



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

---

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 19

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1975**

**SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER**

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MP. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On behalf of hon. members of the House I would like to welcome a number of trainees from the Vocational Training programme in St. John's who are in the legislature today. They are accompanied by three instructors, Mr. Gerald Bannister, Mr. Wayne Watton and Mrs. Graham. On behalf of all hon. members of the Legislature I would like to welcome these people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

o o o

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

MP. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of, I suppose, privilege.

I just want to correct a wrong piece of reporting here. The headline in The Evening Telegram, page 3 today says, "Lower Churchill Will Cost \$200 Million By the End of 1976." It is entirely incorrect, Mr. Speaker. As I explained yesterday in detail, it is \$41 million by the end of 1975, and another \$55 million if we go right through the calendar year 1976. That would make a total of \$96 million. So there is just no connection between the headline of this story and what was stated yesterday. Since it is quite a serious mistake I would like to exercise my privilege as to bring it to the attention of the House.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MP. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to also rise on a matter of personal privilege. Indeed, Sir, the privileges of this hon. House concerning, Sir, statements made to The Evening Telegram on Monday, December 15 and repeated again last night on a Here And Now programme made by Mr. John Pennie, Sir, the caretaker manager of the Marystown Shipyards.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the assumption made by Mr. Pennie, caretaker manager of the Marystown Shipyards, that his predecessor, Mr. Millen, had given me the letters which I read in this House on Friday,

MR. NEARY:

November 13, 1975, Sir, concerning charges of poor management of the shipyards, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is imperative to completely absolve Mr. Millen of any responsibility whatsoever of placing these documents in my hands. Since, Mr. Speaker, the allegations in the letters referred pretty specifically to management during Mr. Pennie's period of directing the shipyard, perhaps, Sir, instead of Mr. Pennie slandering, libelling and attacking Mr. Millen, that he should have followed a different course of action and tried to defend himself against these allegations, if that is possible, Sir, rather than attempt to draw a red herring across the trail by levelling accusations against Mr. Millen.

o o o

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.

MR. WELLS: A point of order. Was that, Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege, or interpreted by you, Sir, as that, or was this some sort of statement because it involved people who are not in this House, who are apparently in some sort of dispute outside this House, and I fail to see how it can be a point of privilege within this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on this point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to clarify that, Sir, the statements were made inside of this hon. House and grossly distorted and slanderous and libel accusations were made against an individual as a result of remarks and documents that I produced in this House, against an innocent party, Sir. This whole matter could affect Mr. Millen's - I have never met the gentleman, Sir, never had the privilege of meeting the gentleman, would not know him if he stood here in front of me. And I think it is scandalous for Mr. Pennie to draw this red herring into this whole issue instead of trying to clear up his own record with the shipyards.

MR. WELLS: A point of order,

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker. Statements made of the sort the hon. member is speaking about outside this House leave both people involved with their remedies in the courts if they wish to pursue them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Amen.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

In my understanding, members rise on a point of privilege basically in two ways: One, a technical, precisely defined matter of privilege, allegation of breach of privilege; and secondly, members rise on a point of privilege in order to make an explanation, or comment, or to give their opinion or clarification on a matter relating to what they may have said themselves in the House or what somebody else may have interpreted the remarks to have been. When both hon. members this afternoon, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) spoke, they got the floor by rising on a point of privilege, and then made their explanations or remarks or comments with references to things said or written and relating to what they, each of them, had earlier said in the House.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN: (See index.)

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, with reference to question no. 1 on the Order Paper of Monday, November 25, asked of the hon. the Premier. The member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) had asked to table the engineering survey of the proposed underwater tunnel across the Straits of Belle Isle.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one engineering survey. It is impossible to know what engineering survey the hon. gentleman refers to. There are a number of engineering surveys and reports on that. I have no objection if the hon. gentleman really wants to go down and look through all these engineering reports or surveys, to arrange that for him. But it would be impossible to table all these in the House.

