

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22, 1978

The House met at 3:30 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Hon. members I am sure would like me to mention some visitors in the public galleries: Boyd Noel, Mayor of St. Anthony, accompanied by Councillor Les Patey and Wes Boyles, Town Manager, are in the galleries. Also from St. Regis, Fox Harbour, Placentia Bay, fifty-two students in grade VII and VIII accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Mary King, Mr. Terry Tobin and Mr. Des Linehan are with us today. On behalf of all hon. members I give them a most sincere greeting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Speaker, today we learn the sad news of the passing of a former member of this legislature in the person of Colonel Jos O'Driscoll who died this morning at the DVA Pavillion in St. John's after what I understand has been a very lengthy illness. Colonel O'Driscoll has been an outstanding Newfoundland citizen, a great patriot, served in both World Wars, highly decorated for service to his King and country and subsequently served the people of this Province as a representative for Bell Island. I believe he was the immediate predecessor of the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) as a representative for that district.

In any event he did represent Bell Island and Colonel O'Driscoll was a man who earned a lot of friends and deserved most assuredly the respect of all Newfoundlanders. His contribution to this House is known to those who were fortunate enough to sit with him during that period and I know that hon. gentlemen will wish to join with me in extending to the family of the late Colonel J.P. O'Driscoll our sincerest sympathy and

MR. HICKMAN: condolences in their very sad loss and a very sad loss indeed as well to the people of Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like on behalf of the Opposition of the House to join with the government side in expressing deepest sympathy to the family of the late Colonel Jos O'Driscoll. Personally I knew Colonel O'Driscoll very well, I think he was first elected to this legislature in 1956 as the member for Bell Island, the member of the House of Assembly for Bell Island. I might add, Sir, that in that campaign I did a little work for Colonel O'Driscoll. He had also served before going overseas in the second World War as Commanding Officer in charge of the Newfoundland Militia that was stationed on Bell Island during the second World War.

As the Government House Leader indicated, Colonel O'Driscoll was an outstanding Newfoundlander, had an excellent war record serving in two World Wars and then serving his country later as a member of the House of Assembly. He always had the interest of Newfoundland at heart and so, Sir, we join today with the other members on the opposite side of the House in extending our deepest sympathy and condolences to the family of the late Colonel Jos O'Driscoll.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Further Statements by Ministers.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement on the progress being made on the consolidation and the revision of the statutes. The Statutes and Subordinate Legislation Act passed by the House of Assembly last session established the office of the Legislative Counsel. Under Section 21 of that act, one of the duties of the office is to prepare a revision and consolidation of the public general laws of the Province under the supervision of the Minister of Justice. Under Section 6 of that act,

MR. HICKMAN:

I may notify the House of Assembly of the progress being made on this task. Section six also provides for the appointment of a special committee on law revision -

MR. NEARY:

Take it as read, will you?

MR. HICKMAN:

This is most

important.

MR. NEARY:

There goes the Oscar winner again.

MR. HICKMAN:

-of the House of Assembly to review the work of the office on the consolidation and revision of the statutes. At the conclusion of my statement today I will move, with the concurrence of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, the appointment of such a committee.

Now Mr. Speaker, in the statement there is contained the different things that the Legislative Counsel must do in performing the job, which I will table so it can be contained in minutes and seen by all hon. members, and I will then continue. These powers contemplate a revision of the statutes rather than a mere consolidation, and the difference is very important. In revision, the revisors re-write provisions in accordance with the authority given to do so. In a consolidation, repealed provisions are replaced and new provisions are inserted and little else is done. This has been the practice in the past in this Province. In other provinces and in Canada, more extensive re-writing of the statutes has been undertaken upon general revisions than in Newfoundland. But to undertake a re-writing requires the participation and the understanding of the purpose of revision by the legislators.

PREMIER MOORES:

It is absolutely necessary.

MR. HICKMAN:

This is why it is very important.

I am being harassed, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, Oh!

MR. HICKMAN: - and I seek the protection of the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. HICKMAN: This is why it is very important that members of the House of Assembly supervise this task on this and future occasions. In using the authority to revise the statutes, the office of the Legislative Counsel must bear in mind that it does not have the power to change the law; rather its duty is to arrange the statutes and modify the arrangement in language of the existing law in order that it may be more accessible to the public and to the legal profession and more clearly expresses the intent of the legislation.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: Much criticism has been directed at the style and language of statute law in general. The revision and consolidation of our statutes should reflect continued improvement in the arrangement, style, and language of the Newfoundland Statutes in order to make this criticism less applicable to our statutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: This will be of interest to hon. gentlemen. Significant progress has been made to date in the task of revising and consolidating the statutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: A working consolidation has been completed of all our public general statutes and is being kept up to date. The office of the Legislative Counsel has prepared a number of draft revisions for the consideration of the Special Committee and has formalized its approach to the task of revising the statutes. Specialized information processing equipment has been ordered to expedite the revision

MR. HICKMAN: and will be placed in the office in May. This equipment will allow for quick revision of work as it is being prepared.

MR. NEARY: Will we have autographed copies?

MR. HICKMAN: It will also be used in the sessional legislative work of the office and in the registry of regulations also under the authority of the office. This equipment can also be readily made compatible with computerized systems for the storage of legal information presently being utilized by a number of governments in Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: In conjunction with the revision and consolidation, the office has prepared and revised the Table of Public Statutes and the Table of Local, Personal and Private Acts. The crossreference to other acts has been identified and included in the consolidation files of the revision. Work is presently being done on a proposed new Interpretation Act to come into force with the new revision

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: This will help simplify the language of our Public Statutes. The aim of the office is to prepare a revision and consolidation for 1980.

PREMIER MOORES: I am glad it is an aim.

MR. HICKMAN: Following that date the revision could be continuously consolidated in a loose leaf form from year to year. The result should be the Public Statutes of Newfoundland that are readily available in an up-to-date form. It is also the hope of the office to provide eventually an up-to-date subject index of the statutes on an annual basis as modelled on the recently completed index of the 1970 statutes.

MR. HICKMAN: This project was carried out by the Canadian Law Information Council as a pilot project.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the following hon. members be appointed as a special committee to be known as the Special Committee on Law Revision to examine and approve the drafts of consolidated and revised statutes. Under Section 6 of the Governing Act, I, as Minister of Justice, am ex officio Chairman of the Committee, I recommend the appointment of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: - the hon. the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: - the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Another law society.

MR. HICKMAN: - and the hon. the member for -

AN HON. MEMBER: LaPoile.

PREMIER MOORES: Kilbride.

MR. HICKMAN: Kilbride (Mr. Wells).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: An unbiased group.

MR. W. N. BOWE: A short comment, Sir, on that earth-shaking statement. What can I say? For the first time in my parliamentary career I am at a loss for words, Mr. Speaker. Let me say this though, Sir, that I am glad that the government has finally made amends for the Budget it brought down last Friday. They have the people back on their side again, Mr. Speaker, as a result of this particular statement. Sir, I hesitate to say anything more for fear that I may arouse the people of Newfoundland and Labrador into a state of excitement over the prospects announced in this statement by the Minister of Finance; therefore, Sir, I see it my clear duty to take my seat forthwith.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) It is moved and seconded as stated. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour 'Aye', contrary 'Nay', carried.

Hon. members would, I am sure, like me to draw their attention to the fact that in our galleries we also have the Mayor of Marystown, Dr. Morrissey, accompanied by two of his councillors, Councillor Tobin and Councillor Farrell, and also by the Town Manager, Mr. Corcoran. Hon. members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the House, I would like to move that the House adopt the following amendments to the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly, said amendments to be enforced provisionally for the remainder of this session of the House. Mr. Speaker, it is lengthy. Hon. gentlemen opposite have it. It sets forth the sittings of the House and unless hon. gentlemen wish me to read it, it could be tabled. For the information of the press it sets forth the times of sittings of the House immediately following the Easter recess, Monday, 2:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M. to 11:00 P.M.; Tuesday, 2:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M. to 11:00 P.M.; Wednesday, 3:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M.; Thursday, 2:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M. to 11:00 P.M. and Friday, 10:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. And then the hours allocated in estimates to the subject matter is included therein. And I move, seconded by the hon. the member for LaPoile, the adoption of the rules.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS) Does the hon. minister have the leave of the House to present the motion? Carried.

The motion entails a change in the Standing Orders so that a standing vote will be required. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour signify by standing in their place.

The hon. Premier, the hon. Minister of Education, the hon. the Minister of Tourism, the hon. the Minister of Health, the hon. the Minister of Social Services, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. the Minister of Justice, the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Young, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Wells, Mr. Goudie, Mr. Windsor, Mr. Cross, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Woodrow, Mr. Power, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mrs. MacIsaac, Mr. Strachan, Mr. Neary, Mr. Simmons, Mr. White, Mr. Lush, Dr. Kitchen, Mr. Flight, Mr. Canning, Captain Winsor, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Rideout, Mr. McNeil, Mr. Jack Winsor.

MR. SPEAKER: Would those against signify by rising in their place.

I declare the motion carried by greater than a two thirds majority.

A further notice of motion.

MR. NEARY: Imagine all of us agreeing on something.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A question, Sir, directed to the hon. the Premier as the Leader of the Government. In view, Sir, of the furor and discontent caused by the announcement in the Budget recently that students will now have to borrow \$700 before qualifying for the provincial government's tuition programme at the university, have the government now decided to do away with the announced \$700 programme and revert back to the programme which was in effect

MR. W.N. ROWE: last year, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that first of all it was with great reluctance that the \$700 limit was put on the students before they borrowed from the Canada Student Loan plan, but however it has to be explained and I think pointed out, and I think quite accurately, that this plan now is the same as all the other Atlantic Provinces and this Province unfortunately, as much as we would like to have, cannot have a programme more generous than our fellow Atlantic Provinces, and we think it is a realistic approach to it. As I say, it is not one that we wanted to do but it is one that we really had no choice but - when we are going to bring things into line we brought this into line as well as other things we have in this particular Budget.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, would not the Premier agree that it is the very reason that this Province is less well off and the people in it less well off than the other Provinces in Atlantic Canada and indeed Canada as a whole that requires substantially more government assistance to people who are trying to obtain the educations and skills represented by a university education? Would the Premier not agree with that statement of philosophy, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, yes, I would partially agree with that. The situation, whether it is vocational school, technical school, whether it is a university education, it is critical that our young people get the full benefit of an education, but as we are educating people to take part in the life of which I think there is going to be tremendous opportunity, and I think most members of this House think there is going to be tremendous opportunity in this Province, the fact that in time they will have to pay back

March 22, 1978

Tape No. 364

NY - 3

PREMIER MOORES: student loans, I suggest, Sir, in the
society we live in, as unfortunate as it is, that the reality
and the responsibility of paying back what one borrows is not
unique to any one class in our society

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

MR. NEARY: In view of the fact - my question is for the Premier - in view of the fact that there is such a violent, vicious protest coming from the students, and in view of the fact that the University itself, the Board of Regents and the head, the President of the University, are complaining and bellyaching about the fact that they did not get enough to carry on their regular programmes at the University, does the Premier not now agree after all of these years of asking him in this hon. House, does the Premier not now agree that it is about time to set up a fact-finding committee to take a look at our post-secondary education system in this Province, to see if we are getting good value for our money, if we are headed in the right direction, and just take a look at the whole post-secondary education system, period, and bring out the facts? Is it not time that we did that? Should we not do it immediately?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier,

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree once again with the hon. member that we do look at our post-secondary education regarding the emphasis that should be on technical and vocational and post-secondary education. Also I am delighted to hear the member defending so vociferously the University and its budget, and demanding that it be increased. The fact is, Sir, that I think whether it is the University or one of the government departments or what have you, I think there has been over the years fat, for the want of a better expression, built into them. I think we have to look at exactly what the quality of education is. I think that whilst what the hon. member suggested, a fact-finding group to analyze what it is is important, and I do think it is important. I also think it is very critical that pressures be put on the organizations that have this fairly substantial budget to also look at themselves, and it has to be by pressure that this happens. And I think the University in this case is a good case in point.

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

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A supplementary, the member for Conception Bay South, followed by further supplementaries.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact - a question for the Premier- in view of the fact that any number of teachers and parents have now met asking and calling for resignation of the Minister of Education, and more are to meet, we understand, has the Premier received such resignation from the present Minister of Education? Has he discussed it with him? Or is he going to take that man out of the Portfolio forthwith?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I mean the gentleman is in the wrong caucus.

AN HON. MEMBER: Psychiatric stuff, is it?

PREMIER MOORES: No, it is crazy.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like for the benefit of the hon. the Premier to say that I am not defending the University's budget. On the contrary -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - they are getting a 4 per cent increase, and with the dwindling enrollment at the University they should be able to give themselves generous increases over there again this year.

MR. W. ROWE: It is the students we are concerned about.

MR. NEARY: It is the students we are concerned about, Mr. Speaker. And there is where the violent protests are coming from, the students, and it is building up and it is going to get progressively worse.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier, if the Premier thinks that is fair for these students to commit themselves, to put themselves in debt, and -

AN HON. MEMBER: In hock.

MR. NEARY: In hock. - then come out of the University with no guarantee of a job. Can the Premier guarantee these students who are forced to borrow \$700 that when they come out of University they will be able to find employment?

MR. W. ROWE: In his 40,000 jobs.

PREMIER MOORES: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think that the University in its programmes, and the borrowing programme for the people to go to university, are very much intertwined. I think the calibre of the education, and the ability to take advantage of that education, and the cost of doing that because obviously both go together, and the hon. member cannot divorce the students from the University programme itself.

