

VOL. 3

NO. 7

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 1978

March 15, 1978

Tape 196

DW - 1

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the gallery visitors from Harbour Breton. They include Mayor Goodwin accompanied by Councilors Mahoney, Buqler, Jackman and the town manager, Mr. Fiander. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these gentlemen of Harbour Breton.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, in the last two or three years the teachers' collective agreement makes provision for educational leave for teachers and I have been announcing that each year in the House. I am pleased to report that we have again approved leave for two teachers for one semester in the next academic year. On the recommendation of the special leave committee I am happy to announce that leave will be granted to a Mr. Warren Rose of Hampton and Mr. Russell Blagdon of English Harbour West.

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

MR. HODDER: I would just like to congratulate those two teachers on their leave and I do hope that the leave to pursue their studies, whatever, will be beneficial to them and to the school system which they represent.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of a total of 845 people of Harbour Breton. And I will read the prayer of the petition as it is written here: "We the undersigned do hereby petition the House of Assembly for consideration of the prayer of our petition in which we are asking for a grant of funds sufficient

MR. J. WINSOR: to enable us to construct a municipal building which will house the council office and chambers, as well as sufficient storage space for the town fire truck and ambulance. Whereas Harbour Breton is a continually growing town which is the largest in the district of Fortune and Hermitage, we find that the council office space is inadequate and not sufficient. The present storage space that houses the town's fire truck is also extremely small and inadequate and the proper maintenance cannot be carried out on this vehicle and will eventually lead to the deterioration of all the equipment." In speaking to this prayer, supporting it, I certainly agree with their needs and this particular item. The building currently used by the town council I do not think anybody knows the exact age of it; they are telling me seventy - five to a hundred years, and a building built seventy - five to a hundred years ago is bound to be inadequate for this time. I do know that the council office is approximately eight by twenty - four and you have to pass through the foghorn papers office get into it. If somebody was invited this morning for a cup of coffee I doubt if they had enough room for their elbow. And I do think it is very important that the equipment that they have, which is now in extremely poor space, to get certain types of equipment off the fire truck they have to drive it out of the present garage they have it in, and as a matter of fact to back it in there they do have to take some of the necessary equipment off. So obviously this building is far from adequate and the town building is not entirely situated in the best place for the size of a town like Harbour Breton; it is expanding far and away from the site of the present town building and I do think that the grass roots government

MR. J. WINDSOR: of any town, especially a town the size of Harbour Breton with 2,500 persons and growing every day, becoming far more important. The economy of that town is real good. Since the firm of Fishery Products has taken over the plant there has been a noticeable improvement in the economy of Harbour Breton and I think they deserve every consideration in their petition.

I ask that this petition be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. W.M. ROWE: I want to speak in support of this petition, Mr. Speaker, so admirably presented by my colleague, the member for the district which includes the vibrant, vital and growing town of Harbour Breton. I have the fondest memories of the town every time I visited it, Sir. And this petition bears out the interest of the people, 845 I believe was the figure the hon. member mentioned as the number of people who have signed this petition in a town of some 2,500 people, which must be, Sir, every single adult man and woman in that town of Harbour Breton. It just shows the interest in municipal affairs, municipal government and the future of their own municipality, shown by the people of the town of Harbour Breton.

It is a modest request, Mr. Speaker, for a municipal public building. They are not asking for the moon. They are not asking for a lavish expenditure of public funds. They are asking for a municipal building to house the various things that go on in a municipality, including council offices, I would imagine, the fire fighting apparatus for that town and other things that go on as well under the aegis of municipal government. A very modest yet a very necessary request being made by the good citizens of Harbour Breton.

MR. W.M. BOWE: I commend the petition, Sir, to the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and the government generally and I do hope that when the budget is brought down on Friday that there is sufficient funds allocated to the Department of Municipal Affairs, or any other relevant department, to allow this very necessary, this very vital structure to go ahead in Harbour Breton at the beginning of the coming construction season.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bay of Islands, followed by the hon. gentleman to my right.

MR. L. WOODROW: I would like to back this petition and in so doing also want to welcome my old friends from Harbour Breton up in the gallery. I arrived in Harbour Breton, Mr. Speaker, on November 31, 1948 and at that time the only way to get to and from Harbour Breton was by boat. I stayed there until July 1956, but during the year 1956, in the month of January, I was one of the people who took part in a conference here in St. John's in connection with South Coast matters and as a result of that conference a fish plant was established in the community of Harbour Breton.

Now I do not know if I would be getting out of order or not, Mr. Speaker, but the way you are smiling up there -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. WOODROW: As I said, as a result of that conference great things happened in the community of Harbour Breton and I can tell you that from 1948 to 1956, living was very hard down there. Now I went back last year; I was so happy last Summer to drive back to Harbour Breton, to be able to go there over a road, I noticed the improvements and the like. And the people down there they were very kind, they were very good to me, they were my friends. And I want to back this petition one hundred and fifty per cent, Mr. Speaker, if that is possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South. Before he speaks I would like to welcome some other distinguished visitors to the House of Assembly this afternoon. They are from the St. Lawrence Development Committee, Reverend Father Holloy, Mayor Victor Edwards, and Mr. Leo Clancy. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these gentlemen to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLOI: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented.

Mr. Nolan:

in such a fine, fine manner by my hon. friend and colleague. Surely we must realize that we hear a lot of bad things about the economy and so on from members of the House, on all sides, from time to time, and journalists and so on, and we are going to hear a lot I would think in the next few days as a result of the Budget. But there is one thing the Budget will not reveal, and that is the state and the extent of volunteerism in this Province of one form or another, and we find it in every single community, in Harbour Breton, in my own district, and every district in fact. There are so many things that are happening throughout this Province where we would be so lacking were it not for the volunteer efforts, many millions of hours contributed by so many people, men and women, and young people, boys and girls, in so many walks of life, giving up of their time from their families, and so many other things to help the community. For example, volunteer fire brigades, that my hon. friend referred to in Harbour Breton. And if it is so, as this petition indicates that there may be a serious problem because of lack of space for this volunteer fire brigade to operate efficiently, then the least we can do as legislators is to see to it that we provide the initiative, provide the structure where the volunteers can operate. I mean, is that not what government is for? Is not that what it is all about?

So I am sure the minister will rise to support this petition signed, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition indicated, by 845 citizens, quite a chunk of the electorate and of the citizenry of Harbour Breton. I mean, if we fail to respond to legitimate, honest, reliable requests like this, then the House of Assembly is completely irrelevant, of course. What we want then is sufficient space to provide, one, for the council, again a volunteer group, one of many hundreds throughout the Province who are wanting and have in the past, who will continue, if we give them a helping hand, to serve their community and their fellow man, the council. And then we have the Chamber of Commerce, I believe, who might also be involved there one way or the other?

MR. J. WINSOR: Well development.

MR. NOLAN: No. I see. And then there is the ambulance that you also need additional space for.

MR. J. WINSOR: Ambulance, fire truck, and support truck.

MR. NOLAN: Fire truck and support truck.

So these are things, they are not luxury items, they are not glamorous items, they are absolute essential items that we have in many communities throughout North America where you pay for every step of the way. This structure, if built, as I hope it will be, will be populated as such in almost every instance by people who are volunteers. They do not get a nickel for the thousands and thousands of hours that they are going to devote to it. Now if you have people like that, and we have plenty of them throughout this Province, in the name of all that is holy let us demonstrate here and now that we are with them, and we are going to help them, and assist them in every way we can, and I look forward to the minister rising, as I am sure he will, to support this very, very fine petition which I certainly do, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. minister, Sir, rises in his place to support the petition, and I hope co-operate with the municipality of Harbour Breton in seeing that they get their new municipal building, I would like to support the petition so ably presented by my hon. friend on behalf of the people who live in the community of Harbour Breton.

What the prayer of the petition is asking for, Mr. Speaker, is a new municipal building. I understand that the old one is about as old as Buckley's goat, and the people are asking for a new town hall, for a new municipal building.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the significant thing that strikes me about this is that here you have a fishing community in Newfoundland that is growing and expanding and that needs new facilities, they need a new municipal building in the community, and the irony of it, Sir, is that today in Newfoundland the most



Mr. Neary: prosperous parts of this Province are where the fishing industry is being developed, And I would think that the delegation from St. Lawrence might take some consolation and hope in the fact that they can get a fish plant in their community.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about the member for Labrador West?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the member for Labrador West?

MR. NEARY: The member for Labrador West?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: On Lake Melville?

AN HON. MEMBER: A fish plant.

MR. NEARY: A fish plant in Labrador West.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, but you said some of the most prosperous areas.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the most prosperous

MR. NEARY: parts of Newfoundland today, Sir, are not the urban centers. As a matter of fact, you have large pockets of unemployment in the urban centers and it is in the rural areas, in communities like Harbour Breton, that you have prosperity and practically full employment, in the fishing communities. And that is why we have to pay more attention to this particular petition than just ordinary petitions that are presented in this House. The future of Newfoundland is in the fishing communities and the future of Newfoundland, Sir, is in the fishing industry, in my opinion. They are growing and in the case of Harbour Breton they are starting to burst at the seams, **They** need new facilities and I do hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will keep in mind the potential of that community and all the other communities in Newfoundland where we have developed a fishing industry to the degree that it has been developed in Harbour Breton. They need these services and these facilities and the future is there, the potential is there and these are the communities and the people that we have to depend upon for the future economic growth of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the prayer of this petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I have to get up, especially in this case with respect to a municipal building in Harbour Breton. I was down to Harbour Breton last year and met with all of the councils, or representatives of all of the councils on the South Coast of Newfoundland and at that time there were some fifty to sixty people who attended from all the councils on the South Coast. It was a conference that we held with them on a regional basis, as we have been doing for the past several years, and it was put on by the mayor of the time, Abe Godwin, who showed the kind of hospitality that I think exemplifies the people in the rural areas of Newfoundland. And I have to say that we held the meeting in a building that was used by Lions Club, and we have to thank organizations like that who make their facilities available when we do not have the many needed facilities

MR. DINN: that we need in Newfoundland today. We have 310, Mr. Speaker, municipalities in Newfoundland today and many of them are operating under the same circumstances that they are operating in in the community of Harbour Breton. I would say that if I could fill all of the requests that come into the Department of Municipal and Housing certainly this would be one that should get some favour in the department this year, although I cannot say what will be contained in the Budget. The municipality of Harbour Breton, as former speakers have said, is a vibrant community on the South Coast; it has local leadership, as demonstrated by mayor Godwin, who is also a member of the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities. These kinds of requests, we have some 100, Mr. Speaker, requests and more that have come into the department this year for funds. We would like to be able to supply all of the funds required for all of the water and sewerage systems and buildings, etc., and certainly this is one that should be given some consideration and will be in the department this year. Hopefully we can come to some kind of an agreement with the council in Harbour Breton for the funding of this greatly needed facility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the petition presented by my colleague with 845 signatures on that petition. Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition I want to say first of all that I sympathize with the residents of Harbour Breton, I sympathize with the members of the council down there, and I sympathize with them for two reasons; number one, of course because there is no question from what we have heard said by the member representing that district that the need is there for a new municipal building, so I sympathize with him for that reason. And, Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with them for a second reason and that is that I would

MR. CALLAN: suggest to them, do not hold your breath expecting to get provincial money for this project. I have good reason to be pessimistic. I have good reason.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say in supporting this petition that Sunnyside, which is a fairly large community in my district, waited for several years to try and get a municipal building. They finally got it for approximately \$100,000 through LIP programmes. Right at this present moment, today, out in Norman's Cove, the community where I live, there is a Canada Works project being carried on to build a building, a beautiful building which is about half constructed now, which houses, of course, offices and a place for the fire truck and what have you. And I would suggest that the council at Harbour Breton, if no money is forthcoming before the deadline for applications for Canada Works programme closes - if no money or no promise is forthcoming from the Department of Municipal Affairs - then I would suggest that this is the best possible route to go if they expect to get a building this summer.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help saying these things, because I know. Out in Coobies, for example, out in North Harbour, these communities waited and hoped to get water and sewer projects. They finally gave up. And out in Coobies alone this past summer a \$71,000 Canada Works grant made water available to that community.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the allegation, the material of the petition, is with respect to a council building in Harbour Breton, and I think in getting into water and sewerage in the Norman's Cove area the hon. gentleman may have strayed geographically and logically as well.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Like the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) I thought I might be in the realm of debate there, but I seem to remember some of the other people who spoke

MR. CALLAN: talked about the fisheries and the backbone of the rural communities and so on. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, in continuing to support this petition I want to say in conclusion really that I hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing will and can find the funds to carry out this worthwhile project in Harbour Breton as well as the many other requests that he no doubt has.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing mentioned that there are 310 municipalities in this Province. Well, the latest figure that I had was 311 and I will be getting into this at another time, another place, in another debate. But I guess where the 310 - or the other one went was that a charter was removed from a municipality in my district. And again, I do not want to go into that now because again it will be -

MR. DINN: At its request.

MR. CALLAN: No, Mr. Speaker, it was not by request, but I cannot enter into debate. I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to lend my support to the petition presented by my colleague from Fortune - Hermitage. As his immediate predecessor as a member for the area I would very much want to be associated with this petition. I know the need that is spelled out in the petition, the need for a new building to house the various functions that have been referred to by several speakers already. I was glad to hear the Minister of Municipal Affairs say he supported this. We shall wait with bated breath to see what the support means. Perhaps it means, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is availing of an opportunity to reverse an ongoing policy of his department, a policy which answers the query he had last Fall as to why there were not too many candidates offering themselves for municipal office. He did not come across the answer to that one yet. He was concerned that some councils did not have enough candidates offering.

