then take out a mortgage and pay it off the same as anyone else would and I think that has to have a beneficial effect because people are going to have more pride in their home, they will have the services, living the same as anyone else, living the way they are titled to live, I submit, and thereby, hopefully, overcome that problem that they have right now. That is an interesting initiative on the part of the Indian Band Council and Chief Bart Jack and the elders of the community. Another interesting thing which took place and I am sure all hon. members are well aware by now, especially as a result of a bit of a fuss from a caribou hunting trip on the Mealy Mountains

June 8, 1978

Tape No. 4102

CW - 3

MR. GOUDIE:

last October I think it was, where a number of people were charged. That sort of blew the lid off the whole thing and as a result the Indian Band Council and the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Morgan) and some of his staff were able to sit down for a couple of days and iron out their problems. The upshot of the whole thing is that in January, or perhaps February of this present year, a number of accommodations were made under existing regulations to allow Indians who are living off the land to hunt caribou, which is their main source of meat when they are living off the land and which they were unable to do prior to this meeting taking place and I think one very important statement in that agreement is that the government of this province supports

MR. GOUDIE: the Indian band council and the Indian people of North West River in their efforts to get back to a traditional way of life.

I was speaking a couple of minutes ago of land development, the initiative taken by the band council of North West River.

I think looking at another land development down there, at North West Point there are two potential uses for that area as I see it. That area used to be used by the American Air Force as a radar station to detect aircraft coming in low over the waters of Lake Melville. They subsequently moved out and the only use the land is being put to right now is by the local people when they travel there in September month to gather red berries or partridge berries as some people probably more commonly know them.

There has been agreement, I think, in principle by the Department of Tourism over the last two or perhaps three years as a result of a number of letters written by various groups in the area, that that is an excellent area for a park. And the hon. minister, the new minister, has been made aware of that again by myself and the Town Council of North West River.

It appears to me that we have, I believe, two or perhaps three provincial parks in all of Labrador right now. We are talking about 112,000 square miles of land. There is all sorts of opportunity to develop parks in Labrador. I think one or two or perhaps three parks are vitally necessary right now in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, not only to accommodate the weekend traffic of local people who want to take their families out and camp and fish, pick berries or whatever it is they want to do, but just a couple of years ago we had a tourist vessel from France visit the port of Goose Bay with some 600 or 700

MR. GOUDIE: tourists onboard. They spent roughly twenty-four hours there.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: No, this would have been about four years ago - four summers ago or perhaps five. I happened to get some of the feelings of the tourists who visited there because I picked up a couple of hitchhikers that day and drove them back to their boat, and they were not upset, but they could not understand why there were no tourist facilities in the area when that vessel indicated on their chartering information that one of the ports of call was the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area of Labrador. Now obviously the tourists wanted to have a look, I suppose, at that bleak land as it has been advertised down through history, but they also when they come to visit expect to have adequate tourist accommodations, adequate tourist facilities in terms of places to dine and that sort of thing. Now agreed, the commercial sector has to come into play here as well, but I think we need a full scale development plan for the potential tourist industry of Labrador, and I am glad to hear the Minister of Tourism state in his remarks at various points in time here in the House that he is now going to pay some attention to that part of the Province and hopefully will come up with a development plan. Because the North West Point area is an excellent area, I think, to develop a provincial park for relaxation more than anything else. There is not all that much good fishing there, but it is accessible to people from North West River and from Happy Valley - Goose Bay as well and now obviously from Churchill Falls, because there is a road of sorts connecting Churchill Falls to Goose Bay.

When I was President of the Labrador Heritage Society, Mr. Speaker, some six or seven years ago,

MR. GOUDIE: the society initiated correspondence and a proposal at that time calling for the development of a provincial park at Muskrat Falls, which now is phase three of the potential hydro development for the Churchill River. Muskrat Falls is about fourteen or fifteen miles up river from Goose Bay. It is steeped in history when you think in terms of the industry we had in that area throughout the history of Labrador, that is trapping. It was the first portage that the trappers encountered going into their trapping grounds, and obviously, the last one coming out. The Hudsons Bay Company used the portage there for years when they set up their trading posts in interior Labrador. The hill around which the Muskrat Falls flow was named Black Scrap Mountain some years back in honour of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Confederation. The hon. the Premier of Saskatchewan, Mr. Blakeney, and the then Recreation and Rehabilitation Minister, I guess, Mr. Doyle,

Mr. Goudie: were up to take part in the ceremonies.