As far as the guarantee of employment after anyone graduates from the University, Mr. Speaker, I can no more do that than I can guarantee employment for the hon. member or myself after we leave politics.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): I was going to recognize the hon. member for Terra Nova, unless it is a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier; I would like a brief preamble to this question. I am gravely concerned about the recent separatist talk that has been associated with this Province, and in view of the fact that Ottawa will contribute \$580 million to this Province's expenditures this year, as compared to \$560 million by the Province, and in view of the fact that the Premier of the Province recently stated that he was contemplating setting up a committee to look into the cost of staying into Confederation versus the cost of staying out of Confederation, I wonder if the Premier can tell this House whether this committee has been established and whether there are any findings to report to the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to debate

Premier Moores: the \$580 million and the \$560 million figure, but that is at a different time. And the thing I think that - you know, what we talked about at that time, I think whether we talk about Newfoundland or whether we talk about Quebec or whether we talk about the West in Canada,

PREMIER MOORES: I think there is a lot of independence amongst every region of Canada and I do not think that is a bad thing. And what I said is as a region of Canada rather than having to come under an umbrella policy by Ottawa, irrespective of what field that was being dictated that that umbrella policy happened, but rather that we looked upon Newfoundland as what we were contributing to Canada as a Province that deserved a better deal from Canada. There was no committee to talk about separation in going our own way; it was talking about getting a group of people to identify exactly what it is we are contributing to Canada because a lot of Canadians do not realize that we are supplying forty per cent of the energy to Quebec. A lot of Canadians do not realize that we are supplying the vast amount of the 200 mile limit and the Continental Shelf which today is Canada's. Now what I was saying was that Newfoundland should get in a position where the rest of the people of Canada know exactly what we are contributing and not be looked upon as a people who accept handouts and are the butt of Newfie jokes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: In view of the recent statement by Robert Coates, President of the National PC Party, to the effect that if any province were to leave Confederation he would not be at all surprised to see Newfoundland to be the first to leave, in view of this statement can the Premier tell the House whether or not it is the policy of the PC Party nationally or provincially or together to promote separatist activities in Canada or at the provincial level?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, it is certainly not the policy of this government or this party in Newfoundland to promote separatism, far from it, but it is the policy of this government to make sure that Newfoundland comes first in our own Province and certainly within Canada.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins) One further supplementary and then I will go on to the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. LUSH: In view, Mr. Speaker, of the seriousness of these remarks, has the Premier made any public statement disassociating himself from the remarks made by Mr. Coates?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I could disassociate myself with that remark very easily and I am only too glad to do so, but I would also I suppose in other deals have to disassociate myself with the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Joe Clarke's remark that the offshore oil and gas would be automatically Newfoundland's and I like that part of it. The fact is, Sir, that as far as this Province is concerned we are not advocating separatism and I do not think the PC Party of Canada is. I think what Mr. Coates said when he came here and when he saw what was happening in Newfoundland and went back, was that there was some independent people in Newfoundland and not just people who are supplicants of a party in Ottawa and did what they were told.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins) Order, please! I have indicated the hon. member for LaPoile. The further supplementary to the original questioner can be raised at a later stage.

MR. NEARY: For the Premier, Sir. Could the hon. the Premier tell the House if Mr. Groom, who resigned as President of Newfoundland Hydro yesterday, will receive a pension from the Province, if he will be rewarded with a pension before he departs for his position overseas?

PREMIER MOORES: I have no idea, Mr. Speaker, but I certainly would doubt it. But I will find out, I will gladly pass on the information as soon as I find out.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins) A supplementary by the original questioner.

MR. NEARY: Could the hon. Premier tell us when the House can get the information on whether Mr. Groom is entitled or in actual fact will receive a pension?

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, I can say that literally within two days after we reopen I can give that information, after the Easter break. Mr. Groom will be leaving at the end of June and certainly that information will be made available very quickly.

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. COLLINS: A supplementary by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, on the same subject, can the Premier indicate whether he has yet received a letter of resignation from Mr. Groom? And, Sir, I have another short supplementary when the Premier answers.

PREMIER MOORES: I said yesterday, Sir, no, I took the gentleman at his word.

MR. SIMMONS: So did Grand Falls.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. COLLINS) Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: A lot of people have taken the Premier at his word, Sir, who have lived to regret it.

PREMIER MOORES: It is not my word, it is Mr. Groom's.

MR. W. ROWE: Well, maybe his word is good.

Sir, my further and final supplementary on the subject, Sir, is what steps has the Premier now taken to stop the political interference into the affairs of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro referred to by Mr. Groom today in an interview in which he gave every indication that this was at least one of the major reasons responsible for his resignation as Chief Executive Officer of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro?

PREMIER MOORES: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in that context he ask the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) what happened at the PUB hearings.

MR. W.N. ROWE: That was not political interference.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. W.N. ROWE: No answer.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Premier.

I want to refer him to the very serious situation that was outlined in The Daily News this morning, the very serious situation which has developed in the Bay d'Espoir area. I have already discussed with the Minister of Mines and Energy privately concerning his proposed visit to Bay d'Espoir and he has assured me he will be down there within the next few days. But to the larger question and the one I wanted addressed to the Premier, in view of the situation which has now developed there and which is the result of a number of long standing grievances, part of which go back to the false hopes raised by the report of the Research and Productivity Council, a report commissioned by this government -

MR. DODDY: Both of which go back to electioneering.

MR. SIMMONS: Not the report, the report goes back to the Hermitage by-election, Mr. Speaker. The grievances which were brought on in part by the fairly high-handed fashion in which Hydro is operating in the area, the question I have for the Premier is what steps his government intend to take to rectify those very legitimate grievances and in particular to help create some job opportunities in Bay d'Espoir?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy can answer part of that question better than I can. I would like to answer the preamble that led up to it that in - it was 1965, Sir, that the people of Bay d'Espoir were led down the garden path, as far as the promise of what was going to happen once the hydro development -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Former administration.

PREMIER MOORES: No, one minute - once the hydro development had taken place and equally, Sir, I think it is fair to say that I think that government and I think this government have tried since to bring major industry, and it has to be major industry if you are going to utilize the power development that is there. The alternative obviously is the Rural Development Programme that hopefully can get the people employed in rural development opportunities that are in that particular area. It is not an easy place because the fishery is not close at hand. The forestry is being developed. There are other industries that can be helped but, Sir, no major industry is obviously there. But I would like to point out one other thing that the hon. member mentioned and that is when we talk about the story in The Daily News this morning, as far as Bay d'Espoir is concerned, this is not something that I guess is in direct answer to the question but as the editor of the News is a policy chairman with the Opposition, and that is fine, getting back to the article itself, I found it absolutely irresponsible that The Daily News this morning would have said that there is sabotage being planned, that there are terrorist activities being planned, that individuals draw lots out of a hat, Unless they can prove that sort of allegation, Sir, I say not only is The Daily News being irresponsible, but I am saying they are inciting a position that may not necessarily be conducive, to say the least, to good journalism.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, certainly the points that the Premier has just raised latterly are good points for debate and if I had the -

PREMIER MOORES: - The Daily News.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, well I will get away from The Daily News. I remind the Premier that the President of CBC is not one of our policy chairmen, notwithstanding -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. SIMMONS: -notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, CBC carried the same report with the same kind of detail that the Premier just referred to in its late night news last night and again this morning.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: And the CBC management is not yet our policy chairman although we are working on them. We are working on them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W.N. ROWE: That is what everyone wants to be.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, certainly - when we are all ready. It is a bit of an oversimplification to dig back to 1965. I would like to get into that one, too, but the kind of aggravation, the kind of frustration that is now being manifested in Bay d'Espoir is not something that has been seething for twelve or thirteen years, and the Premier knows the difference. These people cannot be dismissed with some eloquence in this House. The fact of the matter is that they have a good number of very legitimate and recent reasons for their frustrations. And the Premier makes reference to rural development. Well I have been trying for a couple of years to get a Cabinet Minister into the area. We could not get either one in last Fall for the Development Conference on Rural Development. The Premier has dismissed the idea of the fishery and my question really is this, is he at variance now with his Minister of Fisheries who has been giving some encouragement to the development of the fishery in the area, and with the Fisheries College which is now presently sponsoring two instructional programmes in the fishing industry in the Bay d'Espoir area? And I say to him that he may not think the fishery has a future in Bay d'Espoir, but a lot of people in Bay d'Espoir do think so.

MR. W. CARTER: He did not say that.

MR. SIMMONS: We will see the tapes. We will see the tapes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I should point out to the hon. member that there should be little if no preamble, and the question put.

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

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, I am attempting without too much success to get some answers from the Premier on what his real concerns are for Bay d'Espoir, what he intends to do as a government, as the leader for government, to help create some job opportunities in the area. His comments about large industry leaves me cold because this is a government that is against large industry. So what is he going to do in terms of small industry in the area?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would appreciate an answer in response to his earlier question, some of the points mentioned in his supplementary question as it relates to the briefs that the Concerned Citizens Committee of Bay d'Espoir presented to myself and the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Hydro would be glad to do it if that is in order.

As the hon. member knows, and I guess most people in the Province know, the concerned citizens of Bay d'Espoir through a committee presented a fairly lengthy petition carrying about fifteen to seventeen major points that were of concern to them relative to Newfoundland Hydro's presence in the Bay d'Espoir area. After receiving that petition, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro did an analysis of it, I myself personally did an analysis of it, and I have received Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro's reaction to the various points. I have consulted my colleagues in Cabinet about the responses that Newfoundland Hydro see are the ones that should be given to the people of Bay d'Espoir, and I have assessed then government's position as well through my colleagues in Cabinet. Last night at 6:17, at 6:24 and at 6:43 I tried to contact one Mr. Patrick Wilcox, who I understand from this morning at about 8:40 is now the Chairman of the Concerned Citizens Committee. The number that he left me yesterday while the House was in session, while I was up answering a question, was a number that I responded to last evening. There was no answer at that number, and after calling on those three separate times

Mr. Peckford: I then proceeded to call Mr. John Tremblett at about 7:12 yesterday evening, and was successfully in talking to Mr. Tremblett on the phone and asked him to convey to Mr. Wilcox that I was unable to contact him at the number that he left with my secretary yesterday afternoon. Mr. Wilcox proceeded this morning to send me a telegram in which he said that there would be a meeting next week, March 28, in Bay d'Espoir at which time if there was no response from government he intended, on behalf of the Committee, I assume, to put a number of questions before the individuals there. One, for example, was whether or not they would pay their hydro bills, and another whether they would switch off the power at Bay d'Espoir from the rest of the Province.

I responded to Mr. Wilcox's telegram of this morning indicating to him that I would try before this day was out to set up a time at which I could, as well as representatives of Newfoundland Hydro, travel to Bay d'Espoir to respond to the brief presented by the people a month ago, that the reason I had not done it to date, in the last several days, in response to telephone calls from people in Bay d'Espoir, Mr. Tremblett being one of them, was that the House of Assembly was open, and that I had a responsibility to be here to answer questions not only from the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), but from other members relative to Newfoundland Hydro- Mr. Groom's resignation, for example - relative to oil and gas, and other major issues that are presently before me in my Portfolio; that I would try to get back to Mr. Wilcox before the day was out to give him such a time at which we would meet and address ourselves to the points that the Concerned Citizens Committee gave us a month ago.

That is where the matter lies right now. I still intend to try to meet that commitment that I gave Mr. Wilcox in the telegram. These responses to the points involve industrial development in Bay d'Espoir, involve all of the major concerns, and

Mr. Peckford: even minor concerns that the people had at the time. It is through this vehicle that I wish to respond to the Committee, and will do so in due course, and try to give Mr. Wilcox, and through him, the people of Bay d'Espoir a definitive answer when I can meet with them and go through the whole sixteen or seventeen points that they brought up in the brief.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): One further supplementary, then I feel I should go on to other members.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The name is Wilcott; he not only is the Chairman, but was from the very beginning of this exercise, the demonstration and so on. Mr. Tremblett you were dealing with, but he was appointed by Mr. Wilcott's Committee to speak for the Committee at that time. And the telegram was sent not this morning, but 4:01 yesterday afternoon.

MR. PECKFORD: I cannot help it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: No, no, just for the record.

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: The minister said Mr. Wilcott sent a telegram this morning. For the record he sent it at 4:01 yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, now I thank the Minister of Mines and Energy for his answer, and I was aware of most of what he had said, but it is good for the House to have the information, and I am looking forward to the meeting which he has committed himself to having in Bay d'Espoir. I

MR. SIMMONS: was assuming, but perhaps wrongly so, that the nature of the dialogue that the minister would have with the people in Bay d'Espoir would relate to his own portfolio, but he has now indicated that he might address himself to the larger question on behalf of the government.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to a supplementary to the Premier. I put to him a couple of times today the question of what in particular the government intend to do to help create job opportunities which in effect, Mr. Speaker, are quite separate from the frustrations over Hydro which the minister is talking about. What does the government intend to do to create job opportunities in the Bay d'Espoir area?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that this innuendo a few moments ago that I said the fishery could not work in Bay d'Espoir was wrong. I did not say that at all. I said it was a difficult place to prosecute the fishery from because, as even the hon. member knows, it is a large indraft of water and to get to the fishing ground is not as easy as it would be from Hermitage or Harbour Breton or any of the places on the outside.

So whilst it is a possibility, it is not the ideal location for prosecuting the fishery. It is a way of earning a living if there is no other opportunity there. The only thing, Sir, government can do for the people in Bay d'Espoir or any other district of this Province is to take the resources, whether it is lumber or fishing or whether it is tourism or whatever the case may be

PREMIER MOORES: and try to maximize those resources that are there, encourage people to do those things in the areas in which they live that they can do well and encourage them in every way possible. Other than that, Sir, we cannot invent things to happen in a place where it is not likely for them to happen. We saw a lot of that in the past; that is not going to be our policy, Sir, for the future.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova followed by the hon. member for St. John's West and the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans, if time permits.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, again a question to the Premier in reference to the line of thought that I was questioning the Premier on earlier. It is in reference to the last sentence of the Budget Speech, "Vive la Terre Neuve Libre!", and in view of the fact that this sentence was patterned after a sentence that was used by General De Gaulle in Quebec in the 1960's, I think, and in view of the uproar that that caused in Canada, I am just wondering whether the Premier can clearly define and clearly explain the reference in this context in the Budget.

Monsieur Le Président!
Cette phrase - Qu'est ce que c'est veut dire? Nous désirons une réponse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: I am delighted that we have established the member's ability to speak French and General De Gaulle's senility, which all came up in that same question, I understand, Sir.

MR. W.N. ROWE: (Inaudible) status.

PREMIER MOORES: The Minister of Finance's

PREMIER MOORES: senility? Okay, we will not go into that. Quite seriously, Sir -

MR. HICKMAN: Why not? Why not?

PREMIER MOORES: The Minister of Finance has just told me, Sir, for the sake of this House, that he is not.

Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HICKMAN: Voulez-vous promenade avec moi ce soir?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: No, no.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, this is a serious question.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, and the answer to the question, obviously, is that it was meant as it was said, in the spirit of being within Confederation in economic terms, that Newfoundland be free in its economic potential to develop those things which we have around us for the benefit of our own people and allow us to contribute to Canada rather than always having our resources taken to Ottawa and having to go with cap in hand to get them back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Premier and it concerns a different topic. I understand that the SPCA in Newfoundland has serious financial difficulties and it is in an era of expansion. It has been subsisting to some extent on Young Canada Works Grants, and recently has approached the government, particularly the Premier, for some money to enable it to continue its most

DR. KITCHEN:

valued work in the care of unwanted and injured animals. My question to the Premier is can he tell the House whether there will be any grant this year to the SPCA for the care of unwanted and injured animals?