March 15, 1977

Tape 200

EC - 3

MR. SIMONS: And the reason, Mr. Speaker, the reason is in the policy which the minister has today at least verbally reversed. The reason is that he, and particularly his predecessor, the present Minister of Mines and Energy, had so frustrated every council in Newfoundland -

AN HON. MEMBER: Lay off!

MR. HEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMONS: - so frustrated them beyond words that people just decided to take the easy way out, and you cannot blame them, they just decided not to offer themselves. Because

MR. SIMMONS: such frustration - frustration  
is too soft a word, Mr. Speaker. If they were -

MR. PECKFORD: South Brook has its council.

MR. F.B. ROWE: St. John's has too.

MR. SIMMONS: I would say that.

But now today, Mr. Speaker,  
we hear at least verbally the reverse of that policy. Now  
the department is going to get behind municipalities who  
have councillors who without pay are trying their best  
to do a difficult job under impossible circumstances,  
made all the more imposssible by a department that keeps  
suggesting they should jack up their rates, that they  
should operate without the physical facilitates to  
operate. I would hope -

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

I must point out to the  
hon. gentleman that the Standing Orders require that hon.  
members in supporting petitions confine their remarks to,  
essentially, the material allegations of the petition, and  
also that there may be no debate. I would suggest that  
we are now getting into the process of debate on the  
government policy with respect to local government, which  
is quite a different issue than the actual prayer of the  
petition and that such a debate should wait until a  
relevant motion is before the House.

The hon. member for Burgeo -  
Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I  
was hoping especially that the former Minister of  
Municipal Affairs would address himself to this petition.  
He has always taken a great interest in Harbour Breton,  
Mr. Speaker, a great interest.

MR. NOLAN: Has he got a Summer place  
there or something?

MR. SIMMONS: No, but he specializes in

MR. SIMMONS: bribing twelve year olds  
to destroy political posters and that kind of thing,  
but that is another issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must point out to the  
hon. gentleman that he is straying quite from the material  
allegation of the petition and I would ask hon. members  
to confine their remarks to the subject matter of the  
petition.

The hon. member for Burgeo -  
Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: So, Mr. Speaker -

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible) more about  
South Brook.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, he is back.  
Mr. Speaker, in body he is back, he was never here in mind  
anyway. He is back, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

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

MR. PECKFORD: I do not think that the  
statements now being made by the member for Burgeo - Bay  
d'Espoir as they relate to "he is back" has anything to do  
with the material allegations or material contained in  
the prayer of the petition presented by the hon. member  
for Fortune - Hermitage and therefore he is completely,  
as always, out of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to the point  
of order.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Let the record show, one, that  
I agree completely with the Minister of Mines and Energy



MR. SIMMONS: and let the record also show that for the first time in this House he has said something sensible.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order made the substance of it was certainly valid and I would point out the remarks by the hon. gentleman to my right were out of order. The interruptions by gentlemen to my left - I do not mean the point of order; anybody has the right to make a point of order, but the other interruptions were equally out of order.

The hon. member for Burgeo -  
Bay d'Espoir.

MR. BRETT: Shot down again.

MR. FLIGHT: Keep quiet now, 'Charlie' boy.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is a question of who is shot down or who knows when he is shot down.

MR. PECKFORD: You certainly do, you have had a lot of experience with it.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, 'Poster Peckford' we have had enough from you today. Mr. Speaker, there is certainly a need - I know the minister is tender on this point, Mr. Speaker. Of course, I would be tender too if I went around bribing twelve year olds - Mr. Speaker, there is a need -

MR. PECKFORD: To a point of order.

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

MR. SIMMONS: There is a need, Mr. Speaker -

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

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

The allegation that I bribed twelve year olds is a very serious allegation and therefore I am going to ask, Mr. Speaker, that that kind of accusation, allegation, directed at me should be withdrawn unequivocally by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and, number two, Mr. Speaker, such

MR. PECKFORD: Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.  
And number two, Mr. Speaker, such allegations are not germane to the prayer of the petition and hence the hon. member is out of order in what he is talking about right now.

Number one, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir withdraw the allegation that I did at some point in time in the past bribe ten or twelve year olds. Number two, that he be ruled out of order because the allegation in any case has nothing to do with the prayer of the petition.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to the alleged point of order.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I may well have chosen some rather unfortunate wording when I said 'bribed,' It is a strong term. Mr. Speaker, I also said that if I had bribed I would be tender. I did not bribe, Mr. Speaker, so I am not tender. Mr. Speaker, if -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will acknowledge the hon. gentleman when I have finished my sentence. There are two points before the Chair, one with respect to the mention of bribery and the other, the point of order with respect to relevance. They were both coupled into one so they have to be presumably dealt with together.

March 15, 1978, Tape 201, Page 5 -- apb

MR. SPEAKER: So the hon. gentleman presumably has spoken now on the bribery aspect of it and then if he wishes, say a few words on the other area which was relevance. But I would ask the hon. gentleman to confine his remarks now to the specific point of order which the Chair has to decide.

The hon. member for Burgeo -  
Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I did want to address myself to the point of order as it related to the bribery issue. I have not done that and if I could have the Chair's permission I would like to do so.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the point of order is doublebarrelled, relevancy and the question of whether I hurt the minister's feelings on the subject. The question of bribery, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the appropriate word is. If you approach a young fellow and give him a sum of money to do a job, I have a word for it, Mr. Speaker. The minister may have a kinder word for it. If he does, he should inform the House so we can all use it.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, may I just address myself to those comments by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman may direct himself to the point of order but not to the debate.

MR. PECKFORD: To the point of order then, Mr. Speaker, as has been addressed by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. The hon. member is weasling his words now and he therefore in addressing the point of order even goes further than to accuse me of bribing a twelve year old, but is now giving some of the details which is even more allegations on the point.

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

The two matters - I will dispense with the second one first because it is an obvious case in that it was a point of order with respect to relevance. I have no doubt that the comments of the hon. gentleman had strayed outside the bounds of relevance.

With respect to the mention of the word 'bribery' I do feel that even if that word was

MR. SPEAKER: used hypothetically, even if it was used conditionally with the word 'if', that it is a word of such a nature that it should not be used even hypothetically because it would tend to suggest an imputation, an imputation of motive. The relevant section of Beauchesne on unparliamentary language would, I think, rule that out of order. I think it is a word which should not be ascribed or attributed even hypothetically or interrogatively to any hon. member. So I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the use of that word.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, without qualification I withdraw the word 'bribery' because it is not parliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
I believe that the hon. gentleman's time is up because according to our rules points of order intervening are counted within the five minutes. I would point out to hon. members -

MR. SIMMONS: By leave, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: By leave? Yes. Does the hon. gentleman have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No. No.

MR. SIMMONS: I would just like to say that there is no question that there is a need here -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: No leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: You do not want to hear it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! There is no leave.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I must insist that the hon. gentleman recognize the authority of the House. I have said this before, I have said it to hon. members on both sides, it is not a personal matter, it is the authority of the House and I have no choice but to enforce the rules. I realize often, as well, that hon. members in the heat of debate and the heat going from right to left, not necessarily going via the Chair, or hopefully not going via the Chair, it does get hon. members worked up, but the Chair has no choice, obviously, but to enforce the rules.

I would point out in general on petitions, and I quote from Beauchesne page 256, actually, the first four or five lines on petitions; "The right of petitioning the Crown and Parliament for redress of grievances is acknowledged as a fundamental principle of the constitution, and has been uninterruptedly exercised from very early times." He says further on, "It is no doubt the birthright of every Canadian to apply for the redress of grievances through petition."

It appears to me that the whole concept behind petitions is the right of citizens to bring forward grievances, requests to their elected members.

Our own Standing Orders, of course, in precluding debate and in stating that hon. members may only speak on the material allegation of the petition enforce that. And it seems to me that if one puts both of those together, what Beauchesne says about the whole concept of petitions and what our Standing Orders require, that really periods of petitions should not be ones of heated exchange or of debate or of a great deal of procedural interjection. Because, number

MR. SPEAKER: one, all of that counts in the five minutes an hon. member has in supporting a petition and it would appear that it would detract from the very purpose of the petition. There is no motion before the House, there is no debate and it would appear to me that what Beauchesne says and what our own Standing Orders require is that this should be a period without debate and without heated difference of opinion between both sides of the House.

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

MRS. MCISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I just want to take about two minutes to support this petition. Having worked with councils as town clerk and manager for a number of years I have a true appreciation of the problems that they experience and certainly when they find themselves without facilities to house those emergency type vehicles. I certainly think that we should appreciate the time given by councillors, as well as the volunteer fire brigade and the people who work on ambulances; this is all free in volunteer time, time that could probably be well spent on a personal basis, and I want to say that I think every effort that can be made should be made to provide facilities to house those emergency type vehicles and I certainly support the petition.

JOHN HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. HODDER: I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of fifteen residents in the community of Piccadilly, known as Piccadilly Head.

The prayer of the petition is, "We the residents of Piccadilly Head ask the government to provide us with proper drinking water because our wells are contaminated."

Now, Mr. Speaker, sometime ago, I think somewhere in the middle of October, I received a letter, and I should perhaps give a little background of this petition, I received a letter from a lady at Piccadilly Head who had moved there about a year before and she complained that her children were sick and had stomach cramps, etc., and she thought it was the drinking water. So once I heard of that request I then telephoned the Department of Health and asked them if they would go out and do a survey of that particular area. The report that came back from the Department of Health said in effect that four of the five sources of water which they had checked were not located, constructed or protected in accordance



MR. J. RODDER: with recommended standards and that the samples that were taken indicated the presence of coliform organisms which were an indication that the water was being contaminated. At the same time I wrote the Minister of Municipal Affairs and outlined the problem to him and I received a letter from him stating that his department would investigate that particular source of contamination as well.

Now sometime after that the Department of Municipal Affairs offices in Corner Brook went to Piccadilly Head and they found that of the four wells owned by residents - and there were five people here, although this petition comes from the sixteen names signed to the petition I think it represents about ten wells in that area, only five of them were checked - but of the four wells owned by the residents contacted it appeared that there was a presence of surface water as well as contamination from prior construction or from poor construction and a closeness of privies. And the Department of Municipal Affairs themselves said that all the water might be termed unfit for human consumption but due to the lateness of the season it was unlikely that anything could be done this year.

It was expressed by the Water Services Division that it was hoped that in the next fiscal year they would be able to take steps to give these families suitable drinking water.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the community of Piccadilly, Ship Cove, Campbells Creek, that whole area, the whole central part of the district of Port au Port has either water which is contaminated, or there is no water at all. In some areas wells were drilled prior to the last election. I might say, and I have said here in the House before, the people of the Ship Cove area in particular, did not get - although the wells were drilled and they were promised pump houses and well houses and pumps and that sort of thing, none of these have been supplied yet. But the problem exists throughout the whole area and particularly in Piccadilly which is a low, flat area,

Mr. Hodder: quite stretched out, I think the community runs somewhere about seven miles, and I personally feel that if all the water supplies or wells were checked throughout that area the same problems would be encountered.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a pure clean supply of drinking water is one of the most important services that an individual can expect. And yet in this area, and in other areas in the district of Port au Port, the drinking water is either non-existent or impure. I have raised it many times here in the House of Assembly, last year and the year before; I believe that something must be done about it. I do not know if some of you - or last year the CBC did a little story on this particular part of Piccadilly; you know, it showed a woman coming out of her home Wintertime lifting the water, dragging the water back into her home, and this particular area if anybody saw that - she was a widow - and that particular well was contaminated. Now this is not an isolated incident. It occurs throughout the whole area. I do not know. I have outlined the problem. I do hope the Department of Municipal Affairs will look at this particular problem. It is a very, very serious problem. It is a serious problem for the whole central part, there are five communities involved. I believe that the only solution is to conduct a survey of the whole central part of the district. I think water has to be provided from Campbell's Creek to Lower Cove, and from Piccadilly to West Bay. I think it is a serious problem, and I would ask the minister to do something, to have his officials look at it, and I lay the petition on the table of the House and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. W. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, once again I want to stand in support of that petition, because again it has to do with drinking water and people who are trying to get government assistance to get a better supply of drinking water. The member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) in presenting the petition mentioned of course the

Mr. Callan: artesian wells that are there and that have not been hooked up. I believe this is pretty consistent throughout the Province, wells that have not been hooked up. Mr. Speaker, I hope that when the minister stands to support this petition, as I know he will, perhaps the minister can allude to a question that arises here; starting this new fiscal year anybody or any number of families who want government assistance for an artesian well system or a water system has to come up with 25 per cent of the cost themselves. Now this is brand new coming in in this brand new fiscal year. Perhaps the minister when he supports the petition, Mr. Speaker, can explain a question that is in the minds of many Newfoundlanders; this 25 per cent that will have to be raised, will this just apply to brand new applicants or will it also apply to people who have had ongoing requests, and ongoing problems, and ongoing application with the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing for water and sewer or just in this case of course water system in unincorporated communities. So perhaps the minister, who is not here now, and probably will not get a chance to support the petition, he may; if he were here I am sure that an awful lot of people would be interested in knowing the answer to that question, whether the 25 per cent applies to new applications or ongoing ones. I support the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Section 51 (3) of The Financial Administration Act I table the report of The Guaranteed Loans paid in part or in whole since the last sitting of this hon. House.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to move the House into a Committee of Ways and Means To Consider The Raising Of Supply To Be Granted To Her Majesty. And I further give notice that I will on tomorrow ask the House To Resolve

March 15, 1978

Tape 204

PK - 3

MR. HICKMAN:      Itself Into A Committee Of The Whole To Consider  
Certain Resolutions For The Granting Of Supply To Her Majesty.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Oh, I did not notice he is not there, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the hon. the Premier, Sir, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Deputy Premier, House Leader, Minister of Finance, Minister of Justice, a man who merits all these highfalutin titles.