I do not think that Muskrat Falls should be phase three of the Churchill River development, I do not think it is necessary under the circumstances we have today and under the foreseeable future as far as I am concerned. If the power is recalled or a portion of the power is recalled from the existing Churchill Falls plan and Gull Island is developed, if we are going to have enough hydro power I would submit to last this Province for a considerable number of years down the road. Obviously posterity is not a very good reason to not develop the Muskrat Falls. But I would submit by the time Gull Island is onstream and the power is being fed down through that the technology, well the technology exist now, but the funds would not be available I would think to develop other rivers, I do not know, perhaps jointly with Quebec, I do not know what that formula is going to take. But I would not like to see the Muskrat Falls developed for hydro power. And I believe that if the Trans-Labrador Highway is ever constructed then the most practical point at which to cross the Churchill River is at Muskrat Falls anyway. Now maybe you would be driving over a dam if it is constructed I do not know, but that is the narrowest place, it is the most solid place because above and below the Muskrat Falls there are sandbanks, hundreds of feet deep, clay banks hundreds of feet deep and the construction, I am not an engineer, my colleague from Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) would be able to offer some advice on this, but it seems to me that it is easier to build on rock than it is to build on sand or clay. That is all I am saying.

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is true.

MR. GOUDIE: So that is my suggestion in relation to Muskrat Falls.

The smallest community of Naskaupi district is Mud Lake, my hometown. Ninety-four people, I think, right now, I believe there was a child born this Winter, I am not sure, there were ninety-three prior to that birth anyway. It is one of the communities, well

Mr. Goudie: the only community in Naskaupi district which refuse to be resettled under the effort which took place a few years ago. They decided to stick it out. All of the people there, well I should not say all, 90 per cent of the workforce are employed in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area. The other people trap and fish throughout the various seasons and derive an income that way. It is small, but it is going to stay there, and the community needs a couple of things to complete its requirements. Now they are not particularly interested in water and sewer systems, and I would submit that it would not be practical financially speaking to install a system in that community. The people have taken the effort on their own shoulders and gone ahead with installing their own water and sewer systems individually for each home. But there is a well drilling effort taking place this Summer which will probably end up in a better perhaps quality water supply, I hope. The town does need to be surveyed. There are some land grants there which were obtained prior to this present century and at the turn of the century, and these old grants have been divided up amongst the existing families. But surveys have to be done there. I do not know whether that would come at the expense of the local residents, it does in every other community, I suppose, or maybe it is one of the designated communities under the federal-provincial agreement, so perhaps there may be some funds there, but we will have to see.

I guess the point I am leading up to in relation to Mud Lake is I mentioned that the people there for the most part are employed at Happy Valley-Goose Bay. They travel in the Summertime by what we refer to as speed boat, it is only five miles away from Happy Valley. In the Wintertime they travel by snowmobile. There has been some development over the years on the banks of the Churchill River directly opposite Mud Lake. Now these Summer cabins which people have constructed are linked to Happy Valley by a dirt road which is in very poor condition. The people of Mud Lake in the Wintertime use that road to travel by snowmobile

Mr. Goudie: until the ice is thick enough to travel on the river safely, and they use the road in the Summertime because it cuts down on their gas consumption in the speed boat, and it is quicker because they climb aboard their vehicles and then drive on into work. But the road has not been maintained except for last Summer there was some grading work done by the Department of Highways. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, since this road services a community then it should be the responsibility of the Department of Highways to that it is maintained at least three or four times a year, and put in the condition where people can travel over the road with some degree of comfort.

MR. GOUDIE: I had better speed up I guess. I still have two communities left here in my district and I have not had a chance to talk about them yet. But the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area -

MR. W. ROWE: Could the hon. member talk about Mud Lake? I was interested in their reaction to the proposed park in the area, the national park. Would the member mind spending a minute or two on that and the rationale for their position and so on.