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins)

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, I -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

PREMIER MOORES:

It depends how far the subject material goes, but the answer is that I am not familiar with the policy right now on how far we hope to support the SPCA. Personally, I can say very sincerely I think it is not only a worthwhile organization, I think they are doing something that is very beneficial to this Province and to any other part of our society. I particularly would like, seeing that this question was on that subject, to thank publicly the Humane Society Executive Director in Ontario, Mr. Tom Hughes -

MR. NEARY:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES:

- for having come and supported Newfoundland in its position on the seal hunt - and I do not mean to go off the hon. member's question here at all, but that was a gesture that I suppose some time in the House I would like the opportunity to explain why Tom Hughes has done it. But to get back to the hon. member's question, Sir, certainly I will get the information, gladly pass it on and personally I can say that the function and the responsibility these people have is something that is a very needed ingredient in our society.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans followed by the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier again. It appeared to me, Sir, that in answering a question from the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir with regard to the Bay d'Espoir hydro development, the Premier seemed to have inferred at least to me

MR. FLIGHT: that one of the problems in Bay d'Espoir today as a result of the approach by Hydro in 1965 or the approach by the government of the day, the reason the local population may not be benefitting from that development was due in no small part to the approach the government took, and Hydro took or the old Newfoundland Power Commission took. So if that indeed is contributing to the problem in Bay d'Espoir today, then my question to the Premier is what is he proposing to do to make sure the same set of circumstances does not happen with regards to the Hinds Lake power development as it relates to the Buchans situation and the ability of the Central Newfoundland area, the Buchans area to take advantage of both the construction and any future benefits of that project?

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: First of all, Mr. Speaker, certainly I can say right now that we have never made a statement to the effect that the people of Buchans or the people of Howley or anywhere else will be the beneficiary of a major industry because Hinds Lake is being built. Over and above that I think what happened in Bay d'Espoir, and I think it is a natural thing to have said at the time and probably well meant, was that with the construction of the hydro project there, any energy intensive industry would logically locate as near that facility as possible. And ironically enough, if there is ever an aluminum reduction plant, as an example, that comes to the Island part of our Province, it is logical that it would once again locate in that area because they have back-up electricity in case of failure. So there are certain things that would dictate that industry could possibly be attracted to the site of a major power development such as Bay d'Espoir. And I think, Sir, the previous administration, by the way, and I know this one did, was try to encourage people who could utilize that access to that particular facility in that particular location. But in the case of Buchans/Howley/Deer Lake area, as far as

PREMIER MOORES: Hinds Lake is concerned, Sir, I will say right now that this government will go on the record as saying that that is a project which will take people for construction. It will put power in the grid. It will not establish an energy intensive industry in that particular area. First of all it is not big enough, and secondly that is the sort of false promise that can only lead people up the garden path.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: I asked for a supplementary,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans, a supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that anyone in Newfoundland has demanded of the Premier, of the administration or of Hydro that the Hinds Lake development would one day fuel a major industry in that area, but to be specific I will ask the Premier what he is doing to guarantee the people of the Buchans area, who are located eight miles away from that major project, some economic spinoff from that project, the \$100 million project that will take the next three years, the three years in which we will see Buchans phasing out as a mining operation with nowhere to go except welfare?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, very simply, as I said the other day, it is the wish of this administration that the people of Buchans be given an opportunity wherever possible to work on that project, but there are also union problems here that the member is only too well aware of, and that in the end analysis are union people working it out amongst themselves. And, you know, other than that - what this government would like to do to get the skilled people from Buchans to do that job, we have been on record for saying it, we will try to do it, but in the end analysis it has to be union co-operation, and anything we can do to further that we will as well, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker I should like to rise on a point of privilege of the House, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): A point of privilege has been raised.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, so far this session, Sir, forty-six questions have been put on the Order Paper of which I have asked forty-three, I think, of the Minister of Health. So far, Mr. Speaker, we have not gotten any answers and I believe that is a breach of the privileges of this House, Sir, and I would like for the Minister of Health to indicate to the House when we are going to get answers to the questions that we have put on the Order Paper so far.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

PREMIER MOORES: First of all I do not think it is a point of privilege. But the fact is, Sir, that we talk about abuses of the privileges of this House; the hon.member spoke for five days in the Throne Speech debate and that would mean in the run of a year if we had the same rights for every member of this House there is not enough days in the year for every other member, who has equal rights, to get the same opportunity to participate in debates in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): Order, please!

I do not think there is a point of privilege to which the Chair has to give attention at this point.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): This being Private Members Day the House is debating Motion 7 and the debate was adjourned by the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we were last Wednesday in the process of considering a resolution that was put on the Order Paper by the Leader of the Opposition dealing with the whole question of Labrador development not only as it related to Gull Island or Muskrat, but as it related to development in general in Labrador, as it related to the mineral resources in Labrador, as it related to transportation that could enhance economic development and, of course, the ongoing power developments of Labrador.

I think I was saying last day, Mr. Speaker, that we must identify first of all just what there is in Labrador so that the whole concept as mentioned by the member for St. John's West (Dr.Kitchen) last week is fully considered, is fully aired so that we are talking about some major transportation facilities both in terms of roads - the Trans-Labrador Highway - in terms of railways, and then fit into that transportation network which is vital, as well as Port Labrador and water transportation, all the potential resources that we have. And they are not even potential, they are far further along than the normal definition of potential would lead us to believe. We are talking about uranium, as I mentioned last week, we are talking about iron ore, an expansion of iron ore once the steel industry of the world gets over its present slump, and we are talking about power developments of massive, really, magnitude,

MR. PECKFORD: the Gull Island at 1600 or 1800 megawatts, Muskrat at 600, the five rivers at 2000 to 3000 megawatts, and other rivers which lie totally in Labrador.

Now there was some suggestion, Mr. Speaker, by some speakers that this administration had done very little to plan this whole concept of developing resources in Labrador for the benefit of the people in Labrador and for the benefit of people in the Province generally. The allegation was implied or made directly that this administration had done very little to try to stop the trend that was started decades ago in just extracting raw resources from Labrador to be used somewhere else, either on the Island or, more particularly and more disasterously, to be used somewhere else in Canada or the United States. For example, witness the present situation as it relates to iron ore to some degree and, of course, as it relates to the Upper Churchill contract where we are giving away water at ridiculously low prices over a long, long term and losing therefore \$4 million to \$5 million a year as it relates to how much Quebec is making off our power right now, off the 4900 megawatts, but more particularly and more realistically \$700 million or \$800 million a year if you look at replacement costs today, if you look at power today, for example, the Hinds Lake project coming in at around 30 mils. So you are talking 30 mil power today even in a hydro site like Hinds Lake or Cat Arm or Upper Salmon or the rest of the on-Island hydro sites that are possible in the future. Anywhere in the world today outside of a nondeveloped Northern Brazil or a couple of other more underdeveloped areas of the world you are talking about power at very, very high costs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read into the record what this administration

MR. PECKFORD:

and he emphasized the word 'planning? We have been accused, Mr. Speaker, for many years, over on this side of the House, since we came into power, that we are doing too much planning and not enough action, that it was not well enough planned. It was very interesting to hear from the member for St. John's West when he talked about that you got to have forward looking planning, that you have got to do the lead time activities, which are planning, in order to really bring on stream something that is meaningful and will do something great for residents of a given jurisdiction.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the present administration has long realized that a year-round port in Labrador as the Eastern terminus of a Trans-Labrador railway could play a key role in the economic future of Labrador and indeed the whole Province.

Our basic concept has been as follows:

(one) the development of a major movement of iron ore eastward to the Labrador Coast by an electrically powered railway, thus creating the economic base for the complimentary movement of other mineral and forest products, consumer goods, passengers and motor vehicles; (Two) Port Labrador, whose site cannot be firmly fixed without further detailed study, would be a major export point for mineral and timber products as well as the Labrador terminus of a year-round cargo, passenger and motor vehicle ferry to the Island; (Three) As an interim measure, ways would be found to extend the shipping season into the Goose Bay area for general cargo, passengers and motor vehicles, linking into Western Labrador by road. Not only would this mean a better service for the people of Goose Bay and Western Labrador, but it will give us priceless, practical shipping experience which could be the key to convincing an investor that a year-round shipping season would be possible, provided additional investment were made in more powerful ships and ice breaking support.

MR. NEARY:

Where did you get a copy of our policy?

MR. PECKFORD: Such a development, Mr. Speaker, would be of immense benefit to the Province. It would mean the end of isolation along the Goose Bay, Churchill Falls, Labrador City, Wabush route. It would mean that the natural resources of Labrador could be processed in Labrador using its abundant water power and it would mean that the two parts of the Province would be physically united.

However, Mr. Speaker, the barriers to such a development are vast and may be political as well as technical and economic. Quebec presently has a great strangle hold on the mineral developments of Western Labrador as on Churchill Falls. As we all know, the fact that our iron ore presently goes through Sept Iles means that the vast amount of the economic spinoff of our iron ore deposits go to Quebec. Quebec will oppose the Trans-Labrador Railway with all its might and power.

Mr. Speaker, why was Sept Iles chosen as opposed to a port in Coastal Labrador? The conventional wisdom is that Sept Iles is an ice-free port. However, nothing could be further from the truth. Our preliminary analysis shows that at least with today's ice-breaking capability, year-round shipping from a carefully selected port in Coastal Labrador could be no more difficult and costly than from Sept Iles, depending on the market one wishes to supply. Shipping through Sept Iles makes a lot of sense if the dominant market for our iron ore continues to be the steel mills of Central Canada and the US Midwest, a market supplied through the seaway, the St. Lawrence Seaway. Any move to develop Port Labrador to serve that market would be flowing against the tide of economics, not with it, and in the eyes of the investor who would have to put up several hundred millions of dollars to construct it, not justified economically.

If on the other hand we can develop export markets for our iron ore in Europe, then Port Labrador would hold

MR. PECKFORD: a distinct advantage in steaming time over Sept Iles, particularly in Winter when heavy ice in the Straits of Belle Isle forces ore carriers from Sept Iles to go South, through the Cabot Strait and around the Island.

Markets on the Eastern Seaboard of the United States might also be attractive. In such cases Port Labrador would be swimming with the tide of economics and not against it. It is for this reason that in all its discussions with potential investors, this government has expressed its firm desire to tie the development of the Julianne Lake iron ore deposits, or any other future iron ore developments, with the Trans-Labrador Highway and Port Labrador concept.

While the iron ore market is not the best at present, a new round of expansion is a relatively few years away and Labrador iron ore is in the running.

MR. PECKFORD: In the meantime, a great deal of planning and study will be needed. The key factor in this study is ice, ice in Lake Melville, ice in Groswater Bay and the Labrador pack ice itself. I am sure that everyone knows that this Province is making great strides in building up its expertise in icebreaking and in ice studies generally. This is a major area of commitment for the Province. The Province's marine search agency, NORDCO, has built up world known expertise in this area and has acquired commercial ice research contracts as far away as the Beaufort Sea and the Canadian High Arctic. As a matter of fact, NORDCO right now is doing a fair amount of work in the High Arctic now, in the Beaufort Sea at present for Dome Petroleum. Memorial's C-CORE an ocean engineering group, are similarly at the forefront in this field. At the highly prestigious Fourth International Conference on Ports and Harbours under Arctic Conditions held here in St. John's last September, a significant number of papers given were by persons from the three institutions mentioned above. Two in fact addressed the very problem I am speaking about today, the development of Port Labrador.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) has more information.

MR. PECKFORD: Consider, Mr. Speaker, the following list of field studies - would the hon. member for - Mr. Speaker, could I have silence while I am trying to speak?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister has indicated that he would like to be heard in silence and I ask the hon. member to my right will he please observe the rules of the House.

Order, please!

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) what he is reading -

MR. PECKFORD: You poor man. You are more to be pitied than blamed. You poor fellow. Ignorance is bliss, there is not question about that. Jean Jacques Rousseau said that many, many years ago.

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

I indicated that the hon. minister wanted to

MR. SPEAKER: be heard in silence and I ask the hon. member to respect the order of the Chair.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was just trying to mention some of the field studies and work of direct relevance to Port Labrador that have already been undertaken recently in the Province. There has been, No. (1), done by the ocean engineering group at Memorial, they have conducted extensive onsite studies of Lake Melville over a number of ice seasons with the Province's financial support. Unlike the accusations made by the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) that very little was done with financial support from the Province, and the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen), coming from the University, should be aware of this. No. (2) Last Winter on the encouragement of my department NORDCO spent a significant amount of in-house research money of further investigations of ice conditions in the critical Kigolet narrows and Western Groswater Bay area, research relating solely to Port Labrador. No. (3), the port Labrador concept was one of the main reasons behind the joint NORDCO, C-CORE ship in the ice project of 1977 in which the M.V. Artic Explorer was chartered to penetrate the Labrador pack and drift with it. This enabled the researchers on board to study pack ice and oceanographic conditions and to ground proof certain airborne experiments conducted simultaneously by a unit of the University of Michigan. (4) Even more exotic but equally useful research on the Labrador pack is being conducted by C-CORE using remote sensing satellites transmitting through the Shoe Cove tracking station. (5) The Province is pushing hard to get the National Research Council's new icebreaking test facility established in St. John's rather than in Ottawa as was the original proposal put forward by Ottawa a number of months ago. As anybody remembers the First Minister's Conference, one of the points made by the Premier at that conference in talking about regional economic disparity was the fact that here was an instance of bureaucratic decision making in Ottawa which ran against the tide

March 22, 1978

Tape No. 373

AH-3

MR. PECKFORD: of proper regional development in the provinces
and that if Ottawa and the Prime Minister was really serious he
would try to get a handle on his bureaucracy who had initially
determined that this great tank for determining icebreaking facilities
and so on was going

Mr. Peckford:

to go in Ottawa, the great seaport of Ottawa was suddenly going to be given another chunk of change to develop research facilities when it could be done much better at Memorial or somewhere in Newfoundland. And now of course as a result of the Premier's insistence on this at The First Ministers Conference, the federal government are reassessing this whole area, and we are lobbying very strongly today, in the last number of weeks to ensure that that kind of a research facility comes to Newfoundland.

Number six, NORDCO and C-CORE have been deeply involved in the development of the M.V. Arctic, a 28,000 ton vessel due for completion in the Fall of this year which will be the world's first ice-breaking cargo vessel. It is hoped that during the Winter and Spring of 1979 the M.V. Arctic will make a number of experimental runs into Lake Melville.