MR. NEARY: Future judge.

MR. W. ROWE: The question, Sir, has to do with the agreement, the alleged agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland to get on with the Lower Churchill development - a development which Mr. John Crosbie will never go ahead. The question, Sir, is what exactly is the form of the agreement between the Newfoundland and Labrador Government and the Government of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, hon. gentleman will realize that at the first Minister's Conference there was a statement issued by the hon. Alastair Gillespie and the hon. the Premier indicating the Government of Canada would be prepared to participate in an equity position with the Government of Newfoundland in a corporation which they would be prepared to open negotiations with the Government of Newfoundland to form with a view to developing Gull Island. They have not submitted any proposed agreement to the Government of Newfoundland as of now but negotiations are ongoing; indeed, negotiations opened on the following Monday as the first Minister's Conference ended on either Wednesday or Thursday. But as of today there has been no formal agreement and there will be many things that we need explanations on because we are committed to the principle that the returns from Gull Island must be for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador only. Anyone who realizes what equity participation connotes or indicates may realize that other people may want a share of the return. I am not suggesting that the Government of Canada wants to

MR. HICKMAN: share in the profits but certainly an equity position indicates that that is a possibility and we have to make it abundantly clear to the Government of Canada that we feel they will be discharging their national obligations to this Province and to the rest of Canada by making it possible for financing to be made available to the Government of Newfoundland at reasonable and attractive rates similar to that which has been done with other provinces. And hon. gentlemen will realize that ordinary prudence would dictate that there be very detailed negotiations with the Government of Canada to ensure that the full returns from that resource be made available to this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: That was some answer. That was some answer, Mr. Speaker. The answer in other words, Mr. Speaker, just so that the House is not confused or the media is not confused, the answer is that there is no agreement.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. W. ROWE: Can the hon. minister inform the House as to whether his colleagues, this government, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, has submitted a proposed agreement to the Government of Canada? Have they taken that kind of initiative, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the negotiations as they relate to Mines and Energy are being carried on, as I understand it, by officials of the department of the hon. Alastair Gillespie, Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Government of Canada, and my colleague the hon. Minister of Mines and his officials. I therefore yield to him to ensure that the House has accurate details of the negotiations which are ongoing.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman must think when he is drawing up a legal document he is paid by the word. The answer to the question, just so the House will not be misled or it will not misunderstand the situation, the answer to the question is that, no, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Newfoundland has not submitted any proposed agreement to the Government of Canada.

MR. W. H. ROYE: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Deputy Premier another question. Will he tell me what measures his government, his colleagues, the Government of Newfoundland, have made to date to ensure that if, and, and when construction starts on the Lower Churchill the workers of Newfoundland are guaranteed not only the labour jobs - jobs involving labour, unskilled jobs - but jobs which require skilled training? What has the government done up to now to ensure that when the project gets underway, which I hope will be quickly, it is Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who will get the skilled trade jobs rather than these jobs, the higher paid skilled jobs, going to Central Canada, Quebec and Ontario? What have they done to date, Mr. Speaker? That is a question directly to the hon. the Deputy Premier, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PECKFORD: I have a question from the Leader of the Opposition which I would like to answer. Number one - the Government of Newfoundland has put proposals forward which will be the kernel of an agreement reached on the Lower Churchill Development Corporation. Number two -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, can I -

AN HON. MEMBER: Get your act together.

MR. SIMONS: The school boy does not know the difference.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, number two - we have in correspondence with the federal government insisted on like policies of the past and projects of the past that were initiated by the Liberal Government that we -

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

MR. PECKFORD: - are going to ensure.

MR. SIMONS: Respect the Chair, boy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think it is necessary to point out that in referring to events which may or may not have happened



MR. SPEAKER:                years ago, the hon. gentleman is really engaging in debate, and also I would suggest that during questions and answers, when there are interruptions that this also makes debate, if not inevitable, extremely likely.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD:            Mr. Speaker, there is no agreement signed by both governments for the Lower Churchill Development Corporation. There has been proposals put forward by the Government of Newfoundland which will be the principles that will govern us in negotiating an agreement. Secondly, we have insisted in writing to the federal government, some time ago, that we will want as part of that agreement, and as part of that project or any other project in Labrador, or any other project in Newfoundland and Labrador in which there is financing both by the federal and provincial governments, an assurance that one hundred per cent of the jobs on that project wherever it happens to be in this Province, will be done by Newfoundlanders. That is in writing now.

Negotiations are continuing with the federal government towards the establishment of the Lower Churchill Corporation that was mentioned in the joint press release between the Premier of this Province and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in Ottawa and as soon as negotiations have been completed, and an agreement has been worked out, this hon. House will be informed so that it can be clearly seen that this government is in favour of Newfoundlanders first, and in creating jobs.

MR. SPEAKER:                A supplementary.

MR. W.M. BONE:            The Minister of Justice should really be kept in on the act, Mr. Speaker, so he knows what is going on, as he is the Senior Legal Counsel.

MR. NEARY:                Ask him if he agrees with what his colleague just said?

MR. W.M. BONE:            Let me rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker, because

MR. M.N. ROSE: the hon. the Deputy Premier, who has now relinquished his place to the Minister of Energy, has not understood what I asked in simple terms, **They** are these: What measures has the government taken to ensure that we have in this Province the skilled tradesmen, skilled workers, who can go into the Lower Churchill development and be assured of the jobs going to them when the project starts? Which, Mr. Speaker, to continue the question, is a far cry from merely assuring the people that one hundred per cent of the jobs will go to Newfoundlanders, **if** the Newfoundland workers do not have the training and the trades to take over these jobs, then how can we assure Newfoundland, or how can the Government of Canada assure Newfoundland that one hundred per cent of the jobs will go to Newfoundlanders?

And secondly, Sir, this government, Sir, seems to have some kind of a - the security blanket is to last out at the federal government, to blame the federal government or to pin responsibility. What has the Government of Canada got to do with our responsibility to ensure that our workers in this Province have the trades and the skills necessary to take over these jobs? It is a clear relinquishment of responsibilities.

MR. NEARY: This House decides that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about an agreement between two governments and therefore it is going to be financing between two governments, and we are just insuring that in any agreement, any corporation that is set up, that one of the things that is covered there, so that down the road there is no problem on it, is that all employment will be generated and will come from Newfoundlanders, that any job that is created because of that project is for Newfoundlanders. Now, the first part of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question as related to skilled workmen, we have in this Province right now, as has been demonstrated very recently by comments made by leading companies who did the extension to Bay d'Espoir, that we have some of the most skilled people in Canada for hydro electric projects. We have available a pool of expertise in this Province today who can do perhaps a better job on installing hydro electric projects than any other province of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: Number two, if it comes to the point where we can ascertain that there are going to be skilled tradesmen needed on a project in Newfoundland for which there is not sufficient skilled tradesmen now, we will insure that they are trained and that they get the jobs and that nobody from outside this Province will get them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. H. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One final supplementary by the original questioner.

MR. W. H. ROWE: Let me make sure that we get the answer clearly, Sir. The answer to the question, as I understand it, is that nothing has been done to date to insure in the way of job training, skills, training to make sure that Newfoundlanders get the job. I want to make that clear.

MR. PECKFORD: That is not right.

MR. W. N. BOWE:

Is the hon. minister saying, Mr. Speaker, that we have now in this Province sufficient tradesmen, skilled workers to go ahead if the Lower Churchill development were to go ahead six months or a year from now? That we have now waiting, biding their time in this Province, sufficient skilled workers, tradesmen, to go into the Lower Churchill and to complete that job? Is that what the hon. minister is saying?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BECKERD:

Two points, Mr. Speaker. First, we will take whatever measures are necessary within any project agreement which involves financing other than just ourselves to insure that Newfoundlanders will get first crack at the jobs and that it will be only Newfoundlanders on those projects. Secondly, the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows as well as I do, as does every member of this House, that I cannot off the top of my head be able to say how many skilled tradesmen or how many labourers or how many whatever are going to be needed on any project so that therefore I can equate that with knowing whether in fact we have sufficient in this Province right now. That is impossible to do. That is a number that I do not have at my disposal. Suffice it to say that this government will undertake to insure by whatever means necessary to train Newfoundlanders, if there are not enough, so that there will be one hundred per cent Newfoundlanders on any project that is financed partially or totally by this government.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, along the same line of questioning in connection with the development of the Lower Churchill, Sir. The Government of Canada, the hon. Mr. Cullen, I believe it is, the federal Minister of Employment and Immigration, has indicated publicly both inside and outside the House of Commons that money is available, so much per job, as a job creation programme for this Province because we have record unemployment, to cut the wood on the site of the

MR. NEARY:

Lower Churchill.

AN HON. MEMBER:

To cut some of the wood -

MR. NEARY:

This year - to cut the wood on the site of the development of the Lower Churchill. And my understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that this government have not yet taken the initiative to take Mr. Cullen and the Government of Canada up on his offer. Would the minister indicate if this is right or wrong?

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is right. I will back him up.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PEGGIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, wherein, number one, the federal government offer is one in which the provincial government has to spend \$7 million in order to get \$2 million, or \$14 million in order to get \$4 million, the offer given by Mr. Cullen in no way represents anything close to the request out to the federal government in June of last year, to which he only responded with a whole new proposal in February of 1978; and it took them, therefore, eight months to respond. We are in the process right now as a government of responding to Mr. Cullen's offer which we think falls far short of the kind of request we made in June which was, out of the \$50 million or \$60 million or \$70 million that comes to this Province through Canada Works programmes each year, if it is \$60 million take \$10 million off, use the other \$50 million for your Canada Works programmes, give us that \$10 million to use as a special Canada Works project at the Gull Island clearing site so that we can put to work many of those loggers who lost their jobs because of Linerboard.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDEN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will recognize the hon. member for LaPoile for a supplementary and the hon. member for Port au Port for a supplementary and I think will recognize another hon. member on another subject. This will not preclude members from coming back to this subject if they so wish.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is some time ago, as the minister just admitted, it is some time ago since Mr. Cullen, the hon. Mr. Cullen put forward this proposal, last year, and the Provincial Government have procrastinated and as a result now, Mr. Speaker, because of the time lapse it will be very unlikely that plans can be made to get that project off the ground this year unless the minister takes immediate action. Now, Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is this; do I understand the minister correctly that there have no negotiations so far either orally or in writing with the minister because the provincial government felt that the cost sharing could not be - the Province's share of it could not be picked up, is that my understanding? And could the minister also tell me while he is commenting on that if this agreement, if this offer is negotiable or was it a final offer and if it cannot be - if the project cannot be worked out for the Lower Churchill to cut the wood on the side of the Lower Churchill could some other project be undertaken in Newfoundland? What I am saying is there money on the Ottawa table and this Province is not taking advantage of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it was about two weeks that that offer was made to the provincial government, two weeks ago after a request that was made to them in June of 1977. Eight months later we got a response to our request, to a special request and the response was a program which is

MR. PECKFORD: in place as a forestry improvement for every Province of Canada and in no way represents a proper response to a special request from a Province. That is number one, Number two, there have been talks ongoing with the Federal Government as it relates to this program and as it relates to getting Gull Island clearing going. Number three is that we-

MR. NEARY: They are waiting in Ottawa, waiting to hear.

MR. PECKFORD: After two weeks when we waited for eight months! And the point is that we are going to respond to Mr. Cullen. It is in the process of being - he might have it today or yesterday and therefore we are going to - it was discussed in Cabinet last week, long before the hon. member for Burgeo - LaPoile knew what it was all about. And then after our response gets back to Ottawa and to Mr. Cullen, then we will wait to see what his reaction will be to what our answer is and then go on from there. But we responded in two to three weeks as opposed to the Federal Government's response which took eight months.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated that I would recognize our member for Port au Port for a supplementary and then the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay de Essoir.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, this is a supplementary on the same topic but directed at the Minister of Education. Generally the Department of Technical and Vocational Education, that branch of the Department of Education, is responsible for schools such as heavy equipment school and welders and that sort of thing.

MR. HODDER:

This is a preamble to my question.

Generally what happens once you start turning out welders you set a bureaucracy in place and then when you need new skilled people you cannot change it. Now my question to minister is in light of the fact that the Lower Churchill is going ahead, and we know that at some date it will go ahead, has the minister done any surveys to see what skills are going to be needed at the Lower Churchill or institute any programs, or if there if any program changes in the wind in the vocational systems in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, the manpower needs of the Province is usually dictated by a manpower needs committee, a federal/provincial committee, and the federal, of course, government do buy seats for students for the trades that are required in the Province. And of course in the past number of years we have been turning out electricians, welders and that sort of thing, linesmen, and now in light of this, of course, we have already put on a special course for linesmen in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, I think. So these things -



MR. ROUSSEAU: We shifted the ones at Seal Cove and Stephenville.

MR. W. HOUSE: That is right.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Sixty in a half year, 120 a year.

