



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 52

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 1976

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition, Sir, in behalf of almost every single - or it has been signed by almost every single person who lives in the Labrador portion of my district, and I know in presenting the petition I do so in behalf of every single resident. Sir, the petition states in its words succinctly, and at least as effectively as I could, its point, and perhaps the best way to outline the prayer of the petition is simply to read the form of the petition, Sir.

I reads as follows: "We, the residents of Labrador South know only too well that the gravel road from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay - and if I may add a word here for the benefit of members of the House who may not be intimately familiar with that part of the Province, that is all of the road in the Province from the border with Quebec to the end of the road, to the road head which is at Red Bay - that the gravel road from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay is seldom if ever in good driving condition. During the Spring, for example, it is always in deplorable condition. At the moment it is in danger of becoming completely impassable."

"We, the undersigned, believing that our provincial government has an obligation to improve living conditions in our part of the Province, most strongly urge the government, particularly the Minister of Transportation and Communications, to ensure that we Labradorians get sufficient funds, one, to provide and/or hire equipment to drain the road immediately and to keep it adequately graded thereafter: two, to properly rebuild and upgrade the road where necessary and/or desirable during this Summer; and three, to purchase a snowblower for next year instead of relying on the present blast which has to be installed onto a Hough 70 loader which is used regularly during Summer maintenance and construction."

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, before I say a word or two with reference to the petition itself, may I point out to the House, Sir, that this petition has been signed by 112 of the 132 voters in the community of L'Anse-au-Clair, by 186 of the 215 eligible voters in the community of Forteau including Buckles Point and English Point, by 122 of the 269 voters in the community of L'Anse-au-Loup, by 38 of the forty in the community of Capstan Island, by ¹¹²109 of the ¹⁰⁹112 eligible voters according to the voters list in the community of West St. Modeste, by 65 of the 96 voters in Pinware and by 36 of the 182 people eligible to vote in the community of Ped Bay. So I think it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that it has the wholehearted support of the people who live in that part of our Province and that part of my district.

Sir, a delegation from that area was in St. John's recently and the Minister of Transportation was good enough to see us, the delegation and myself, for an hour, an hour and a half. We had quite a thorough discussion of the points made in that petition. At that time I did not have the petition. It has come to me subsequently with the request that it be presented. Let me say, Sir, that the minister listened sympathetically to the request made by the people who made up the delegation. He gave us some satisfaction on some of the points. I would hope that he would now upon further consideration be able to give more satisfaction and grant the requests which these people make because I think, Sir, the requests are both modest and reasonable and I think the case in support of them is unarguably sound.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying again as I have so often that I think it is of great importance that we in this House, particularly the Queen's ministers - if the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) would perhaps lower his voice, Sir, I could carry on. He has a voice that penetrates with great effectiveness and clarity. The point I was making, Sir, is that I think it is terribly important -

MR. DOODY: It is distracting.

MR. ROBERTS: It is distracting I say to the gentleman from Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doody). I agree with him. It is terribly important that we in the House, Sir, and particularly those who hold the Queen's commission as ministers, pay very great heed to the justifiable needs and legitimate requests of the people of the Labrador portion of this Province. I am not in any way encouraging the separatist feeling. Indeed, Sir, I feel we must fight against it. But the way to fight against it, Mr. Speaker, is by showing the people of Labrador that they can get, within the constitutional and political framework of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, a fair and an adequate response to their needs. I think Sir, that this petition makes such a fair and reasonable request and I would hope, Sir, that the government this year out of the \$45 million or \$50 million or \$60 million which the minister will have available to him for construction purposes, will be able to find the relatively few dollars that will be needed to satisfy the prayer of this petition. I support it, Sir, and I do so wholeheartedly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition in behalf of his constituents from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay. That road, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that stretch of road is about the worst piece of road, I suppose, in Newfoundland and Labrador. The road is carved out of the side of a cliff. There are no guardrails. It is a very narrow stretch of road. It is very hazardous and very dangerous. I am amazed that in the Wintertime they can clear the snow there at all to allow the traffic to get over it. Most of the time the road is blocked off. It is not the first time, Sir, that the problems concerning that stretch of road have been raised in this hon. House. Mr. Mike Martin, when he was the member for Labrador South, raised the matter, and I believe on one occasion persuaded the Minister of Transportation and Communications to go to the Straits of Belle Isle to take a look at that stretch of road. But it would seem that it was all in vain, that they still do not have the snowclearing equipment that is necessary to keep this road open in the Wintertime. The upgrading and the reconstruction of the road has not taken place. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, that if we are to prove to the people on the Labrador side, especially in the Straits of Belle Isle, that we are sincere and genuine in making Labrador truly a part of this Province, Sir, then I hope that the Minister of Transportation and Communications will see fit to grant the prayer of the petition, Sir, which strikes me as being a very reasonable one indeed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

HON. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, just to say a few words on the petition. The delegation I met with from Labrador clearly pointed out the need for improvements. In fact, last year I was in that area, not as a minister but as a member of the House on a different matter pertaining to the fisheries. I saw the road conditions myself. This government has spent substantial

MR. MORGAN:

amounts of money in that area the past couple or three years - last year, \$150,000, I think the year before \$100,000 on that road from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay. The engineering estimates to reconstruct the road to make it an all weather road, passable all year round and in good condition, the engineering estimates of cost is in the vicinity of \$2 million. Of course the population of Red Bay is approximately, I think, 500 people. It is, looking at the cost and the population, it is very difficult to determine at this time whether or not this Province can afford to totally reconstruct the road and to -

MR. ROBERTS: You are talking about the whole road - not just the section particular to Red Bay.

MR. MORGAN: I am fully aware of the road conditions in that area. I saw the road conditions, prior to the hon. gentleman seeing the road conditions.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no.

MR. MORGAN: The road from Red Bay - the worst section of road is from Red Bay approximately eight to nine miles in the direction of L'Anse-au-Clair. That is the worst section of road. There are no guardrails on the road because the road is a narrow road. It is rough terrain and it is at the bottom of a mountain and hilly area. It is almost impossible to install guardrails without causing havoc with snowclearing operations, because the road is too narrow and the guardrails would be torn down each Winter with the ploughing operations. So what I intend to do, as indicated to the delegation from Labrador, is that I will be travelling to the area the early part of the Summer. I will be holding a public meeting in Red Bay and clearly pointing out to them that there is no substantial amount of money this year to enable a contractor to carry out the reconstruction of that road because of the really substantial cost, \$2 million, and talking to them of the possibility of some alternate accommodations with regards to adequate transportation in that area. I will be doing that by outlining to them what the views of my department are at a public meeting and to get the reaction. I am inviting the hon. gentleman from

MR. MORGAN:

the area to attend that same meeting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of some 814 residents of Labrador in six communities - the communities of Cartwright, Happy Valley, Rigolet, Mary's Harbour, Paradise River and Fox Harbour. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows: "Whereas residents of Coastal Labrador only have air and sea transportation; whereas sea transportation is only provided by Canadian National; whereas Canadian National boats do not have the capacity to transport residents between communities because space is taken up by tourists; whereas local residents are herded aboard Canadian National boats like cattle and in most instances without sleeping accommodations; whereas Canadian National is subsidized by the Canadian taxpayer, we as Canadian taxpayers do hereby request that Canadian National boats be used only for the transport of local residents who use the boats as a highway."

Mr. Goudie:

That, Mr. Speaker, is the prayer of the petition.

And just in supporting the petition I might add that it was, the petition itself, although the conditions have existed for a number of years, the petition itself was sparked by an article in The Daily News dated 29th. of August, 1975. And the petition was circulated by two residents, two people who are now residents of Happy Valley, Labrador, but were at one time residents of coastal communities, Ruby Durneau and Daphne Roberts, and they point out a number of things. They took a trip on one of the CN boats, the Motor Vessel Bonavista themselves to look into these conditions, on their own initiative, and point out a number of things they feel are wrong. And that is, for instance, residents who have to travel on CN vessels were travelling with only sitting space available and in some instances there were not even chairs to sit on. People have to travel without sleeping accommodations, while deluxe and first class cabins are occupied by tourist or families of the crew taking round trips. And so on down the line.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this petition be tabled, be referred to the Department of Transportation and Communications, and I request that particular department refer this petition to the appropriate Federal Department and support it as I do now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

HON. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate that approximately two months ago, back in February, when the Minister of Transport, the hon. Otto Lang was here in the Province and met with the ministers who are responsible for transportation in the Atlantic Region, that at that meeting the hon. Minister of Transport in the Federal Liberal Government, announced to us he intended to increase the ferry tariffs in the Atlantic Region, including the coastal boat services to the Labrador. And, of course, we very strongly opposed that in a submission to the minister, not only the increase in ferry tariffs across the Gulf and throughout the Atlantic

MR. MORGAN:

Region, the one to P.E.I. and Newfoundland, and from Yarmouth to Bar Harbour, in Nova Scotia. But very adamantly opposed any increase in the coastal boat services in this Province based on the fact that there was an obvious, substantial need, a desperate need, for improvement of these services. And the hon. gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) quite clearly pointed out in that petition the need for improved services.

So I was indeed pleased last Friday when I met with officials of the Department of Ministry of Transport in Ottawa that I was officially informed then that there will be no increase in the ferry tariffs or the coastal boat service tariffs as a result of our strong opposition put forward to the Federal Minister. So there will be no increase in the coastal boat tariffs in Labrador. And now, of course, the pressure will be put on, and I say 'pressure' because I am of the opinion as results of my meetings in Ottawa over the past number of months that we have to put pressure on to get results from Ottawa. You can sit down and talk honey all you wish, and you will get no results, You need pressure and pressure. And if the hon. Minister of Transport in Ottawa wants pressure, the hon. gentleman here could give him lots of pressure in the next number of months.

The pressure will be on to have improved services in the existing coastal boat services in Labrador. And he will have lots of pressure over the next number of days and weeks with regards to what we saw recently, the recognition in Ottawa that there are two different sections of Canada, if not three, whereby transportation policies apply. Because the transportation policy of Central Canada is obviously now being applied to the Eastern part of Canada, and this is quite unfair. It is quite unfair and it is obvious it is going to increase regional disparity in this country.

We see the increase in our ferry rates across the Gulf, which is our link with the mainland, a part of our Trans-Canada Highway. No recognition of our opposition made earlier while the minister was here in the Province, not even consultation with this Province. I

Mr. Morgan:

happened to be in Ottawa on Friday when the officials indicated that the information will be given to me officially by the minister on Monday of this week, and I was unable to get the details of the increase in the ferry services, and whether or not there would be at that time any increase in the coastal boat services to Labrador. But I pressured them into giving me the information based on the fact in Newfoundland on Monday was a holiday. So only because of that little factor I got the information Friday evening, but much to my surprise I tuned into the media on the weekend in this Province, and here was the East Coast Marine Ferry Services announcing the full details. The Minister of Transport in Nova Scotia, responsible for transportation, was not informed officially, I was not informed officially except for the information I obtained late Friday afternoon in Ottawa as a result of a holiday here in Newfoundland. The minister responsible for transportation in

MR. MORGAN:

P.F.I. was not officially informed. Pure arrogance, the same kind of arrogance that the Ministry of Transport is responsible for Coastal boat ferry services in Labrador, the same kind of arrogance was also shown on the ferry service from Portugal Cove to Bell Island last week.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order! I would request the hon. minister to confine his remarks to the matters referred to in the petition. I realize that in so doing he may well comment on matters closely related. But the dividing line between closely related and by a great leap of the imagination related is one that I ask hon. members to impose upon themselves.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While I was may be getting away a small bit, Mr. Speaker, what I was trying to do was show that this matter is a federal matter. If the present attitude of the Federal Government towards the existing ferry services we have in the Province and the Coastal boat services, unless that attitude changes, then the hon. gentleman's petition is going to go on deaf ears in Ottawa. That is what I am getting at, Mr. Speaker. But I can assure the hon. gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) that representations will be made quite strongly from this hon. gentleman in Ottawa in the next number of weeks and months to have the Coastal boat services to Labrador improved as they should have been improved the last number of years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Eagle River, is not in the House today. He is in his district attending a number of meetings on public matters. So perhaps in his absence I could say a word or two to indicate that we very much support the prayer of the petition. Indeed most, if not all of the people who signed the petition, judging from the places read out by the gentleman from Naskaupi, are residents of the district, the constituency of Eagle River.

MR. ROBERTS:

In supporting the petition, Sir, may I begin by saying I am really very, very pleased that we have a Minister of Transportation and Communications who pressures Ottawa. I have not figured out yet whether he is doing it in his personal sense, in his ministerial capacity, officially, unofficially, or in his capacity as the best dressed man of the year. But I am equally glad, Sir, I am equally glad, Mr. Speaker, that we have a Liberal Government at Ottawa, as he has reminded us, which responds - I say sorry?

MR. DOODY: I say we are glad -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I am glad they are too. When you see what the Tories did for this Province, Sir, you know why I am glad we have a Liberal Government at Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance is not allowed to enter into debate, nor am I. If we could I would be very happy to debate it with him. In the meantime perhaps he would control himself as best he can. The point I am making, Sir, is I am awfully glad we have a Liberal Government at Ottawa which responds in a meaningful way to the seductive tones with which the Minister of Transportation approaches them.

Now, Sir, the prayer of this petition is a reasonable one. I am not sure I would go so far, and I am not sure that even the gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. J. Goudie) meant to go so far as to say that nobody should be allowed to travel -

MR. MORGAN: You will get more good news next week.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) should control himself. I realize it is a struggle for him, Sir. But his seduction, his seductive tactics, Sir, should be aimed at Ottawa and not at me. I am not the Minister of Transport in Ottawa. I have a better chance of being the Minister of Transport in Ottawa than does he, but I am not nor do I expect to be. Now the point I am making, Sir, is that the gentleman from Naskaupi I do not think meant to say that nobody should be allowed to travel on the Coastal boats except people who live along the Coastal communities and who must, as he pointed out, use the boats as, really, their

MR. ROBERTS:

means of transportation. I think they should be given priority. It is not a new problem. It is a very old problem. It has cropped up on the Island. It has cropped up on the South Coast in the district of LaPoile, in the old district of Burgeo-LaPoile and the present district of Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir. It cropped up with respect to Harbour Deep often represented by my friend, the member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

Mr. Speaker, let us also remember two other things. First of all for the benefit of the Minister of Transportation, and so he will send the petition to the right place, the Coastal boats are not operated by the Ministry of Transport. They are operated by the CNR. That is the way the terms of union set it up. The Government of Canada foot the bill. The CNR operate them and thus comments about the operating principles and practices should be directed to the CNR. I am not sure the Minister of Transportation appreciates that. I want to remind him. Second -

MR. MORGAN: The Ministry of Transport is responsible for transportation policy.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let the hon. gentleman contain himself. The CNR is operated by a board of governors who are appointed by the Government of Canada. I would suggest, Sir, that the directors of the CNR would be very offended -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I should point out that when people are speaking to petitions there should not be, and indeed cannot be any debate, and that interjections almost inevitably lead to debate and indeed constitute debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman is misleading the House by saying that the representations as indicated today by my friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) should be passed on to the CNR. The CNR is acutally controlled by the Ministry of Transport. Therefore, representations, as I earlier indicated, should be made to the Ministry of Transport which controls CNR.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, before Your Honour makes a decision.