Seven, the Province's new petroleum regulations provide that the oil companies conduct petroleum related research and development in the Province. Certain of this work, particularly on the Labrador pack, will no doubt be of direct relevance to Port Labrador.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, for the list of activities which have a direct and indirect bearing on Port Labrador is almost endless. The critical thing is that we are well on our way to having the capability for year-round shipping in Port Labrador, into a port in Labrador if you will. In view of all of this I find it highly ironic to say the least, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Opposition state that this government and that Memorial, one of the top ice research centers in the world, is doing nothing on Port Labrador. Indeed, while I cannot speak for Memorial I would think that the dedicated individuals involved must find such remarks highly insulting, to say the least, particularly when three of their colleagues recently narrowly escaped death in a helicopter crash while investigating an ice

MR. PECKFORD: problem directly relating to the Port Labrador concept, and when two of them still lie in hospital together with the helicopter pilot, but I am happy to state he is well and on the mend.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is almost -

MR. PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, neither this government nor Memorial has been resting on our oars on Port Labrador. However we are dealing with a mammoth undertaking with unparalleled ramifications for this Province. To turn Winston Churchill's well known description of Churchill Falls around, Port Labrador is a grand anti-imperialistic concept. For, Mr. Speaker, the actions of Quebec re Labrador are nothing short of imperialism, economic and political, and the Trans-Labrador Railway and Port Labrador will help free us from that kind of situation. But, Mr. Speaker, I fear we will again have to fight our own battle.

The Opposition talks of the great support the Liberal Government in Ottawa gives this concept. And it is in the -
DR. KITCHEN: (Inaudible).

MR. PECKFORD: Just let the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) hold on to his seat just for one second.

I have less faith in the federal government's willingness to set us free from Quebec's grasp. Mr. Speaker, the next logical step is a massive, comprehensive study of the technical, economic social and environmental aspects of the Trans-Labrador Railway and the Port Labrador concept. That study will be expensive, particularly the ice research. However, armed with the results of such a study I am confident that we will be able to go to the investment community and prove it can be done, and that it makes economic sense. Then our talks with industrialists on the shipping of Julienne Lake iron ore and other minerals through Port Labrador, now met with an understandable skepticism, will take on a new light. But, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the clear justification for such a

MR. PECKFORD: study, Ottawa has refused our request for funding.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget, let us not forget that in that resolution put on the paper by the Leader of the Opposition, he mentions in one of the Whereases, he brings in the Liberal Party, I thought he did,

MR. PECKFORD: some party. Yes." Whereas the Labrador portion of our Province contains vast hydro - electric resources together with an immense treasure house of other natural resources; and whereas at a recent National Convention of the Liberal Party from which the Federal Government of Canada is now formed, there was unanimous support for a resolution presented by the Newfoundland and Labrador delegation." Alright Mr. Speaker, let us hear what the federal government, the great Liberal Federal Government which was willing to endorse that kind of a resolution by the Newfoundland Delegation to its political convention in Ottawa, did, let us see what they did; They rejected funding for this overall concept which I am sure, at least in principle all parties, not only the parties represented in this House, all parties in Newfoundland agree with.

On September 22, 1976 my department submitted what we felt was an adequately documented proposal to DREE for joint DREE-Province funding of a major two year study of all aspects of the Trans-Labrador Railway, Port Labrador concept. The funding would have come under the Province's planning subsidiary agreement with DREE under which there was and remains a significant amount of unspent money. Our Port Labrador proposal did not meet with a favorable or quick response from DREE. This coolness was considered by my Cabinet colleagues on January 21, 1977 and it was decided that in spite of DREE's reluctance the Province should in the words of the Cabinet directive "press vigorously" for funding for the study. On February 17, 1977 my department, with the assistance of Nordco, submitted a new, comprehensive eighty-five page proposal to DREE for a three phase \$1.7 million project extending over two years with the cost to be shared 90 - 10 as agreed under the planning subsidiary agreement. Had DREE given its quick approval, phase one would have

MR. PECKFORD: been tied into the complimentary Nordco - C-CORE - University of Michigan research program last spring, a program which itself cost \$500,000. But, Mr. Speaker, that glorious opportunity was lost. On March 1, 1977 the proposal was turned down by DREE on the unbelievably shallow ground that approval of such a study could not come before an overall study of Labrador's transportation problems was completed, whenever that might be.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is reasonable.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, some reasonable that is!

Thus, Mr. Speaker, unless there is a radical change of heart, Ottawa is not going to give us - as one would think they would given the resolution on the Order Paper today by the Leader of the Opposition - is not going to give us -

AN HON. MEMBER: Try them again.

MR. PECKFORD: No doubt we will. Do not worry, we will. We have a good proposal. Do not try to weasel out of it. Mr. Speaker, one can tell already the response now. If the Liberal Opposition was responsible on the other side now, Mr. Speaker, they would get behind this kind of proposal that we have put twice before Ottawa -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. PECKFORD: Now they will weasel word and they will not let me finish my speech now, I suppose.

AN HON. MEMBER: Order, order!

MR. PECKFORD: Oh no, Mr. Speaker, we know now. We can see the hon. member now for St. John's West, there he is now over there in his corner, there is the great bureaucrat, the great theoretician from the university, one of the greatest Deputy Minister's that this House will ever produce. Here is our great philosopher king over there who is going to look over at me now in all his academic buffoonery and tell me that because we have put two good proposals before Ottawa, there is something wrong on our side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. PECKFORD: Oh, no! Thus, Mr. Speaker, unless there is a radical change of heart Ottawa is not going to give us the great assistance that the Opposition would have us believe that they are going to give us.

I personally do not understand why Ottawa would take such a position.

DR. KITCHEN: (inaudible) your proposal.

MR. PECKFORD: I know there were senior federal officials highly qualified in the port development field who were very supportive we know this, of the concept, and yet the whole concept was dismissed -

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. PECKFORD: -as being speculative. That is why the whole proposal was rejected. Remember now, Mr. Speaker, this was under

MR. PECKFORD: a planning subsidiary agreement, not under a transportation subsidiary agreement, not under an industrial development subsidiary agreement, not under a fisheries subsidiary agreement, but under a planning agreement - that is what the planning money is for, is to conduct these kinds of studies. In any event, Mr. Speaker, this concept is too important to let stand. We will find a way to conduct the necessary studies and we will use the development of our mineral resources to bring the Trans-Labrador Railway and Port Labrador into existence. It will mean an end to the isolation of the people of Goose Bay and Western Labrador and an end of the isolation of the people of the Island and Labrador from each other to the mutual benefit of both. It will mean that the resources of Labrador will be able to be processed right in Labrador. Finally, it will mean that Quebec will no longer be able to dictate to us who receives the benefits from such a development in our own Province. Mr. Speaker, we will find the way to build the Trans-Labrador Railway and Port Labrador, and when we do our victory will be all the sweeter because we will have done it all by ourselves. And, Mr. Speaker, that puts it on the record pretty clearly. Many of the people in the federal government agree wholeheartedly with us. Two different proposals for the very plan that the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) wants, the very kind of plan and concept that the Leader of the Opposition wants from his resolution, the very kind of plan that the Liberal Party in Ottawa, the government in Ottawa, ostensibly wants from the kind of support they gave to the Newfoundland resolution at the Liberal convention. Now I say, Mr. Speaker, the ball is in Ottawa's court. Let them accept the proposal put forward by the government for the very kind of thing that the Liberal Party is now advocating as the best way to build Labrador, because we agree wholeheartedly that we have taken the initiative two years ago to do exactly that and will continue to take the initiative. And if it means that we have to do it on our own it will only mean that the planning process will be

MR. PECKFORD: delayed, but we will find the money if it comes out of the Provincial Treasury to go ahead with this very valuable planning experience so that when, as I have already said, we have to talk to investment people, when we have to talk to potential industrialists, when we have to talk to people who want to expand iron ore, who want to get into uranium development, who want to get into other transportation things in Labrador, they will have the kind of facts and figures, the kind of developmental plan already in place that the Opposition talks so meekly about but which this administration has taken action on.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: I hope the minister will be tabling his speech or the extracts he was reading from. Mr. Speaker, I rise with some humility after listening to that.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. STRACHAN: Ah you shut up or I will get you later on. Mr. Speaker, I live in Labrador in 1978 in a community with no vegetables and a community with travelling and transportation means with which we risk our lives every day. Are we going to listen to what Jeremiah Sillitt, the chief elder in Nain calls, this wind, absolute wind. It reminds me of when I was young a statement in MacBeth, the quotation which states, "Out, out brief candle. Life is but a walking shadow" - like the minister - "a poor player that struts and frets his hour upon the stage and then is heard no more. It is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." Because we are living in a Labrador of 1978, not a Labrador of dreams, of nonsense. We are living in a Labrador in which the inroads have not been made by this Province, in which we lean not towards the Island part of the Province but towards another part, Quebec, because they are making inroads, not in a political sense, but they are doing the the

MR. STRACHAN:

things that this Province will not do; that is, they are making inroads in the economic sense.

Let us get this straight;

it was this government and this administration last year which dealt with Seven Islands, which bought its food in Seven Islands, Quebec, passed it up the railway to Schefferville, contacted a Quebec air company to fly vegetables to Newfoundland and Labrador government stores on the Labrador Coast to supply the Labrador people - this government! And we listen to this kind of wind about what they are going to do to the Labrador people.

MR. STRACHAN: We cannot get a subsidy for a Twin Otter service for the safest, fastest method of travel. We stay in Labrador and sit and wait nine days, ten days, twelve days, twenty-one days in order to try and get to a meeting or get somewhere. The transportation problems are today and we cannot get a mere \$125,000 subsidy to provide safe travel. We risk our lives all the time and in fact the helicopter accident he was talking about, I almost was in that helicopter and I do not like listening to that kind of nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, the attitude, if the minister will travel in winter and it will freeze his butt off, the attitude is abominable. Quebec is making inroads. We are already getting subsidized service from Air Gava and Laurentian Airways. Quebec is already prepared to provide subsidized travel into Northern Labrador and we cannot even get a subsidy within this province. We are not interested. Fine, we need plans, wonderful plans, but the people in Labrador are also looking for a certain quality of life. They are also looking for some benefits. They are also trying to look towards the province because that is where they want to be and that is where they are going to be. But at the same time the links are all going Westwards. Quebec is now already starting to make moves into Labrador City and Wabush, not in a political sense, but I will guarantee you in three or four years time there will be more Quebec workers in Labrador City and Wabush. The link when the roads go through to Fermont and West to Montreal will be towards the West and not towards the Island part of this province. It makes economic sense for us to buy in Montreal and not in St. John's.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STRACHAN: Listen to the Yahoo from St. John's who sits in a comfortable house, centrally heated, with water and sewage. My wife, Sir, my wife right now carries water and empties the buckets. Do any of the other members' wives in this House do that? Empties the buckets, puts shoeshoes on to fetch water and this Yahoo from St. John's sits and talks about Labrador. Why do you not just shut up and learn a lesson or come

MR. STRACHAN: down with us and we will take you out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MRS. MCISAAC: Yes, for you it is.

MR. DINN: I am not from Aberdeen. I am from St. John's.

MR. J. HODDER: That is the longest speech he has ever made in the House, that one he just made.

MR. STRACHAN: It is this typical kind of ignorance that makes the people of Labrador wonder whether they should turn towards St. John's or turn elsewhere or be on their own. What a heap of nonsense, a heap of total nonsense!

Mr. Speaker, having said that we will try and get back to the resolution which is in front of us. I am in total agreement. I think the minister delivered a wonderful speech enunciating a policy which had been enunciated here and talked about for years and years. In fact Port Labrador was first discussed in Labrador in the late 1960's, the whole concept, at that time. I am no great lover of the previous administration, the administration before this one; in fact I was never politically oriented in Labrador towards any side, I had no political stripe whatsoever, but it was in Labrador that they started discussing that and it was Mr. Smallwood who started off the discussions toward the concept of a Port Labrador and towards trying to utilize some of the resources within Labrador.

MR. NEARY: As a matter of fact, he looked at a place called Old Port Bay one time and it happens to be in the Quebec Province, Old Port Bay.

MR. STRACHAN: Our argument is basically that do we agree that we have to look elsewhere. We have to look somewhere else because it is obvious that a Port Labrador will not make sense in an economic sense if all it is is a transportation process for passing people. It must have something, a financial base, an economic base on which it can carry on. It does obviously then mean that the markets must point Eastward and not Westwards. There is no argument in that. We have discussed that many, many times and we realize that full well. We do disagree that the iron ore should not be taken from Labrador and moved Eastwards. Our concept and our idea and what we are proposing

MR. STRACHAN: was to put a blueprint together for Labrador in which it was metal products, steel, which moved out of Labrador, not iron ore, to the eastern markets, but the finished product as much as possible within Labrador, not raw iron ore moving anywhere. To move iron ore eastwards is no better than moving iron ore westwards. There is no development whatsoever involved in that. And our argument is to develop within Labrador with the power we have, to develop within Labrador these kind of products which would put us on a market and also give secondary industries in Labrador which would open us up and free us from our economic colonialism to Quebec, because we are economically colonial to Quebec in all senses of the word.

So, what we are asking then is an overall development scheme be made for all kinds of products, applying to all kinds of things in Labrador so that the finished product, as much as possible, will go out of Labrador and whether it is a Port Labrador or some other concept that is used, let it be so. But we are talking ultimately of a finished product.

I understand full well, and I should say that the five-year plan, the blueprint, and the Budget Speech was wonderful, a great deal of mention of Churchill Falls power, but I saw no mention whatsoever, no mention whatsoever of any development, five-year development of Labrador, no mention apart from the regaining of Churchill Falls power. In other words, Labrador was not involved, not part of it. No five-year plan for Labrador.

MR. PECKFORD: There was no five-year plan for Green Bay, it was for the whole Province, including Labrador.

MR. STRACHAN: We are talking about a very large area of the Province in which there are a great deal of resources available.

MR. PECKFORD: Nobody wants to send our minerals out of the Island (inaudible)

MR. STRACHAN:

All being developed!

At the moment what Labrador sees is right at the moment they are getting none of the benefits but they are being told all the time the potential is there, "You have the potential". Well, people get fed up with potential because you cannot live on potential.

MR. NEARY:

You cannot put that in the oven for Sunday dinner.

MR. STRACHAN:

If you do not have vegetables, how can you have potential?

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is better to develop them than to give them away.