With reference to question no. 2 asked of the hon. the Premier on the same Order Paper, it asks for the tabling of the Preece, Cardew,

MR. CROSBIE:

and Rider report on transmission of electric power from Labrador to Newfoundland. The position on that, Mr. Speaker, is that during the period 1964 to 1968 Preece, Cardew and Rider submitted five reports regarding the transmission of electric power from Labrador to Newfoundland, along the Anglo-Saxon route so-called.

We do not know from the hon. gentleman's question what particular report he is referring to. In addition there is only one copy that we know of that we have.

MR. ROBERTS: There may be one in the cabinet records.

MR. CROSBIE: There may be one in the cabinet records. But there are not sufficient copies to be tabled in the House. But if the hon. gentleman wants to -

MR. ROBERTS: There were only twenty copies printed.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes. I do not know where they have all gone. Probably with ministers and so on. But if the hon. gentleman wants to have it arranged for him to see whatever the Hydro Corporation has there, you know, I do not mind arranging that for him.

Question no. 3 asked of the hon. the Premier on the same Order Paper: Did the Churchill Falls Power Corporation before being nationalized refuse to develop the Lower Churchill? Obviously, Mr. Speaker, they did not refuse to develop the Lower Churchill. They proposed to develop it and sell the power to Hydro Quebec under the same terms and conditions as had applied on the Upper Churchill. Those terms and conditions were not acceptable to the administration and they were not given permission to proceed under those terms and conditions. So the answer is no, they did not refuse to develop it, but the terms and conditions under which they wished to develop it were unacceptable to the government, and I think they would have been unacceptable to any government of this Province.

Question 4 asked of the hon. the Premier on the same Order Paper by the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood): Did the Churchill Falls Power Corporation before being nationalized refuse to bring Labrador electric power to the Island of Newfoundland? The answer cannot be answered in that fashion. They were not - and they never

MR. SMALLWOOD:

suggested nor did they offer to develop the Lower Churchill hydro power and transmit it to the Island of Newfoundland. When it was discussed with them verbally on one or two occasions, they indicated that they were not interested in that because they did not think it would be economic or feasible at that time.

MR. CROSBIE: Question No. 5 asked by the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) directed to the Premier on the same Order Paper. The question asked: How much money have the government paid in interest on the monies borrowed with which the government purchased controlling shares in Churchill Falls Power Corporation? During the same period how much money has been received by the government as their share of profits earned by the said corporation? How much has been received by the Government of Quebec? To answer the last part of that question first, <sup>no</sup> monies have been received by the Government of Newfoundland from CFLCo as our share of the profits to date because, as I explained yesterday, CFLCo cannot declare dividends under their trust deeds and so on and so forth until 1977. So if the Government of Newfoundland has not received as yet any share of the profits of CFLCo, the profits have got to be kept, and can only be paid out in way of dividends from 1977 onwards, nor has the Government of Quebec received any dividends from the shares their own of CFLCo for the same reason. Both governments will start to receive dividends from 1977 onwards.

With respect to the interest paid on the money borrowed to purchase the controlling shares of CFLCo, the interest paid by NIDC and Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro for the period from June 27, 1974 to November 30, 1975, in relationship with the shares of CFLCo, is an amount totalling \$19.2 million.

Question No. 6 on the Order Paper of the same date, November 24, asked by the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) to the hon. the Premier. It asks: What financial assistance the Government of Canada offered toward the cost of developing the Lower Churchill, and certain other questions? This question has been answered as fully as we can answer it in a statement that was delivered in the House by myself November 28. So the question has been answered as far as we can answer it at the present time.

Mr. Crosbie.

Question No. 83, Mr. Speaker, on the same Order Paper, asked to the Premier by the same hon. member (Mr. Smallwood). The question was: Some account of what has resulted from the modified concession and claim-staking system developed to encourage a much higher degree of mineral exploration than has been the case in the past, as announced in the Speech from the Throne on January 31, 1973. I will table the reply, Mr. Speaker, and the reply certainly shows what has happened as a result of this new concession system, a claim-staking system. We have seen a tremendous increase. For example, in 1970, the number of claims nine; in 1972 it was thirty-five; in 1973 it was 490; in 1974 it was 1,455; and in 1975 it was 2,475 to date. This illustrates the kind of increase activity there has been as a result of the new system and the number of miners' permits issued has had a vast increase from fourteen individuals in 1970 to 150 in 1975 to date; fifteen company permits in 1970 to twenty-nine in 1975 to date. There is a bit further information in the written - there will be a series of these. You may as well wait. There are seven copies, I think, for the House and hon. members.