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest that on a number of occasions the Chair will certainly hear submissions, and on other occasions solicit submissions. I think there are some occasions where a matter is called a point of order where it is self-evident and that there would be no need to hear submissions, and I think this is a case as such and that there is no valid point of order before the Chair.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must defend myself against the allegation by the hon. gentleman I am misleading the House. I am not even misleading him, and heavens knows, Sir, he is instantly easier to mislead on his record than is the House.

The point I wish to make, Sir, is that the CNR operate these coastal boats and this is a matter having to do with the operations of them. The further point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN: If the hon. gentleman is going to stand in support of petitions signed by thousands or hundreds of residents on the Labrador Coast.-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. MORGAN: I take exception to the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must ask hon. gentlemen to my right, and indeed if there are any interruptions to my left, all hon. gentleman to please remain silent so that I may hear what the hon. gentleman is saying and then decide whether it is a point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the point I am making, if the hon. gentleman is wishing to stand and support a petition signed by thousands of Labradorians, a part of this Province, or hundreds of residents of Labrador, I sincerely hope that he will refrain from abusing a member of the House of Assembly or a Minister of the Crown.

AN HON. MEMBER: Order! Order! Order!

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

MR. MORGAN: In his statements he is abusing -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down boy where there is order called.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Again this is an occasion where a decision can be made because I think it is self-evident and that no purpose would be served by hearing arguments. I hope hon. gentlemen agree with the general principle on which I am going here, and that is on some opportunities one will ask for, and certainly on many opportunities one will be glad to hear, but there are some which are self-evident, and that there is nothing to be served, and in my opinion this is such a one and that there is no valid point of privilege: a difference of opinion, but there is no point of privilege.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I am very grateful for your ruling. But the only thing I would say is that the hon. gentleman opposite, and I cannot say knowingly, but obviously, repeatedly is abusing these points in an effort to make points in debate and I am not permitted to reply to them, but let me say simply, Sir, that the hon. gentleman opposite has had none of his privileges abused, he has had none of his prerequisites of office abused, All that he has done, Sir, is

MR. ROBERTS: expose once again the reason why his seductive approach to Ottawa has proven so notably successful.

Now let me make a final point in supporting this petition, Sir, it is one that I would direct properly and appropriate to the minister concerned. If he is concerned, if he is concerned about the travelling conditions which the people, Sir, on the Coast of Labrador must face. May I point out to him, Sir, two ways in which his administration, his government, as he is fond of telling us, as if he were the Queen, can make a positive contribution. First of all, Sir, they can increase the subsidy which they pay, started by the Liberal Government, to the people who use Labrador Airways to travel by air, That subsidy must be increased and that will bring down the cost and many of the people, not just the commercial travellers but ordinary people going back and forth on the Coast use that, as if the Minister of Transportation is prepared to put a few dollars where his mouth is, Sir, let him do that. Secondly let him do something to provide airstrips instead of -

MR. MORGAN: A point of order.

MR. ROWE: Ah, sit down. Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised.

MR. ROWE: You are the most pointless point of order.

MR. MORGAN: It is not now relevant to the petition tabled by the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie). The rules of the House indicates that an hon. gentleman may comment on the petition in support of, or on the petition. The petition tabled by the hon. member for Naskaupi is not with regards to air services, none whatsoever. It is pertaining to the Labrador services provided by the coastal boat service of CN.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may to that point of order. The hon. gentleman opposite either did not hear the petition or has forgotten it. Let me say, Sir, the point of the petition had to do with the transportation services made available, and let me say, Sir, that the minister opposite in speaking in support of the petition

MR. ROBERTS: without any objection from this side, Sir, wandered sufficiently far away from the coastal boat service to talk about the alleged arrogance of the hon. Mr. Lang in Ottawa, the reaction of the Minister of Transportation in Nova Scotia to certain events, to the fact that he had not been informed "officially" and other abuses of his -

MR. MORGAN: A point of order. A point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman opposite has raised two points of order - I am sorry a point of order and a point of privilege that Your Honour dismissed without even calling on anybody other than the plaintiff to make his case, which shows how weak the case was. Now Your Honour has asked for submissions from both sides on what - at least at first blush the hon. gentleman has stumbled across an apparent point of order, and all I am doing - and let him control himself - is attempting to show as I believe to be correct, that he has no more point of order than he has merit in his approach to the problems of transportation in this Province.

I submit, Sir, that

MR. ROBERTS:

what I was saying was precisely in point of the subject matter of the petition. All I wish to do is to make a sentence or two to conclude my remarks. If the hon. gentleman opposite, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), in his professional, personal, political, official, ministerial or even private capacity could just control himself and contain himself for a moment or two longer I shall conclude.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order was with respect to the relevance of the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. In my opinion they were not out of order as being irrelevant. I was about to interject myself and caution him with respect to debate. I think I would ask him now in concluding his remarks to bear that point in mind.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That makes three out of three for the gentleman opposite now, Sir. Three strikes - he is out. Let me say in concluding, Sir, that if the hon. gentleman is sincere in his desire to improve transportation services available to the people of Coastal Labrador, everybody concerned agrees that the biggest thing that could be done is to provide airstrips. If talk could provide airstrips there would be one four miles long and 150 miles wide in Labrador.

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman was just ruled - a ruling was just given by the Chair that the hon. gentleman in talking about airstrips was getting involved in debate. The hon. gentleman is now out of order again.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. As I understood Your Honour's ruling, your ruling was that I was not allowed to get into debate. Well, that is common ground. But I would submit, Sir, that Your Honour, as I understood and heard, made no reference to the fact that mentioning an airstrip was out of order. All I am doing is

MR. ROBERTS:

making an example. I said that if talk could build an airstrip the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications would have had an airstrip in every community from Black Pocks, which is the border, to Nain and we might even have one at Hebron or Saglek or even at Cape Chidley. I submit, Sir, there is no point of order and that I should be allowed - all I want to do is finish a sentence, Sir, if the hon. member could but contain his sense of self importance long enough to let me finish it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: He is irresistible.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. gentleman was out of order in the case put forward by the hon. minister. I would point out that this I would have to check. I would have to adjourn for a few minutes to check, but it is my impression that although obviously we have rules with respect to petitions, that there is a certain discretionary power in the Chair with respect to terminating not debate, but comment. I am not saying that there is. I am saying that it is my impression that there is, and if I were to use it then obviously I would want to adjourn for a few minutes to be sure. But if we cannot dispense with the comments on the petition without frequent interruptions and situations certainly leading to debate, a situation which one does not expect to occur and which should not occur in the presentation of petitions, then I would adjourn for a few minutes to check what is my impression to be sure I was right before making such a ruling.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour. That makes four out of four. The hon. gentleman is batting well today. Mr. Speaker, all I was saying, the sentence I have tried about thrice to get out of me is that if the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, is sincere in his desire to improve the transportation facilities available to the people of Coastal Labrador, (comma, for his

MP. ROBERTS:

benefit, we are still on the same sentence) -

MP. MORGAN: I will show you what sincere is, if you were man enough.

MP. ROBERTS: Well, he says that he is sincere, Sir. I would say, Sir, that talk is cheap. I would point out, Sir, that if he is sincere, Mr. Speaker -

MP. MORGAN: They are laughing at you in Ottawa, they are laughing!

MP. ROBERTS: No. What they are laughing at in Ottawa, Sir, is not Labrador. What they are laughing at in Ottawa is the hon. gentleman, just as they are laughing in this Province at the hon. gentleman, and in this House and on both sides.

What I am

MP. ROBERTS: trying to say, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman could but contain himself - and he is giving a splendid example, Sir, of what Your Honour said when Your Honour just ruled that comments from the other side tend to provoke debate. He is leading me astray. I regret that. He is seducing me, Sir. He is being seductive again.

MP. MORGAN: I am being seductive?

MP. ROBERTS: Yes, Sir, he is being seductive and it is not parliamentary to say what I would appropriately say right now. But let me say, Mr. Speaker, to finish that sentence, that if the hon. gentleman is sincere -

MP. MORGAN: Take care now! Take care!

MP. ROBERTS: If the hon. gentleman -

MP. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

I am now directing the hon. gentleman to my left to remain silent and not to interrupt the Leader of the Opposition.

MP. ROBE: Name him! Name him!

MP. SPEAKER: And just to expand on that, as the hon. gentleman knows every member has the right to be heard in silence. There are times when the member insists upon that and then it is enforced. There are times when a member allows or encourages interruptions. I think there is a third case as well. The third situation, I think, is the present one, and that is where the hon. gentleman speaking has not specifically said he wishes to be heard in silence, or has not said anything to the contrary, but where it is evident that such interruptions, which at best are permissive, tend to disrupt the business of the House. That I think is the case here. So I shall now ask the hon. gentleman not to interrupt the Leader of the Opposition even if there is a permissive attitude on the part of the Leader of the Opposition.

MP. MORGAN: Even if he is asking for it?

MP. SPEAKER: Even if he is asking for it, yes.

MP. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If this were debate, I would not only ask for it I would gladly give it back with interest to hon. gentlemen opposite. He is now batting five out of five. Now the point of the sentence, Sir - I think this is the fourth time now - if

MR. ROBERTS:

the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, is sincere in his desire to improve the transportation facilities available to the people of Coastal Labrador, - comma, the same comma we had there before - then the best way that he can do that, Sir, since all concerned, knowledgeable authorities agree that the most effective means of improving the transportation facilities available to the people of Coastal Labrador is to build new airstrips, particularly in the communities between Mary's Harbour and Nain, which do not have any road connections at all, - comma, still in the same sentence for the benefit of the hon. gentleman - then, Sir, he can go to his colleagues and use his much vaunted, persuasive ability, this seductive ability, this ability to wheedle and to weasel and to get money out of things.

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

I must direct the Leader of the Opposition to confine his remarks to the allegations in the petition, or matters closely related thereto, and not to his impression of the manner of executing of the duties of the hon. minister.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize if I was led astray by the hon. gentleman's seductive abilities. But let him, Sir, quite simply let him go to his colleagues in the cabinet and say, "Boys, let us put up a couple of hundred thousand dollars to build an airstrip or two this year." That will do far more good, Sir, than all the posturing and postulating and positing, Sir, that the hon. gentleman has done.

This government, Sir, have built airstrips -

MR. WELLS: To a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. WELLS: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is waxing eloquent. He has persisted despite the warnings from Your Honour in making this into a debate. This is not a debate, simply some comment on a petition. So I would ask Your Honour to enforce this.

MR. ROBERTS: If I may to that point of order, Mr. Speaker. Let me say, Sir, that I am trying hard not to enter into debate, because as Your

MR. ROBERTS:

Honour has said, and as the rules quite clearly state, that is not permitted. I am merely making a few comments as required - or as permitted under the rules. All I am saying, Sir, I may be saying it eloquently and I thank the gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) for his unwanted but deserved tribute, I may be saying it eloquently and forcefully and effectively but, Sir, I submit what I am saying is quite in order. Your Honour has been quick to call any member to order, and rightly so. I submit, Sir, that I am in order and I would like simply to conclude the very few remarks I set out to make about fifteen minutes ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order was with respect to whether the hon. member was in fact debating the petition. I am not in a position to say that he was debating the petition. I would request him to bring his remarks soon to an end. I am quite sure that the five minutes has expired. I have not timed it. I realize that there have been many interruptions. So I have not drawn that matter to the hon. gentleman's attention. But I would hope that that would be the result.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate Your Honour's charity and generosity. I shall draw my remarks to a close. I had largely finished what I wanted to say. Let me say again, Sir, that my colleagues and I, including in particular the gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), certainly support a request that the people who must use the boat service, the coastal boat service, be given an absolute priority, because they must use it. To anybody else it is a holiday or a discretionary trip of some sort. Let me say also, Sir, that for the benefit of the minister's opposite, including in particular the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) in his official capacity, Sir, his ministerial capacity, as a man who represents the Queen, personally, directly and effectively, Sir, that the best way he can help the people of Coastal Labrador in his departmental responsibility is to find a few hundred thousand dollars and put it into airstrips. If he can persuade the Government of Canada with his seductive wiles to put some money in, well and good. If not, Sir, then let him do the job.

This government, Sir, have built airstrips in Bonavista, in Winterland near Marystown and a number of other places throughout the Province. Some of them were carried on from the previous administration but they have been upgraded and paved since this administration came into office, Sir. If the government of this Province can find money for those airstrips then, Sir, let them find a few dollars, a few hundred thousand dollars - that is all that is needed - for the people of Coastal Labrador.

MR. FOREPTS:

I hope, Sir, in closing that when the Minister of Finance speaks in his own inimitable way to support that petition he will announce, Sir, that as Minister of Finance and as President of the Treasury Board that he feels something should be done about it and he will get it done right away. Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, unlike the Leader of the Opposition who seems to have his feathers ruffled today, Sir, I would like to calmly and as briefly as I can support the petition so ably presented by my friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Coudie) on behalf of his constituents who are finding it very difficult with the present accommodations that they have from Happy Valley, I presume, right up the coast right up as far as Nain.

I presume that the coastal service that the member referred to originates mainly in St. John's, maybe to a certain degree from Lewisporte but mainly from St. John's. I would like to point out to the House, Mr. Speaker, that this year it is a bit of a new ball game because the ferry William Carson will be operating, I understand, from Lewisporte to Happy Valley, from St. John's to Lewisporte to Happy Valley, so it would seem to me that some of the coastal boats now that are carrying the tourists, carrying the passengers - and I do not think the member means to get rid of the tourist industry in Northern Labrador, because log cabins and clubs and taverns and so forth have opened in recent years in the communities in Northern Labrador. It is just starting to open up to the tourist industry. I do not think the minister means to bar that but would like to see the people - and rightly so - in Northern Labrador get preference.