MR. STRACHAN:

Nobody is arguing that. What we are talking about is potential. It is all potential. So people see it as - it amazes me, too, when I hear about it, that we are going to develop and make a whole atmosphere of free enterprise, an atmosphere for investment in Labrador and you wonder if the atmosphere of investment and free enterprise, and people can come in and develop Labrador, and - this is the Administration who talks about the atmosphere of free enterprise or investment in Labrador, and this was the Administration which, in an economic sense, put the gun to Brinco, who took over Brinco at a cost of \$160,000,000, who turned around and told us the other day, and I accept the Premier's response as a very serious response, that Gull Island cannot develop so we might as well tell Goose Bay and Happy Valley that you cannot be developed until a market is found for the power. So we tell Happy Valley/Goose Bay people that we cannot develop Gull Island until a market is there, and yet \$110,000,000 was spent in 1975, already poured into development for which there was no market because if there is no market now, where was the market in 1975? People see this as money upon money upon money for which there is no development. There is no plan. It is political expediency.

Our basic arguments are very simple arguments.

Our basic arguments are pie in the sky, and we realize full well we have had enough of them and great pies in the sky all down the road. We realize

MR. STRACHAN: full well that we do not want a Brinex operation unless there are certain controls, unless there are obvious controls imposed on that, and sure, we would like to stop developments if these developments mean wiping out a people or wiping out a land.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: We should not have bought back our water rights from Brinco, eh?

MR. STRACHAN: Just hold on.

Our arguments are basically -

MR. FLIGHT: What benefits have accrued to power companies? How are we better off for it?

MR. STRACHAN: It makes it funny, you know, that they buy back the water rights and then they proceed to sue themselves, to take themselves to court.

MR. PECKFORD: Can you give me a better alternative?

MR. STRACHAN: Buy it back and sue yourselves? Was it necessary to buy it back and then to sue yourselves?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STRACHAN: There is an animal, I should remind the Minister of Mines and Energy in Labrador, in the Arctic, called an ookpic, it is an Arctic owl, and the Arctic owl struts on the ice, and it is always looking around it. And you will never shoot that animal in the morning nor at night nor at dusk, but you can shoot him in bright broad daylight because he cannot see. And I say to the minister that sometimes he reminds me of an Arctic owl, an ookpic, because sometime he will get it in bright broad daylight, and the way down is just as rough as the way up, and sometimes rougher.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Municipal Affairs is a twit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Twirp.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, we have no argument basically in the concepts and we support the resolution. We put together this motion. But what we are arguing is that we are arguing the realities of life. And the realities of life are that the people in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, and the Central Labrador area have taken a terrible, terrible punishment in the last two years. Gull Island closing down immediately after the election, a major exodus; Labrador Linerboard closing down, another major exodus; the Carson sinking, through no fault of this government, the only one which was through no fault of this government.

AN HON. MEMBER: The only thing is they cannot take credit for.

MR. STRACHAN: And the people who are left now, hanging up in the air, businesses going to the wall, people wondering what is going to happen. The people of the coast can see wonderful plans of Port Labrador, and wonderful ice studies- and we have no argument, that has to go ahead- but they are wondering when they are going to get \$125,000 to give them Twin Engine service so they can hop aboard a plane instead of freezing, and sitting in sleeping bags on a plane for three hours or four hours waiting and trying to get to

Mr. Strachan: get to Goose Bay.

MR. NEARY: Well if we can get Dr. Bruneau to stop towing icebergs around for one year we will enough to put the Twin Otter on.

MR. STRACHAN: What we are arguing about is putting together a comprehensive plan which will bring benefits to the people. The people there are fed up watching some of the things occurring and we asked in this House, for instance, in our fisheries and the Hamilton Banks, we have discussed here that in our resolution, we have discussed here that we should develop within Labrador the fisheries. It never has been developed. Very little money has ever been put into it. There are no stages, there are no wharves, there are no fish plants. And what we are arguing about is try and develop that fishery, move in and develop that fishery, do not just leave it alone and start developing a Nordsee plan in which we are going to use vessels from elsewhere to catch the fish on the Hamilton Banks off Labrador with no benefit whatsoever to Labrador. In fact, it is the very opposite; we are catching fish which we should not be catching, by rights we should not be catching.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) all the way anyway.

MR. FLIGHT: Oh look! He understands the fisheries.

MR. NEARY: The expert.

MR. FLIGHT: He is an expert on the fisheries.

MR. NEARY: Are you an expert on everything or what?

MR. STRACHAN: The basic spawning grounds of the whole Northeast fishery is the Hamilton Banks. To prosecute that fishery is criminal, it is absolutely criminal. It should not be allowed. Similarly, I say, that we should not be drilling on the Hamilton Banks. And these are things that if we cannot do anything in the development sense, at least we can stop or prevent. We all witnessed the blow-out in the North Sea. That was a very easy one to put out, although it took weeks, because it was above sea level. What would happen if we allowed drilling, which we do now on the Hamilton Banks,

Mr. Strachan: and there was a blow out at 1,000 feet? We all witnessed the fact that the submarines cannot even go down and inspect The Carson, let alone go try and plug something on the seabed which is covered for eight months of the year, and we wipe out a fishery, because there is no other way of doing it then letting it blow and blow forever, and the life of some of these is fifteen years, twenty years.

MR. NEARY: Like the Minister of Municipal Affairs, blow and blow forever.

MR. STRACHAN: What we are worried about is that we do want development. We are seen sometimes as being anti-development, but the kind of development we do not want is development which will wipe us out totally.

AN HON. MEMBER: Blow it out!

MR. NEARY: There are a few blow-outs over on the other side.

MR. STRACHAN: He also "struts and frets his hour upon the stage."

Mr. Speaker, I think that what the minister has said here is wonderful, wonderful, wonderful. He has outlined some of the ice studies that have been done. I think when I used to see scientific papers or technical papers there was a word

MR. STRACHAN:

for a person who took someone else's scientific work and published it. I think a minister with all the resources of his department and the resources of NORDCO and the resources of the University does well to stand up and read exactly what they have been doing and give technical details of their ice studies. That is wonderful. We have no argument with that. We do not wish to argue that. But we are wondering however just what is going to happen to us. We are wondering what is going to happen in the next few years, the next five years. By the time we get around to all the things he is talking about, the pie in the sky things, there may be nothing left. We may have looked elsewhere or we may have been forced to look elsewhere in an economic sense. I believe in ties with the Island. There have to be strong ties with the Island in transportation; that does not occur at the moment. And we are looking to the West and not to the South to link up to this Province. And that has been done in a most insidious way. Make no mistake about it, people are flying in.

In fact it is funny that Quebec now passes the Department of Tourism. The Quebec Department of Tourism has a pamphlet which it circulates in the rest of Canada and the United States calling people to come and visit the Quebec Alps and the Quebec Alps are the Torngat Mountains located just off of my home, within this Province, totally within this Province, but they are now the Quebec Alps and Quebec is now promoting it and putting a great deal of money into the development of the Quebec Alps, the Torngat Mountains of this Province. Insidious, Sir, insidious! And we sit back and nothing comes from here.

If we stand up and talk about Labrador I am talking about separatism, I am talking about wild schemes. What I am talking about is sense. It is occurring now in 1978 and has been occurring and unless something is done the ties will be towards that way, because we are being pushed that way. If the people of Happy Valley-Goose Bay have the choice of a road right through to Labrador City and on to Montreal, then that is the way they will go. And so

MR. STRACHAN:

it is no matter what you do in five or seven years time. There is no use putting up a barrier and saying, you cannot go that way, you are part of this Province, you cannot go that way. If it is there and economically it is better to deal there, then that is the way we will go.

Aircraft landed this Winter on the ice in Nain bringing vegetables, fruits, the finest kind of fruit, the finest kinds of vegetables, the first we had seen since Christmas. The first week of February, the first vegetables, the first fresh eggs that we had seen since Christmas landed and there it was on the ice in Nain, flown in by a Quebec company, airline company, bought in Quebec.

I said it before and I still have a little slice of bread here on my desk, that it cost us sixty-four cents to buy a loaf of bread in Labrador and Goose Bay and to get it from Goose Bay to Nain it cost us ninety-two cents to transport it. From Goose Bay to Nain it cost us six cents a slice just to transport it, more than the cost of the bread.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much?

MR. STRACHAN: Six cents a slice for the bread, ninety-two cents a loaf just for transportation costs alone on top of sixty-four cents to buy the bread in Goose Bay. Now those are the realities of life. That is what people are arguing about. That is what they are talking about. That is what they are concerned about. So it is fine to have beautiful, finest kind of ideas but we have got to make a determined attempt to stop the flow before it is far too late to stop the flow.

The hon. member there from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) in putting together this resolution to go to the policy convention, he discussed with many of us in Labrador much of the points mentioned here. Many of them have been discussed for many,

MR. STRACHAN:

many years. It is a policy because policy is the way forward. We do not see that you need a policy to give safe travel to the Labrador Coast. Surely that is not a policy. Surely it is a necessity. It is a social service that should be done. It is not a policy. We should not have to draft a policy paper for that.

MR. STRACHAN: Social Services should be done, that is not a policy. We should not have to draft a policy paper to give us a subsidy in order to be able to operate safely. In fact in many cases it is amazing that there are no more deaths in Labrador in flying.

MR. NEARY: : Only due to the skill of the pilots,

MR. STRACHAN: Absolutely. The pilots who I know well and have flown with for year, and years and years, tremendous skill, the best in Canada - and recognized. In fact Ian Massey of Goose has more hours in a single-engine plane, in an Otter, than anybody else in the world, bush pilot, except for one in Australia. People like that have flown hours and hours, 14,000- 15,000 hours flying in bush planes in which everything is a skilled judgement made by him. These people, and we see that two years ago, for instance, they were getting nailed to the wall by the media, nailed to the wall by a number of groups who do not understand flying by visual flying rules, VFR. But what you are is relying on the skill of the pilot; there are no control towers, there are no warnings, there are nothing, it is totally by his skill. And the amazing thing is that out of the number of landings they make in terrible conditions, in white-of conditions, in the Fall of the year when there is ice, in the Spring of the year when there is no open water. By the time you leave Goose Bay and three hours later when it is time to land in a community, the tide may have gone out and there is no opening anymore and you have no gas left to get back. These people who have kept us going, our life line who have kept us going, are asking not for a policy, they are asking now for a certain amount of social services to bring us up to some kind of level, and that is what we are arguing. The administration opposite say that they have done this and they have done a great deal of planning, and a great deal of programme has gone into a policy of theirs for Labrador and the development of Labrador. They are the ones who in the last seven years have been in the position to do something to benefit us on the Labrador coast and we see very little benefits .

MR. STRACHAN: So we cannot see any little benefits in the last seven years in the social sense. And in the service sense, are you going to ask the people on the coast to believe they are going to see anything more in this policy statement? They regard it as wind, total, absolute wind; it comes and it goes, which is the normal answer you get from it. And I say that not in a nasty sense. In 1971 when that administration took over I was strongly in favour of that administration, of some of the things that they were saying and in some of the things that they were doing; I had no political stripe at that time. In fact I never even voted in the elections, in fact one of the elections I did not even know the results of until four days later because we had no communication, none whatsoever. We got the communication, thanks to Newfoundland Telephone. They did a marvelous job, an excellent job, a tremendous amount of money spent, the only ones in Labrador who spent the money and have upgraded the services. Otherwise as far as the rest are concerned they are as backward now as they were in the 1960's and the 1950's. So what we are asking is develop the policies you want, but also let us see some of the things happen there. Do not write it off as a small population, write it off as strange people who live strange ways, because they are not. They also need vegetable and eggs. It makes us mad sometimes to hear some of the statements, makes us utterly mad, no wonder most people from Labrador who come into St. John's are glad to get back and say we will stay out of it. They are disgusted, poisoned, fed up, talk about all kinds of different things. All they are doing is talking about ranges of ideas because they are so frustrated.

So, Mr. Speaker, we support in our presentation here, in the resolution which was presented - it is a resolution, it is a policy, a definite policy, that tied together in Labrador a lot of the resources.

MR. STRACHAN: And with that it seems within this House and I will not take up the House's time to go over it, with that there seems to be a great deal of accord that that needs to be done. But in order to be done there should be some things done which will renew the people's faith that they do live in this province, to give them the ordinary ways of life, the ordinary standard way of living and not to write them off or pass it off because they are out of sight, and if you are out of sight you are out of mind. Many times you argue that we are petty when every time we bring up the fact that it is Newfoundland and Labrador that it is a very clumsy way of saying things. It should be Newfoundland. This Newfoundland and Labrador is clumsy. The argument is basically that where there is carelessness of speech there is also carelessness of mind and that where you want to drop it when you speak about it you also want to drop it when you think about it. And that is people's basic argument that they want to be reminded, and that is why there is such fervour, emotional fervour when you wipe it off the licenses and you wipe it off the birth certificates and so on. Their argument is basically that they think they have been forgotten. It is not because of a separation sense or a feeling they want to go separate ways; it is a feeling that very little is being done. Their argument is basically that there is a rape of the resources of the area. Their argument is that much of the mineral wealth of this province is in Labrador, now in this year is in Labrador much of the mineral wealth. I do not know what the percentage is in iron ore, but iron ore in Labrador for instance produces a very high percentage of the mineral wealth of this province. I would venture seventy per cent or something in that region.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, it is extremely high, extremely high. And also we have talked, and it is redundant to say, that we have talked about utilizing the iron ore resource, is it possible for smelting operations there? If we have excess electricity can it be done? If we need

MR. STRACHAN: coke then coke would be the only thing we would have to bring in. If we need three materials for smelting, if we need iron ore, electricity and coke then the only thing we need to bring in is coke for the smelting process. Is it possible? I am not going to get involved in a technical discussion whether it is or not, but these are the kind of things we are looking at. Can it be developed? Can we have steel mill plants producing bars of steel? Can that be done? Can the electricity be used and developed in concert with the uranium? If so, is it a safe industry to have? And I would be the first to agree that if it is not a safe industry we do not want it. I never was a great lover of resources which were foreign to us. I never was a great lover of oil refineries, which are totally foreign to a province like this. And similarly in Labrador and in a country like that maybe we do not want a further process in the development of uranium if it is going to mean disastrous affects on their environment.