Now Question No. 84 on the same Order Paper asked to the hon. Premier asks: What has been the outcome of a detailed study to identify opportunities which exist for the further processing of minerals in the Province? It refers to the Speech from the Throne of January 31, 1973. As this is a long answer, Mr. Speaker, I will table copies of the answer here.

Question No. 120 asked of the Minister of Mines and Energy in the same Order Paper by the same hon. member (Mr. Smallwood). The question is: A statement showing the diamond drilling done by the government and number of feet and so on. I table the answer to that now.



Question No. 121, the same Order Paper, the same member (Mr. Smallwood), the same minister (Minister of Mines and Energy), the amount of diamond drilling done by private mining companies in the last five years, the amount of money spent and so on. That is a long answer so I will just table it, Mr. Speaker, but all the information is there.

MR. ROBERTS: It will all become part of Volume 7.

MR. CROSBIE: This will all become part of Volume 7, yes, of The Books of Newfoundland .

Question No. 122, the same Order Paper, the same minister (Minister of Mines and Energy), the same member (Mr. Smallwood) about

MR. CROSBIE: the value of gold produced at Buchans since it began operations. We do not have the information on the total volume and value of gold produced since it commenced mining operations, but we have some information from the report of the industrial enquiry commission from 1962 to 1971 and that is contained in this answer here. It is \$2,292,000 from 1962 to 1971.

Question No. 126, the same Order Paper, the same people; how many mines inspectors are employed. At present there is one inspector employed, electrical, mechanical and a chief inspector. Two more have been engaged and will take up their appointments in January. One vacancy still exists and the candidate remains to be interviewed. There has been an extensive advertising campaign.

Question No. 127 is about oil shale at Deer Lake and I will just leave that. It is too long to go into verbally. It is asked by the same hon. gentleman.

Question No. 128, the same member, this question is one that says, what exploration or drilling have been carried out on possible oil deposits under the dry land portion of the Province in the past three years? The answer is the only oil or gas exploration carried out on the dry land portion of the Province during the past three years was a drilling by the Union Oil Co. and Brinex, an exploratory well in the Anguille Mountains. That well, drilled in the Fall of 1973, reached a total depth of 5,781 feet and encountered no indications of either oil or gas.

Question No. 129 by the same gentleman, how many feet have been drilled and how many holes and by whom in the various off-shore oil and gas concessions. A total of 478,047 feet have been drilled in fifty-one wells during the search for oil and gas within the jurisdiction of this Legislature off-shore. Details of the wells are given in this answer and the locations are given on a map, this map here. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Clerk might keep the maps so any interested member could see the map, but there are seven answers to the question here.

MR. MURPHY: Is the map autographed?

MR. CROSBIE: It is not autographed. No.

Question No. 130 by the same member, on the same Order Paper, a statement of geological surveys for the period 1970-75. The answer, which is too detailed for me to give here in detail at the moment, shows a very encouraging increase in the amount spent on geological mapping parties since the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) ceased to be Premier.

In 1972 the cost of the parties was \$45,000 and this year it is \$251,000 and last year \$284,000 and so on. Great progress is being made.

Question No. 131, same parties, about efforts to bring about development of the magnesite deposit in Central Newfoundland, the answer is that that deposit located at Great Bend on the Gander River is controlled by NALCO, the friends of the hon. former Premier (Mr. Smallwood), as it is within the concession area held by them under the NALCO Act. We have no recent information on the company's activities, if any, with respect to that deposit. If the hon. gentleman would contact NALCO principles and ask them to push that forward I am sure it would be very helpful.

Question No. 132, same Order Paper, the present status of the salt deposit discovered by Hooker Chemicals. The reply is, "Following the termination of a concession agreement, Hooker Chemical Corporation was issued five development licences in the St. George's Bay area on July 25, 1975. These licences were valid for a five year period. Subsequently three of the development licences were surrendered and the remaining two were assigned by Hooker to Forresters Petroleum Limited, a subsidiary of Hooker. Rentals on the two licences have been paid up to July 25, 1976.