So I am going to make a suggestion to the member and the minister. I do not know if it is a practical suggestion or not. I am going to make a suggestion along the same lines that CN did on the Southwest Coast, that they brought in these small type ferries, these

MR. NEARY:

fast boats. I do not know what the distance is between Happy Valley and Nain. Is it 150, 200 miles?

AN HON. MEMBER: More than that.

MR. NEARY: More than that. Well it would be -

AN HON. MEMBER: About 300.

MR. NEARY: About 300 miles. I did not realize it was that far.

Well then, my suggestion, Sir, may be impractical, to get a fast boat to go from Happy Valley to Nain in one day. It would not be possible to do it, like the Runner for instance which leaves Port aux Basques, goes down to Ramea and back again in the same day. It makes a round trip in one day.

MR. DOODY: It is not the same Runner that left Bell Island the year before?

MR. NEARY: No. And then you have the Sprinter. That is the one that is left on Bell Island, the Sprinter.

MR. HEARY:

But that would be worth looking into, Sir, because I think you are going to need a different type of boat, a fast boat, because most of the people that travel travel in the summertime from Happy Valley to Nain. They do not want to fly in the summertime. They want to go by boat. I presume it is cheaper and it is probably more convenient because they want to carry freight and carry parcels and so forth. So I believe what is necessary, Sir, now that this new run of the William Carson is starting up this year and will probably continue, I think what the minister should concentrate on is to try to get the CN to either operate a service just from Happy Valley to Nain, back and forth, maybe a boat leaving Nain and one leaving Happy Valley at the same time, or just leaving Happy Valley, going up and making the return trip back, or get a different type boat designed for the service, get a faster boat that would give the people the service that they rightly deserve on that Coast.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

HON. W. DOODY: Just a few words, Sir, in support of the petition from my hon. friend from Naskaupi. The transportation problems on the Coast of Labrador are something that are certainly not new. They seem to be becoming more obvious. They are certainly being brought more to the attention of the public through the House and through the member since he has joined the House. I feel that the situation is one that should have been remedied a long, long while ago. It is a part of Canada. It has been long neglected by the department responsible, by the federal department responsible. I think that it is one that is really one of the crying shames of neglect of a part of Canada that is one of the real frontier areas that deserves attention and deserves consideration.

I should say, Sir, in supporting it, though, that I would like to say a word or two about the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's comments regarding landing strips on the Coast of Labrador. I think that that is one of the most obvious and outstanding areas of neglect in this Province, one that should have been looked at a long, long while ago, should have been addressed a long, long while ago, and I think for the first time is being

MR. DOODY:

addressed. I know that the Federal Department of Transport, the M.O.T., have had an assistance. The Northern Indian Affairs Department, I think, have had a programme of assistance in northern areas in landing strip programmes. This Province has never, despite all its representations to the Federal Government with the exception of last year when I think we, or the current fiscal year, we achieved a magnificent contribution of \$100,000 from that programme. In all the years of Confederation the service to one of the most neglected and one of the most deprived areas of Canada, one of those areas that are most needy in terms of communications, our first and only gesture from Canada in their Northern - and there is a vote for it. Every year in the Federal House of Parliament there is a vote, Your Honour, for Northern landing strips. We have never been able, despite all the seductive wiles of all the various ministers involved through the years - and I would attribute that with great respect to our predecessors in the previous administration because I can assume that they made the same, or at least I would hope that they made the same, or even perhaps some of them or stridened representation and the provinces we have to get the sort of landing strip facilities that are necessary. Manitoba has had its share. Saskatchewan has had its share. The major share of that vote has always gone and continues to go to Quebec. It is still going into Quebec. We have never been successful in doing so. But I would refer the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and put it in the record of the House that in this year's estimates, in Transportation and Communication, as he asked my seductive friend, the minister responsible, to approach me as Minister of Finance and as President of Treasury Board, I would refer to him to page 105 in the estimates, landing strips, 1706-03-06, there is landing strips capital, \$632,000. I think that you will find that that is the first time there has been a substantial vote. They will be spent in the Coast of Labrador or perhaps in Burgeo, all of these places that have been neglected during the previous administration's twenty-five year period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: The first move forward for the Province of Newfoundland, with its own limited resources, with our meager resources and capital works have found it necessary to delve into our own meager resources to provide the transportation and communications system that has been passed out from Ottawa for other provinces, many of which are more prosperous than we have been. Blanc Sablon, for instance, on the Coast of Labrador, on the Quebec border, this year has got its air strip paved. That happens to be fortunate enough, perhaps, to be on the other side of the Quebec border. We on the Labrador side are not in that happy position. Perhaps some of the people there can correct that by making a trade with the Province of Quebec and give them a few hundred thousand square yards of territory and they might give us a few yards of pavement in exchange. I do not think the people in

Mr. Doody:

Newfoundland are prepared to make that sort of exchange, Sir. We will stick with our own small capital grants and we will try to do it on our own, if it means giving up our integrity and our territory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to speak a few words of support in the petition presented by the member from Naskaupi (Mr. J. Goudie), and I hope I am granted the same latitude as the Minister of Finance was just granted in supporting the petition. I would simply like to say just one thing.

MR. ROBERTS: Last year they budgeted \$450 'Fred' and spent \$5,000.

MR. ROWE: Yes, Sir, the budget last year, Sir, was -

MR. ROBERTS: \$450,000 budgeted.

MR. ROWE: \$450,000 and the actual amount spent was -

MR. ROBERTS: \$500.

MR. ROWE: \$500, which gives some indication of the sincerity of the present administration -

MR. ROBERTS: And of the minister.

MR. ROWE: - in putting airstrips in this particular Province and in Labrador.

MR. MORGAN: I only became minister last Fall.

MR. ROWE: But may I just make one suggestion over the noises emanating from the Minister of Transportation and Communications,

MR. MORGAN: Are you going to support the petition, or what?

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the way to get successful negotiations or expenditures of money from Ottawa is to stand in this House and lash out at every opportunity at various ministers in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: We have seen this time and time and time and time again. We have seen it this afternoon -

MR. MORGAN: Right! Do not say anything about Ottawa -

MR. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: - I ask for the same -

MR. MORGAN: - and their buddies up there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must direct the hon. gentleman to the rule, no doubt well familiar, and that is that his remarks are to be on the material allegations of the petition, and obviously this well may lead to matters related, as long as they are closely related. The hon. gentleman did refer to latitude of other speakers. I will point out that to the best of my memory when previous speakers spoke with respect to a different form of transportation, such as airstrips, it was as a development or an example of the argument of transportation, but I would not wish to get into a discourse specifically on airstrips and specifically on a vote in a department of government, a specific estimate. These things are made as a comparison or as an example or to emphasize a point, as long as the point deals with the material allegations to the petition. That is what I wish to draw to the attention of the hon. gentleman.

MR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The whole question, of course, has arisen, you know, we are talking about the sincerity of the Federal or the Provincial administration, and as an example in 1974-1975 there were zero dollars spent for the landing strips, in 1975-1976, \$450,000 estimated and the actual amount spent \$500. Now this year we have \$652,000, and I sincerely hope, Sir, that this administration will spend that estimate, and that it will be an expenditure and not an estimate -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: - as has been the case in years gone by.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROWE: My son, this is like the black flies of Labrador!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman is now debating an estimate heading in the Department of Transportation and Communications. We are not on the estimates of my department. We are supporting or commenting on the petition that was tabled in this House today by the hon. gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie). We are not debating individual subheadings of estimates, we are not debating the amount of funds we spent on airstrips, we are supporting and commenting on a petition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance made an example, I may add at the suggestion of his colleague from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), and all that my friend and colleague is doing is merely referring to the same example, and if it is in order to make the example, and surely it must have been or the knowledgeable gentleman from Bonavista South would not have made it, then, Sir, surely it is in order to comment upon it. There is no debate. I only wish we could debate it.

Let me say, Sir, that the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South reminds me exactly of what is going on at the Clearview Drive-in tonight, a matter of transportation, a drive-in. The paper tells us that among the features that is playing tonight "She is Seventeen and Anxious", Sir, and that describes the hon. gentleman. Let the debate carry on, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! There is no doubt that the last sentence or two the hon. Leader of the Opposition was not relevant to the point of order.

With respect to the point of order, the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Powe) may, in order to develop a point relevant to the petition, may make a reference to this matter of airstrips, but he would be out of order to develop a discourse on airstrips unless it is done as a subsidiary argument or to emphasize a point. But to just give a discourse on airstrips or on expenditures for airstrips would be out of order, would not be relevant to the petition.

MR. ROWE: Thank you for the guidance, Mr. Speaker. I take it that applies to any other type of strips. Sir, there is only one other point that I would sincerely like to make in supporting this petition. That is that hon. minister's opposite refrain from publicly attacking Ottawa and ministers in Ottawa because it can only jeopardize any ongoing negotiations for the success of the things that are called for in this very petition.

MR. MORGAN: Like Old Perlican?

MR. POWE: Now listen, Mr. Speaker, if they want to talk about Old Perlican I will rape the Minister of Fisheries in this House.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that in order 'Fred', is that in order? Seducing him is but not raping him.

MR. POWE: Because I have held my tongue pretty, pretty closely in the last two or three weeks on that one.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Sir, if the hon. gentleman was in order he would be seducing him not raping him, Sir.

MR. ROWE: Now I think my point is well taken, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. A point of order.

MR. POWE: Mr. Speaker, could I just finish. I will finish with one word.

MR. WELLS: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The thing is getting out of hand in the House. The House today is becoming the worst kind of an example of what can and does happen in this

MR. WELLS:

Chamber. I would ask Your Honour to bring matters back in hand.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Sir, I agree for once with the gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) and I would say that the House has certainly had some levititious moments, if that is the right word. But I will say, Sir, that the comments of my colleague, which in turn led to some comments by the Minister of Finance, which in turn led to some comments by me, all of which, I suggest, were out of order, were prompted solely and simply, Sir, by yet another interjection from the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), who has already been told by Your Honour in no uncertain terms, in a statement that is a prelude to being - the statement which His Honour made from the Chair is a prelude to naming a member - the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) has been directed to being quiet except when according to the rules he may speak.

Sir, if we have strayed, and I think we all have - and the House Leader is well-advised to bring it up - I would say, Sir, that I apologize and my colleagues do for our share but, Sir, let him make sure that his own house is in order and we will take care of our side. It is the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), Sir, who has touched off this unseemly levity and, Sir, he has done so despite Your Honour's friendly but accurate admonitions to be quiet except when according to the rules he has the right to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Does the hon. minister wish to speak on this point of order?

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order brought up by the hon. House Leader?

MR. MORGAN: My hon. colleague, the House Leader.

The point of order is that this actually commenting on, which is what we are doing right now, on the petition has become a debate. And the hon. gentleman in the Opposition has used points of order to get up and to make disparaging remarks about members of this side of the House of Assembly. The hon. gentleman who was speaking in

MR. MORCAN:

commenting on a petition - a comment was made by my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries regarding Old Perlican. The hon. gentleman referred to replied that he was going to rape the member. Now these are the kinds of comments that have been made by the Opposition this afternoon that my hon. colleagues, the House Leader, is referring to, that this is completely out of order and they should get back on the right base and let us refer to the petition and not to a debate of the kind we are now seeing in the House.

MR. POWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was - and it is obvious to everybody in this Assembly - that I was pleading with this government to do certain things in order not to jeopardize any ongoing negotiations with Ottawa with respect to road building or anything else. It was at that point that three hon. gentlemen opposite leaped in with the Old Perlican situation, about which I had been utterly silent for ten to twelve days, in spite of the fact that my constituents are climbing down my back trying to get some answers and I have been maintaining silence in order to try to get a number of people together.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the hon. the House Leader and the comments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition thereon are very valid. To a very large extent the rules of the House are legalistic. There are technicalities. There can be interruptions from the Chair every five minutes. There can be points of order every few minutes. This may or may not have much effect on the House at all. To a very large extent it is matter of self discipline. The rules obviously are there. They have to be imposed. They are to a large extent technical and legalistic. Rulings on points of order may come every few minutes, but that does not necessarily improve the position of the House for the consideration of public business. The point I am making is emphasizing the self discipline which I think is essential, and pointing out that in my opinion this has been lacking during the last twenty or thirty minutes or so, and asking all hon. members on both sides to practice it now and to confine remarks to the matters under consideration without interferences or personal remarks.

The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly try to wrap up my remarks as quickly as possible if I do not have any interruptions from the other side. May I just in closing say this, that it is, I suppose, in order for private members both on the government and Opposition side to take any other government to task on certain policy. But when a minister of the Crown attacks another level of government on a point about which he may be negotiating with that government at that particular time it can only do this Province harm.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: The only thing that I am sincerely requesting the ministers opposite to do is to refrain from publicly attacking ministers of the Crown in Ottawa because these are the very people with whom they have to negotiate. Now during an election it is a different matter. That is the only point

MR. F. BOPT:

that I want to make.

MR. SPYAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. H. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition I feel I am perhaps in a better position to be able to enlighten the House on the transportation in Northern Labrador especially. I can go back, Sir, as far back as 1936 when at that time the Department of Natural Resources under the Commission of Government chartered the family vessel, the Winnifred Lee which operated at Northern Labrador services for nearly thirty years.

MR. HICKMAN: Grand Bank.

MR. WINSOR: Originally owned at Grand Bank, built in Shelburne and built by Mr. Duffet, I think, of Grand Bank. I am not too sure of that. However that service continued for more than twenty-five, nearly thirty years. In spite of what the hon. members have said, since that time there has been a continuation of improvements in transportation in Labrador. Let me just lead up to the present time. In 1950 - and that was way back when we had the Kyle leaving St. John's and made one trip per year into North West River, one trip and that trip was in July. That was the only trip that the Kyle made into North West River, in the Hamilton River at all. However, after Confederation the CNR took over the service. We still operated the little Winnifred Lee, but we terminated at Hopedale and went North as far as Hebron. Now Hebron is approximately 160 miles North of the further most settlement of Nain today. Then, of course, the CNR chartered another one of our family vessels, the Trepassey. The Northern Labrador service then was extended to Goose Bay. The ship leaving St. John's terminated at Goose Bay, and we in turn picked up the service there and went as far as Hebron and came back and terminated at Goose Bay. So what you had, you had two boats, the Southern boat terminated at Goose Bay and the Northern boat terminating at Goose Bay, one going North and the other going South. That continued for a few years. Then the service was improved again when they brought in the Burgeo and put two faster boats

April 28, 1976.