MR. GOUDIE: Certainly. I thank the hon. gentleman for his question. The people of Mud Lake were the first I believe, I could be corrected, but I believe they were the first to react publicly to the suggestion that there would be possibly a provincial park established in the Mealey Mountains area.

AN HON. MEMBER: National park is it not?

MR. GOUDIE: National park, yes I am sorry, not provincial but a national park. They objected to it. Well firstly because they had no information on it. They did not know what a national park would mean in terms of employment, in terms of development within the park area itself. The Mealey Mountains traditionally were the caribou hunting areas for residents of - well all three communities. The caribou herds have been depleted to the extent that they are now protected. There is no season at all. But we are hoping that they are going to build up.

A number of Indian families traditionally trapped parts of the Mealey Mountains area, a number of families from Mud Lake trapped that area, generally speaking. I think one of the proposed boundaries for the proposed park if you will, was the Kenamu River, which flows diagonally by the community of Mud Lake. It is the largest salmon spawning river in the Western Lake Melville area. They wondered what sort of effect the park development would have on that. But I think they found it rather humorous as well, because the Mealey Mountains are inaccessible

MR. COUDIE: except by aircraft. It is a closed hunting area and you are not allowed to travel there on snowmobile in the Wintertime and there is only one lead over the mountains that you can get into anyway. The Mealey Mountains are something like 2300, 2400 feet high.

So based on their lack of information, based on the lack of plans really, or at least publicized lack of plans by Parks Canada, they just were not in a position to make any kind of a decision. And they have since the initial meetings with Parks Canada and some of the people from our Provincial Department of Tourism, the agreement is now that - well people are going to sit back for a while, try and obtain more information, try and make up their minds whether or not they would like to see a park established.

You see the whole thing is, since it is accessible only by aircraft then the people in the area locally are not going to be able to afford to get in there. It is only going to be the rich people from outside the area to take advantage of it. I do not know what kind of job creations are going to take place or anything like that so it is just laying dormant right now. But they did object initially and they are object now, until they have what they feel to be a full slate of information.

The Happy Valley - Gosse Bay area, I referred to at the outset of my remarks as being a depressed area when you think in terms of employment, or any kind of industrial development. I think that area of Labrador is going to be the future around which the development of Labrador is going to evolve, or revolve. And eventually I believe it is going to make a very valuable contribution to the provincial economy. But I would like to take it back a few years, Mr. Speaker, to when the American and Canadian and British forces moved in to initially develop that area, because there was no community at all where Happy Valley - Goose Bay now exists.

June 8, 1978

Tape No. 4195

DM - 3

MR. GOUDIE:

That development, with the forces coming in to build a base which would accommodate overseas traffic, traffic travelling to the European theatres of war, was a blessing in many ways. It brought a modern society to the people of Labrador, a part of Labrador which traditionally was isolated. We did not realize we were isolated because we did not know the difference. We were not exposed to anything else. We were told we were isolated after the people moved in, and we are still being told

MR. GOUDIE: were isolated by people who had moved in. As far as I am concerned, when I am in the middle of Labrador, whether there is a house or not I am not isolated, and I would suggest the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) would probably feel that way as well, when I think of the story he just told me about caribou hunting trips and other ventures into the unknown.

But the effect that that base has had on the development of the people of Labrador as opposed to anything else is probably one of the most regressive steps in a way, that ever took place in Labrador. Now obviously, for twenty-five or thirty years there was all kinds of employment, money was good. There was no initiative on the part of high school students or students in schools, let us put it that way, to further their education. Four or five people when I graduated from high school, left the area to continue their education in other areas. There were so many jobs available with such large salaries at that point in our history that there was no need to go anywhere else. You could get a truck driving job that would pay you better than any university student was getting or any university graduate was getting. The accessibility to cheap products - if I can give a personal illustration, when I reached the age of twenty-one I became a member of the American NCO Club on the base, walked in with fifty cents in my pocket and bought a scotch and water and two packages of cigarettes. So I would submit to Mr. Speaker and hon. members -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: - double scotch - that you would not be able to do that today anywhere. Half of the town of Happy Valley, the private homes in Happy Valley were built from material that was obtained on the American air base or the Canadian air base, so there was a different