MR. HOUSE: So it is about 120 per year will be turned out under that programme. But, of course, that is looked at yearly, from year to year, with the Manpower Needs Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated that I will recognize the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir followed by the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation. It relates to the Auditor General's report, I am referring to the printed document, page 31, Paragraph 53. The Auditor General points out that there was a so-called extension to a highway contract which resulted in an amount of \$441,000 being paid out in contravention of the law, \$441,444 being paid out to a contractor, or at least being approved for payment to a contractor, in contravention of the law. I wonder would the minister indicate what steps have been taken to put an end to this practice of approving so-called tender extensions which in effect are in violation of the law, if steps have been taken to put an end to this practice, and if so, would he indicate what these steps are?

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member and members of the House are aware, this is a contract extension programme or a controversy, if you will, there is an ongoing one between the Auditor General and the government, both governments, the previous one and this, an ongoing difference of opinion each year. I notice that this year there is one only instance noted by the A.G. which makes me think that tremendous strides have been made in correcting what the Auditor General feels is an unwise practice. However, the one that he does call attention to is a substantial one, and I have asked the people in the department this morning to try to brief me on it, and bring me up to date. I saw it last night as I was going through this document. As the hon. member mentioned earlier, it is a relatively small Auditor General's

Mr. Doody: report, and one that I think is very complimentary to this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: There are of course some areas of concern in here, one of which the hon. member has brought to the House's attention, one which I have brought to the attention of the senior officials in the department, and one which I hope to have a briefing on in the very near future. But as I say, obviously, Sir, steps have been taken to correct what the Auditor General feels were improper procedures, since there is only one contract extension mentioned in this year's report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: The question that I put originally was whether steps are being taken to put an end to this practice, and I can only assume from the answer that I got from the minister that no steps are being taken.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Well perhaps the minister could be more explicit in his answer. What I wanted was what steps have been taken? Or in the absence of that, is he saying that he, the new brightly polished minister is, as his predecessor, the not so polished minister, is he condoning the practice as his predecessor obviously did, this practice of -

MR. DOODY: No.

MR. SIMMONS: - and we are not talking, Mr. Speaker, about a contract extension. Let us be clear with the Auditor General is saying. He is talking about extensions at prices higher than those in the original contract, the act is specific on that point, and the minister can weasel all he wants, but this is not a contract extension, the Auditor General says so. Is he condoning the practice as his predecessor has done? Or is he going to take some steps to put an end to it?

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is aware that the item to which he refers, and I think he called it to by attention by page number and paragraph, page 31, Paragraph 53, titled Cost of extension of highway contract exceeding original contract, which is indeed an extension of a highway contract, which is exactly what the question was, and exactly what the answer was. As to what steps have been taken to put an end to that procedure; and hon. member is well aware that only a week or so ago in my office he and a delegation came in and sat down and discussed the possibility of including as an extension of a contract which might be going on in that district in the next few days.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: And in the presence of the Deputy Minister I explained to him that this was a complete contravention of what the Auditor General wants, and we cannot possibly go along with that sort of thing.

MR. SIMMONS: Why I mean -

MR. DOODY: Because it is the sort of thing that the Auditor General has taken to task to try to correct. This is why I bring it to your attention now, Your Honour. The department has taken steps to correct that sort of thing, and it was pointed out to the hon. member and his delegation only a week or so ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Misleading! Misleading!

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: If this is going to get into debate, Mr. Speaker, we would all like to get into it if we are going to divulge confidential discussions, or our own version of those discussions. I will advocate anytime that the Public Tender Act be obeyed, including extensions to contract. I will not, nor will the Auditor General, Mr. Speaker, and that is the question we are asking the minister, whether he is going to condone as did his predecessor -

AN HON. MEMBER: Jaws.

MR. SIMMONS: Jaws. Mr. Speaker, Jaws was the name given to an intelligent shark. Mr. Speaker, if he is going to condone -  
You do not bother me at all.

MR. SIMMONS: If he is going to condone, Mr. Speaker, if he is going to condone as did his predecessor, this business of lashing out \$400,000 in violation of the law -

MR. W.N. ROWE: \* Illegally.

MR. SIMMONS: Illegally, outside the law, \$400,000? And it cannot even come under the guise of a contract extension. The documentation clearly shows that it is not what we were asking for, an extension to a contract as the Public Tender Act provides, but indeed an expenditure of \$400,000 without any reference, Mr. Speaker, to any public tender legislation whatsoever.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order.

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

MR. PECKFORD: I think the hon. member instead of posing a question has rambled on long enough to enter the realm of debate and therefore I think that he is fringing on being out of order.

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS: The hon. member knows more about rambling on if we go by what he has done in this House this afternoon when we tried to get some concise answers to questions. He is second only to the Minister of Justice who sits next to him.

MR. PECKFORD: Proper thing.

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, my question was very, very specific. The Minister of Mines may not have understood it but that is par for the course for him, Mr. Speaker. My question is very specific.

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, could I have some order while I -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman would like to be heard without interruption.

MR. SIMONS: I am not upset because I did not pay off a young fellow. I am not upset about that. Do not misunderstand me. I am not upset because you did not pay off a young fellow. I am not upset by that. I am not a bit.

Mr. Speaker, the question is simply -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I recognized the hon. gentleman at the beginning to speak on the point of order, and now it being before the Chair it has to be disposed of. May and Beauchesne have a number of pages and chapters on questions and it would hardly appear to be necessary to do anything now but refer to them. But our Standing Order 31 (c) summarizes very succinctly what the procedure is in the House of Assembly.

"In putting any oral questions, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated except so far as may be necessary to explain the same; and in answering any such question, the Minister is not to debate the matter to which it refers."

I think in this particular instance, and I think there is a tendency in general to question and to answer as if that Standing Order were not operative. And it may be that hon. members are thinking of usage in the House of Commons; however, our Standing Order 1, is quite specific and it establishes the priority of authority in the House of Assembly. One, the Standing Orders; two, the precedence, and where neither of these apply then the contemporary practice of the House of Commons. And of course the

MR. SPEAKER: first two do apply, so I would call that to the attention of hon. members to my right and to my left.

In other words, the televising of the Question Period in the House of Commons has not to my knowledge changed our Standing Orders. That can be done but it cannot be done that way.

The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, the question I originally put to the minister is whether steps have been taken to put an end to the unlawful practice of paying out money, in this case \$441,000, without even going through the motions of awarding a contract? Can he indicate whether such steps have been taken?

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

MR. DOOHY: As I indicated a little while ago, Your Honour, the answer to that question is obviously yes. The Department is well aware of the fact that extensions to contracts are not acceptable and we have taken steps to see that that sort of procedure is no longer followed and this is demonstrated, as I said earlier, by the fact that there is only one, albeit a large one, quoted by the AG in his present report.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members Day, notice two. The debate was adjourned by the hon. member for LePoile.

MR. HEARY: Mr. Speaker, because of the severe flu that I have, cold on the chest, Sir, and because I have been speaking for a considerable period of time on the Throne Speech, I would like to decline the opportunity to speak on this resolution today and yield to some other member if Your Honour wishes to recognize another member.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Before the hon. gentleman starts, it would appear to be an appropriate time, so that nobody will have to be interrupted, for the Deputy Speaker to give a ruling on a matter which came up towards the closing minutes of yesterday's session. This will then be dispensed with and then the hon. minister.

DR. COLLINS: Order, please! I am sure hon. members will recall that last evening an interjection was made into a subject of debate which went unheeded by the Chair and I undertook at that time to consult Hansard and to indicate a decision on the point having done so. You will also recall that the matter was raised as a point of privilege. Now hon. members may or may not always remember that the discretion of the Speaker is limited in matters of privilege much more so than on points of order. It is well established that it is the House and not the Chair which decides the substantive matter or the substantive content of privilege when raised on motion. And I would like to bring to your attention a section in Beauchesne. It is Section 113 which in part reads as follows: "A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the House power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy." Now the Speaker's role in this matter is set out succinctly in another section of Beauchesne which I would like to bring to hon. members's attention. It is in Section 104, Subsection (5) which reads as follows: "As a motion taken at the time" this is referring to privilege "taken at the time for matters of privilege is thereby given precedence over the prearranged programme of public business, the Speaker requires to be satisfied, both that there is a prima facie case that a breach of privilege has been committed, and also that the matter has been raised at the earliest opportunity."

I do not think there is any doubt in consulting Hansard that the matter was raised at the earliest opportunity, so we can

DR. COLLINS: dispose of that aspect, and we are then left with the aspect of a prima facie case. That is whether there is a clear-cut, unequivocal breach of privilege over the remark in question. Now in this regard I would refer hon. members to another section of Beauchesne, Section 111, Subsection (h), which reads as follows referring to what constitutes a breach of privilege, and Subsection (h) of Section 111 says as follows: "Imputations against members of corruption in the execution of their duties." At the same time it is being held to hon. member's attention, I would like to bring to their attention that part of Beauchesne that deals with order, not with privilege but with order. And this is referred to in Section 154 and 155. Section 154 in part reads as follows, and I would like to emphasize that this refers in Beauchesne to order and not to privilege. Section 154, Subsection (3) reads: "The imputation of bad motives, or motives different from those acknowledged," and Section 155 in part reads "The imputation of false or unavowed motives."

It is my opinion, therefore, having consulted Hansard that the obliqueness of the remark made by the hon. Minister of Tourism does not satisfy a reasonable interpretation of Beauchesne Section 111, Subsection (h) and that therefore a prima facie case for a breach of privilege has not been established, but that the remark does fall within an interpretation of the other two sections of Beauchesne which I have alluded to in that it was therefore unparliamentary and out of order and should be withdrawn in large terms.



MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not too clear as to what I am to withdraw. The statement made, if it is in Hansard - I did not check Hansard - was a question put across the House by this hon. gentleman to an hon. gentleman then speaking, who is the member for LaPoile, And the question was who paid his trip to New York City? If that is derogatory, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the question again sometime when I am speaking in debate, but surely in asking a member a question of that nature it is not derogatory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

My understanding is that the hon. minister is asking for information on the remark in question, that is the remark that I have ruled was unparliamentary. And I think that is a legitimate question and I would have to point out to him that the remark I referred to is stated in two places in the extract from Hansard. When the hon. member for LaPoile was referring to the possible sale of the oil refinery as opposed to perhaps returning it to its original owners, the Hansard reads, "Mr. Morgan: Now we know who paid your way to" and further down, "Mr. Morgan: I know who paid your way to New York." And the ruling of the Chair is that in the context these can fall under the two sections I referred to, that is the imputation of bad motives or motives different from those acknowledged and imputations of false or unavowed motives, and as the ruling was that they do fall under those two sections, they are out of order as being unparliamentary and the hon. minister is requested to withdraw them in large terms.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if I have to withdraw the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if I am given a chance to explain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

March 15, 1978

Tape 212

EC - 2

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Will you give me a chance to explain?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair has only a very narrow function here and that is to make a decision and make a ruling. If that ruling is to be in question there is a mechanism for doing it, but I am afraid that the Chair just has to give the decision and expect a response.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the statement that I know who paid for his trip to New York, but I will rephrase it by saying I asked a question, Who paid his trip to New York?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: I withdrew the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think the hon. minister has acceded to the ruling made and I now will call upon the next speaker in the debate.

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. MORGAN: The question is still in the air, brother, still in the air, and I will get the answer to the question too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: You are right, I will get it. I will disclose it in the House as well.

MR. NEARY: What about the helicopter that brought the minister down to his lounge? Get the answer to that, too.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. NEARY: If you are unparliamentary, you are unparliamentary and you just withdraw, eh?

MR. MORGAN: How about Panama?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Speaker is running this House.

MR. MORGAN: How about Panama? Who paid for down there?

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: I would like to draw to your attention that the hon. gentleman again, Sir, has insisted on being unparliamentary and I would like Your Honour to discipline the hon. gentleman. I am asking for the protection of the Chair. Withdraw these innuendoes, these insinuations, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down, boy!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think this point can be disposed of. I was not aware that any member other than the hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations was standing in his place and therefore I am not aware of any point of order that came up in this regard.

The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The hon. minister is trying to.

MR. MORGAN: We will get the answer to it, boy.

We will get the answer to it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: First of all, having as is the courtesy and the way of the House

MR. ROUSSEAU: Here we got forty-five minutes each, and if we get it through we might even make it before six o'clock.

MR. MORGAN: Poor little 'Roger'. Wearing your pumps today, 'Roger'? Wearing your high-heeled shoes today? Wearing your pumps?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! I believe the Hon. Minister is having difficulty in making his remarks and I would ask hon. members to give him the courtesy of listening to him.

The Hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, first of all as is the courtesy of the House of course, this is my first occasion to rise to my feet in this session I would like to take the opportunity to welcome the newly elected hon. members from Twillingate (Mr. W.N. Rowe), St. John's West (Mr. H. Kitchen), and Ferryland (Mr. C. Power) to the House. I am sure that they will provide the same high expertise that the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) offered before, and that the member for Twillingate (Mr. W.N. Rowe) offered before and I am sure the member for St. John's West (Mr. Kitchen), all previous members who sat immediately prior to their sitting. I would like to take this opportunity to welcome them to the House.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a very nice thing to be able to stand up and speak to a resolution on Labrador. I think it should be noted, and I do not know whether hon. members have noted it, there are two resolutions on this session's order paper for Labrador, another one of great importance by my friend and colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) that the House of Assembly Act of 1974 to establish a broader and more equitable representation in Labrador be looked at. I think these are two very important items in respect to the Labrador.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I believe, if I am not incorrect, Mr. Speaker, that during the past five years that I have been a member of the House, since 1972, that I believe there has been at least one, and possibly two in some sessions, major resolutions in respect to Labrador. I think that is a very good thing. I think that all hon. members of this House, and all past hon. members of the House probably with twenty-twenty hindsight, could feel that perhaps the isolation and neglect that the people in Labrador have felt, as have people in other areas of the Province, have not been unfounded. At least the opportunity to hear the views of the people of Labrador, through their elected representatives, is something I think that will lessen the frustration and the feelings that the people have. Of course that is only half the story. Action also has to be taken as well as the ability of bringing their problems to the attention of this highest court in the land, that something be done to rectify them.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, in the five years since I have been here, the members who have represented Labrador, Mr. Joe Harvey, and Mr. Mike Martin, and Mr. Melvin Woodward, and the now sitting members, the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. E. Roberts), and my colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), and myself have taken the opportunity where possible to speak on behalf of Labrador. We hope, and I hope that I made a contribution, as I know the other hon. members, both past and present have done, and have done so at times with a vehemence that people may question. I have assured the House before and I can assure it now, and I am sure I assure it on behalf of the four people who represent Labrador, that the vehemence

MR. ROUSSEAU: is only the echo of what we feel in Labrador to bring to this hon. House of Assembly.