Tape 2242

RH - 3

MR. WINSOR:

in the Northern service, the Tavenor and the Hopedale. This provided a very good service and there were very little complaints from the people along the Northern Labrador Coast. Then we saw from the Burgeo to the Cahot Straff.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: It too started to service, a much larger boat, and now of course this year we learn that in addition to the other boats, the William Carson will be operating that service.

So, Sir, there has been a continuing improvement in the transportation system along the Labrador Coast, grant you not sufficient because more people are travelling today than ever before. But I would agree with the hon. member who presented that petition, that I do not think our local people are getting a fair deal with accommodation on those boats. Practically all of the cabin deluxe or first class cabins or deck cabins, what have you, are taken by tourists and this is where I think we should have an increase in tariff, toward the tourists, because, Sir -

MR. MORGAN: Two rates.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: That is right. Because it is a tourist paradise to -

MR. MORGAN: A giveaway for tourists.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: That is right, absolutely, a pure giveaway where a tourist will fly down from New York, pick up the CNR boat here and for \$150 or less have ten days on that boat with free board, you know, and lodgings.

MR. ROBERTS: It does not even cover the board.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: It does not cover the oil it takes to keep them warm.

MR. MORGAN: Two categories, resident and non-resident tickets.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Yes, that may be a good idea. However, I just thought I would bring the House up-to-date on the improvement because I could not stand or sit here and hear the ministers and members accusing the previous governments and other governments of not improving the transportation system in Labrador. It has improved and I am a witness to the fact. I navigated and operated the vessel for ten years myself, and I know what problems there are, and I know what problems there were, and I know what problems there will

CAPTAIN WINSOR: continue to be.

Now my hon. friend from LaPoile suggested that they might have faster boats. This can be done. There is no problem in operating a fast boat from Goose Bay to Cartwright one day, and the next day go back. Instead of every day you would have every second day. And the same thing applies to the Northern part. It may take two and a half days but those things may be in the future and I am sure it will be given consideration. So, Sir, I strongly support the petition and I am very happy that the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) has taken the initiative again, once again, because this is the not the first time. There have been many requests for improved transportation problems in Northern Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a couple of words to this debate. I feel as Minister of Tourism I should say something with regards to the transportation problems in Labrador and especially with regards to the matter raised by my colleague, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie).

First of all, Sir, I would like to say that this administration has made repeated representations to Canadian National to provide by charter a vessel on a trial basis, or as a pilot project, to cater to the people interested, tourists I mean, interested in going up the Labrador Coast and we have held many discussions with CN officials on it. I cannot say that Canadian National has expressed a great deal of interest, and are not opposed at all to the idea. They agree with us that there is a very real potential and I think, at least my impression of those discussions are simply that funds have not been available in the past. And the other issue seems to have been the fact that they should do something to provide a link between Goose Bay, Lewisporte and St. John's before getting into what could be termed, I suppose, a more luxury type of vessel.

MR. HICKEY: Now that this has come about, the William Carson going from St. John's to Lewisporte to Goose Bay, now that that is out of the way, I would hope that Canadian National can pursue further, and hopefully be successful in bringing about a kind of cruise ship which we can develop package tours for people who are interested in going up that Coast, and I can assure this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, that the surface is barely scratched in this regard, There are a great number of enquiries and a great deal of interest in this kind of development.

Mr. Hickey:

We in our discussions with Canadian National have pointed out that certainly a vessel that could be chartered to go to the Labrador Coast and be developed by way of package tours during the prime tourist season, could then be used to go South, cruise South in Southern waters in the Winter. Mr. Speaker, if the great number of people who have gone to warmer climates this present Winter is any indication, than certainly the business is there for someone to tap.

So I would suggest that the problem of tourists using the coastal vessels -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order raised by the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I find the comments of the hon. minister extremely interesting, but, Sir, he is completely irrelevant to the particular petition that has been presented to the House of Assembly.

MR. MORGAN: You only want your side to speak!

MR. ROWE: Just one moment now. On this particular side we have been ruled out of order on a number of occasions as a result of points of order raised by hon. members opposite in not being strictly relevant to the petition. Now I find the minister's comments sincere and interesting and informative, but they are not strictly related to the particular petition with which we are dealing. So I just bring this to the attention of the House, and if the rules of relevancy are going to be applied they should be applied equally to both sides.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism speaking to the point of order.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I find it astounding having sat here for the last hour and fifteen minutes, and listened to all the jargon that has gone on in relation to this very vital subject which has kept us up until this time. Certainly nobody wishes to close off debate on this very vital subject. But, Mr. Speaker, I

Mr. Hickey:

that I am not out of order at all, that the matter raised by my friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) indeed calls into question the abuse of this space or the misuse of the service, the coastal service going to Labrador, and I am simply providing the House with information where my department and this administration has made some valiant efforts to sort that very matter out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: And so, Mr. Speaker, if I might now just finish by saying -

MR. SPEAKER: Before the hon. gentleman does that the point of order should be decided. As I recall the allegations of the petition presented by the hon. gentleman from Naskaupi with respect to complaining of the service in that area and that residents had inappropriate or no accommodation, and that much of the accommodation was taken up by tourists, a suggestion that tourists perhaps should not be on it, and the space reserved exclusively for residents or something very closely related to that: As I understand the hon. Minister of Tourism's remarks, he is speaking on one of the several allegations and that is with respect to the tourists taking the place of the residents. So in that respect he is in order.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I say, and may I not delay the House any longer, simply to my colleague from Naskaupi that I agree with him completely that many times this space, this vital space required by residents of Labrador is taken up by tourists, and that his argument indeed is a very valid one, and the issue is a very vital one, and I simply wish to point out to him that he has my support as well as every action that we can take, and we will continue to pursue the matter with regards to the issue that I raised insofar as a special vessel to cater to tourists and to provide an improved service for the residents of Labrador through the coastal service.

CAPT. WINSOR: May I ask the minister a question?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that to agree would be perhaps a kind of precedent.

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

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, before we move on I have a petition of my own. I almost feel like apologizing, Mr. Speaker, for presenting a petition at this late time in the afternoon. However it is quite an important one. The prayer of the undersigned, "The residents of the general area within one quarter of a mile from the junction of Oxen Pond Road and Freshwater Road in the city of St. John's, humbly sheweth that we oppose the granting of a lounge license to Curtis Limited to operate an establishment to sell spirits, beers and wines at 316 Freshwater Road, St. John's. Notice of intent to apply for such a license appeared in the March 27th issue of The Evening Telegram. It is our sincere belief that the result in traffic and parking problems, combined with the general increase in evening and nighttime activity in a residential area, already overcrowded with service type business establishments would reduce the value of residential properties to an unjustifiable level.

"In view of these circumstances we therefore pray that the license will not be granted and your petitioners as are duty bound will ever pray." Now, Mr. Speaker, this petition has been signed by practically every householder within a radius of about quarter of a mile of this particular premises. By checking the voters list, even a cursory glance, shows that this -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is Stockwoods, is it?

MR. J. CARTER: It is the place known as Stockwoods now, yes. There is a great fear that this lounge license might be granted. They are not afraid that a preliminary refusal by city council means the necessary absolute refusal and therefore have asked me as their member to call the attention of this legislature to this matter.

Now they are against the traffic hazards, as they point out, and particularly what they are against is having the rules changed

MR. J. CAPTEP:

in the middle of the game. Most of the people there built their houses within the last ten, fifteen years fully expecting to live in the suburbs. They did not elect to join the golden mile. It is not a question of them being against the consumption of spirits. It is not a teetotalers' petition by any means. It is merely that they wish their area to remain residential and wish to call the attention of this legislature to that matter. Therefore I would beg leave to put it on the table of this House and let it be referred to the department to which it relates, or indeed to the agency to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, in speaking in support of the petition and on behalf of the department to which it relates, I can assure the hon. member that the matter has been dealt with. The city of St. John's Municipal Council have already served notice that they are not responsive to the application for a liquor license. As these indications have been submitted to the department, or to the Liquor Licensing Commission, they have responded to the sentiments of city council. I can tell the hon. member that his petitioners have been satisfied to the best of my knowledge, that there is no intent of issuing such a license, and there will be no such license issued despite the number of teetotalers in that particular part of the city of St. John's.

MR. NEARY: You can go home happy now, "John"!

MR. DOODY: As for the golden mile thing, I think that is an absolutely delightful expression, Sir, and I intend looking out there again during the next few days to see what great industrial impulses have dictated that description.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills:

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act."
(Bill No. 40).

A bill, "An Act Respecting Queen's Counsel And Precedence At The Bar." (Bill No. 41)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the hon. House to introduce a bill, "An Act To Authorize The Province To Undertake, Organize And Manage Lottery Schemes."
(Bill No. 42). These are varied and wonderful schemes there.

I also, Sir, give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the Guarantee of the repayment of bonds or debentures issued by and the guarantee of the repayment loans made to certain local authorities and municipalities.

Sir, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in relation to the granting of supplementary supply to Her Majesty for the financial year ending the 31st of March, 1976. And they neglected to put A.D. there but that is a Justice Department error, not mine.

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of Transportation and Communications Act." (Bill No. 43)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. T. HICKFY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce a bill, "An Act To Adopt A Flag For The Province of Newfoundland." (Bill No. 39)

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know who is speaking for the hon. Premier in the House this afternoon, but whoever is speaking for the hon. Premier would he care to enlighten the House on the Province's attitude towards the new Federal Energy Strategy Paper that was tabled in the House of Commons yesterday wherein it suggests that gas may rise, that hydro might get the short shift, and that the offshore Federal development looks bad, and that heating fuel may increase by twenty-five cents a gallon. Has the Province been notified? Does the Province know anything about it? Will the Province be fighting this, objecting to it? When the people read it this morning in the paper they nearly had a stroke. But will whoever speaks for the Premier tell us what the Province is going to do about this.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, the Province has not yet been officially notified nor have we received anything from the Federal Government as yet, and a check was made before we came into the House this afternoon, and neither the office of the Premier nor the office of the Minister of Mines and Energy, who is at a meeting in Quebec today, has been notified. What I can say is that the reports in the Press which, of course, we have all read are cause for grave concern. It would appear, it is especially concerning to see the Federal statement on the matter of offshore oil and gas which would seem to indicate that in the mind of the Federal Government there is a lack of priority

Mr. Wells:

on the offshore oil and gas off the Coast of Labrador particularly, where our information is that there is a strong possibility, and a very real possibility that in the next five years commercial quantities will be found. It would, of course, take approximately seven, eight to ten years to develop these, but we are extremely optimistic and our advice is that there is grounds for optimism on that score, and we are disturbed and concerned if the news reports are correct that this seems to be down-played. We are also extremely concerned that we who are great potential producer of energy, particularly in the form of electrical energy, that this does not seem to, if the press reports are correct, does not seem to have been given the priority that we would wish to see. We are concerned also that the Federal Government seems to have lost sight of the fact that sometimes national steps are necessary to ensure that energy is developed in the provinces, and it is disturbing to the Province and to the government, and I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, to all Newfoundlanders that we seem to have a balkanization taking place in where one province can lay down strictures which controls and hampers the development of another province. And certainly I believe and we believe that this is happening in Newfoundland. Increases in the cost of gasoline and all oil products are inevitable, but we intend to fight and oppose them wherever we can, recognizing nonetheless that over the years they are bound to go up, I think, nobody could argue that that is not so.

MR. NIARY: Not by twenty-five cents a gallon.

MR. WELLS: And not by twenty-five cents. And we will do everything in our power as a government to oppose this, and, of course, we have to say this bearing in mind that the Federal Government is of course the final power and authority in Canada on these matters. But every

MR. WELLS:

representation which can be made, and every stand which can be taken by the Province of Newfoundland to keep the prices of these necessary goods down and in line with what people can afford to pay granted their needs, this step will be taken by this Province, Mr. Speaker. There are certain areas we recognize also where there is waste. Obviously in the coming years we recognize that we are going to have, for example, I think as a people to be less wasteful, of energy. But there are certain areas, particularly in the area of home heating oil and this sort of thing, where in the climate in which we live we must have heat, you know, we cannot say we are just not going to use energy. We can use it efficiently and we accept that. But there is a point beyond which we cannot go. We must have energy supplies if we are to continue to live and produce in this country. There is one also very important thing, Mr. Speaker, and that is development. There is no way that we can even begin to help and foster the development of this Province industrially without energy supplies. We do not accept any position where we are going to be cut back in the right to develop and the ability to develop by regulations of the Federal Government. The strongest possible stand will be taken, Mr. Speaker, on these issues and I hope with the support of everyone in the House and everyone in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. WEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. It is all very well, Sir, what the minister said in reply to my question. I thank him for the statement of policy of the government. But would the minister not agree that it would be in the interest of the Atlantic Provinces at this moment, the have-not provinces, if Newfoundland - if the other provinces will not do it - if Newfoundland would take the initiative to join with the other Atlantic Provinces in demanding of Ottawa that they immediately tee up a federal-provincial conference, that the Atlantic Provinces join forces to fight against this policy that apparently will be adopted by the Government of Canada, not just talk about it, if necessary to put a

MR. NIARY:

resolution forward from this House to go and join with the other Atlantic Provinces, let Newfoundland take the initiative? Does the minister not think that this would be a worthwhile project for the government to undertake at this particular moment?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: It may well be. I do not discount the suggestion at all, Mr. Speaker. It may well be. When the full text and intention of Ottawa is communicated to the Province, which I am sure will be in the next day or two, then obviously the government is going to have to consider every possible avenue, and also in the normal course of things the government will be learning the approach and the views of other provinces in Confederation and particularly the provinces most closely concerned - all provinces are closely concerned - but particularly the provinces whose problems are more similar to ours. This may mean an approach or co-operation with all or any number of provinces who may wish to co-operate with us in any representations being made to Ottawa. But certainly we do not discount the suggestion at all, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question which I believe should be addressed to the Minister of Finance, but possibly it should go to his colleague, the Minister of Industrial Development, whichever minister is responsible for the government's dealings with Atlific Inns Limited. I believe the Crown corporation is Hotel Holdings Limited. But anyway, I believe it is one of the two ministers who is responsible. My question arises out of a tender call which appears in today's issue of the Evening Telegram whereby tenders are invited for certain expenditures in respect of new electrical services and electric heating in the Hotel Port aux Basques in Port aux Basques which of course is owned by Hotel Holdings Limited and operated for them, as I understand it, by the Atlific firm. My question, Sir, is this: Are the government liable? Will they be involved in any expenditure as a result of this tender call? If not, who will pay for it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. W. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that since the Department of Finance is responsible for N.I.D.C., through whom these people deal, have not been consulted or involved in this tender call, I am only assume that the Atlific people or the Holiday Inns people themselves will accept responsibility for it. I know nothing of it other than what is in the paper. We certainly have not been consulted or asked for any participation or anything.