MR. GOUDIE: value system altogether. And then where you have trappers who are exposed to only living off the land and that type of lifestyle being exposed to a cosmopolitan area - because there were people from all over the world, not just from America or Canada or Britain, but all over the universe who came in and worked there and were exposed to all the different values and the different societies - it has to have a very emotional effect on people. If I can just illustrate again, my brother told me just this winter, as a matter of fact, that he was travelling back to his trapline at Lobstick Lake in February one year, and rather than take in a pack of makings with him he would buy some tailor-made up at the base or get his uncle, a fellow who was working at the base, to buy some tailor-mades for him. So they stopped at -

AN HON. MEMBER: You mean cigarettes.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, cigarettes.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: I knew what he meant but I wanted it on the record.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) makings.

MR. GOUDIE: I just said - no, never mind. Anyway, he gave his friend \$10. He thought he might get enough to do him a couple of weeks. And the guy came back - now this was to buy cigarettes only so that he could lash them on his sled and travel on into the country; he had a 250 mile walk by the way - the guy came back with three armsful, like junks of wood, of cigarettes and candy for ten bucks! Unheard of! Never heard of it before. When you consider that the traditional practice had been for trappers when they come out of their trapline in December or January to go in to the Hudsons Bay to settle up their bills it was always quite a coincidence

MR. GOUDIE: that when you cashed in your fur and the man passed back your records you always broke even.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. GOUDIE: One gentleman when he cashed in his fur ended up with the company owing him fifty cents. He walked around for about three months with a half dollar in his pocket and did not know what to do with it - never had cash before in his life, never heard tell of it, you always broke even with the Hudson's Bay. You never owed them any money after you cashed in, but then, they never owed you any money either. So it is this sort of thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, I would imagine that the fishery was the same thing as well.

I am going to have to leave Happy Valley - Goose Bay, I guess. No, I should not leave before I mention this one thing. I travelled home for some ceremonies last weekend which the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and I took part in at the district vocational school. And this year, I guess, was the first time in about fifteen that the ice travelling out of the Churchill River has had such a devastating effect on the river bank. Before the Churchill Falls development we had a great deal of damage, because it is a very sandy soil. The river banks are just torn out. Some residents of Hamilton River Road

MR. GOUDIE: in Happy Valley have had to move their homes two or three hundred feet in from their original site. They are out along the side of the street now because of the erosion which has taken place. When I got off the aircraft I met a friend of mine who is the only resident left of a place called Birch Island which is directly off Happy Valley. There is another island called John White's Island that used to exist but after the ice came out this Spring it does not. The ice took the island and moved it right out the river - gone off. There is a hunk of sand and a few willows stuck on it and that is it. So when you get ice piling up thirty or forty feet high it has to have some sort of a force. This other friend of mine was somewhat surprised two Sundays ago when he woke up Sunday morning to cook his breakfast and realized that he had to stand at the stove frying eggs with his long rubber boots on, water a foot and a half deep in his house, travelling in and out off his house in a canoe. Now that sort of thing is what causes -

MR. HICKMAN: Is he still going to stay on the island?

MR. GOUDIE: Well the river has receded now. There is no reason for him to move right now. He might decide to move the Fall before the freeze-up. I do not know.

But anyway that is a few remarks on that area. Churchill Falls is obviously the most prosperous community of my district right now.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. GOUDIE: I am going in there this weekend and I would like to read into the records a newspaper clipping which I came across today. Some hon. members might have already seen it. It was issued at Brunswick-Maine, "Postponed last December after a tragic airplane crash ceremonies will be held Saturday to commemorate the history making and peril fraught 1891 boat and college scientific expedition to Labrador." A watertight message jar they call it here - A mason jar I would call it, left at the foot of Churchill Falls in the Labrador wilderness by two explorers eighty-seven years ago will

MR. COUDIE: become part of a permanent display at the world's largest hydro electric power station. C Warren Ring Vice-President for development at Bowden and author Joseph R. Smallwood former Premier of the Province of Newfoundland will be the principle speakers at a Bowden news released last week. Now there are some 200 people expected to take part in that ceremony which I am attending on Saturday. But - a little bit of the history.