Before speaking to the actual resolution, and I am sorry the hon. Leader of the Opposition has left his seat, he probably is in the confines and can hear what I am going to say, I am not going to propose an amendment to the resolution but I am going to ask that the - what do you call them? - the recitals be looked at between the two House Leaders, and I have already mentioned it to the House Leader of the Opposition and our House Leader, to get together because - and rightfully so. The hon. Leader of the Opposition in introducing the resolution indicated that it should be a nonpartisan resolution and I agree fully that it should be a nonpartisan resolution and I think that the House of Assembly convened, agreeing to a resolution

MR. ROUSSEAU: Assembly convened agreeing to a resolution of this nature would be more in the better interest of Labrador than for it to read as it does in the recital. So I have asked the House Leader on the other side, the Opposition, and our House Leader to get together and attempt to come up with some phrase that would make the resolution a nonpartisan resolution, as suggested by the hon. Leader of the Opposition when it was introduced.

On behalf of government I can speak that as far as the resolution is concerned government does support the resolution itself.

MR. SIMMONS: What is the problem?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well there are some terms in there that we do not think are appropriate or proper, that the House of Assembly, together on this recital might be a better usage of terms than either or both political parties since it is to be what the hon. Leader of the Opposition suggests, a non-partisan resolution.

So we for our part do support the resolution and I am not, as I say, making an amendment to the resolution but asking that both House Leaders get together and probably come up with a recital that might be more appropriate and more acceptable to both sides of the House of Assembly.

MR. W.N. ROWE: If the hon. minister would not mind yielding for a second to a question, Mr. Speaker. I would have thought it would have been more appropriate to get together with the mover and seconder of the motion to see you know - but is this what the hon. gentleman is worried about, that "the -

MR. ROUSSEAU: The second paragraph.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - National Convention of the Liberal Party, from which the Federal Government of Canada is now formed," does that bother him? It makes it partisan?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well the hon. member said that it should not be a partisan action. We agree with the resolution.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Would he not agree that the Federal Government of Canada does happen to be formed, through no fault or credit of my own, from the Liberal Party of Canada? The point I was trying to make, Mr. Speaker, which I should impress upon the hon. minister, is that the Government of Canada, which is formed out of the Liberal Party, has been instructed by the Party out of which it is formed at a recent convention, unanimously instructed by the membership at that Liberal convention, to support this resolution on the Federal level. Now it is not my fault, or I cannot take any credit either for the Federal Government of Canada being formed out of the Liberal Party, but it is a fact of life that the hon. minister may have to live with, after the next election as well as before.

MR. ROUSSEAU: If it be, you know, the mover and the seconder - no concern to me - or the two House Leaders, but I think they should get together. We feel for our part the resolution is not - the resolution is, let us put it in a positive way, the resolution is the government's position on Labrador, you know, so we feel that the two House Leaders, the mover and seconder and so on - I am giving the government's position on this, that we support the resolution - we would like for the mover and the seconder, or the two House Leaders or what have you, to get together and probably make it more appropriate or more acceptable to the House of Assembly since it is to be, in the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's words, a non-partisan resolution.

MR. SIMONS: There is nothing worse than a reformed drunk, you know.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Why?

MR. SIMONS: You were a Liberal once.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Anyway, to go to the resolution itself, Mr. Speaker, with those few introductory comments, these are resolutions of course that one would like to be able to do immediately.



R. ROUSSEAU: There are long term plans here, and long term plans in keeping with the government's hopes for Labrador. I think it is fair to say that in the past five, ten years that many things have happened in Labrador to bring it into the mainstream. I think that people now do not feel the amount of isolation that was once felt in respect to Labrador.

I think a major breakthrough in development in Labrador has come recently, about a year and a half ago, I believe, when the now Minister of Justice and the Attorney General and the Minister of Finance was the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and we signed what was the first DREE agreement for Labrador, was a very, very moving thing for the people of Labrador as we had been shut off from that source of funds for some time. As one can readily appreciate, the cost of enhancing lives of the people in Labrador and the cost of development is a large one and one that, even though the government

MR. ROUSSEAU:

would like to move faster on is probably beyond the economic competence of government, some of the larger developments. So the DREE agreement that we signed, and the recently signed subsidiary agreement on DREE consisting of some projects for coastal Labrador, I think it is a step in the right direction in response to the needs of the people of Labrador. And I have no hesitation at all in praising this development. We worked a long time for it. The answer always was that, you know, What does Labrador West need with a DREE grant? And I think the people in Labrador West have as much right to DREE money as anybody else in this Province or anybody else in this country.

I remember specifically the agreement that was signed. Most of the projects went to the Eastern part of Labrador and rightfully so. We had one development over in Western Labrador which Mr. Lessard, the then minister and now minister, when he signed it, called Rousseau's Dream, which was the industrial park in Western Labrador. I think this is a big item toward development in Labrador. The problem has been brought to public notice many times in the recent past of the fact that most of the service industry has been generated South of Newfoundland Labrador, or the Labrador part of the Province, in Quebec, in the Seven Islands area especially - it has been a growing and booming town and this development, of course, will enable service industry to develop in Labrador. Now I am not one who has ever subscribed to the principle of numbers created by direct jobs - the multiplier effect. I do not know what they argue here. You hear there are three and one-half or four for every job. I would not venture a guess as to what number there are, but certainly there are significant numbers of people who could be employed in the service industry because of a primary industry like the mining industry in Western Labrador, the mines at Wabush and the mines at the Iron Ore Company of Canada in Labrador City.

So we hope that this will be a big move in the development of Labrador and the development of a secondary

MR. ROUSSEAU:

service industry for Labrador.

Of course, involved with that as well it is very difficult to build up a service industry without having the housing to accompany that. We had built, I think it was in the mid 1960's, some fourteen or fifteen Newfoundland and Labrador Housing units. That has been a big difficulty in the development of Labrador; people went into Labrador - of course Western Labrador I am referring to now specifically - and had very great difficulty in procuring housing. They still do to some extent. And they were paying astronomical prices for basement apartments - \$250/\$300 was pretty good. You hit \$300/\$350/\$400, I would assume, in certain instances for a basement apartment - one of the reasons why I always say that the census in Labrador is never correct, because these people do not want to go on the census list because they are living in places that if fire commissioners knew about it they would probably condemn it as being unsafe because of living in basements. So instead of the 12,000 or 14,000 people they say that we have, I think it is more like 16,000 to 17,000 people or maybe more. But of course that is a point that we hope will be rectified. We have 141 houses now nearing completion. Some of them have been occupied in Labrador City - Newfoundland and Labrador Housing units - and these are excellent. They enable people who would not otherwise be able to procure housing to get housing. These are the people who go in looking for jobs not at the mines, where the money is big, but people who work in other aspects of the industries associated with the towns. I have never had the opportunity to move into a home. These are done, of course, in the same way that any Newfoundland and Labrador Housing unit across the Province is done. There is a point system and the people who score the highest in respect of needs and salary and so on and so forth procure these houses. Also we have in Wabush a lot development - as yet there are no housing units on that - a lot development of something like 270 lots. And this, you know, took a long time in coming. I started with it in 1972. It did not come to fruition until the past year or year and a half. There was a lot of blood, sweat, toil and tears went

March 15, 1978

Tape 215

EC - 3

MR. ROUSSEAU: in on the part of a lot of people  
between then and now. Of course, the difficulty originally was that  
there was no land

MR. ROUSSEAU:

up there available for individual occupancy and the companies did give over some land to the government which they utilized in this way. So I think coupled with this housing development in Labrador City, the lot development in Wabush and the industrial park now in Wabush, which will serve Labrador City and Wabush, is one in which government has attempted to provide a secondary industry in this town. Of course you always have the problem in Western Labrador where both towns depend on only one industry, the mining industry of the Iron Ore Company of Canada or at Wabush Mines, and the people are naturally worried. And any secondary industry that will take time to build up of course is welcome from the psychological point of view that at least there are other things there, not nearly to the extent that the mining industry now controls the area, but there are other options for people to work in the area and unfortunately not at the same salaries that they are receiving at the mines.

So I say now that the agreement that was signed with DREE, the original agreement which I think was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$13 million or \$14 million, provided for the Goose Bay Development Corporation funding as well so that the people in Eastern Labrador could hire full-time people and could look at their needs over there and suggest in future what should be included in DREE contracts and other projects in Eastern Labrador. The industrial park in Western Labrador was one that was welcomed by the people of Labrador. The new subsidiary agreement that was signed involving a number of projects on the Southern part and part of the Northern part of Coastal Labrador is a welcome thing. This, of course, will I hope increase in a number of subsidy agreements. I know there is one very important item that is mentioned in the resolution that is supported by government and I know that as a matter of policy on behalf of government that government feels there should be a highway across Labrador. The costs of course are quite extensive. I remember

MR. ROUSSEAU: a few years ago when we were talking to Quebec on the possibility of jointly going to the Federal Government in respect to a Trans-Labrador highway going from Seven Islands up around and down through to Blanc-Sablon and across into the Northern Peninsula. The cost then was something like \$520 million and that was three years ago. So the cost now would probably be up in the \$700 million or \$800 million bracket.

Of course the big problem with the whole situation now is the connection between Labrador City, Wabush and Esker. Esker, as hon. members know, is a railhead and the people from Goose Bay-Happy Valley, while not over good road, can reach Esker in the summertime. In the wintertime of course it is very difficult, and at times in the spring and fall it is even more difficult to reach that area, but they have that outlet. What we need now undoubtedly is the connection between Labrador City-Wabush to Esker to give the people in Western Labrador access by road to the railhead. I think that would go far in alleviating many of the frustrations people feel in driving home for the summer. I think it is fair to say nowadays that a lot more people than when I first went to Labrador in 1962 in the Western part of Labrador feel that Labrador is their home. But still there are an awful lot and a greater majority who do not feel that Labrador or Western Labrador is their home and they still refer to home as the Island part of the Province. I think that these people should be given an opportunity to be able to reach their Island home, if that is the way they want to refer to it, through their own province. It is very difficult. I remember when I used to have to drive down and you would hit Seven Islands and you would breathe a heavy sigh of relief when you hit Campbellton. At least you felt a little closer when you were in Atlantic Canada to being home than you did when you were in Quebec.

So I would hope that subsequent DREE agreements will provide for the connection of the Labrador City-Wabush area to Esker and the upgrading of the road right through to the Goose Bay-Happy Valley

MR. ROUSSEAU: area. That of course would enable people to get out without going through another province. I know that initial talks have been held with DREE and I would hope that DREE would consider this to be a priority item. It would certainly go far in developing the Labrador insofar as this province is concerned and indeed insofar as Canada is concerned and would open it up to much more development. Now in opening it up to development of course the people of Labrador do not always like to see everybody come in with a pick and shovel. There has to be some developmental strategy or policy in respect to its development and I think that the people of course who must be consulted on this development or proposed development or policy in respect to the long-range, medium-term and short-term development of Labrador are the people in Labrador themselves. These are the people obviously who have

MR. ROUSSEAU:

to live with the repercussions of the development. I remember a development in 1962 when I landed on August 16, 1962 in the middle of Wabush and I said, "Where is the town", and somebody said, "You are standing in the middle of it", and life was pretty disruptive for a period of time. In those days I remember truck drivers, you know, driving ten, twelve hours, four or five hours sleep, back to work for eight or ten hours. All of the sudden the shock comes when people who had been working sixteen to eighteen to twenty hours a day, seven days a week, making good money, sending it back, by the way, to the Island part of the Province or to the other parts of Labrador, having to get used to the idea of forty hours a week, which is a very difficult thing, a very difficult adjustment for people to make. So we have to be very careful in the development of Labrador and that we do not do too much too fast, that we do not have the boom and bust situation, that people are brought up slowly, their expectations are brought up slowly in the development and they are let down slowly so that they can associate themselves in a very meaningful way with the development.

My friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) has just reminded me of my days in school when he put up his hand and said, "May I go for a cup of coffee? Do you mind?" No, Sir. I am sure you can hear what I am going to say anyway. But it is very important that these people be consulted. I think the Labrador Advisory Resources Council which includes a representative from Western Labrador is one vehicle. There are a number of other vehicles up there. I think obviously that there has to be a number of government persons or a government presence in Labrador. This has been long sought after. People in Labrador feel, whether rightfully or wrongfully, the only time that this happens is when somebody wants to gouge some money out of them for one thing or another, tax money of various kinds, and they would like to feel the presence of people in Labrador always, primarily people who understand and appreciate and have some



MR. ROUSSEAU:

feeling for what these people are going through.