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

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I could. I thank the minister. Could the minister undertake to have inquiries made with a view to finding out because while the contract between Hotel Holdings and the Atlific firm to my knowledge has never been ratified publicly, it has been made public. As I recall it,

MR. ROBERTS:

you know, there is a possibility that the government might be liable for some expenditure even though they may not have been consulted in advance. So would the minister undertake to have it looked into by the appropriate officials with a view to letting the House have the information tomorrow or Friday?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I am grateful to the hon. Leader of the Opposition for bringing it to my attention. It is something that I will certainly look into. It is something that I am very interested in and I certainly will find out about it.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

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

MR. HODDER: A question for the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. Does the Department of Transportation and Communications have any plans to replace the Kippens Bridge this Summer?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as a result of the question asked by the same hon. gentleman yesterday in the House, I have instructed the engineering staff of my department to take a look at that bridge today or tomorrow, as soon as possible, and to give me a report with regards to the safety aspect of the bridge, and upon receiving that report a decision will be made with regards to the possible replacement of same.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister remember that I spoke to him about that bridge some two weeks ago and that it is the only bridge leading from my district? Heavy trucks are going over it and for two weeks now nothing has been done. And all throughout this time I felt that there had been a survey done and that officials had gone out there.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did mention it to me in passing approximately a week ago, a week and a half ago, and at that

MR. MORGAN:

time I referred it to the field workers of my department, not the engineering staff, to take a look at the bridge and the indication there was that the bridge is passable and now the question has to be determined by the engineering staff. The people working in the field are not engineering staff. I am talking about engineering staff from the head office here in St. John's to take a look at the bridge and to determine if it is safe or not. Once that report is in a decision will be made.

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. member for Lewisporte it has been drawn to my attention that Mr. Dermot Roche, the chairman of the community council of Branch, St. Mary's Bay, and a number of the gentlemen who are members of the council are in the House of Assembly and I know that all hon. members would like to welcome them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. Some weeks ago the minister indicated to the House that the four Atlantic provinces were going to Ottawa with a proposal with regard to upgrading the Trans-Canadas or improving the Trans-Canadas in all four Atlantic provinces. Now the minister seems to have changed his view with respect to this joint approach and he is saying that Newfoundland roads are worst than other Atlantic provinces and we need action here. I wonder if he could explain this seeming inconsistency in his approach to Ottawa?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it was a while ago, in fact March 10, when the Ministers responsible for highways in the Atlantic region made a joint submission to Ottawa and to the federal minister, the hon. Otto Lang, and it was for a reconstruction and upgrading and in some cases twinning or paralleling of the existing primary road system in the Atlantic region. In our case the primary road system is the Trans-Canada Highway. About approximately ten days ago I

Mr. MORGAN:

received a response, in fact all the ministers responsible, in this case Highways Ministers, received a response from the federal minister which was indeed in my view not a positive response and not a negative response. It was merely an acknowledgement of our submission made to him. Upon receiving that, and upon discussing with my counterparts in the Atlantic region that I felt - and I feel the support of my colleagues is with me as well, in fact if not all the Province - that Newfoundland is a separate case from the rest of the Atlantic region. Our case is much stronger to have something done immediately. Upon recognizing that I met with the officials of the federal Ministry of Transport last Friday and submitted to them our case, and when I say 'our case; Newfoundland's case, alone.

The fact that for example in 1970 there were 2,000 tractor-trailers left the boats in Port aux Basques and went to the highways, 1970. In 1975 - these are figures supplied by CN - that figure was increased to 21,500 tractor-trailers, heavy vehicle traffic. The projections of CN by 1978 is that there will be 57,000 tractor-trailers leaving on an annual basis from the boats in Port aux Basques onto the highways. Now tying this also into the fact that just recently we saw an increase of the trucking rates from North Sydney to Argentina, and no increase in the trucking rates coming into Port aux Basques which means now all the trucking, practically 100 per cent of all the trucking will now come to Port aux Basques, which means further heavy vehicle volume on our highway.

MR. MORGAN:

And any travelling motorists in this Province who travels our Trans-Canada from St. John's to Port aux Basques must surely recognize the desperate need for some reconstruction of our Trans-Canada Highway.

So based on these factors we feel as a Province that Newfoundland's case is indeed a case over and above the rest of the Atlantic Region. So on that basis we are going, if you wish, separately, but still with the other Atlantic Region.

Now as a result of my meetings last Friday in Ottawa, the Federal Ministry of Transport officials who are in the Surface Division, with the Highway Division of the Ministry of Transport in Ottawa, top level officials, they will be coming to Newfoundland arriving approximately, I think it is the first or second week in May, the second week in May, they are coming down to travel the Trans-Canada Highway with the engineers from my department from St. John's to Port aux Basques. Well my engineers can show them the bad points, and they can also recognize them themselves, so they can go back and make a report to their minister and hopefully recommending that something can be done immediately. And tying this in to the fact also that we have seen two reductions recently since the 1st. of January, two reductions by CN's rail freight movement, which means more freight onto the roads, tying all of this in that, I think the officials also recognize in Ottawa now that something has to be done. So I am hoping that as a result of the officials coming from Ottawa taking a firsthand look, making a report back to their minister that we can get something done here in Newfoundland immediately, and when I say immediately, hopefully commencing this year.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member from Lewisport.

MR. WHITE: Could the Minister of Transportation and Communications indicate whether or not he is going to wait until this Federal study is completed before trying to do something about the deplorable conditions of the highway as it exists now, or is he going to get his

MR. WHITE:

officials to fix up some of the bad spots along the road?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly answer that question.

The fact is right now in this Province we have 2,700 miles of rough, gravel road winding, dangerous, hazardous gravel roads used by school buses and other means of transportation in the rural parts of the Province, either secondary roads or roads connecting in some cases smaller type communities like out in Branch and St. Mary's Bay, a typical example, I mention them to my colleague, 2,700 miles on the Island part of the Province, also 600 miles of what we call a tote road across Labrador. Now the estimate of cost of the engineering staff of my department to do these roads on the Island part of the Province right now, to do them, reconstruct them to a level for paving, and then pave them, 2,700 miles of road will be \$700 million.

Now looking at Labrador and the section down there, adding it on to that cost, and looking at the fact that there is need for many areas of the Province new construction, of a road going into a place where there is no road now, but to reconstruct existing roads and pave them, and to build new roads is going to cost close to \$1 billion. Now if we have to supply that need and demand, how can we possibly afford as a Province to carry out the reconstruction and upgrading of the Trans-Canada Highway that is now needed?

So the best we can do, Mr. Speaker, to answer the hon. gentleman's question, the best we can do is carry out some preventive maintenance, if you wish, maintenance whereby we can do some surfacing of areas which is really at a level right now that we can retain. But most parts of our Trans-Canada, for example, I can refer to a section from the Western boundaries of the National Park into Gander, there is no point in resurfacing it, it has to be totally reconstructed. Now in that kind of outlay of funds this Province cannot afford to do it. The most that we can afford to do is maintenance, of some just basic resurfacing work. And we will attempt with our maintenance crews this year to do some patching and repairing in areas where we

MR. MORGAN:

can do it in a feasible way.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow the hon. gentleman one further supplementary.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary to the minister.

MR. WHITE:

Would the minister indicate whether or not he has followed up on his suggestion in the House a few weeks ago, that he may impose a limit, probably a half-load or something like that on the Trans-Canada Highway. Has he gone any further with that thought?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier that that was a consideration and I also indicated to the officials in Ottawa that unless some action was taken to improve the situation whereby some improvement was made to our Trans-Canada Highway, and if the volume of heavy vehicle traffic further increased, and it looks right now as if it will further increase, there is a possibility that some action will be taken with regards to restrictions which means restrictions on the gross maximum weights and the axle weights.

Now I am sure every hon. gentleman of this House realizes what the consequences of that means, if we do that. It means that it is going to be a cost to the consumer, a cost to the shipper first, and a cost to the consumer because - if the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will listen - if it is forced back on the rails, if people have to pay the rail rates. And the rail rates right now are higher than those by the truckers. The service provided by the CNR is also not near as good as that being provided by the trucker. That is the main reason for the freight volume going on to tire, going onto the roads.

So if we restrict the Trans-Canada Highway with regards to maximum gross weights, it is going to be a severe blow to the Province. But again I emphasize that if nothing is forthcoming from Ottawa, if they do not recognize our situation, which is a desperate one - and I am at this point now more confident and more hopeful that something will be done - but if the response after further negotiations is still negative, if it is negative after many negotiations and talks occur, that we will have to look at the possibility of placing restrictions. That is what I said a few weeks ago and I still retain

MR. MORGAN:

that position.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde and then the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. DOME: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House Leader could throw some light on the decision that has been made by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to award a contract to a certain contractor for the building of the transmission line from Churchill Falls to Happy Valley. I understand that the decision has been made, but it has not been announced yet because some details have to be clarified with respect to hiring preferences for Newfoundlanders. Now in view of the fact that a Quebec firm has tendered the lowest bid, are we encountering problems with respect to having hiring preference for Newfoundlanders on the building of that transmission line and is it in any way related to ongoing negotiations with the Mines and Energy Minister of Quebec with respect to the recall of power from Quebec?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: The position of the government is, Mr. Speaker, that in every way wherever possible it is part of any contractual arrangement that we make that wherever possible Newfoundland labour from Newfoundland and Labrador, you know, labour from this Province, be used. There are discussions going on on this and it would be premature to say anything about them at this time until they are sorted out. But they are not part of any kind of playoff on any other matter or negotiation taking place with the Province of Quebec, not at all. But it is government's intention to secure best possible terms and every possible safeguard wherever possible, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians need.

MR. DOME: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde for a supplementary.

MR. DOME: I thank the minister for answering the second part of the question, but the first part basically was: are we encountering any real

MP. POWE:

serious problems with respect to hiring practice preferences for Newfoundlanders? Probably the Minister of Finance could answer this.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MP. DOODY: I may be able to help because I was in on a discussion on the particular contract that the hon. member refers to. The letter which went out from the minister responsible, the Minister for Mines and Energy, of which I received a copy, was most explicit as regards to instructions to the Hydro people, that the most important overall and overriding consideration was that hiring practices be geared to the necessity of hiring Newfoundland and Labrador residents, that this was to be a primary consideration and it has to be one that has to be considered at all times. The lowest tender is item one, but that can be considered only in a context of the hiring of Newfoundlanders. It has to be demonstrated conclusively that there are no Newfoundland people available, Newfoundland and Labrador people available before any alternatives are considered whether it is from Quebec or Massachusetts or wherever. This has been laid down, stipulated, printed and poured out. I must say there has been tremendous emphasis laid on it. As the hon. House Leader has said it has not been in any way connected with any discussions that are going on now. It has been simply in the context of the construction site.

That has been something that we ran into considerable trouble with in the past, the construction trades industry, the labour people have laid it on us pretty heavily and we have been very, very careful about it. I hope that

MR. DOODY: that if any member of the House hears something to the contrary that they will inform us about it so that we can correct it before it gets out of hand because I think it has happened in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde, a supplementary.

MR. ROWE: I thank the ministers for their answers, Sir.

MR. NEARY: That was all answered a week ago. The hon. member should come in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: I have not missed a day of the House, Mr, Speaker. Anyway I will not be distracted. This obviously applies to the prime contractor. Would the same rules apply to all sub-contractors?

MR. DOODY: No. No.

MR. ROWE: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Industrial Development if he would bring the House up to date on the repairs to the damage at the Marystown Shipyards and also inform the House if the Marystown Shipyard was successful in getting the Guiana ships contract?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. LUNDRICAN: The shipyards will be back in operation in a matter of a week. I guess I can give the House the details of the cost for the actual damage that was caused and the cost of putting it back into shape at a later date. On Guiana I cannot give any answer at this moment. We have not had a firm response. We have had trouble dealing with the people in the last number of weeks. We have encouraged them in making up their minds that they come to the Province and visit the Shipyard, look at the facilities, be aware of the extent of our capabilities, and I anticipate that that will.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I would not want to go into any great amount of detail in talking about another jurisdiction, but we have been a little discouraged that they have not been more prompt in making their own decision. Certainly it is not because of the lack of support received from us or the lack of information that we have communicated to them. We put together an excellent package involving the Export Development Corporation, involving the Fisheries College, involving the Shipyard itself, naturally, and we are quite proud of the presentation on the contract bids or the bids that we have made.

I do not want to go overboard on making any comments on it because when we started to look at the prospects for the Guiana contract or the Guiana shrimp boats, we were almost aware of the fact that the chances of getting the contract would be pretty close to zero. At this stage we can still only say that it is only a possibility we might get the contract, and in making any comments public you always give the impression to the people in the area that there are prospects beyond what in fact are realistic.

So until we get a firm answer from them I do not want to even give any impression that there is a clear prospect to achieve any kind of a formal relationship with them. But to sum up the -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Have those people been invited to come at the expense of the Shipyard, or are they expected to pay their own way and come to Marystown?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I think we have made some kind of an offer to them to help them themselves.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Make them an offer they cannot refuse.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Well, we have done that pretty well, Your Honour. We have helped or indicated a level of assistance to help them come because they are a -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Treat them like kings when they get there.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Well certainly. That is typical of Newfoundland.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Anything but that, of course, would be not like Newfoundland and I think we have taken more interest and devoted more of our energies to the Marystown Shipyard as a government than would be normally expected. I am disappointed that we have not been able to fetch and lay on the table more formal contracts and I hope that that will change. But to sum up again, there is not a formal decision made by the government. They are a new government, I might add. The government is only as an independent government less than a decade. And I guess they have got their own problems with decisions and allocation of funds and they have the growth problems as well, and we have got to be a bit patient. They have got to make their own decision.

We are not as competitive in some ways as we should be. Not as we should be - I might add that because of the quality of the product that we can deliver we are not in the same ballpark as two or three other people who are interested in the contract. But nevertheless we have done everything even to the point of encouraging them to come here, look for themselves and realize that by associating with the Province in a package arrangement which involves training as well that they are going to be in a much better position in the long in developing the long term fisheries policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, would the minister tell us then apart from the Guiana ship contract possibility, what contracts do the Marystown Shipyards have at the present time? Are any ships presently being constructed or will be constructed once the repairs to the damage are complete? Are there any contracts at all now for construction of new ships for the Marystown Shipyards? Is there anything on the table at all?