In 1891 two Bowden college graduates Austin Carey and Dennis N Cole struggled through 250 miles of hazardous and unchartered terrain to survey and map the almost legendary falls. They left the jar in an alpine meadow at the base of the 270 foot falls deep in a spectacular gorge which they named Bowden Canyon. Their message urged others who found the falls to leave a record of their visit. Well the upshot of the whole thing is, Mr. Speaker, that that mason jar is going to be unveiled in a ceremony Saturday morning at the A and C Building at Churchill Falls, the main structure for the transmission of power out of that community and it is going to be my honour to take part in it.

One particular interesting development has taken place in Churchill Falls this Winter past. That obviously is a company town, everything is regulated and provided for the citizens of that town - I am sorry!

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. STRACHAN: The Minister of Transportation is being very humorous as usual.

MR. COUDIE: I am used to the hon. minister. I must admit though that he provides very adequate refreshment on occasion.

A citizen's committee was elected there just a couple of months back. It was reported in the Daily News I think and I have talked with the chairman of that community a couple of times, Mr. Watson Lane and their priorities are to relate or to be an liaison group if you will between the citizens of the town or the community and the company itself so they are going to be concerned obviously with

June 8, 1978

Tape No. 4187 (Night)

AH-3

VP. GOUDIE:

little problems which exist within or between the community and the company itself. I believe it is the beginning of what will I hope become perhaps a Board of Trustees I think is the term under a local improvement district area. I do not believe that companies should provide everything for citizens of communities. The companies have provided everything for every community West of Northwest River and that includes Happy Valley-Goose Bay if you think in terms of the Airforces being a company and that

MR. GOUDIE: and has I think a very devastating effect on the people of the given communities. But I think there is another - while we in the debate on the private members' resolution which was voted on yesterday, discussed the pros and cons of the Freedom Road as it is referred to right now, and the requirement for a hook up at Wabush - Labrador City. I do not think I need really address myself to that any more. But in the last couple of minutes remaining, Mr. Speaker, I would like to - I have not had time to deal with everything I wanted to but perhaps at some future point I will.

One of the events in the last year, which has had a devastating effect on Labrador as well, particularly the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, Cartwright as well, is the sinking of the motor vessel William Carson. I do not know if all hon. members have received a copy of the report but it is all told here in two paragraphs.

"The sinking of the motor vessel William Carson was caused by the rapid flooding of the forward motor compartment and the balast thrusting compartment as a result of ice penetrating the hull, about one foot below the water line on the starboard side, near the bulk heads separating both compartments. Damage was observed in the forward motor compartment and it probably extended into the bow thruster compartment. As the ship settled by the head, water escaped into "E" dock; this caused the head to settle more steeply and the ship was overwhelmed."

And that is I guess quite an epitaph ^{epitaph} for that vessel. But we have another vessel coming on the service now, projected to make its first run on July 3rd., the Sir Robert Bond after conversion has taken place to allow for passenger accommodation. But that in itself presents a problem. School is out the middle of June. There are teachers, Mr. Speaker, in excess of 100 I would suggest, who are hoping to get out here this Summer,

MR. GOUDIE: to take advantage of Summer courses offered so that they can upgrade themselves, and they are going to be three weeks late. Either that or they are not going to attend at all because there is no point of them coming down, hiring a vehicle to last them for three or four weeks. So they are going to be very badly effect that way. There are people right now I know trying to get a vessel to make the run prior to July 3rd., but it does not look right now as if there is going to be very much success with that. But that is a problem, a very real problem for the teachers who want to upgrade themselves and also for vacationers who would like to leave a little earlier.

I promised my colleague for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) that I would relate an incident to the hon. House tonight, but there is obviously no time left so I will have to inform him that when the main motion is called perhaps I will get a chance to address myself them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE:

I move the adjournment of the debate,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. gentleman has moved the

adjournment of the debate.

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining

Order of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday at ten of the clock, and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER:

It has been moved that this House adjourn until tomorrow, Friday at 10:00 A.M., those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", carried.

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow Friday, at 10:00 A.M.