But what we are talking about here is trying to put together a blueprint, a plan, an attack, something that will give people hope in the future but also give them some of the basic social services. And I do not say water and sewage to every little village or every little community, but give them some basic services. I do not regard fresh eggs or a loaf of bread or fresh carrots as being luxuries. I will not get into the kind of things that occur in the operation of the store and things like that because these are all small details. These are things that are mechanical failures within the system. But what we are asking for then are two things - let us develop, let us plan, let us put it all together, but also at the same time in order that we do not turn the people off, that in order that we do not allow them to face West instead of South to this Island, in order that we stop the inroads being made by Quebec. It astonished me that two months ago a very good friend of mine who has become the wildlife officer in Nain, and he therefore goes checking people in Nain, hunters who are in the barren lands, and we have them in Nain who live in snow houses, who hunt caribou and trap fox and trap wolves, and they are in for five

MR. STRACHAN: days and out for two and back in for another six or seven days depending on the weather and out for two or three and they love it, that is their life. And the wildlife officers duty is to check them as they come in from Nain after being in a snow house for five days to see if they have their paper license on them which allows them to carry a gun and allow them to kill caribou. It is like asking a fisherman to go around in his oilskins with his license.

MR. STRACHAN:

Meanwhile Quebec flies into Labrador. People fly in from Quebec into Labrador and kill caribou wholesale and we cannot put a helicopter on the border and catch people like that. But we can send a man into the community to check to see whether a hunter who has been beating his backside off for a week has got a piece of paper on him.

MR. NEARY: Do you mean to tell me they cross the border from Quebec into Newfoundland, kill our caribou and bring them back to Quebec?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes. The herd is a herd which knows no border.

MR. NEARY: Is the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) listening to this? Just repeat for the benefit of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman).

MR. STRACHAN: About six weeks ago there was put a wildlife officer in, which is a very serious point of contention. In fact, the man almost got killed. But we tried to straighten the situation out. But he is now in Nain and he is sent by the government and this is how they feel about it. No wonder they feel bad about it. People go West, stay in snow houses and shoot caribou, hunt caribou, bring them back, go long distances, travel 160 miles. One hundred and sixty miles is nothing. I did that in one day in January on a skidoo in low temperatures. So these people do it and that is nothing. They hunt their caribou and witness aircraft flying in from Quebec, from Schefferville, landing in this Province, killing caribou and flying back out with them, and the whole situation of flying permits in Quebec, the whole situation on the caribou herd has gone berserk.

So our argument is this -

MR. HICKMAN: Is this because of the lack of wildlife officers?

MR. STRACHAN: No. What we are arguing is that the ordinary people see the wildlife officer as a government representative all of the sudden dumped into the community and his job is to stop people who do not have this little piece of paper which says he can hunt

MR. STRACHAN:

four caribou because he has got four members in his family, or he can hunt eight caribou because he has got eight members in his family, check his gun to see if it is loaded. Our guns are always loaded. We always have shells in the breech, not in the chamber but we always have shells in the breech, otherwise we would never kill a wolf. But it is an offense and we can be fined and have been fined. But in the meantime Quebec can come in and kill caribou, fly in illegally and have been doing it for years.

Furthermore this Province, another example of the same things that the people say, is that this Province has an embargo, we cannot hunt polar bear as much as we see them. And that is respected. Yet Quebec hunters - Inuit people, be it as it may, they are still from the Province of Quebec - can go over to Cape Chidley and come down the Labrador Coast during the Summer and obtain polar bear in Labrador to bring back to Quebec to sell at prices in excess of \$2,000 to \$3,000. Now this is their idea, their argument, this constant erosion -

MR. HICKMAN: Is the polar bear not controlled by the Federal Licensing Authority?

MR. STRACHAN: No, the polar bear in this Province is controlled by this House.

MR. HICKMAN: Are you sure?

MR. STRACHAN: The law has been passed, I believe, in this House in 1970 -

MR. HICKMAN: I am not sure. I thought the feds had such right.

MR. STRACHAN: 1969-1970. But our argument is basically this, regardless of the details of it, that it is being done and done and done and that is why people feel that the Province has turned their back on them, that it cares little about them.

So what I am trying to point out here is a two pronged attack, that we need a development plan for Labrador, a big development plan with a future and our hopes and our aims and the thing

MR. STRACHAN:

to keep people buoyed that they think there is something or know there is something down the road. Whether it is 1982 or 1985 is immaterial, but that is the hope for living there.

At the same time you cannot ask people to have faith in those kinds of plans if they have at the same time to suffer many of the lack of services which they are presently suffering which can only turn them off, from where they think the government and the administration is going. I support this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells).

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I would say at the outset that I support this motion. I think it is an excellent motion and I have no hesitation about it. But before starting off my remarks I would say that by no means do I consider myself qualified to talk about any aspects of life in Labrador. I listened to the debate here in this House as I have for the past few years. When I visit Labrador I love the country. There is no more exciting place in this Province than Labrador and that applies to Labrador City, certainly to the Goose Bay area. When you fly over it and you see the vastness of the country - the coast I am not

March 22, 1970

Tape 384

88 - 1

MR. WELLS: familiar with. I would be the first to say, but it is a marvelous area.

MR. STRACHAN: You should make time to come and visit us.

MR. WELLS: Yes, I will, no question about it. It is to my mind a marvelous, marvelous part of this Province and yet everybody who lives in this Province and everybody who sits in this House knows something about the problems because we have heard them so well outlined and described.

But what I want to talk about, and I want to talk about it because in a sense I suppose what I want to do is ensure that the government considers the thoughts which I would like to enunciate this afternoon on power development, because power development is a major part of this resolution. I do not mean there is any doubt about that. Now we will just look at for a moment and it says that " This hon. House urges the Provincial Government to commence immediate negotiations etc. with the Federal Government: (a) Developing Labrador's hydro resources primarily as a source of power for the industrial development of the Province, particularly Labrador, and for the Province's domestic and commercial use" with surplus power made available to other provinces etc. And there is where we come, I think, to the thing that I consider the nub of this resolution and particularly what I want to talk about and that is the hydro - electric development in Labrador.

Now before dealing with that specifically I would like to go back a little distance and I would like to consider the relationship between the Province of Newfoundland, and the Dominion of Newfoundland before Confederation, with the Province of Quebec. And our

MR. WELLS: rows and our troubles with the Province of Quebec did not start with the Smallwood administration and did not start with the Moores administration; they started many, many years before, Mr. Speaker, and if we do not want to look any further back than the report and the judgement of the Privy Council on the boundary question, we can see that right there and then, back then, there was a major row in which Quebec wanted this part of what was then the Dominion of Newfoundland. And we are very fortunate in Newfoundland, and the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador would not be the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador if we had not won that particular case. But the reason I mentioned it is to illustrate something that we have to face up to, that Quebec wants Labrador, she wanted Labrador fifty years ago and forty years ago, and she wants it today just as much -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. WELLS: -and I think that Quebec will use everything that it can or she can in order to try to get her hands on Labrador, both formally as a territory if she can manage it, but informally but effectively none the less as a storehouse of wealth if she can get it. There is no doubt in my mind about that and I think we have to be very, very careful.

Now let us consider the position of the Province of Quebec and position of the Province of Newfoundland on development of the Lower Churchill. You know, one thing I must say I think detracts from the debate in this House is trying to ascribe blame for things that went on in the past. What happened, happened. But what we have to do, and we have the duty to the people who put us here,

MR. WELLS: is to try to evolve a way in the future that is not going to let mistakes happen. Anybody knows that when you are dealing with matters at the time you do not see all the facts, how can you? How can we look into the future? Eyesight is 20 - 20 as we all know, but we have got to try to be as wise as we can now.

Now let us look at the development of Gull Island in the Lower Churchill. There are several options, as I see it, open to this Province. We can develop that, always assuming we get financing, and the power can go west. Now I, for one member of this House and one citizen of this Province, would be bitterly disappointed to see that happen, because if it goes west all we are going to get is cash back for the sale of the power. Now cash is fine and God knows we need it in this Province for social services for more development for everything that a province of Canada needs cash for, and we need it I suppose as badly as the worst. But more important to me is to see that power go into Labrador itself, what can be used there or for what can be attracted there, but also brought down into the Island part of the Province to tie the Province together with very sound economical link. And that is why it is so important to me the power should be developed in Labrador and that the Lower Churchill be developed and brought down here and the development in the Province, and that I think is a good thing about this particular resolution; it says "for the industrial development of the Province;" for the whole, the one entity, and that can be both the Island part, Newfoundland, and the part of the Province which is Labrador".

MR. WELLS: you see, if we go the Western route just look what can happen: At the moment now our power is sold at the bus bar into the province of Quebec, they have it and people say, various people in frustration, I suppose, as much as anything else say we should turn the switch, And maybe we should, and maybe it will come to that. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, if Quebec becomes a foreign country and breaks up this Dominion of Canada and gets out of it, I think I would be one of the first up there to turn that switch. But let us assume that Quebec stays; what happens if we get a corridor or whatever or if we make an arrangement to go West with that power? We will always be utterly and completely in the hands of Quebec because it is Quebec then that can turn the switch if she did not like something that Newfoundland did. If Quebec, for instance, if we had a corridor through Quebec, who is to say if Quebec left Confederation that that corridor would remain open for our power? Who is to say it, Mr. Speaker? Could Quebec suddenly turn to us, as I think it could, and say "Well we are a foreign country now. We want a new deal. We are going to exact so much money off you for the use of this corridor." Or "We are going to deny you the corridor. We are going to turn the switch." What would we do then? I feel, Mr. Speaker, if we go West with any kind of an arrangement or contract or corridor with the province of Quebec we are then in Quebec's hands. It would be no good then to try and renegotiate anything with Quebec because Quebec would have another hold over us and that would be the Western corridor for our power from the Lower Churchill; I think we would be caught.

Now I am sure that the Federal Government would do its best to help us. If the Federal Government was instrumental in helping us get a corridor they would do their best to make sure that it stayed open, I do not think there is any doubt about that, because I think that we in the Federal Government have common cause

MR. WELLS: in some respect with the province of Quebec. But the point is, and we have got to recognize it, the government and the province of Quebec, and their governments not only now but in the past fifty years or longer as far as I know, have been very good negotiators, very tough negotiators, very hard negotiators and propelled by a remarkable self-interest. I do not blame them for that, but we in this Province have to be just as self interested if we are going to stand up to them and if we are going to make sure that we get the benefit. So in my view that should be the last option that we go for, the option of selling the power Westward through Quebec.

Now let us look at the option of bringing the power down through Newfoundland. If my figures are correct, and I can only speak in very rough figures that I have heard spoken in this House of Assembly to develop Gull Island, and maybe this is the figure of a couple of years ago, I do not know, but to develop Gull itself would take about \$1 billion. I understand that to develop the transmission line and tunnel down to Newfoundland would take again about \$1 billion, so we are talking about \$2 billion there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that that kind of money cannot be raised on world markets without a major user of that power. In other words it has got to be an industry, whatever it is I do not know but whatever there cannot be the development of that power based on domestic usage in Newfoundland and Labrador. That is the point I think. There is no way that the ordinary customer in Newfoundland and Labrador, or the ordinary small business can use that power and there is no way that anybody is going to lend this Province or Newfoundland Hydro or whoever the money to develop that resource unless there is a major customer of such a size that it can take a major block of power and pay for it and assure the people who will lend the money, both public and private, that the money can be repaid

MR. WELLS: over whatever period it is. So to me it is fundamental when you are talking about developing Gull and bringing the transmission line and tunnel down through that you are talking about a major customer for the power. And quite frankly, for my part I would have to think a long, long time before I would see it go westward, in other words before I myself would see Gull developed without the transmission line and tunnel. We need every connection in this Province, one part with the other, that we can get. We need the connection of good air service,

Mr. Wells: we need the connection of social services and presence of the government in Newfoundland wherever we can get it, and I use 'Newfoundland' in the sense of the official name of the Province. We need this presence in Labrador. We need Labrador presence here wherever we can get it by means of exchange students, by whatever other device we can find so that this Province begins to know each other. Because I know and I recognize full well that the people living on the Coast of Labrador, I suppose, and the member would know, I suppose St. John's is as foreign to them or Harbour Grace or Grand Falls or Corner Brook as is South America.

So we have got to do whatever we can, but if that -

MR. STRACHAN: Badger's Quay.

MR. WELLS: I am sorry?

MR. STRACHAN: Badger's Quay.

MR. WELLS: Yes. That is right. That is right.

So that if we see that power develop and go West what we would be doing, Mr. Speaker, is forging another link between Quebec and the Labrador part of our Province, and it would be to the detriment of this Province. And we might get cash coming in, and God knows we need that cash, but I think I would almost forego it rather than see it go that way. Because I feel that if it is developed and goes West that it will be a long, long time before we ever get that transmission line and tunnel down into Newfoundland. I have always-when I was in Cabinet, when I have spoken here in the House before when this issue was on the go - I have always supported the tunnel and the transmission line. I know it is costly, I know it is expensive, but I feel that with the proper industrial user it could be feasible, and without it it is just as well to say that we would be forging a link by the Western flow of power between Labrador and Quebec, and the Labrador part of this Province may remain technically part of this Province, but de facto, and in fact, it would become part of

Mr. Wells: Quebec much more than it is now. And I would hate to see that day because I must say it galls me the advantage that Quebec is prepared to take at every turn. And it is all very well to be nice, and it is all very well to be compliant, and it is all very well to be polite to people, fine, but by God I think we have come to the stage where we have got to say to Quebec, Look as far as we are concerned you have had designs on a part of this Province since before it was a Province, and since it has become a Province, and unless we get some satisfactory considerations out of you, we are not going to negotiate anything with you, be it headwaters or rivers or anything. That is, I think, the position I believe we have to take, Mr. Speaker, because if we negotitate anything with them then we give them another handle to berate us with or something that they can take away from us if we do not go along with them in other matters and other considerations.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WELLS: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WELLS: What I am saying is this, as a member of this House elected by the people of Kilbride to come in here and say what I think.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WELLS: No. Well this is my view, and I put it forward.

So this is my point, Mr. Speaker, that we should say to Quebec as a condition precedent to any kind of negotiation, to any kind of talk with you, we want that 800 megawatts back that it would need to sustain the tunnel and transmission line and pay for it, and if you do not go along with that, and you are not prepared to negotiate that, then we will go the court case route that we are already on, and we will wait for the decision, and if the decision comes we will have to abide by it, but damned if you are getting anything else from us, either before or after, and let us

Mr. Wells: settle that issue, and we are not going to be too happy about giving you anything else afterwards, You know, I might be naive, or I might be oversimplifying matters, but it does gall me to see what they are getting - what? -37 per cent of their power needs at this moment coming from the Province of Newfoundland, and we getting back so little, and they are getting back so much. And I am not trying to ascribe blame for that. When it was done it looked all right, I dare say, and maybe if it had not been done that way it would never have been done at all. But the point is times have changed, economic circumstances have changed, and now they are reaping everything that is to be reaped from this, and we are reaping next to nothing; and now they want another deal with the power going West, and they will reap from that too. Do not anybody tell me, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Lesvesque and his government would do that for nothing. If we get a corridor there we are going to have to pay for it, But the point is they became the broker of our power and they did not pay for it, we have paid for it. So I am very firm and very clear, Mr. Speaker, in my thinking on that.