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

Beyond what has been there the last three months or, yes, I would say relatively speaking three months, except for the repairs to the tug which we gained a number of weeks ago from Manitoba, I believe it was, and the normal repairs, and other types of repair work that we are attracting under normal circumstances, the answer is, no, there are no new ships. We have not made any new contracts. The last contract of a formal nature of a new ship was the one that I announced about three months ago, two and a half months ago, which really is our own trawler that we are indirectly building ourselves.

MR. NEARY: Building it on speculation.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Well speculation, the hon. member might suggest but we are quite confident that there is certainly no risk in the speculation. But the answer is that there is no new contract that we plan to table today.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: This being Private Members' Day we proceed to Order 7, and the adjourned debate thereon.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion put forward by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, this addresses itself to the future of this Province. It seeks to offer the government a method and a procedure of ascertaining what are the prospects for economic growth and development in this Province. The resolution asks that a select committee be established to collect, gather, organize, and collate relevant information so that appropriate criteria and strategies may be adopted which will give this Province a sound economic base.

Mr. Speaker, this is a large resolution. It is a noble and a magnanimous resolution, so much so, Mr. Speaker, that I feel almost inadequate to the tasks at hand namely, to intelligently and rationally to debate the full impact and consequences of this motion. Yet,

Mr. Lush:

Mr. Speaker, the intent of the motion is so very simple, so very practical and so very vital. The motion demonstrates concern, profound concern, almost anxiety about the future of this Province, Newfoundland and Labrador. This motion is asking, where we are going? How far we can go? And how do we propose to get there? In other words, what are the economic prospects for this Province?

It is asking for a re-examination of our economic development to date, and from there to set up goals and objectives compatible with the skills and lifestyles of our people. Mr. Speaker, this motion is not merely a call or a plea to government for reaffirmation of faith in the future plans and for a disclosure of its development plans, and how the government plans to achieve them. This resolution is a call for all of us in this House to reaffirm faith in ourselves as a people. This motion is a call for all of us to reaffirm our faith in this Province. As necessary as this is, Mr. Speaker, as necessary as it is to create a feeling of optimism, hope and aspiration in our people this is necessary and desirable. But this motion goes beyond the romanticizing and the philosophizing and theorizing. This motion is asking that we take a hard practical look at our economic potential to determine what it can produce in the way of employment to the application

MR. LUSH:

of industrial expertise and new technology that is presently available to us. Through a select committee, Mr. Speaker, to gather, collect and organize all pertinent and relevant information respecting the growth and development of this Province, through discussion and dialogue with the people of this Province, to talk with our people, to discuss with our people, to gather new ideas for the proper and efficient development of this Province, to develop goals, aims and objectives and consequently establish criteria and strategies for the sound development of this Province - a noble resolution, Mr. Speaker, to say the least. But what will be its fate? This, I thought, was a resolution that would take us all beyond partisan politics. This could be the one resolution that could bring this House together in a unified fight for the growth and development of our Province. How can one disagree with the principle of this motion? How can any patriotic Newfoundlander, Labradorian not vote for this resolution? If you disagree with the committee idea, then one would have thought that the government members and other Opposition members would have advanced some other method. But all I have heard to date basically is an outright condemnation of the motion by government members. The hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) agreed, I think, with the principle but disagreed with the method. He instead proposed a productivity council to encourage and promote better productivity among our people. But he does seem to agree with the principle. The hon. member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) has indicated that he will support the motion. He agrees with the motion in principle. But all we get from the government members is an outright condemnation of the principle even of this motion.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy in his now famous speech of gloom and doom did not do very much to leave us with any hope, with any aspirations, with any faith in our Province. The hon. member from Kilbride (Mr. Wells), I think it was, when he was speaking to this resolution, and I am not certain of what I am saying -

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not speak to this resolution.

MR. LUSH: He did not speak to this resolution? Well, I want to make a

MR. LUSH:

point anyways. Put I will backtrack from that one. There is one hon. member here who said that there was no need for such a committee because all M.H.A.s knew the needs of their district. Now that is a very narrow look at this resolution here, to suggest that all M.H.A.s know the needs of the district. I am not at all intimating or suggesting that all M.H.A.s do not know the needs of the district. But this is much bigger than that. Even if it were not so, that there is no way of bringing together the information that M.H.A.s have of their districts. There is no way. There is no channel of communication. There is no forum whereby we can bring together and colate all of these ideas that we might have about our districts. We can get here and talk about them, but there is still no channel, no systematic way of bringing these ideas together. So this motion goes much larger than just talking about the little bits of information that we indeed ourselves might know about our districts.

The point I wanted to make, and I hope I can be forgiven for this, but I want to bring in this point; the member from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) was probably talking about another point but I do want to use it. I think at one point - and I just forget what it was that he was talking to - but he will recall, I think, using the analogy of the sinking man or the sunken man in talking about the kind of treatment that we get from Ottawa, if you will. He was pointing out that

MR. LUSH:

we were not getting - what shall I say? - the proper method of funding from Ottawa. I think what he said in essence was that the federal government's strategies to eliminate regional disparities and inequities have failed to enable this Province to attain a level of services and production that would result in producing new income and continued employment. I think that is the idea that I got in another situation.

MR. WELLS: If the hon. member will permit me.

MR. LUSH: Sure.

MR. WELLS: The federal government had improved services, there is no question about that, vastly in Newfoundland or provided the money to do so. No question. But what I was taking exception to was there does not seem to have been to me over the years the right kind of effort made to transplant, if you will, some of Canada's productive industry into this new Province of Newfoundland which we were in 1949. This is where I felt and used the analogy of the man down in the water, that they would hold his head above but never really help him out. I felt this is something that possibly ought to be impressed upon.

MR. LUSH: I sort of got the impression too, rightly or wrongly, that you were also making inferences about the transfer of payments that we were getting probably not directed, or the OPER funds and the LIP projects and all of these, not being put into the proper types of development. But maybe I was wrong.

But anyway on that point it is something that I can agree with. I think that we probably have not been using the monies from Ottawa, or that they have not been spent in the proper fashion to result in continuing employment. I think all hon. members on this side of the House would agree that we certainly got tremendous amounts of money from Ottawa, and that we certainly could not get by without them. But certainly we would want to see that our monies from Ottawa are not wasted, that they are spent properly, that they are spent in a way to generate more employment. We certainly cannot be contented with the kinds of jobs that will just give a man or a woman sufficient

Mr. LUSH:

stamps to qualify for unemployment insurance. We want the monies from Ottawa to be invested wisely. We want monies which will promote the growth, the diversification and expansion of projects and industries that will put the Province on a sound economic base. This we expect from Ottawa. We would want this. We want Ottawa's money to be invested wisely. We want this Province to become an independently economically viable unit in the Canadian Dominion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe hon. members very often in talking about the federal government and the various plans, that they had use this as a bit of a political ploy, if you will. A couple of times in this House government members specifically referred to the inadequacy of some of these funds and some of the difficulties they were having with the federal government. But, Mr. Speaker, we on several occasions indicated to this House our willingness to help in any way we could to try and get federal assistance in a proper fashion.

I recall two occasions when we did this. I think there was when the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy was presenting his - I do not know exactly what it was - his document, I will call it for the moment, on the Lower Churchill, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition presented an amendment to that. And I think hon. members on the government side sort of indicated that to vote for this amendment would not put them in such a favourable position to negotiate with Ottawa. It would show that we were a divided House. We then indicated that we would be willing to support a motion giving the government support to get financial support from Ottawa in this respect. But no such motion came forward.

Then there was another incident. A couple of days ago when the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Dove), I think it was, in referring to or in talking about the fish plant, the building of the fish plant, it was then indicated that we were having some problems with Ottawa with respect to getting funds for the rebuilding of that

Mr. LUSH:

plant. Again I think it was the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) who suggested that we were concerned about this and that we wanted to do something. We wanted to show again our concern about this and that we were willing to demonstrate that we wanted Ottawa to take action on this very important matter. When the decision finally came for us to do this, again we were told late in the afternoon that particular day that everything was all right, that channels of communications seemed to be in order and there was nothing wrong.

MR. LUSI:

Again this demonstrates our sincerity with respect to our willingness to show the House that we are very concerned about the monies that come from Ottawa, that we want more monies from Ottawa, and if not more, certainly to channel the monies that we are now getting into proper and efficient ways whereby we can develop this Province soundly. So we have certainly demonstrated this and we have demonstrated it time and time again, Sir, that we are concerned about the funds that Ottawa so willingly gives to this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me rather than attempting to find a way whereby all of us here can in a co-ordinated and concerted effort demonstrate to Ottawa our concern, rather than looking for a method and the procedure whereby we can form a united front in an approach to Ottawa, rather than providing a means whereby the people of this Province can articulate and clearly enunciate its concerns to Ottawa, this government seems more preoccupied with castigatory rhetoric. This will not do, Mr. Speaker. I am aware that there are some frustrations when we go to Ottawa for funding of certain programmes. I sincerely believe, for example, that the Federal Government should be giving vast sums of money, most certainly a substantial contribution to the development of the Lower Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, it does seem that we have not been successful in getting Ottawa to really understand the financial and social needs of this Province as far as giving us funds that we think will result in ongoing and continuing employment. As I have said again, we are very grateful for what we have gotten. We could not get by without it. We are very appreciative of it. But, Mr. Speaker, we need a plan that is going to help promote the sound development of this Province, more money for a sound and economically viable projects. But how can we get more? How can we get Ottawa to spend more wisely the money that they have been giving us, if indeed the case that has been stated by so many people that it has not been? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, a partial solution is found in the intent of this rather magnanimous resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the report of the Royal Commission on the Economic State and Prospects of Newfoundland and Labrador, 1967 states, and I quote,

MR. LUSH:

"The lack of defined regional objectives and strategies by the Federal Government helps account for the disconnected nature and lack of effectiveness of many Federal Government programmes across Canada. But this is further complicated by the failure of some provincial governments even to attempt to develop plans of an economic kind. As governments grow larger and more complex so planning becomes more urgent. The onus for drawing up regional development strategies seems to rest with the provincial governments despite the fact that the Federal Government may be transferring large sums of money to the region in question." So it would appear that the responsibility lies solely with the Provincial Government in setting up strategies and plans for the development of its Province. The Newfoundland Government to my mind has never defined any strategy for development. This has undoubtedly handicapped the programmes of both federal, provincial and municipal governments, as well as the private sector. The Newfoundland Government should pursue a strategy of formal planning which would enable all levels of government to agree on orders of expenditure priorities. If that were the case, if there were some priorities of expenditures today the people of Newfoundland would know which communities are going to get road work done, which communities are going to get paving done, which communities are going to get water and sewer. But here they are waiting from month to month, from year to year, waiting in a frustrated manner, wondering whether or not the government is going to give them water and sewer services this year, wondering whether or not this community is going to get new and improved roads this year. But there is no such plan.

Mr. LUSH:

The report previously referred to also suggests that government expenditures should be on those regions with the better prospects and also on those projects that are likely to result in an early, tangible return on their investment. Certainly then, Mr. Speaker, the need for planning, the need for setting up priorities, the need for establishing aims and objectives for the economic development of this Province is essential.

Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge there has been no sign of any systematic attempt by the government, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, to draw up an overall strategy for the economic development of this Province out of which would flow a consistent order of public expenditure priorities. Neither am I aware of any substantial criteria for the economic development of this Province. This resolution states that we concentrate on the development of these industries that are best suited to foster and encourage the way of life most desired by the people of Newfoundland. What is desired by the people of Newfoundland? What is desired by the people of this Province, Newfoundland and Labrador? Do we know?

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, development must be in line with our resources, natural and human. What about our natural resources? We are led to believe that our physical natural resources are fairly abundant. The mineral prospects, though probably not as promising as they were eight or ten years ago, still seem to be very good while the forest, fish and hydro power resources seem rather plentiful. Again the report previously mentioned says that our forest and our fish and our hydro power resources are not being fully exploited. They are not being developed to their maximum potential. Well if this is the case then certainly we as people of a government, we as politicians, we as administrators of a Province, we must be concerned about this, to make certain that we are making maximum use, that we are getting maximum return, that we are getting maximum benefits from our natural resources, to create more employment for our people, to raise our

MR. LUSH:

standard of living. These are the issues with which we must concern ourselves.

The people of this Province find it very difficult to comprehend, very difficult to understand why for example that we must be paying such high prices for our electricity. Naturally so. We have an abundant supply of hydro power and yet prices keep going up. It is only natural to understand and appreciate why the people of Newfoundland should feel this way, why they should feel that the prices that they are paying for electricity are not justified.

Then our minerals, Mr. Speaker. Again we are led to believe that we have a fair supply of minerals. But again in just about every report you read we are told that we are not getting the maximum return for our minerals, that we are not getting the maximum benefits that we should be getting from this Province.

I just want to comment for a minute away from the natural resources to tourism. Again we are led to believe that Newfoundland has a fair potential with respect to tourism. We realize that we are not competing with people in the sunny South but we do have unique things to offer the tourists, that we can attract more tourists than we do. Granted that is something that we only started ten years ago, in 1966 I think was when government really got serious about tourism. But I believe that we are not doing nearly enough in this area.

I think of my own district, the district of Terra Nova. I have mentioned in this hon. House on many occasions now that my district, all the communities in my district are either adjoined to or adjacent to the Terra Nova National Park and

Mr. Lush:

the communities in my district are not reaping sufficient economic spin-off from the Terra Nova National Park. No way! And of course it has got to be the responsibility of the Provincial Government to see that the two go hand in hand, that the Terra Nova National Park is not developed out of harmony with the surrounding communities, that in order to reap the total benefit of the tourist trade that the two must be developed together. And presently in my district it is lacking in the tourist facilities, it is lacking in recreational facilities. The Northern end is not doing too badly, Glovertown and the Eastport Peninsula. But there are many things that still can be done there. There are still communities there without water and sewer services, although that government is progressing very well, particularly in Glovertown, but there are still other areas St. Chads and Burnside. The roads are not up to par in these areas that could attract a lot of tourists. I am thinking particularly about the road from Eastport, yes, from Eastport down to St. Chads and Burnside, and then the ferry across to St. Brendan's. The ferry is not at all in a condition that would let us say, operating in a way that would attract tourists. The docking facilities there are very, very bad.