The question of government service and government presence is now being rectified I think in the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area in that we are using what was the Paddon Hospital to provide a government center in the Labrador East area and the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area. I have had some personal thoughts on that, whether it should be in Western Labrador, because I naturally have a bias, or whether it should be in Eastern Labrador. The main thing, number one, is that it is in Labrador and that there will be a center established in Labrador concerning the various departments. There are a number of individual items I think. We are talking about a policy statement now where we could talk about the

Department of Transportation and Communications to provide licenses and that sort of thing. I do not think that is in keeping with the spirit of this particular resolution but that can be a topic for another time in this House of Assembly.

But I think that the presence that they will feel on the Coast of Labrador and in Eastern Labrador in particular, and I hope in Western Labrador, will be one that will make the people feel at least the government is a little closer to them than way off in St. John's. I think the appointment of an individual up there to oversee the Labrador Services Division is something that I hope will work out. We have had that happen in the past. It has worked out as well in the past as we would have hoped for it to have worked out. I would hope that with twenty-twenty hindsight and with past experience we can learn from the mistakes of the past and hope that these people will provide the kind of service that the people in Labrador need especially. And remember, as we have said so many times in this House, there are many Labradors, there is not one Labrador. There is Western Labrador, which is a world apart. There is the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area. There is Northwest River, Mud Lake.

MR. STRACHAN: The Northern Coast.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Then there is the Northern Coast of Labrador, my hon. friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) says, the Indian and Eskimo people and the settlers up there. There is the Northern Coast of Southern Labrador which I think tends more towards the Goose Bay-Happy Valley radius. And then there is the Southern Coast, the Southern part of the Southern Coast of Labrador, which I think generates more towards the Great Northern Peninsula. So we are not talking about one Labrador. We are talking about four, five, six Labradors, different people, different feelings, different needs, different expectations. It is not a very simple thing to mold a policy in such a way as to please all the people in Labrador.

I must say one thing that I was very pleased with is that we were able to come to an agreement that I hope is satisfactory

MR. ROUSSEAU:

to the natives of Labrador in respect to hunting. And that is something that these people have wanted. They want to go back to their traditional way of life. I hope that they meet with success in it and it is nice to see that the other people in this Province have said, "If they get it, why can we not have it?" And that people have recognized that these people have a special need in this area, they have a special desire, special expectations, and that is the way they want to live and who we are to say, "No, you are going to live our way and we are going to do this for you and that for you." I think the consultation process and sitting down and arguing, because both sides never sit down at a table and agree on the objectives and priorities they need, and hope to come to some compromise that government can live with it, that the people who are affected can live with it, is one I think that is very important.

I think a very important item also is the processing within Labrador of the raw materials that are produced in Labrador. I think this is an issue that has to be faced squarely, that nobody in Labrador is saying, "We want it and the Island part of the Province does not get any of it." That is not, I do not think, the feeling of people in Labrador. But the feeling is that it is their resource. And the people who have gone to Labrador, you know, are a funny breed, at least the people who went very early in the days in Eastern Labrador and the people who were there forever, I guess, as far as history is concerned, and the people in Western Labrador who were later comers than the people who lived on the Coast of Labrador and the people who went up in the Island part of the Province to fish in the early days, feel that it is their Labrador.

Now I cannot stand up, having resided in Labrador since 1962, and say with the same force of conviction that it is my Labrador as much as the person who has been there for

MR. ROUSSEAU: hundreds of years, but I like to feel myself that I feel as much a part of Labrador as they do. You bow to their seniority. You bow to their great sense of adventure. But when these people went up they went through Hell on earth, And do you know sometimes when we stop and think about 1927 and that great decision in which Labrador became part of this Province, that if it was not for the people from the Island part of the Province who went up and faced the situation, and those people who lived in Labrador, and who developed it, however primitively in that time, that is this great land of which we are all proud, I think the Island people are proud of Labrador being a part of the Province. You should never say the Island owns Labrador, of course I think we have that one out of the way. But being a part of the Province they are as proud of Labrador as I hope that the people of Labrador will some day become proud of being part of this Province.

I heard something, by the way: my reading, and I only have one reading, and I am sure the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) and the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) and the other hon. members who stand will have an opinion, I do not know whether it concurs with mine or not, but I do not think Labrador will ever go with Quebec. And that is a personal feeling I have, and it is not from my read-back, and I do not think that is one of the alternatives that the people of Labrador would accept. What may happen in the future I do not know but I do not think that joining with Quebec is one of the alternatives that the people of Labrador generally would accept. But I think it is very important to ensure that Labrador remain a part of this Province and the way to do it is to make Labrador feel that they are part of the Province and one of it is to let them feel some of the benefits of the resources we have in Labrador. Do not forget, by the way, a lot of people forget that one of the greatest resources of Labrador are its people. I am sure many of us

MR. ROUSSEAU: in this House of Assembly, and many people on the Island part of the Province, have visited, for example, the Coast of Labrador. These are hardy people, one of our greatest resources. And if they were not like they were, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we would have any settlement in Labrador. People like the hon. member for Naskaupi's forefathers, people who went in and tilled the land, the land that God was supposed to have given to Cain. It is a barren and bleak land in the Wintertime but a beautiful land. It is a beautiful land in the Summertime, and these people worked hard to develop what we have up there now and they feel that they should get part of it. This is why I was so pleased, as the people I hope in Labrador East and indeed the people of this Province were, with building of the transmission line from the Churchill Falls to the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area. That was something

MR. ROUSSEAU:

that was long overdue in coming. This is the sort of thing that alienates the people in Labrador, that they do not share in their own resources. I think it is explicit and a part of government policy, whatever government it may be, because whatever happens there is going to be a long term development. There can be a lot of things done in the meantime. The raw materials from Labrador will have to be utilized first in Labrador, and I do not say 'Labrador first' trying to suggest that we break up this Province. Labrador is part of this Province. Newfoundland is a part of this Province. But they have been in their opinions maligned and short-changed so often the time has come now when they need to run to catch up, and to run means that they share in the benefits associated with any development in Labrador including the construction of any hydro-electric projects in Labrador, any mining or anything of that resource based nature.

But still the people in Labrador still want the land to hunt on and the land to fish on and somehow we have to rationalize the development from a resource point of view in Labrador with the style of life that the people in Labrador are used to. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the hon. members of this House that the people in Western Labrador, who are not often looked upon as the hunters and the fishermen that the people in the other parts of Labrador have been, they I guess look at it more from a point of living than we do from a point of enjoyment, but they are as hardy and as anxious hunters and fishermen as the people anywhere in this Province and anywhere in other parts of this country and continent. They want to see that maintained. They do not want to see the rivers contaminated with the materials of the mining towns. They do not want to see their open areas contaminated across Labrador. They want to ensure that, as I say, vast tracts of land are kept for that type of life, for the enjoyment of the social, psychological benefits of life as well as for the development of the natural resources in Labrador.

MR. ROUSSEAU:

Of course the question of Port Labrador and the question of, I guess, a circle emanating from the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area is one that is acceptable, and I have to say acceptable because, you know, I would like to think that Western Labrador can provide that, but unfortunately it is not in the geographic position to do so. As I understand it, a few years ago that they were looking at the construction of icebreakers that could pretty well keep those ports in the Arctic open for twelve months of the year, that the development of oil and gas, the development of hydro-electric power, the continuation of the fishery in the Labrador and other aspects of our resource development would make it a pivotal area in Eastern Canada and would secure for it the hope that the federal government might see fit that one of these twelve month icebreakers might be able to keep a port open and to make it an all-weather, all-year port. I think which would greatly enhance the chances of development of Labrador.

The Western part of Labrador, the railway is there. The Eastern part of Labrador has pretty well nothing for six to eight months of the year, depending on the season. It might be, I think, generally around the middle of June until the first of November, somewhere in that area. It could be the first of July in a given year. People can never count on it and it is a very difficult thing from a financial point of view for people to have to do so much in such a short of period of time and to have to provide for the wares of the long and torturous Winter from November until April or May, to do it all in that very short period of time.

I think that is one of the greatest problems that we have in Labrador, and I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that we do share some problems in Western Labrador as they share in Central Labrador as they share in Eastern Labrador and as they share on the Coast. Not in the same way maybe, Mr. Speaker, but the same basic problems. And one of the most important is transportation. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that every time an airline wants to get a few more dollars they put the shaft to the people of Labrador.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is a very difficult thing to live with, Mr. Speaker, because I have said in this House of Assembly on a number of occasions that people should not just look at dollar values. You have to remember, as I indicated a few minutes ago, that people like to come home during their vacation from western Labrador. In order to come home it takes a family of three people and a husband and wife perhaps up to \$1,000 just to get home. Now, Mr. Speaker, to look at that as \$1,000 is incorrect and erroneous.

AN HON. MEMBER: I suppose it is cheaper to come from Toronto.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is cheaper to go from St. John's to Montreal than it is to go from St. John's to Labrador City/Wabush and through Goose Bay/Happy Valley.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point you have to remember is that these people have gone up, on their own, by the way they wanted to do it, nobody pushed them, and they made a life for themselves when it was not as easy on the Island part of the Province to get a job, they went up and did their work in developing Labrador for this Province. They had to have at least take-home pay of \$1,500, maybe up to \$2,000 of take-home pay to net the money to get them back to the Island part of the Province in the summertime. And look, Newfs are Newfs! In the area that I live in, I speak to you now of, Mr. Speaker, the western part of Labrador, a lot of people still feel they want to come home for the holidays. They want to come home and visit their aunts and uncles, their mothers and fathers, their brothers and sisters, their nieces and nephews -

AN HON. MEMBER: And get some cod.

MR. ROUSSEAU: - and get some cod. I think EPA could make a good profit on shipping the cod back and forth. But it appears that, bango! the fares go. We have the airport tax; we do not have an airport. We have to pay these astronomical amounts to get back and forth. It is unbelievable.



MR. ROUSSEAU: The other day I was up and I had a very good meeting, I would like to think it was, with the people in Sheafferville who are Newfs. They feel like they live in a foreign country. They feel an alienation towards the Island part of the Province. Luckily, through the media, their problems have come to light, and I went up and met with them. The people up there, by the way, tell me a very funny thing. They say, "We have no quarrel with the people here from Quebec". They live very well side by side. But what they want is a little more of Newfoundland in their area, and we hope to be able to do that for them, to make life a little more Newfoundlandese. We have already instituted a few things, and I am sure my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, could give you some indication of the iron ore deposits up there that belong to this Province which ensure scores of years of production in the iron -

AN HON. MEMBER: Give it eighty.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, give it eighty years.

These people feel a need to travel back and forth within their own Province and the costs are, as I say, astronomical. Now, we are told, they are going to increase them again. And, Mr. Speaker, in five years I think one of the biggest files, the second biggest file - the biggest file is on the pensions for the Goose Bay people, that was a pretty big file - is wiring or writing on behalf of Government in many instances to the CTC or the Minister of Transport and just getting no response to the individual problems that the people in specific areas of this country have. The only link with the outside world that the people of Labrador have, and I am speaking specifically now about this Province, is their transportation system.

The other day picket lines went up in Seven Islands and the picket lines went around the Quebec North Shore Railway, and the stores in the Labrador City/Wabush area had to get a Hercules to bring food in for the people in Labrador West.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did they (Inaudible)

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, they did not.

MR. STRACHAN: I had it in my desk.

AN HON. MEMBER: The people, I mean.

MR. STRACHAN: The speaker, I had it in my desk but there was a slice of bread because I thought I might be off my feed. But this indicates some of the costs. We pay sixty-four cents for a loaf of bread in Goose Bay. It costs us ninety-two cents to fly it from Goose Bay to Nain. That costs six cents to get from Goose Bay to Nain. More than the cost of the bread.

MR. ROUSSEAU: One slice or a whole loaf?

MR. STRACHAN: One slice only costs us six cents to fly. It costs us one and one-half times whatever produce we buy to fly 200 miles.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I only have a few more minutes.

The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that the people of Labrador are not saying, "Look, we should have special status in respect to transportation". But, because and until the transportation system is such that the sole dependency really is on airlines, then every time a rate increase occurs in any part of this country, Mr. Speaker, if that would make

MR. ROUSSEAU: people across this country feel any better but specifically in Labrador that we get the brunt of it. I think that our regional airline here, if it were not for Labrador I do not think that would have gotten off the ground as well as it did because it has gone back and forth from Labrador since the late 1950's or early 1960's with its loadage almost - well, not one hundred per cent on average but I will tell you it is as close, Sir, to one hundred per cent as anything across this country and we feel that now some of the benefits should accrue to us because of it. It is a very difficult situation. It is one that demands government's attention on providing an alternate means of transportation. That has to be done before any development in Labrador occurs and not the railway as it now exists, a railway down there, the Quebec North Shore and Labrador railway which the people of Goose Bay-Happy Valley can get to if they want to drive for a day or so over a road that is not conducive to that sort of thing and the people of Labrador City-Wabush want to take ten hours to go to Seven Islands on it if they are not of sane mentality. That is not a railway for people or for produce it is a railway for iron ore.