Now then to come to this other business about the link between the two parts of this Province.

MR. WELLS: When I say that I supported a tunnel, yes, I do. I supported it then, I support it now. It could not go ahead for economic reasons but I, for one, would vote and urge that it go ahead at the earliest possible opportunity and as soon as the economics can be arranged, and that would be the finding of a major customer for the power.

Now, on this question of a tunnel I think there are various options that are available to this Province, assuming a buyer for the power can be found. That is a tunnel that can take the cables only or a tunnel that would be larger and would take more than cables but would also take traffic. I do not mean that you could ever perhaps drive cars through it. The problem, the logistics of getting rid of exhaust fumes, that would be too great. But electric rail cars onto which motor vehicles could be loaded, or freight, or whatever, and rail cars for people, that is the kind of concept that is in my mind. Because if you are going to go under there and you are going to put a tunnel, the major cost is getting the hole there. The cost of enlarging it to provide for more than cables to carry electricity would not be proportionately as great. So I would like to see that tunnel enlarged if it is built; once the hole is through, enlarged so that it could take rail traffic, enlarged so that it could take, if necessary, if it ever comes to that, gas which may come from the offshore, or oil, or any other installation of pipes to carry goods of that nature and, also, a rail type of arrangement to carry persons and freight and vehicles. So if we are going to cut that hole underneath that channel, the Straits, Mr. Speaker, we ought to have a broader concept than a tunnel merely large enough to take a cable or oil. There, I think, is where the Federal Government could come in. The Federal Government, I believe and I understand, is going to have to support this project anyway, particularly as regards transmission line and tunnel, if it can go ahead.

MR. WELLS: I do not think even a major industry here can make that go ahead and pay for the transmission line and tunnel without Federal help, and I think we have to say as citizens of this country and as citizens of this Province to Mr. Trudeau and his Government: "We want Federal participation in that transmission line and tunnel but we do not intend to give you control of it. We do not want you to have equity in it. We will see that the money is paid back to you on reasonable terms, the money that you put up, but for God's sake you have got to give us a help with the financing of this. But we have so little in Newfoundland really when you come to it, when you compare us with the more developed parts of Canada, that we do not intend to give you equity in it. We do not intend to give you a profit in it but we will pay you back your money at a reasonable rate of interest." That is the kind of deal I think we should strive for with the Federal Government, and I think any right-thinking person in Newfoundland and Labrador and any right-thinking Canadian would support us in that effort because, as I have said in this House before, Mr. Speaker, we have had infrastructure come in here by the load and maybe we do not have enough yet, but we have had infrastructure, water and sewerage systems, all kinds of things come in here since we have been part of Canada. I do not knock it and as a Newfoundlander I welcome it, and I am glad of it, and I am grateful for it, if you like, but I have to say, and I have said this before in this House, that although we have had these things come in, the one thing that we have not had come in in sufficient or almost any quantity, is capital from Canada to get industries going here in Newfoundland.

So when you look around, when you look at the mines of Buchans, American capital, they are going now, they are phasing out; when you look at the mines in Labrador, American capital; when you look at Bowater's, originally British capital; when you look at Grand Falls, originally British capital; Bell Island is gone now, Dosco, I do not know, that was a mixture of capital, we do not have it here but, certainly, it did not come here after Confederation, but back at the turn of the century.

MR. WELLS:

Look around, Mr. Speaker, around this Province and show me the industries that are put here and run here by Canadian capital. I cannot see them. Maybe one or two fish plants, maybe one or two, and I am not talking now about Newfoundland investment such as it is, maybe one or two fish plants, if that. We have all the retail stores in here and all the financial institutions, all the infrastructure, all the Federal services, all the Federal presence, but we do not have industry put here as a result of our joining Canada. To me, as a Newfoundlander and as a Canadian, that is the saddest, saddest, saddest thing about Confederation because I believed as a young man when Confederation came, I thought this Province would develop. I remember people saying to me, "Oh, if you build roads, and if you supply domestic power, and if you upgrade the railway, for example, if you

MR. WELLS:

do all these things, industry will follow." When I heard this advanced to me first twenty-five years ago I thought it was true. It sounded sensible, but it did not work that way. And here we are today trying to get small industries going, I hope trying to get large industries going but we are not doing it with the benefit of Canadian capital and that is the tragedy of Confederation up to this point with all the good things.

I am going to say a word too, if I may, Mr. Speaker, about this business of large industries vis-a-vis small industries. We in Newfoundland have never had much of an industrial base. We have had the fishery for centuries since we have been here. Then later came mining, beginning just before the turn of the century with Bell Island. Then came Buchans I suppose. Then came Bowaters and Price or their predecessor companies and the fishery carried on. But we have never had a major industrial base. We are not like Southern Ontario. We are not like many parts of Canada or the U.S. or Europe. So now we say, and I hear the argument developing in this House, should we have small industries, should we have large industries. Mr. Speaker, to survive in the twentieth century, in the later part of the twentieth century, we have to have if we can get them both small and large industries. My God, more than anything else I would want to see that refinery out there at Come By Chance reopened. I was not hung up on refineries in my life. I know nothing about them but I want to see it reopened. I want to see the Linerboard mill converted into something that is viable and can pay its way and reopen. I want to see Bowaters and Price stay there. I want to see the major mines stay here and I want to see more opened up. And if any other major concern can be attracted to the Island part of the Province or to Labrador I want to see it there. I want to see major fishing companies come here. I do not care myself where the capital comes from as long as we in Canada and Newfoundland call the shots. And I want to see a small industry, be it a two man

MR. WELLS:

industry or a one man industry doing something with his hands in a workshop, I want to see that if we can get it.

If we are going to survive, Mr. Speaker, in the latter part of the twentieth century, if we are going to have the standard of living that we want and that we have become accustomed to, we are going to have the big and the small and we are going to have to fight for the big and fight for the small and we are going to have to get together so that there is never an argument, you know, we must go small industry to the exclusion of big industry or we must go big industry to the exclusion of small. That is a defeatist argument. Either we want to be pastoral people living in huts or we want to be part of a modern industrial nation. And we have to make up our minds and I have no doubt where my mind goes. I want to be part of a modern industrial nation. I am that by being a Canadian. But I want more than that, I want to see it in my own Province, in my own home. That means we have to go both routes and use every device, everything at our command to get this Province to develop both great and small industry. And that is the only way we are going to survive. We are not going to be able to fly on one wing, Mr. Speaker. We need both.

I often think of an area like the greater London area in England. People think of that as a major industrial area and so it is. But do you know the bulk of the industry in the greater London area, which I suppose comprises about 10 million or 12 million population, is firms that employ fewer than, what, twenty-five, thirty people?

MR. R. WELLS: So the small industry and the small business gives strength, but the big industry and the big business gives the kind of revenue and the kind of work force that we need vis-à-vis Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Labrador City, Wabush. These places would not be there today without big industry and we need both. And when we think in terms of the development of power we are going to have to think, I think, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to think in terms of a major development. Now if that major industry that can attract the power can go in Labrador, great. I am all for it and I support it but I suspect, because of reasons of climate, because of reasons of ice, because of various other problems and because of the remoteness from actual services and technical abilities, I suspect that it would be more feasible for the first such industry that might be attracted by the power to come to the Island part of the province rather than Labrador. I suspect that may be the case. That is not our decision here. That is the decision of the industry that would locate here and the people who would finance it.

Now we can have input into that, we can have guidance into it, we can have our say, but basically let us not kid ourselves. It will not be us who will make that decision and I suspect that it would be more convenient for them and more economic for them to come to the Island part of the province but there would be one great benefit in that. If that happened in the first instance

that benefit would be that we could get that transmission line and tunnel that we could join up the two parts of this province and that I think we desperately need. We need it and Labrador needs it, both parts of this province. We have to think as one and we need that link. So if the first major industry that power brings causes that transmission line and tunnel to become a reality, then God bless it because we need it. This province needs it, Labrador and the Island of Newfoundland.

So that is how I feel we should go, Mr. Speaker. If we get Lower Churchill, if we get Gull developed, there will be other

MR. WELLS: developments in Labrador. Labrador has a vast potential for electrical developments beyond Gull and beyond the Upper Churchill. There are others. And once we have that transmission line and tunnel then I think there is a time when we might be able to attract major industry in Labrador and I for one would fight and do everything I could as a citizen of this province and as a member of the House of Assembly to help that along. You see, I think Labrador to and Labrador people and I know that they realize this that it is hard to maintain the kind of services they want on the kind of economy they have. They realize this and I think it is fair to say that the people of Labrador want industry. They want whatever they can get in Labrador, both large and small, and why should they not have it? And I think this House would speak with one voice to give everything, or not to give but to allow, to encourage and to foster everything that could go into Labrador that is feasible and that private enterprise and perhaps even government enterprise can possibly put there.

So that should, I think, be our approach, Mr. Speaker. It should be our approach to development. We should recognize the dangers that lie in the Westward route for power. There is quick money in it but we would be forging a link for one part of our province and another province that is not a province that simply just wants to deal in a normal way but has designs, overt designs on our province and has had them for years, since we were a Dominion. And we have to recognize that and face up to it and we have to be courageous enough and bold enough to tell Quebec straight where to get off if it comes to designs on this province or a good deal out of this province without a good deal coming to this province in exchange. There can be no more one-way streets, Mr. Speaker. God knows our eyes have been opened and should be opened to the danger of that sort of approach. And we have the benefit of hindsight now and we can see what happened before and we must not let it happen again. And I think that should be fundamental to our thinking and likewise it should be fundamental to our thinking to put everything that we can into Labrador by way of

MR. R. WELLS: help, by way of expenditures of money, but we should make sure if at all possible and by taking the advice of the people in Labrador that the monies are not wasted. And I believe that money has gone into Labrador which has been wasted, not wasted altogether but not used to best advantage, which is a different thing.

I remember being in Cabinet and seeing the allocations for water and sewerage go through and I think this was funded - what? - ninety per cent by the Federal Government and ten per cent by the province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Makkovik.

MR. WELLS: Yes, Makkovik.

AN HON. MEMBER: Seventy.

MR. WELLS: Seventy? No, I believe it was even more than that.

MR. MORGAN: Seventy-seven.

MR. WELLS: Seventy-seven. Yes, that is right. I knew there were two formulae. And, you know, I am told that these systems were installed but the proper backup was not there. The expertise was not engaged to run them properly and I am told that some of these systems failed after the first Winter. You see, now that is pitiful. That is a shame for our Province and for our country that this kind of money be spent, not wasted but not used to proper advantage. That we have to guard against and that we have to take the advice not only of our technical experts wherever they may be but the people of Labrador themselves who surely know their community best and should be able to advise governments, federal and provincial, in that regard.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suppose my time is just about up. I have not dealt with the other aspects of the resolution. In all respects the resolution is good and I think should be adopted as a matter of principle. I have chosen to deal with this one aspect of the resolution about which I have very strong feelings and I think which I have expressed to this House. And as I say, Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to naturally support the motion on the Order Paper. In doing so Labrador is very dear to me having spent a great part of my life navigating along that coast and then, of course, I was in my early years and then latterly I became the Minister of Labrador Affairs. My association with Labrador has been very, very close. But, Mr. Speaker, just let us think of Labrador. What is it that we are talking of? What territory is it we have in

CAPT. WINSOR:

mind? Let me just remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that we have in Labrador 110,000 square miles which was referred to for some time as a frozen wasteland inhabited by polar bears and Eskimos. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was so far from the truth as the term which we are hearing today about Newfoundlanders being a bunch of barbarians.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

CAPT. WINSOR: In 1927 on March 1, Sir, when the Privy Council ruled in Newfoundland's favour and gave Newfoundland a territory called Labrador, that great land ^{masts} I wondered - and I was only a small boy - but I recall going to the post office, the telegraph office, and I was not able to read. The telegraph operator was a very poor writer and we young fellows always had to tag along with someone a little older than ourselves in order to get the public news. I recall on that special occasion going to the telegraph office with my buddy and hearing one of them read out aloud that Newfoundland now owns Labrador. In the mind of a boy could we not but wonder? Here we are a little Island out in the North Atlantic, 42,000 square miles, all of the sudden we get the ownership of a vast land ^{masts}, three times its size, Mr. Speaker, that was something to behold. You know, we just could not fathom it, how we ever came to get that last, vast area of land.

Sir, having got it, how did we get it? That is the question that has always puzzled me. On what grounds did we really get it? Now the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) said that Quebec always had its eye on Labrador. But I can tell the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) that Quebec did not always have its eye on Labrador. We will recall during the years between 1924 and 1928 when we had a Tory Government - and I do not want to get political here - I think it was in 1925 or 1926 when the hon. W.S. MONROE was the Premier of this Province, he offered to sell to Quebec Labrador for an amount of \$15 million.

Capt. E. Winsor: Well, Quebec said, 'Look, we are not interested in Labrador. We would not take it if it was given to us, because they did not realize the potential of Labrador. But shortly after, of course, when surveyors got in and exploration was carried on in Labrador, all of a sudden Labrador started to bloom, and it looked very well with its vast mineral resources, timber resources, and its fishing of course. And it was fishing, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, which gave us the claim to Labrador. When our Newfoundland fishermen sailed to that part of Labrador known as Quebec, of course they were always pestered by the wildlife officers from Quebec, and they had to pay for trap berths, and they had to pay for this, and they had to get a licence to go in there. It was because of the fishermen, I believe, that the incentive was there by the government of that day to take the case to the Privy Council which was decided in Newfoundland's favour.

MR. HICKMAN: Does the hon. gentleman realize that our fishermen too are having precisely the same problem today?