I think that it is very important that areas, communities surrounding the National Park should have the services that would attract tourists. After all, these are the places that the tourists will visit. These are the communities that we hold up as the models of Newfoundland. And I think it is very important that the government would ensure that these communities have the services that will make Newfoundlanders be proud of these communities. And we have the natural beauty and the natural scenery that would attract tourists. Also I think that having developed these services that the government should take on an extensive advertising programme or a programme of publicizing the tourist attractions in these areas, the natural beauty in these areas.

The area I think that is most neglected in this respect is the Southern part of my district, which would include Port Blandford,

Mr. Lush:

Musgravetown, Bunyan's Cove that area, a tremendous amount of tourist potential there, but nothing done, not even a park, not a park anywhere from Port Blandford down to Jamestown and Winter Brook, not one single park, not a picnic ground. And for communities just on the periphery of a National Park I think it is ridiculous. And I think the government should take some action and see that these areas are reaping from the economic spin-off of the National Park, and of course the two have to be developed together in order to get the maximum potential from the tourist trade for the Terra Nova National Park.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to comment for a moment on the development of our human resources. I have talked about the importance of the development of our natural resources. I have heard the members of the government on several occasions talk about their concern about the development of our human resources. Mr. Speaker, fundamental to the development of any country must be the full development of our human resources.

Again the report of the Royal Commission on the Economic State and Prospects of Newfoundland and Labrador state an important determinant of Newfoundland's future economic growth will be the quantity, quality and extent of utilization of the Province's human resources.

What are the educational and skill levels of our people? And I will not dwell on this too long, because I mentioned it last night, but again I think it is sufficiently important to mention today that we must determine what type of education our people are going to need in order that we can develop the resources that we have. Naturally we

MR. LUSH:

must train our people in the skills that are compatible with the kinds of developments that we will promote in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the time has come in this Province, not for less emphasis on education, but for more emphasis on education, education at all levels, primary, elementary and secondary schools, post-secondary schools, university, polytechnical institute, community colleges. There must be a tremendous emphasis put on education. With that, of course, must come more expenditures, more money. I think we must realize that we cannot spend less money on education, that we must be spending more on education if we are to develop as a people, if we are to develop our human resources to their maximum potential.

Mr. Speaker, we must look, take a fresh look at education, as I suggested here last night, to see where it is that we are going and how we plan to get there. We must ask the question very seriously - what kinds of people should our educational institutions be producing? If we lack trained people, and statistics show we do, we must place more emphasis on education. There are weaknesses. We must find out what these weaknesses are. It sort of sickens me to hear people make derogatory remarks about education. What we have got to do is look and find where the weaknesses are and go from there. We have been told that the Province is in trouble, beset with financial, economic and social ills, has the highest unemployment rate in Canada, the highest cost of living, the lowest income per capita, and so on. It is time, Mr. Speaker, to get concerned. It is time to look at what are the prospects for the economic growth and development of this Province.

I have mentioned we have got financial, economic and social problems. I would like to just speak for a moment about Labrador. I heard so many people who seem to be not concerned about Labrador, who seem to be not at all concerned about the economic development of Labrador, not at all concerned about the people of Labrador. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that it is very important that we be concerned about Labrador. We have to demonstrate our

MR. LUSH:

concern by doing something for these people that is tangible, to make the people of Labrador feel that they belong to this Province, that we have been responsible, I think, in the past for making the people of Labrador feel alienated. Basically in Labrador - and I am no great expert on Labrador; having spent five years in Western Labrador I do have some feelings for Labrador. While there I met many people from Coastal Labrador, taught many adults and had many occasions to talk about the way they felt about Newfoundland and Labrador as a Province. Mr. Speaker, if we are to make these people feel that they belong to this Province, that they too will reap the rewards of the economic development of this Province, then we have to do something tangible for those people. We have basically two groups of people in Labrador that makes it important that we do something for them, do something tangible. In Coastal Labrador you have the people who feel that they have been neglected and exploited by this Province. You have the people in Western Labrador who feel no affinity towards this Province, no attachment because they have come from other parts of Canada, other parts of the United States, other parts of the world, and hence feel no real attachment to this Province. So you have got these two groups of people who, shall we say, are not bound to this Province. We have to do

MR. LUSH:

something about it and I think as a government we should be concerned and not hope that the separatist movement is just going to go away. It will not go away. We have to do something about it. We have to show that we are concerned and do something. Even in education we have done so many things to make them feel alienated. I wonder if the Minister of Education has taken a look at the books in language arts, in literature and noticed how many books are there on Labrador. We have got a phrase that we use, 'Newfoundlandia' and we try to promote all the good literature that we can about Newfoundland, and rightly so, all the literature that has been written. We try to get that into our schools so that our young people will be able to appreciate our heritage and our culture and understand it.

But what about Labrador? Very, very little. I remember hearing one official of the Department of Education up to a couple of years ago saying that he did not think it was very important whether or not we put books in there on Labrador or not.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the official still there?

MR. LUSH: He is still there. But I do believe this year we have a couple of books in, not very many but we have a couple of books in there. And there is all kinds of literature on Labrador that we could have in the school curriculum that in itself would -

MR. ROBERTS: The book written by the mother of the gentleman for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) is a marvellous book.

MR. LUSH: That is right. Just digressing for a moment, I remember when I went to work in Churchill Falls. My family was the sixth family to move on site there. After the first year there were sixty families there, and three Newfoundlanders. I tell you it was very difficult to feel that you were a part of Newfoundland at that time. The only newspaper I got was the paper from Montreal. I forget the name of it. I think it was the Gazette. The only thing that made me feel at home at all was a programme done by the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie). I forget what it was called now, Unc or something was it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. LUSH: Yes it was similar to the Uncle Mose programme that used to be here for so many years except I do not think it was a written script or anything. It was just an ad libbed sort of thing. But it was a very good programme and one that I enjoyed immensely. I must say it was the only thing that made me feel a part of Newfoundland because I just forget the exact details now but I think then most of our radio was coming from Toronto or somewhere. It was a Northern services, this sort of thing. And I just point out it was very difficult - and I was there five years - from the time I went there to the time I left it was very difficult to feel that you were a part of Newfoundland although the government, they have done things. Now radio, I think, is a little more local down there. On television you can see the news and this sort of thing. At the time I was there, five years ago, at that time you could not do these things and I realize that it took time to do those things. I am just illustrating a problem that is there, that people feel no affinity towards Newfoundland. I would hope that the government will not take Labrador lightly, that it will do everything within its power to make these people feel that they belong to this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I think in view of what I have said I think the time has come for united action. I think the time has come for all members in this House to be concerned about the economic development of this Province. The time has come for patriotism. I think it was Wordsworth who said, "Breaths there the man with soul so dead, / Who never to himself hath said, / This is my home, my native land." I believe all of us who are concerned about Newfoundland, I do not believe we have any choice but to support the principle of this motion. What a glorious time to be in government, at a time when we do not have too much money to spend, when we do not have to be talking about building great buildings, schools, construction of roads because we are in a period of restraint it looks like, you know, there is very little going on. But what a glorious time to be in government, to look at where we are going, to be able to come up with a new direction for this Province.

MR. LUSH: I tell you it would be quite an election if this government were to go ahead with this motion, to come up with a new plan for an economic development of this Province. I would not want to go into the election. I do not know who would win it. Of course we would certainly say that we were responsible for putting it forward, but the government would be able to tell the people that here they were the people who executed this great motion. But in all fairness I think even with that I would have to give the edge to the Liberals. But in all sincerity I believe that all patriotic Newfoundlanders, all of us who are concerned have no choice but to support this motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT: No two ways about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there are too many more who want to take part in the debate but I certainly would like to say a few words because as my hon. friend has said, and it was the phrase I wanted to open with, "Breaths there a man with soul so dead/ Who never to himself had said," because I think basically this motion, or the meat of the motion, concerns all of us here in Newfoundland, and as we go back in years - and I am perhaps a bit older than most of the members in this House and it is no good dwelling in the past - where we spoke, or the stress if you like, or the responsibility was put on human endeavour rather than on the millions of dollars that we are talking about today.

As we look at Newfoundland in its present state, where we brag, and perhaps quite truthfully, that never did we have a more enlightened people education-wise, that never did we have so many social benefits as we enjoy today, never did we have so many groups who have come together in the interest of their fellow men or their fellow women, whatever the case may be.

Now being a part of this House going on fifteen years, and having listened to and heard motions for setting up a royal commission on this and an investigating committee into that

MR. MURPHY: and a select committee on something else, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, are we really going the right way about it all. We are talking about Ottawa, Uncle Ottawa, the millions of dollars they send in to us, the LIP grants, this grant, another grant and something else, have we as people done away with our own natural resources, and what I think of as the human element that enters into things.

I represent a district right in the heart of the city of St. John's. To me the talk of development is just something that I can only look back on in the early 1930s, which I travelled this Province of Newfoundland, from one end of the country to the other as a travelling salesman, I saw how people lived, I spoke to the merchants of these days who in a great many cases did not even have the equivalent, I suppose, of grade eight or nine, but men who had that desire, that initiative to do things, they were creators, they were inventors in their own way.

I can look at any area in this Province and you go in and there was always something happening there. In these days there were no handouts as we see today. You know, you go back to the old days that they called it, and I often heard the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), he is not in his seat at the present moment but I see he is listening, and he could back far more in his memory to the hard days where many of us faced almost starvation, those of us who came from big families. And we look today at our great labour movement where we have thousands of our workers, whether they be white collar, blue collar, whatever they might be, formed into a huge organization here. We have got our great teachers organization here. If you picked the brains of Canada possibly you could not get a more productive group or a more highly educated group.

You look at many other areas, and what comes to my mind now is the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe)

MR. MURPHY:

and the hon. member's problem with his fish plant down in Old Perlican, I think of that today, in this day and age with the thousands of fishermen that we have, Mr. Speaker, in the fishermen's union today, we hear the demands, they come into the Cabinet Room, they come in with this demand - literally thousands, earnings, very good incomes on the whole, did it ever enter into the minds of the executive of that group or the people, let us own something for a change. What do we need in Old Perlican? What do we need to put this plant back? I think, and I am just quoting from memory, some 300 people, I believe, hon. member, sort of get a living out of selling fish to the area.

MR. ROWE: Between fishermen and plant workers, about 500.

MR. MURPHY: That is nearly 500 people that earn their living from it. Still we have to go to DDFE, we have to go to the Provincial Government. The hon. member stressed many times in his speech - and I really enjoyed it - I thought it was a well delivered speech - that the Provincial Government must do this, the Provincial Government must do that, the Provincial Government must do - is that what is wrong with us, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, in development today? Have we lost the initiative, as I tried to say earlier, that belonged to the people who had to generate something? The hon. member's district, the Clovertown area, eh? I can remember, perhaps you go down there to Angle Brook in the old days; I remember Norman Grey who was an hon. member at one time, the Angle Brook stores we used to do business with. What a beautiful area of the Province that is. It is all nearby to the National Park. We take the beautiful little Island of St. Brendan's where I have been out many times - go out from Burnside on the ferry there, eh! We go over to Greenspond across the bay. With all our talk about monies I wonder how many people have been encouraged to go out to St. Brendan's on some kind of a little expedition and have a meal of cod tongues or something like this. I am referring to tourist development in this area, right? We talk of again - and I sort of got away from the fact - the fishermen's union, thousands of members. I

MR. MURPHY:

do not know how much dues is paid by this organization. This group - and please do not misunderstand me at this time. I am not preaching against unions or unionism. I am just putting forth the thought if we all work together- let us forget the Federal Government, what money they are shovelling into this, one way or another, let us forget Ottawa for a moment. Let us forget the Provincial Government for a moment -let us say look, we can do this. Three weeks ago I spent seven hours in Moncton to attend a meeting of the co-operatives. We had them there from every area of New Brunswick, the lowly fisherman, the farmer and everything else. They went there and discussed their own lives. Talk about development! they had their own little farms. They had their own little fishing places. They were generating basically millions of dollars in purchases through co-operatives, not the co-op that we know here in the sense that we go to a store just to get this patented rebate but really to produce the things that we want. Hit any area of this Province, Mr. Speaker, any small area. Again I speak as living right here in the centre of the city of St. John's where we have everybody sort of out on their own. You get a little place - and I will go back many years in my memory to a little place called Michael's Harbour, just down outside of Lewisporte. We were looking for lobster at the time. I was in Grand Falls with a group of people. We went down looking for lobster. I looked around and here was about fifteen people with their own little boat selling their lobster. I said to one of them, Look, you know - He said, "I sold so many today but I believe the fellow over there sold so many." I said to him at the time, "Look, in Grand Falls" - you know, how many miles? forty miles, fifty miles away approximately - "Look, you could sell every one of these lobsters down in front of the F.V.R.S. down on High Street." "But, Sir, how are we going to get them up there?" Here was five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten men peddling lobsters off the head of their wharf. If the ten of them got together, even if they had to hire a truck they could have brought these into Grand Falls and I would say got three times the price for them.

Here is development in some sense that is going directly back to the people without someone else taking a rake-off.

MR. MURPHY:

We were talking about housing today in this Province, which in itself is a form of development providing homes, providing employment for carpenters and everything else. Of all the thousands of people that are organized in labour today, how many have actually gone to CMHC, and again there must be thousands, hundreds of thousands of dollars collected in dues and fees of some kind, where does this money go?

We are all talking about the 12 per cent mortgages, the 14 per cent mortgages. How much of this money, I ask, if we are going to develop our own little Province, is ploughed back to the labour member at 6 per cent any more or where is their money invested? That is the form of development that we talk about, truly development that people are happy in, their own homes. Instead of going out somewhere and being taken for 12 per cent, 14 per cent, 15 per cent, 16 per cent we are helping ourselves. The forest, the woodcutting the same way - we can go back in memory thirty-five or forty years where they had the bucksaw, where they had the horse, where they went into the woods in the worst kind of weather and managed to eke a living in some way, Now they have got all of these other modern appliances that help them out.

Labrador - we hear so much about Labrador. I have been hearing about Labrador for forty-odd years since I first started to take notice of politics. And in these days, of course, Labrador of that day is not the Labrador - And I often tell the story and I get my hon. friend going here about Labrador. I attended a political meeting at one time, I was only a young man, I was not a voter even, but I used to go around and listen to these great speeches when you had Dr. Mosdell and the Charlie Hunts and all this group of the old days, perhaps the days of the - and Labrador came up. And there was a story on the go that someone wanted to buy Labrador for \$10 million. And this chap was expounding on Labrador and the Labrador alluded to then of course was the Coastal Labrador where thousands, literally I suppose of fishermen, Mr. Speaker, went down from Carbonear, all around the place went down fishing on

Mr. Murphy:

the Labrador and come back. And he was talking about selling Labrador for \$10 million. And he said, "What do you people think of that?" And some fellow said, "Why sell it for \$10 million?" He said, "Give the G.D. thing away, it is costing us a fortune!" This was at that time. Have we still got the same attitude with regard to Labrador?