We need a transportation system and that is the system that is of course the most essential to all of Labrador now. The communications system is getting better. In the last few years we now have some live television. We feel, I think, that it would not be unusual to ask for an alternative to the Peter Gzowski Show. I mean you know the people of Labrador I think if they have a fixation on their mind it would have to be Ninety Minutes Live. I afraid to say it but I have from a usually reliable source, as the member from LaPoile would say, Mr. Gzowski will not be with us next year. I hope he is not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Because the people, you know, you picture a man, and I can speak for my own part in Western Labrador, who gets off a four to twelve shift and looks forward to a late movie and have to watch Peter on there with that bunch of madcaps he has on from time to time. It is not the sort

MR. ROUSSEAU: of thing that you look forward to on a long cold winter evening after eight hours in the Iron Ore Company of Canada or Wabush Mines sniffing dust sitting down. And looking at this? It is something that I think is very bad for the morale of people. I would hope that from what I hear is true that this will be his last year and we will be very happy and as a matter of fact the people in Labrador West, and the rest of Labrador I would assume, would be more than pleased to give him a resounding going away party and a great recommendation for whatever else he may choose as long as it is not that hour of the night on television that we have to receive.

MR. DOODY: I heard he is going to the Senate.

MR. ROUSSEAU: He is probably going to the Senate, I do not know. As long as he gets out of that and gets away from the people of Labrador I think they will all be happy.

But anyway it is a very difficult thing but I think it is fair to say that the communications system have improved but the essential ingredient for any development in Labrador be it near-term, intermediate term or long-term has to be the transportation system itself in conjunction with the other resource base and socially minded development of Labrador. And I think that a big move here, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, has to be the connection of the Labrador City-Wabush area to the Esker route that is not at all passable now. Of course there is no road there at all and of course the upgrading of the road from Esker to the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area which will allow the people across Labrador to be in as close a contact with the other part of their province as is possible and hopefully at a future date that the population would warrant it and the cost would be such that the road then could swing South and hopefully hit the Great Northern Peninsula and we would be able to drive from the pocket in Western Labrador to any part on the Island part of the province.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are a few thoughts of mine on the development of Labrador. I must say that I always feel that when you

MR. ROUSSEAU: speak in the House or anybody speaks in the House on Labrador that the reception from all hon. members on both sides of the House has been one of extreme courtesy and attentiveness. I think that is something that has happened here since I have been here in five years and in speaking about Labrador I think it is nice to know that all members of this House of Assembly and I think indeed all

MR. ROUSSEAU: people on the Island part of the Province would like to see the people in Labrador feel a closer part to the Province. I think with the development of Labrador and the concern the government has to show for it that this will come over time, and in so saying that, Mr. Speaker, the government does support the resolution contingent on the points I raised at the opening. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to be here in this hon. House and to see so many friends on both sides, and also, Your Honour, to see yourself there in the Chair.

The resolution which we are debating, Mr. Speaker, is not a motherhood resolution; it is a specific type of resolution which suggests a certain specific type of development for one of the great undeveloped parts of this nation. It says that we develop in a certain direction rather than in other directions. And I wish to address my remarks to that, that we are proposing here a type of development which has to be appreciated - it is not a development which everybody perhaps would subscribe to - and I would like everyone to be quite clear as to what the resolution calls for.

There are in the district of St. John's West, which I have the honour to represent, 1,000 people unemployed - young men, young women, many of whom are very highly trained. There are another 1,000 people unemployed in the district of Bellevue, which I almost came to represent, but which my hon. colleague now represents. There are another 1,000 people or so in the district of Harbour Grace unemployed, which I also at one time represented. And there are many people unemployed in the Goose Bay area of Labrador and in other parts of Labrador and other parts of this Province. We have a great many unemployed people in this Province, many of whom have exceptional talents. It is hard to understand why we have so many unemployed people, Mr. Speaker, when we are a province of such immense resources. And one of the areas

DR. KITCHEN: which has the greatest resource is that of Labrador. We could speak of hydro. And it has been estimated by an engineering friend of mine that the hydro of the Upper Churchill alone provides jobs in other parts of Canada - he estimated as many as 450,000 jobs are underpinned by the electricity from the Upper Churchill.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy yesterday, I believe it was he, who said 40 per cent of Quebec gets its hydro electricity from the Upper Churchill - 40 per cent, population of around seven million, 2.8 million people are supported hydro-electrically, domestically and industrially, by the power that comes from this great resource. And that is only part of the hydro resource; there is more undeveloped hydro, as much as can supply perhaps a million jobs, according to my engineering friend, many more than a million jobs according to the Minister of Mines and Energy if his calculations are correct. This is just hydro.

We export raw - virtually raw - from Western Labrador close to thirty million tons of iron ore every year. We do have some jobs from that iron ore, but not nearly as many jobs as that iron provides in other parts of North America, in Ontario and in some of the Northern cities of the United States. There are other minerals too which are used or can be used to provide jobs - copper, uranium and so on; forests that are not utilized very much at the moment, hardly at all, the fishery,

DR. KITCHEN: virtually the whole of the resource of which is brought away from other areas.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the last great frontiers of Canada, probably the greatest of the undeveloped frontiers of Canada. And I see in this the opportunity of providing work for our people who are presently unemployed throughout the Province and for many, many more Canadians as well. But the development must take place properly. There need be no more jobs there now than there are at present unless our strategy changes. This is why this resolution is so important. It calls for an integrated strategy for the use of the hydro electricity to work the iron ore so that we do not export a raw material for jobs somewhere else but we export a finished product, or close to a finished product, the other industries that can spring up around the metallurgical industry and the other industries that can spring up. This is what we are talking about, the great industrial development. We may or may not be talking about Pittsburg, Chicargoes. We are talking about whatever is appropriate, certainly much more than is going on at the moment.

I wish to draw the attention though of the hon. House to some things because we must have the appropriate concept for developing Labrador, the appropriate plan, the appropriate development strategy and I fear that many people have a different development strategy. There are many false doctrines and false theories and false concepts and false plans about the development of resources in all parts of this Province, particularly with respect to Labrador's development.

We talked about colonialism, where this is looked upon as a colony of Upper Canada, where hydro can be brought out the Province, taken and used to develop another part of this nation



DR. MITCHEM: or other nations, where iron ore can be brought to underpin Hamilton and other parts of Canada. I think this is an improper concept. It may be appropriate for Canada as my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition has stated, but it is not appropriate for the development of this Province, providing jobs for our people and for the development of our resources here.

I think we have to avoid the export in raw form of any of these resources if we can possibly avoid it, and that is why the resolution calls for short-term, non-renewable, recallable contracts on hydro electricity.

It is pretty hard to export hydro electricity on a short-term basis. What do you do when Nova Scotia starts to depend on the hydro electricity and we decide we are going to need it? Are we going to cut them off and leave them in darkness? It is hard to do that. It is hard to cut off Quebec, too. It is hard to pull that switch because fellow Canadians, fellow human beings are going to be left without jobs and in darkness. We have to be careful how we are putting forth these contracts to export raw materials, even on a short term basis.

So I think that that colonial theory, whether it be wood into the Island or fish to Europe for processing, or hydro and iron ore and other minerals into other parts of Canada and the United States, that that concept is an incorrect one. It is a wrong one. It will provide very little for people living in this Province.

Another incorrect theory, I believe, is the theory that we sell the hydro and live off the interest. We become sort of like the Arabs. There are no jobs in that, no jobs in that; we become like the Spaniards in the 1600's, the rich without jobs, and all that has to happen is that the cost of living goes up and the price of what we have goes down and we are left without any industrial base at all, without any base on which to base our prosperity.

March 15, 1970

Tape No. 223

Q1 - 3

MR. KITCHEN: No, Mr. Speaker, what we have to do is not any mercantilist theory of developing Labrador and living off our

DR. KITCHEN:

interest but using the hydro, using the iron ore, using the oil and gas, using it all as much as is humanly possible to develop jobs and to develop a strong economy for this Province and therein, plus the development of the fishery, lies the economic future for this whole Province. When we can make this Province not a have-not Province but a have Province, perhaps the greatest Province in the whole of Canada, perhaps the greatest Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

From what I can gather

about the present Gull Island project, the proposal, if it is the Roosevelt proposal that we just export 1800 megawatts South via Quebec to the United States Border, I believe that this is an improper concept. It is improper, it will not provide anything beyond a few construction jobs and a few dollars afterwards by way of being paid for the electricity. It will not provide the works and the jobs in this Province that our people need, and even worse it will prevent development because we cannot export electricity and have the electricity as well. We cannot have our cake and eat it too, we cannot export our power and have it too, we cannot provide jobs in the United States and jobs in Newfoundland and Labrador.

We have to be especially careful of the Lower Churchill power development, as I understand, because this is the real - of all the power sites presently left undeveloped this is the chief one, this is the one that is most economical and quite larger. It is much cheaper than many of the other sites in Labrador, so we have to be especially careful with this Lower Churchill. If we goof on this one there will be very little future in Labrador and very little future

DR. KITCHEN: anywhere else in the Province.

I was dismayed yesterday when the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy in response to some question here said, "What are we going to do with the Upper Churchill power should it be recalled?" "What are we going to do with it?" he said. And properly so for him to say it because we do have, I understand, at the present time the right to recall 300 megawatts of power and we do not know what to do with that. The only concept that I have heard put forth is that we bring 800 megawatts down to - I was going to say Churchill Square - Soldiers Pond and then sort of pipe it around the Avalon Peninsula to get a few more shopping malls going. There has to be a better concept. There has to be a better concept than just using electricity in these ways. The only projections, the only thinking that I have come up against with respect to what we are going to use this power for is that we are going to be increasing the load growth, the energy load growth by 5 or 10 per cent per year and this was referred to in ministerial statements made last year by the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy and by previous ministers and the Premier, 5 or 10 per cent per year our need for energy goes up and therefore we have to have more energy.

But that is not the concept that is going to develop Labrador power or Labrador anything else, it is a passive concept, a very passive concept. In 1973 there was a brief submitted by Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation to the Committee on Energy of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and that company was scratching its head here and suggesting certain uses for the hydro power in Labrador. They did not scratch very hard but they did come up with

DR. KITCHEN: a few suggestions. They suggested, for example, that if a copper mine were developed in Central Labrador that might require five megawatts of power. Five megawatts and we have 15,000 perhaps. An iron ore mine at Julienne Lake might require sixty megawatts, an electric copper smelter and refinery at Goose Bay might require thrity-five

DR. KITCHEN:

megawatts. An aluminum smelter at Goose Bay, 250 megawatts. They even proposed the electrification of the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway and that would use up 100 megawatts. Then they speculated about a steel plant at Labrador City but they were not able to put up a figure. The total being about 450 megawatts. Now that was in 1973. I was very surprised to hear yesterday that there were no plans for any more except to export a bit to the Island to take care of normal load growth in the houses and things like that.

At a recent hearing of the Board of Commissioners of the Public Utilities where Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro were proposing a rate increase, I asked the Director of Planning, the Vice-president in charge of planning what plans Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro were able to come up with for the use of hydro. He says, "Well, even though we have \$1.3 million per year which we spend on planning, we do not get into that sort of thing." They do not plan. They have no notion of what they use the hydro electricity for. Now, Mr. Speaker, six years - was it six years or seven, a long time anyway, since 1971 when I sat here in the House and then we did not get in again - but in that seven year period no plans for the development of industry or the development or the use of that hydro electricity, no concrete plans, nothing. They do not know what to do with it. Well if we do not know what to do with it, by what right do we have to bar Quebec from getting it? We must have plans for the use of that hydro-electricity. And I believe that we have to have government planning to develop and to think through what we are going to use it for.

I believe - let me give some off the cuff suggestions - that that steel plant which I understand the Government of Quebec is proposing for Seven Islands could probably just as well be located in Labrador to provide jobs for us and related plants and all the light industry and the semi-heavy industry that springs up around

DR. KITCHEN:

that type of plant, that would consume quite a number of megawatts of electricity. There should be planning going on about that, proposals and advanced thinking.

If there is a mill in Goose Bay, suppose there is to be some sort of forest processing at Goose Bay - it makes sense that there be forest processing at Goose Bay, particularly when we get that port on the Coast with a railway going from the port into Goose Bay and on to Labrador West. It makes sense for some plans to be there about wood processing. There was nothing in the 1973 report from CFLCo about that. But that will use certain electricity too and quite a bit of it perhaps if other industries develop in the Goose Bay area. Then there is the - if a railway goes to Port Labrador, why can we not make that one an electric railroad rather than just the railroad to Seven Islands as a proposal?

Now these are not very good thoughts on my part. They have not been properly developed. They should be developed. They should be developed by people who are hired by this government, put in planning positions and said, "Get at it." And our great University should be having a section up there that is researching, developing plans, thinking about it, putting in people who are skilled in the engineering field so that they can come up with plans. For what in the world we are going to do with this electricity that our whole future depends on in this Province? We cannot get by with passive planning and letting other people take over. We must have research. We must have thought. We must have exploration. We must have studies. We must have

DR. KITCHEN: . prototype projects and experimentation and this should have going on for many years; it should have going on before 1971 and it should have going on since 1971. I was very surprised to hear yesterday that there are no plans, no plans for 15,000 megawatts of electricity which is-what? Let us see-it is about ten times the power of Niagara Falls. Interesting.

Another interesting thought, if we adopt, if we adopt this policy of an intergrated development of these resources where one resource, the energy resource, is used with the other resources to provide jobs, if we go that route then it is not just enough to have a concept and a few plans. We must have the will to crack the whip and I submit that one of the whips we are going to have to crack is one on the Iron Ore Company of Canada, I do not want to single them out but I was very annoyed the other day when I wrote and asked them for a copy of their annual report when they declined to produce one on the grounds that they were a private company. Private? A member of the legislature in the Province of Newfoundland cannot get financial information from Iron Ore Company of Canada, which to a very large extent is not doing the job in Labrador that it should be doing as far as intergrated processing of minerals there! I believe that, that information should be made available by all companies in the Province.