CAPT. E. WINSOR: In the Province of Quebec?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Well it may be a different type of fishery. But the fishery I am speaking of is when the Newfoundland floaters went into that part of Quebec, and of course, -

MR. HICKMAN: A man from Port au Choix arrested recently, charged recently -

CAPT. E. WINSOR: We had stationers go in there as well, I can remember Captain George Whitely going into Blanc Sablon and fishing out of there, but it cost him an awful lot of money to be able to do it. However, my memory cannot go that far back, and it was only by reading down through the years, and my interest in Labrador that I came to the conclusion that it was the fishermen of this Province, or Newfoundland at that time, who got the government to take the case to the Privy Council.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Now, Mr. Speaker, what has happened in Labrador? You know, we talk about developing Labrador. And surely it needs to be developed because it is the only storehouse of minerals and water power and woods that we have left in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no group of people in this Province today that have suffered so many ups and downs as have the people of Labrador. Let me just remind the House, we had the - now of course I am not taking into consideration the cosmopolitan part of Labrador, which is Labrador West of course, and that was developed, and I believe, if my memory serves me correctly, it was in 1957 that IOCC started operating and mining in Labrador West and then followed Wabush.

But, Sir, if we think back we can just sum up some of the disappointments of the people of Labrador. We had, let us take prior to the war years, the lumber company of J. O. Williams go into Port Hope Simpson. It failed. It went down completely.

MR. HODDER: Did the Commission of Government also sell J. O. Williams the whole of Labrador?

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Well I do not know about the whole, but they gave him a grant of a certain area in Alexis Bay where they carried on a woods operation. And of course then we go down to Hawkes Harbour we had a whaling factory there, and then there was another woods operation down in Paradise, and it all failed. Another woods operation down in Kaipokok Bay, in Three Rapids, operated by J.O. Williams, Bowaters carried on a woods operation in the same area as J.O. Williams did a little further to the North, I think. All failed. Why did they fail? Mainly I would say there were two main reasons, one, for management, and the other, of course, transportation. The J. Grieve and Sons operation in Northern Labrador, that is up around the Three Rapids, Kaipokok Bay, the first ship they had come in there broke the company because it came down in the Spring, it waited outside of the ice, in order for the ice

Capt. E. Winsor: to clear off, and by the time it got in
it took so long to load the ship that the lay days alone, the
lay days, that is the time, I am sure the minister knows
what I mean, the time it took to load the ship, you know,

CAPT. WINSOR: over and above the chartered period allotted for that particular time, that lay days, alone, broke the company and they had to pull out. But after all of that, Sir, there were disappointments in each of those communities, and after, of course, we saw the war. We know what happened in Hamilton Inlet where the base was established in Goose Bay. The Americans came in there and people began to come in to the Hamilton Sound, the Hamilton Inlet, from all parts of the coast. People came in where they were making good money and where the type of living was unknown. Most of them never thought that life could be so luxurious as it was while working on the base. Now, of course, there were other bases established all along the coast. I can think of the one at Hopedale which improved the economy of Hopedale so much so that there was not a man in Hopedale for four years that even went out to catch a fish. All of the people were working on the bases, men and women.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, all the way down through, through history really, Labrador people have suffered. They have suffered in the ups and downs and optimism, all to no avail, and now we see the present Government letting the Linerboard mill flop, the last hope we have. We also see now where they are laying off miners in Labrador City, another indication that things are not going all that well in Labrador. So, Mr. Speaker, what have the people of Labrador got to hold on to? They can only hope and pray that this Government will come in there and establish some sort of a permanent basis, some sort of an industry whereby they can get the privilege of working and making a living for their families because, Sir, time is running out. Time is running out and let us not forget if Mr. Levesque gets his way and separatism is imposed upon the people of Quebec or if they impose it upon themselves, we had better watch out. In less than two years, the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) may be right that Quebec will certainly have its eye on Labrador and I believe that this is why Quebec is making it so difficult for Newfoundland today because it feels we will be a victim of

CAPT. WINSOR: circumstances eventually and we will have to bow to their wishes. I sincerely believe that, and if we as a Government do not take the steps and take the ball in our own hands and get in there and develop something apart from the Fishery - The Fishery was always developed in Labrador but, Mr. Speaker, the Fishery in Labrador today is carried on as it was fifty odd years ago. You know, the vast coastline and the fishing grounds of Labrador, I would say the fishermen along the Labrador coast have gotten very careless because they feel that the Government does not have all that much interest in it. As my colleague stated, there are very few stages or very few wharves, and no freezing units at all up there, and the people of Labrador today have better communications than they ever had. They have television, they have radio, they have telephones, they know what is going on in the outside world as well as we do here, and they feel a sense of being left out. What does it mean to Labrador? What does it mean to the people of Labrador? Does it mean anything at all? No, Mr. Speaker, it is very discouraging to live in certain parts of Labrador today, very discouraging, and as I said, if we do not wake up and if we do not take some action, in a very short time we are going to be very sad indeed because someone else will go into Labrador and develop it and take possession of it. I do not think that is inevitable. I am sure this is what Mr. Levesque has in mind and we, of course, must be on our guard.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to pursue this matter any further but to say that I support

CAPT. WINSOR:

the motion. And the idea of developing Port Labrador on the Labrador Coast. Now, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Peckford) said, that is a great concept. But can it be put into practice? We have had - I would hesitate to say where that port should be developed. I do not think we can go North of the Strait of Belle Isle. We had experiences up there several years ago when the Canadian government put in one of the most powerful icebreakers they had to try and penetrate the Hamilton Inlet. It could not do it. We had the experience out there today in Groswater Bay, the ice is too heavy for the sealers to get into. We had one of the powerful icebreakers down there trying to penetrate the ice, to free a path for the sealers to get in but they can only get so far. So this problem is always going to be there, this problem of ice. And, Mr. Speaker, if we get the right prevailing winds any year you cannot depend on that part of the Coast to operate a free port in Labrador.

So therefore we have to think perhaps of somewhere further to the South. Now the minister spoke of the ice-blocked Strait of Belle Isle. That is very true but I think it is easier to navigate in the Strait of Belle Isle than it is going to be in Groswater Bay. So this is just a point, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps we might give a little more thought to when we get around to making some concrete proposals as far as the Port Labrador is concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many months of the year is the Strait of Belle Isle blocked with ice?

MR. W. ROWE: Well on navigation I would say perhaps you would run into three or four months of the year, maximum four.

MR. HICKMAN: What place is that?

CAPT. WINSOR: Strait of Belle Isle. But of course you run into the problem in the North, up in Groswater Bay, where it could very well last from December until June. It is very seldom that a ship gets into Goose Bay before the first of June.

MR. HICKMAN: That is not all ocean ice, is it?

CAPT. WINSOR: It is Arctic ice.

MR. HICKMAN: All of it Arctic ice?

CAPT. WINSOR: Winter ice is like a frozen pond, you crack it and you break it and there is no problem. But it is the Arctic ice which drifts up from the North which causes the greatest problem. And this is where - I do not think judging from the minister's paper there, I do not think there is anyone really who can come out and give a definite statement on what reaction the ice is going to have along the Labrador Coast because it varies from year to year. Some years we get it very heavy.

I myself when I was navigating a vessel up there made the port of Nain June 1, the earliest ship that ever got in there. But while we were there discharging the Arctic ice moved in and we were there fifteen days and could not move.

AN HON. MEMBER: July 16, last year.

CAPT. WINSOR: July 16, yes.

MR. W. ROWE: Well what about on the Straits?

CAPT. WINSOR: In the Straits you get quite a current. I think the old saying is that the current runs in on one side of the Straits of Belle Isle and out on the other. So, you know, you have more current there and the ice is not usually that heavy, not that tight. But the problem with the opening up there, what are we going to do - you know it is very easy to say we are going to construct the powerful icebreakers but the powerful icebreakers are not going to bring the cargo out, it is the conventional, commercial ship, that is the one that is going to have to go in there and unless they are ice breaking ships we are going to have a problem there. But you see it is not the owners of the ships. The owners have to insure those ships and this is where the problem arises. You know the problem is there that the insurance rates will be so high that it would not be very - if the insurance rates go up, of course, the price of the product has got to go up. So, what are we talking about?

CAPT. WINSOR:

Are we going to price ourselves out of the productive market? It is very easy if we have to get into that sort of a transportation system.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly support this motion and I am sure there are others here who will enlighten the House on the many problems pertaining to Labrador.

SOME NON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for
Ferryland.

MR. POWER: Mr, Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, it is
with a great deal of joy that I can support this
resolution supporting Labrador because I think that
what is taking place in Labrador now is very similar
to what has taken place in Newfoundland in years past.
In Newfoundland history developed in a very haphazard
manner because of the economy we had. In Labrador
we have a chance to look back on our past history and
see what we have done rightly and wrongly and in
Labrador hopefully avoid some of those problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: It is for that reason that
I speak on this resolution for Labrador.

We started off the House
today on a very friendly note, if you want, and I
support the resolution almost entirely except that I
have had one experience that causes me to at least
mention that there is one section of the resolution,
part (b) of the resolution, that I cannot fully believe,
that the Liberal Party of Canada passed a resolution
supporting section (b) of this resolution on Labrador.
It amazes me that the Federal Liberal Party can pass
a resolution saying that they intend to build a railway,
or are in favour of a railway and a road going through
Labrador when they have, in fact, on the Island part of
this Province done just the opposite and they have
allowed the railway part of our transportation system
within the Province to deteriorate to the extent that
we had to take off the passenger service and in reality
we are actually having to remove our freight service from
our rail system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Be constructive.

MR. POWER:

I shall. That is the only note that I wanted to interject at the beginning because I do not want to be - it is not a partisan resolution, it is a resolution that I think we all agree with, but in this case I find it a little bit unusual that they would support a resolution for a railway and road in Labrador when, in effect, they have deteriorated the rail and road system in Newfoundland and not really greatly helped us to improve it.

MR. STRACHAN:

May I make a point?

MR. POWER:

Certainly, Sir.

MR. STRACHAN:

It is the case is it not that railways are used to open up frontiers? Generally railways after a period of time become uneconomical but in frontier country, the frontier areas, railways are generally the first means of transportation such as the Schefferville to Labrador City which is open now, which eventually will be a road. The idea, particularly, is that Newfoundland itself, the Island itself is hardly a frontier country as such, but Labrador most definitely is.

MR. POWER:

Good point, Sir, good point! I agree, Sir, but again having worked on the rail system in Newfoundland I find it somewhat unusual that we lost our rail passenger service in Newfoundland when I think it still had some value to the Province.

I would like to spend a minute on the history of Newfoundland as it developed, and on the history of Newfoundland and Labrador in particular, as it should develop. The previous two speakers who spoke immediately preceding me, especially the member for Kilbride who mentioned that to take things from Labrador and to go into Canada with them is not really the right direction to take and mentions, in fact, if there is

MR. POWER: a direction to be taken in bringing goods out of Labrador it should be taken Southwards to Newfoundland. My belief, not being an economist, is that it is pointless to take things out of Labrador when you have two or three of the basic ingredients of a sound and substantial industry within Labrador. Where in Labrador you have some of the basic ingredients - you have an adequate supply of power, you have an adequate supply of raw materials in the form of uranium and iron ore - to take these out, to bring them to Newfoundland, if you want, the Island part of Newfoundland where you have only one element of resource which is the people, and possibly some people to not only work in industry but also to use it, to my way of thinking will do something. As in the case of Labrador Linerboard where you take a raw material in Labrador and you try to bring it out and make it into a finished product on the Island it simply is uneconomical. And to do that to the iron ore or to the uranium or to the other things that are in Labrador to my way of thinking will really be uneconomical. I would certainly not want to see that happen.

In Labrador we have a chance to develop a community, a section of our Province almost as if we were creating something. We can look and see what we want and we can actually create it or make it into the way we want to have something. As the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) mentions, we have to temper this with reality. You cannot go in and buy out all your major industries like IOCC and Wabush Mines. You cannot buy those people out and turn them out of the Province simply because they are foreign investment. You have to be able to allow those persons to develop within Newfoundland, to develop resources within Newfoundland,

MR. POWER: within the Province of Newfoundland for our benefit, and in this case, within that section of Labrador.

In the case of Labrador which has that major element of hydro power, major elements of raw material in the form of minerals, the Island section of the Province has a very large workforce, an unemployed section of a workforce which is very enthused about going to Labrador. It is a myth that people will not go to a barren country, will not go to places simply because it is uncomfortable. I know there are many constituents in my district who phone me daily hoping to get work in Labrador, who would go almost anywhere, irregardless of the temperature and the climate, to work.

MR. POWER:

So that fallacy that we have some people in Newfoundland who are too lazy to work or too indifferent to move out of their own communities to work, that is not really true.

In the case of Labrador I believe that industry must maintain, it must stay within Labrador for the people of the Province. This business of separatism is a very, very real problem especially in Wabush and Labrador City, where I have some relatives and some good friends. I have not been to Churchill but I have been to Wabush and Labrador City many times and in that area it is a very, very real fear that the Province of Quebec will force, actually force Labrador to go their way because they will be willing to give it services, be willing to develop and willing to put money into the place to make it a much better place to live.

I think, as the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) said earlier, you do not expect water and sewer in every tiny community on the coast of Labrador. What this resolution is trying to get across is that there must be some balance developed.

In the case of the off-shore oil and gas we are talking about going in and developing something on an economic base and getting lots of money coming into Labrador and I often question whether the people of Labrador, the people of Newfoundland really want all the money that has gone into parts of America and parts of Canada. Do we really want a Chicago on the coast of Labrador? Or would we like to have some kind of a balanced economy, Mr. Speaker, where native people, Inuit, Indian and the settlers who have gone there can continue to live their lives as they have done in the past, but with a little more help and

MR. POWER: co-operation from government, a little more services, a few more menial things, if you want, to make their way of living a little tiny bit easier. I find, Mr. Speaker, that this is what this resolution wants; to develop a general balanced plan for Labrador, a plan that takes into account the need for social services, the reality of the climate and the reality of the economics, the fact that you have to let foreign investment come in, you have to allow your mines and you have to allow your oil and gas to be developed. But it has to be developed in co-ordination and in conjunction with the people who are living in the area, the people who love the area and who know and have decided to stay in that area.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that in the case of Labrador, as I said earlier, the history of Newfoundland has shown that we have done many things wrong. As one historian once said, "If there is anything we learn from history it is that we learn nothing from history." In the case of Labrador we have a great chance to develop Labrador as almost an ideal community, to develop it the way a community would be almost planned by God, if you want, created by us as a government and as a people.

All I can say is that I support the resolution as placed by the Leader of the Opposition and I support it simply because I believe that in Labrador we have a chance to rectify many problems that are being created within the Province and to maybe avoid many problems that should not arise. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, if it is okay with the hon. House, I would like to move the adjournment. I can go for four or five minutes.

MR. NEARY: Call it six o'clock.

MR. LUSH: Call it six o'clock?

MR. HICKMAN: You cannot call it six o'clock, move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. LUSH: Move the adjournment of the debate? Okay.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Thursday, March 23, 1978 at 10:00 a.m.