Question No. 133, what, if anything, is being done to discover other deposits of salt. No salt exploration is being conducted recently in the Province apart from the work conducted by Hooker and Forresters Petroleum.

MR. YOUNG: The happy hooker.

MR. CROSBIE: The happy hookers.

MR. CROSBIE: Question 134. This is a question asking for the names of all mining companies that have come into the Province to do prospecting and developing in each financial year from 1970 to 1975. There is a list attached here, Mr. Speaker, which will show the encouraging increase in the number of mining companies in the Province in the last five years.

Question 136. This is really for the book, because it asks for a table showing the value of minerals produced here from 1950 to the present day and our answer comes from the Canadian Mineral's Year Book. But we will do all we can to assist hon. gentlemen and we reproduced it all here in the answer to this question. The answers to these questions are costing us thousands of dollars in time and effort but -

MR. ROBERTS: You will get a credit in the book, "John".

MR. CROSBIE: A footnote. Question 138, Mr. Speaker, asks me if I have taken serious note of the public complaint of a British Petroleum officer - recently made - that it has been taking them from three to nine months advance ordering to get goods delivered to them in this Province. The answer could simply be "Yes, I have taken serious notice," but we do not want just to fool around with these questions so we have a larger answer.

MR. NEARY: How about Lou Murphy reading it?

MR. CROSBIE: That would take a long time.

We have taken notice of the comments of the official of B.P. The Department of Mines and Energy, who are in constant contact with offshore operations, are keenly aware of this problem. In conjunction with Industrial Development, considerable efforts are being made to impress local business with the need for prompt and timely service in the very costly oil business. Local businesses have responded well to this challenge. The basic problem arises from a lack of adequate freight service from the mainland, a problem which has long been a source of much inconvenience and cost to Newfoundland consumers.

It is our hope that pressure from the oil companies for better service will force the federal government into some action in this area. This will result in benefits not only to the oil companies but to

MR. CROSBIE: all sectors of the Newfoundland economy.

One question here, Mr. Speaker, that was asked by the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who has fallen far behind the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) in the number of questions, but he is attempting to catch up.

MR. NEARY: Wait until tomorrow when I really get going.

MR. CROSBIE: Getting ready for your own book.

Question No. 675 asked me to table a chart showing in detail the areas of the offshore exploration for gas and oil and mineral rights granted to various companies and detail for each block the period for which the exploration rights have been granted.

MR. NEARY: That looks like a road map of the House of Assembly.

MR. CROSBIE: Is that right?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer is almost all areas off our coast hold some prospect for oil or gas and at various times during the last ten years virtually every portion of Newfoundland and Labrador's continental shelves and slopes have been examined in the search for hydrocarbons. Most significant exploratory activity has, of course, been the drilling of fifty-one wells as detailed to the House in reply to question 129, which shows where the fifty-one wells have been drilled. The early stages of this exploration activity were conducted under a series of grants, agreements and undertakings entered into by the previous administration. These agreements were not issued for a specific period. Areas subject to such agreements are shown on the attached map entitled "Provincial permits issued prior to 1974". Most of those we do not consider to have any validity for the future.

Since passage of the amendment to the Petroleum and Natural Gas Act of 1974, no company has been allowed to undertake any petroleum exploration activity without securing an interim permit from the Province. Unlike interim permits issued by the previous administration, these interim permits are granted only for specific programmes to be conducted in a particular area with a limited time. The period for which they have been issued has normally been twelve months and they

MR. CROSBIE:

confer neither ownership nor production rights, they are only for exploration purposes. All such interim permits presently in force are shown on another map here called, "Term interim permits outstanding December 15, 1975." The two maps mentioned above together detail all offshore oil and gas rights which have been granted by the Province and which are currently in force.

MR. NEARY: Got the money in the bank?

MR. CROSBIE: This is only the Province, not what the federal government has granted.

MR. DOODY: The hotel manager in Panama, have you got his there?

MR. CROSBIE: No, he was cancelled I think.

MR. NEARY: Do I get to keep that map?