I am afraid of a company whose president is a Quebecer, and the record of such a company of setting up Seven Islands as a great area. Its track record is not particularly good in this Province as far as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are concerned and I believe, regardless of what the track is like, that we have to exercise in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, we have to exercise some



DR. KITCHEN: direction over how these companies operate. They are operating in our Province and we should have control over what they do; not the day to day control, but they must conform to our plan for the economic development of this Province, and the same thing is true of other companies that operate. We may have to call some hard shots, too, if we are going to conform to a plan that will bring about some sort of economic salvation for this Province, and apart from fisheries development this is the only major area of hope that I see and a tremendous area of hope it is too, then we may have to make hard decisions within Labrador as well, hard decisions; which road will be more important, what is the next most important thing, is it to build a road to Churchill Falls or is it to get on with that port and the road to the port? There may some things that are much more important for the future than other things. We may have to call certain shots in conjunction with the people as the resolution says. What I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that this concept of the intergrated resource development of Labrador is not a motherhood resolution. We cannot just say we are for it without being committed to implement it, to implement it, and this means that we are going to make certain stands and we are going to have to do certain things.

A question which I would like to address myself to a little bit is where is the money coming from? And here there has been, I think, a false doctrine abroad in this Province for many years, a false doctrine of take or pay contracts. I believe that this Province and its industrial development has been far too long in the hands of the bond holders of the United States. This was the concept that a former minister of Mines and Energy had and I see - I have here somewhere a fifty page statement that was made in this hon. House some years ago, fifty pages of a statement,

March 15, 1978

Tape 226

DW - 3

DR. KITCHEN: and the concept that came through there was that before we did any development we had to sell the bonds; the only way to sell the bonds was to have contracts all lined up in advance. Sometimes I think that any mistake that was made on the Upper Churchill was probably that mistake, to put too much reliance on private companies, who operate in their own interest, and they operate by putting up bonds and they must have take or pay contracts in order to meet the bond interest.

The government's financial advisors were, and I believe still

DR. KITCHEN: are, a firm by the name of Morgan and Stanley. I had the opportunity of questioning the other day the person from Morgan and Stanley who was advising on this development. And I tell you, I was not impressed.

The take or pay concept of paying is fine for a private company, it is fine for a public utility, but it is not necessarily the only recourse that a government has, because a government has other resources. It has been mentioned that the federal government may very well participate in the Lower Churchill development. Now that is a resource that a private company does not have, and it would avoid to some extent the need for take or pay contracts before starting. I submit that we have an ace in the hole, we have the Upper Churchill. And I believe there are two mechanisms there by which we can use revenue from the Upper Churchill, get revenue from the Upper Churchill to use it to develop Labrador. It has been mentioned that a resource tax or a similar mechanism might yield considerable sums of money. At 10 mils on 34½ gigawatt hours a yield of \$350 million per annum is possible. At 20 mils, which would be more appropriate these days to bring it up to the current cost of electricity, this would yield \$700 million per annum. I cannot think of any better way to use such money than in the development of the other resources of Labrador to bring about this type of integrated development that we need.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN: So we are not restricted to thinking in terms of the way the bond market thinks, Mr. Speaker. We are not restricted in those terms; we can think as a government beyond that narrow businesslike way of doing it. This is not a business, this is a government and we have more power than a private business in many ways. We have the power to tax, and we can use our tax revenues to build up the Province. We could renegotiate the price. Some people have mentioned, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has mentioned, 'Pull the switch - make them pay more.' Never mind your resource tax, there is another way of



DR. KITCHEN: there may be as many as one billion barrels - Is it one billion barrels? Wait now, I have to check this right. No, thirty-five billion barrels worth of oil and gas out there and if that is so we are talking about a resource that may be worth \$500 million or \$1 million for every man, woman and child in this province.

Now it does not matter very much what the figures are. The point that I am making is that this is an immense resource and our share of that resource can very well be spent in the long run in the developing of Labrador resources generally. So that we can have when the oil is gone, it may very well be gone very quickly after it is found, we will have remaining to us industries that have been properly developed and we can have a heavy, well-prosperous province for many years to come. So we are not restricted to take or pay contracts on electricity. We have other ways of generating funds if we have a government which has the concept first, you have to have the concept, the notion of an integrated development. Not just piecemeal exporting hydro down here today because we are a bit strapped for funds and sending up a bit of iron ore somewhere else and putting a bit of wood somewhere else; that is not integrated development. Integrated development as I see it is the development of processing industries as close to the resources as possible and the export of finished goods to the extent that that is possible and that will provide the jobs that we need and the industry we need to make this province what we want it to be.

The other question, and that the question of payment, has to be looked at in a variety of ways. It is not just the question of lining up electricity contracts. There is also the question of taxes. There is also the question of using other resources. What bothers me at the moment, Mr. Speaker, is that there seems to be no concept, no single concept that the government has in mind, and I would hope that the government would have in mind a concept. I would like to refer for a moment to a letter that I received from the Premier some time ago in response to a letter that I wrote him requesting a copy of the terms

DR. KITCHEN: of reference of the joint committee of Quebec and Newfoundland to study the hydro developments of Labrador and he responded that he was unable to supply me with the terms of reference. I submit that the reason he was unable to supply me with the terms of reference was because there were none. Now how can you negotiate when there are no terms of reference? How can you negotiate? You have to have something in mind before you negotiate. What bothers me, yesterday - not yesterday, over the weekend, was an obviously changed concept. Let me read you from a press release of last year that the hon. Premier made: "Now we have to see Mr. Levesque about this. Quebec is very upset because we have the head waters to the five rivers flowing into the Gulf of St. Lawrence and they would like to develop these hydro sites but of course they cannot without our permission and our permission is certainly not coming forward without renegotiations of the Upper Churchill." Now that was last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: What did he say yesterday?

DR. KITCHEN: That is not what he said yesterday. So I do not know if there is any concept there at all. It seems to be hit or miss - we will do something today; boys, we have to do something tomorrow. No concept of what we are doing, no plan, and that bothers me because we are talking about the greatest hydro resource in the world and we are talking about the greatest undeveloped area of Canada and we should have a plan, a plan that we can all subscribe to. It does not matter who brings forth the plan, whether it is that side of the House, this side of the House, the people of Newfoundland need a plan. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador need a plan for the development. And I submit that this resolution brought in by my colleague, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, is the basis of such a plan.

We have here a call for the integrated development of Labrador resources. This is not a motherhood resolution. It calls for certain things to happen and other things not to happen. It calls for the development of Labrador's hydro resources primarily as a source

March 15, 1978

Tape 228

JM - 3

DR. KITCHEN: of power for the industrial development . The Province particularly Labrador, and for the province's domestic and commercial use, with any

DR. KITCHEN:

surplus power being made available to other Provinces of Canada on a short-term recallable basis only. That is the basic concept.

Before that concept had any meaning, before we can ever get anything like that going, we must have that port. We cannot go ahead without that port. That is why the port is so vital. I would like to get some assurances, perhaps some other member might speak from the other side of the House, that such planning is in process, that such a port - the sites have been looked at, that whatever ice breaking and so on is being looked at, that the survey has been conducted for the railway to go from the port to Goose Bay or that something has been done in that regard. But we cannot do anything unless we have the port because otherwise we have to go down through Seven Islands again and if we go down through Seven Islands we lose control of what is happening, we lose control completely.

We cannot develop it without a port and a railway and a road. And of course section (d) where we must, I did not dwell on that because other people have dwelt on it much more ably than I could, that we cannot proceed with these developments unless most everybody in Newfoundland is for them.

We have checked out this resolution with many community groups in Labrador and have received no dissenting voice. Although there may be some. Certainly the detailed plans would have to be checked out. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.



MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy indeed to have the opportunity this afternoon to begin my few remarks on this resolution that was put on the Order Paper by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and to have a few things to say about a number of the things that are contained in the resolution.

As the former speaker has already mentioned, perhaps the greatest potential left for development in Canada, one of the great potentials left for the development in Canada lies within the boundaries of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. There are other major developments in Northern Canada which might rival this great land mass of 110,000 square miles. There is the possible developments of the Arctic both from a mining point of view. There is now for example a mine on Baffin Island. There are a number of fairly permanent sites on a number of islands in the Arctic Ocean, Elsmere Island and others, that a number of oil companies have established which will see the eventual intensive exploration and production of hydrocarbons, gas and oil, that will either see a major pipe line down from the Arctic through Central Canada, or the development of an LNG system to bring it down the Coast of Labrador which could, in some way if that goes ahead enhance the development of Labrador, and on down into the Maritimes and into the Gulf of St. Lawrence. There is the development further west in the Mackenzie Delta - Beaufort Sea area, once again on oil and gas primarily, which can be a big boost to Canadian development for jobs, a major energy project which is about to get started from the point of view of a pipe-line to bring Alaska gas down to Western Canada and down in the United States. But outside of those two developments that will be based primarily on oil and gas, both in the Arctic Islands and in the Beaufort Sea and Mackenzie Delta, we have in Labrador the potential for not only onshore facilities to help enhance hydrocarbon developments that might occur offshore, but we also have the possibility of major developments of uranium, of other base metal operations in

MR. PECKFORD: the Central mineral belt of Labrador, uranium being the very promising one now, not only because of the discoveries of uranium that have occurred, brought about by the exploration of Brinex, brought about by the explorations of Shell, but also because uranium is becoming a more valuable commodity today than ever before, and whilst uranium goes up, copper, lead and zinc have been going down. And so that having identified in Labrador uranium rather than the lead and zinc deposit, or a copper deposit, you have fortunately and luckily discovered a ore that is going to be very valuable for energy production.

MR. PECKFORD: in the decades to come and already now. One of the big developments taking place in Australia today has to do with uranium development, one of the big developments planned in Brazil has to do with uranium development, and so on in other parts of the world.

You have in Labrador or around Labrador, attached to Labrador, a potential for major expansion in oil and gas with onshore facilities and all that that is going to mean. You have the possibilities of major development in uranium in Labrador on land. Thirdly, you have the possibility of further expansion based on the iron ore deposits. The present depressed condition of the steel markets in the world is, by most experts, viewed as a very temporary depressed situation; that if there is going to be a world economy that is going to keep on expanding, which it must, over the next ten years, it means necessarily a further expansion of the iron ore developments in the world because western countries, capitalist countries, are linked inextricably to steel and iron ore for any further plant expansion and so that this whole iron ore area of Western Labrador, whilst today in rather a depressed state, has great future not only to maintain present levels but to expand. So we have the oil and gas, we have the uranium, we have the iron ore and we have, as most people put a lot of weight on, hydro-electric power. The amount of hydro-electric power we have will vary with the person you talk to. It is logical to conclude that between now and 1985 you can bring on at around 30 mils, Gull Island 1800 megawatts, Muskrat 600 megawatts, three of the five joint rivers for another 1200 megawatts.

There are some studies going on to identify other rivers which are totally in Labrador which might be developable. All energy will be so expensive by 1990 as to make these competitive. Hence your other rivers, your Pinwares and all the other rivers in Southern Labrador, and even going up into Northern and Central Labrador. But between now and 1985 the most logical progression for development would be Gull first, possibly Romaine diversion, possibly Muskrat to just

MR. PECKFORD: build it on downstream where Muskrat is.

One of the problems with Muskrat, has been the sandy soil there.

As a matter of fact there has to be a lot of engineering work done on the Muskrat site to see whether in fact you can, without spending a whole lot of additional money, build structures there that will remain and will not sink down in the sand. It is a very major engineering problem. So you have all of the ingredients, as everybody has pointed out, as this resolution points out, for a developmental plan, as the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) mentions, that could see a lot of new dollars being created and a lot of jobs being created to give Newfoundlanders the kind of push that is needed to give the Government the flexibility it needs fiscally to get on with the Social Service end of Government. But, in order to get that flexibility we need either a new arrangement with Ottawa or fiscal arrangements and/or massive expansion of our economic base to create the new dollars, and I mean massive, really massive. If anybody looks at what is needed in order to change the whole thing around in this Province, considering the equalization payments that come from Ottawa, you are looking at hundreds of millions of dollars and, hence, any plan of development. And that is the great bugaboo, and that is the great dilemma, and that is the great enigma in talking about proper and rational development of Labrador because I do not think there is a Newfoundlander born who has been exposed to the land mass of visiting there who does not

MR. PECKFORD:

Labrador either through books or by visiting there that does not agree with the basic tenet that all of these resources surely can be developed to provide jobs to Newfoundlanders, to provide re-processing facilities in Labrador for Newfoundlanders so that we will get the additional revenue that is needed in this Province to give us the kind of flexibility we need to both simultaneously have an economic activity ongoing which gives the jobs and at the same time gives us the revenue to keep expanding socially in education and health and social services and municipal affairs and highways and all the other ways that it has to be done.

Okay. So, Mr. Speaker, we have all of these identifiable resources now. Two years ago or three years ago now we did start a fairly comprehensive terms of reference and plan for a Port Labrador. That started two or three years ago. There has been a fair amount of work done in government on the whole concept of a Port Labrador and to identify where in fact is the best location for this so-called Port Labrador which would be the nucleus around which the other resource developments could—this would be the sort of terminus or the center of it. This started a couple of years ago.

In line with that, at the same time, there were a number of studies undertaken by NORDCO and C-CORE on the ice conditions. There was a fair amount of information gathered through the University, through government departments, through the federal government and through private industry on the new technology for water transportation.

Now, before I move on I shall have to, Mr. Speaker, I think, move the adjournment of this debate.

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

It now being six o'clock the House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 P.M.