I heard today about this fifty mile road. That all the petition was in from L'Anse-au-Clair up to Red Bay, and it represented some 95 per cent of the voters. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition said there were 671 voters in that particular area, living in this, you know, fifty mile, and this road as the hon. minister knows would require some \$2.5 million. I often think - and I was Minister of Labrador Affairs for about five months - and you take the area from Mary's Harbour, Black Tickle, and we can go right on up to Cartwright, so on and so forth, and there were about twenty-five communities there - now I am not talking about resettlement in the sense of the word where we pluck someone from here and put him the so-called growth centre - to provide the transportation necessary that my hon. friend again talked about today, do we think that a steamer can go into every little place, you know, where there are fifteen families, ten families, twenty-five families? Could we not in this modern age establish about four areas between Cartwright down to Mary's Harbour where we would make living pleasant for the people there, where they could go in there and establish nice homes, where we could provide services?

I remember at one time I had a letter from two families in Black Tickle, who sort of lived on the other side, we visualize St. John's where most of live on this side, and there were two families lived on the other side of the harbour there. And they wanted a road there, and I think the road would cost something like \$175,000, but they felt they were entitled to the road because they have their homes over there, and I kind of suggested to them that it would be far better for us to build the two homes on this side where the other people were living, but, you know, they just could not see

MR. MURPHY:

that, they wanted to stay where they were.

So as far as developing this Province is concerned a select committee, you know, let us forget it, you know, these select committees. Just let us forget it. We have in this House of Assembly today fifty one - actually we have forty-eight at the present time - there are fifty-one elected members. And in my opinion, and I say this without any fear of contradiction, we all have our little idiosyncrasies and all our little oddities, but I think quite basically that the people of Newfoundland have chosen fifty one fairly competent people. Now there might be people more competent in a sense, that there might be more professional people in one way, perhaps more highly educated, but basically, Mr. Speaker, I believe that in this hon. House Newfoundland is very well represented.

MR. MURPHY:

I believe again that we are all here for the one purpose, not to get the miserable \$12,000 a year that everybody talks about. "Well you might sit on your big fat arse", one fellow said to me one day, "hauling down your big salary." If I am out of order, Sir, I apologize but I am just telling it as it is. I said, "How much do you think I am getting, brother?" And I showed him my check as a cabinet minister. I showed him my stub, \$265 every two weeks.

MR. PECKFORD: He thought that was pay for one day.

MR. MURPHY: I said, "Now let me see yours." He said, "I have not got it, but I tell you this, mine is \$325 plus the provision of a car and my expenses paid." I only say this. I mean I came into this with my eyes open. In 1962 I thought I was the biggest shot in all of Newfoundland to be elected the member for St. John's Center. I was defeated and my one ambition still is to sit in City Hall, to do something for the people within the city of St. John's. I thought I could do something.

I have spent my life, as most people know, in recreation in different areas, community efforts. I never had this great education people talk about, but I was, I think, one of the people of the area. And as I say when I was asked to run in 1962 I thought it was the greatest thing that could ever happen to me to be elected. I believe it was, quite frankly. I think too the hon. gentlemen on the other side must feel that they did have something, whatever it was, whether it was the campaign we used, or whether they were going to abolish the school tax, whatever the story is. But still we are here, gentlemen. Let us not forget it.

This is a matter - I say it is not political. Well it could be political because I am speaking on this side against the motion brought in from the other side. But deep down I believe that working together, and with the theme again that the hon. gentlemen used and that there that we are all Newfoundlanders, that this is our own native land, and they are all here to do good for the land, working

MR. MURPHY:

together and getting to work, not the provincial government, but getting these other groups together, these labour unions to go out and work for their own people, the Teachers' Association. Look at the power you can harness. You talk about harnessing Churchill Falls! I suppose the hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Development has met and talked with more people who could have more input into this Province than all of us here combined, if we sat down and steered the course the one way! And I do not mean the one way politically but the one way thinking of our own people.

We cannot afford - and the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) just said that we were lucky in this stage to be in an age where there is a restraint on spending. There might be a restraint on the dollars but there is no restraint on the demands. I refer the hon. member to the petitions that are presented here every day and there are dozens of them. But this is a part of life. This is a part of the life we are living in. As I said to my hon. friend from Lewisporte (Mr. White) one day - he passed the remark that someone was hung up for two days on the Trans-Canada because it was slippery. I mentioned to him about being hung up on the Gaff Topsails for three days back in the old days. Oh he says you know, this was 1976. I realize it is 1976. But can we continue to be spoon-feeding all our people all our lives, or some day are we going to be all honest people and say to someone, "No, you just cannot have it because it is not there. Whether you voted for me or not there is not too much I can do about it. But I am trying to tell you the story as it is."

Back in the 1930's when we had Commission of Government - and that was a story in itself. In my opinion it was the best form of government we ever had in many ways of speaking because there was no political demand on anybody. They were sort of appointed. Now it might have been dictatorial but at least one of the commissioners did not have to worry whether the people down in Torbay or somewhere

MR. MURPHY:

else would not vote for him again. But they said, "We have the money here. Let us do it as we want it. We will cut it up in six, ten, twenty-five pieces," which is ideal.

AN HON. MEMBER: All the commissioners were in St. John's.

MR. MURPHY: No, there are only three Newfoundlanders. Oh, yes, I agree with your there, yes. But, you know, they were the type you know, but I believe they had different - but, you know, notwithstanding that. But at that time there was great fear expressed because we had lost our own Responsible Government and gone into a form of Commission of Government with six, three English, I think, and three Newfoundland, and the Governor as Chairman. I believe that was the setup at the time and this was it. And for months people were demanding a return back to our own Responsible Government. And there used to be a big headline across, I remember, The Daily News particular, "Wherefore And Wither Tending." And this is something that perhaps that we could say to ourselves today, "Wherefore And Wither Tending."

Education has been mentioned, and I mention it myself; it should be one of the great factors in deciding our future. Two hundred and sixty million - is it? - we spend on education. Just about twenty-five per cent of our budget is going into education.

Hospital services: Today with transportation you can go almost from one part of this - not the Province actually, but we talk about the Clarendville area. What are we, an hour and one-half from St. John's by car - the Grand Falls area back and forth, you know. It is time now - and I think always it is some kind of a regional setup where we look after your regions. And I look again at the hon. member where he has the great National Park, and you have Gander, all that beautiful area, you know, you could almost take it in where you could have some kind of a regional setup there that would provide all the services, like basically you just about have now with your trade schools there in the Gander area. You got your hospital there in Gander so on and so forth.

If we do not get down to helping ourselves, in a few years time there is no one going to help us. I will say that right here and now, Mr. Speaker. And we have talked about everything. I have heard the hon. Minister of Fisheries tell these men buying these boats

Mr. Murphy.

they should form a limited liability company, otherwise they are stuck instead. I have heard of the hon. member again about his fish plant, and many other people talking about things.

One of the greatest movements in the world is almost completely neglected in this Province and that is I get back again to co-operatives, People helping people, - and I think that is the basis - with no great cost. So I am very much in favour, Mr. Speaker - I have to be in favour because otherwise I would not be in this hon. House - that our Province has to be developed. But setting up a Select Committee, Sir, I say is no answer to this. We have fifty-one people here, I think, or forty-eight again at the present time, who should be the greatest Select Committee you have in this world.

MR. NEARY: Get out the Economic Prospects Report and bring it back into the House.

MR. MURPHY: You know, pay another few million to do it, eh? How much did we pay for the Labrador Commission?

MR. NEARY: Let us get the old report out and bring it into the House.

MR. MURPHY: What do we do, go into the same thing?

But I will say this again just to wind up, and I did not mean to be so long, Mr. Speaker, but I very much enjoyed the speech of the hon. member for Terra Nova. I think there was a lot of good stuff in it. But let us get, impart to all our friends - and I talk about the great Federation of Labour, all the great labour unions, all the great nurses unions, everybody else who is connected in an organized group - let us get us altogether in one solid group to work for the betterment of Newfoundland and do not let us say, So-and-So here is scrounging or gouging someone else, when there are millions of dollars literally in union fees and all other forms going out of this Province, going somewhere to someone. Let us start. And I just impart this, that if it is to be done, it has got to be a united effort,

Mr. Murphy.

not only by the provincial government, not by the federal government, but by the fifty-one members in this House, the elected members with the help of all the unions or all the groups that are formed in this Province. Thank you very much. Will I move the adjournment of the debate unless someone else wants to? We will adjourn the debate.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the proper call of the order is but I was watching the clock, and I intend to speak on this debate, and I will adjourn it in five.

MR. WELLS: In that case if the hon. member has adjourned the debate, and, of course, will speak next Private Members' Day, unless the hon. member wants to speak for a couple of minutes now.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, okay.

MR. WELLS: Well, very well. If the hon. member then would adjourn the debate at about one minute to six o'clock.

MR. FLIGHT:

I had intended to say a few words in this debate and I doubt very seriously if I will be able to go the forty-five minutes, and I doubt very seriously if it is necessary that I would go forty-five minutes. I went to say from the start that I am in sympathy with some of the things outlined by my hon. friend, the member for St. John's Center (Mr. Murphy). On the surface one should say, really, I think, that the fifty-one members of the House of Assembly should be able to decide the way this Province goes.

But, Sir, the problem is that in twenty-six years since Confederation this House of Assembly have adopted an ad hoc approach to development. I remember quite well, Mr. Speaker, in 1970 when this government came into office. I had supported the outgoing administration and having supported them, of course, I listened to the flack over the years of the type of development, the jobs or perish situation. And this government came into power and their heaviest plank in their platform was, we have had enough heavy industry, we have had enough Come By Chances, we have had enough this, we have had enough that, we will go back to resource development. And driving back with my wife in the car I said, "Well fine. Maybe they are right. Maybe there should not have been the heavy industrialization, the Erco's and the Churchill Falls and the Come By Chance. Maybe instead of putting \$200 million into one project we will put \$100,000 into twenty or thirty projects. Maybe they are right." I assumed that is the way we were going to go. I was very interested in watching it and taking part in it.

Then, Mr. Speaker, within six months the industrial, the rural development, resource-based labour-intensive industries were gone and we were right back on the heavy industrialization again. We were going to have two oil refineries. We were going to have a petro-chemical plant. The government itself got involved. We brought the linerboard mill and quite recently we brought Brinco. Rural development was forgotten. Now rural development is the name

MR. FLICHT:

of the game again. So I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot depend on this House of Assembly to come up with the way we go economically because we have proven over this past twenty-six, twenty-seven years it is ad hoc, it is a scatterbrain approach.

I think that if there were probably a select committee to sit down and in their wisdom decided which is the right way to go, look at the resources we have and how to develop them, and probably recommend to this House how they should be developed, then I think maybe this Province would indeed be better off. On that basis I am inclined to go with the select committee unless this House can make a commitment to themselves that they will indeed take a rational inventory of what we have available to developing Newfoundland, that is in human resources, basic resources, and address themselves to it. There is no indication in this present House that that is the situation, Mr. Speaker. With that I adjourn the debate.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I do move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday at two o'clock in the afternoon and that this House do stand adjourned.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I was just going to say on behalf of my colleagues if the minister could indicate, will we continue with the estimates tomorrow and what department is likely to be called after Education?

MR. WELLS: After Education it is our intention to call Health.

MR. F. ROWE: Health. Thank you very much.

On motion that the House at its rising do now adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at two of the clock.

C O N T E N T S

April 28, 1976	Page
<u>PRESENTING PETITIONS</u>	
By Mr. Roberts in behalf of residents of the Labrador section of his district asking that conditions be improved on the road from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay.	6046
Spoken to by:	
Mr. Neary	6049
Mr. Morgan	6049
By Mr. Goudie in behalf of residents of six communities in Labrador asking that CN boats be used only for the transport of local residents who use the boats as a highway.	6051
Spoken to by:	
Mr. Morgan	6052
Mr. Roberts	6055
Mr. Neary	6069
Mr. Doody	6071
Mr. Rowe	6074
Capt. Winsor	6081
Mr. Hickey	6084
By Mr. J. Carter in behalf of residents of the general area of the junction of Freshwater Road and Oxen Pond Road, St. John's, objecting to the granting of a lounge licence for an outlet to be located at 316 Freshwater Road.	6088
Supported by Mr. Doody.	6089
<u>NOTICES OF MOTION</u>	
Mr. Doody gave notice that on tomorrow he would move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the guarantee of the repayment of bonds and debentures and the guarantee of replacement loans made to certain municipalities and local authorities; and to consider certain resolutions in relation to the granting of supplementary supply.	6090
Notice was given that on tomorrow leave would be sought to introduce Bills Nos. 40, 41, 43, 39 and 42.	6090
<u>ORAL QUESTIONS</u>	
Government's attitude to the Federal Energy Strategy Paper. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	6091
Federal-Provincial conference suggested. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	6093
Query as to Government's liability on a tender call for new electrical services at Hotel Port aux Basques. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Doody.	6094
Request that Government check existing agreements to determine liability for such improvements. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Doody.	6096
The Kippens Bridge. Mr. Hodder, Mr. Morgan.	6096
Efforts to improve the Trans-Canada Highway. Mr. White, Mr. Morgan.	6097

C O N T E N T S - 2

<u>ORAL QUESTIONS (continued)</u>	Page
Query as to what action the Provincial Government will take to improve the highway. Mr. White, Mr. Morgan.	6099
Possible imposition of a half-load limit. Mr. White, Mr. Morgan.	6102
Query as to whether hiring Newfoundlanders has been complicated since a Quebec firm has reportedly been low bidder on a tender call for constructing the transmission line from Churchill Falls to Happy Valley. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Wells.	6103
Query as to difficulty in hiring Newfoundlanders. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Doody.	6104
Report sought on repairs to the Marystown Shipyard and the possibility of the Shipyard being awarded a contract by the Government of Guyana. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	6105
Contracts to be filled by the Shipyard. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	6107
 <u>ORDERS OF THE DAY</u>	
Private Member's Day	
That a Select Committee be established to enquire into and report upon the prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador, including the prospects for economic growth etc. (continued).	
Mr. Lush	6108
Mr. Murphy	6125
Mr. Flight	6137
Mr. Flight adjourned the debate.	6139
 <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>	 6139