MR. CROSBIE: Well, I think if the hon. gentleman would look at the maps and let the Clerk have them for anybody who wants to look at them it would make it easier.

MR. NEARY: I would like to have one for my office.

MR. CROSBIE: That is all, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further answers to questions?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answer to Question No. 449:

What new water systems were placed in the Province in each of the financial years 1970-1975, and the capital cost of each? That was on Monday, November 24 asked by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). So the whole list of water systems that have come on stream in the last five years is detailed here showing a total expenditure, which I will table.

Question No. 450: What new sewer systems were placed in the Province in each of the financial years 1970-1975, and the capital cost of each? There is a list of the places with sewer systems: Brigus, Catalina, Clarke's Beach, Crow Head, Deer Lake, Englee, Millertown, Pasadena, Peterview, Robert's Arm, in the great historic district of Green Bay, St. Bernard's, St. Mary's and Upper Island Cove, -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: - and the cost of each.

Question No. 451, asked the same day by the same hon. gentleman: What new water and sewer systems - a logically based question, I might add - were placed in the Province in each of the financial years 1970-1975 and the capital cost of each? And so we go down through a whole list of those as well, giving the places, the capital costs in the various years, which piles up a fair number of dollars on the Province, a total of \$62,582,000, Your Honour.

Question No. 468, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of hon. gentleman present, hon. members, I should say: A statement showing, for each of the financial years since Confederation, either by cash or by guarantee, to provide central water, central sewerage, or central water and sewerage systems, how much of the said amount in any financial year was contributed by any and what agency of the Federal Government? In assessing this question and all its ramifications, we have, after labourous hours, studying the question, found out that it would take five or six

Mr. Peckford.

people in the department anywhere from fifteen to twenty-six days to get together all the information, so we have not answered that question as of yet, and that is the reason -

MR. SMALLWOOD: What term?

MR. PECKFORD: - since Confederation, water and sewer, water and sewer and the agencies through which these funds are payable, and we are going to attempt to get them. So we have delayed answering that question right now because it is extremely difficult to come up with all those -

MR. ROBERTS: You have to check out all of those?

MR. PECKFORD: Exactly.

MR. ROBERTS: Those volumes must be moving right along.

MR. PECKFORD: Well, you know, I might even get a complimentary copy of something.

Question No. 473, Mr. Speaker, giving the contracts awarded and so on for water and sewer systems for capital works in the Province in the past year, and they are all here. Who they were awarded to? Who were the consulting engineers? The contract award date, the contractor and contract value? This gives all of it for this present year, our capital works programme that a lot of people have been asking for. The information is here in this answer on the capital works programme since December 1974 to December 1975.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: So, Mr. Speaker, I table the answer to these questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in answer to Question No. 419 placed on the Order Paper by the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), the question was the information regarding the expenditure per year since 1970 by the Federal Department of Regional and Economic Expansion for the reconstruction and paving of roads in this Province. In 1970-1971 there was \$13 million from the federal government; in 1971-1972, \$23 million;



1972-1973, \$28 million; in 1973-1974, \$18 million; in 1974-1975, \$20 million and this year to date, up until November 1, \$16 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: A very Liberal government up there in Ottawa.

MR. MORCAN: We need much more.

MR. PECKFORD: After conservative badgering.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. MORCAN: Only \$13 million in 1970.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor).

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answers to a number of questions on the Order Paper of November 24 asked of the hon. the Premier by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), questions no. 8, 11, 19, 20, 21, 29, 41 and 47.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in the continuing story of efforts to provide information for volume 7, I have some answers. The answer to question no. 372 in the name of the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood); no 377 I will be kind to the House. I will not read all of them - no. 374; no. 378; no. 380; no. 386; no. 389.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why do you not read them out?

MR. H. COLLINS: I do not think. It is not of any great interest. No. 396; no. 397; no. 400; no. 403; no. 373; no. 408; no. 411; and in the name of the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) the answer to question no. 655.

MR. NEARY: Read the answer.

AN HON. MEMBER: What was the question?

MR. H. COLLINS: It is a long answer. It is a question asking the names of the members of the Board of Governors of the St. John's General Hospital Corporation. They are all listed and I might say that in response to the third part of the question, what salaries, wages or other remuneration are paid to the members of the said board, the answer is nil, not a cent.

MR. NEARY: They do not get paid for meetings?

MR. H. COLLINS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

MR. MURPHY: For a slight change of pace, questions no. 642 on the Order Paper of November 3, I believe, asked by the hon. member for Carbonear

MR. MURPHY:

(Mr. R. Moores) with reference to any attempt that has been undertaken or is about to be undertaken to depollute and revitalize Carbonear pond in the center of the Town of Carbonear. We suggest he ask the municipal authority.

Question no. 643, to ask the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs, the same member, to table the pollution study related to the Newfoundland Leather, Fur and Hide Company located in the industrial park Carbonear - no study made by this department.

Question no. 644 deals with a study of pollution related to the construction and opening of Earle Proteins Limited Carbonear, my department has made no study of this group either. So, the subject of pollution is finished as far as Carbonear is concerned.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Sir. Is the minister aware the the RCMP in Burin made a statement this morning that the accident on a road called The Scrape was caused by slippery road conditions? If the minister is aware that this statement was made causing the fatality in Burin, will the minister tell the House what precautionary measures or investigations are carried out by the department to make sure that the minister's department is not at fault in these cases and why that road was not sanded, say, at four or five o'clock this morning?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, no I am not aware of any statements made by the RCMP, whether or not the accident was caused or in fact about the accident. But I will make this statement in reply to his question, that I intend to be in contact with all RCMP detachments around the Province to give me reports, if not daily at least weekly, with regards to accidents that could be caused or were caused or if the road conditions had any effect at all on the accidents.

MR. NEARY: Good idea. That is a good idea.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I address this question to the Minister of Mines and Energy. It is again pursuing the establishment of the mining school in Newfoundland. Would the minister indicate if a firm decision has been made as to the location of such a proposed school?

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, you know I tried to answer this before.

There has been no firm decision made that there is going to be such a mining school. There is a study that has been done as a result of the initiative and get-up-and-go and drive of the member representing Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) -

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: - for the Whalesback mine to be used, the abandoned Whalesback mine to be used for the purpose of a mining school. That report is before the government. It may or may not be accepted. If that is not accepted, if this venture is not found to be a good plan for the Whalesback area, then presumably the government could look at other areas if it is considered that it is desirable to have a mining school. So no decision has yet been made. But the one area that has been studied that there is a report on, and the first one to be brought to government's attention is the Whalesback mine, and that is what is being looked at.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister consider my drive, get-up-and-go in requesting that now such a study being done to ascertain whether or not such a school would be maybe more desirable in Buchans and serve a greater purpose?

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, this is a reasonable government and its mind is not shut to anything. If it is found that the Whalesback mine and a mining school for that area is not feasible, it cannot be done, then we would not hesitate to look at other areas. The situation is that at the moment Buchans is still an operating mine. We hope it will be for longer than the period until 1979. Bell Island has another abandoned mine. We have striven with might and main to develop something there, and as the present member for that district has got a project going on there now that may result in great things for Bell Island.

MR. MURPHY: The excavation on Barters Hill -

MR. CROSBIE: So I will not say that we will not look at it. We will see what happens with this study and if the hon. gentleman wants this considered, in connection with Buchans if it is turned down for Whalesback, we will look at it, sure.

MR. FLIGHT: I thank the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. What efforts has he made to approach the federal government on the development of the harbour or additional development of the harbour in St. John's? What reply, if any, has he received?

MR. NEARY: None, I hope. We do not want Port aux Basques wiped out.

MR. DOODY: Especially Sid Tavenor!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Port aux Basques is out.

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question, I met with the members of the St. John's Port Authority, in fact; Mr. Nolan in particular, about two weeks ago and discussed with him the need for improvement to the St. John's Harbour. I then gave him the assurance of every co-operation and support from my department on that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Would the minister do this to the detriment of any other port in Newfoundland, especially Port aux Basques?

MR. MORGAN: For the benefit of all Newfoundland, hopefully.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Exploits.

MR. MULROONEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Could the Minister of Fisheries state whether or not the study on the wood that was exported for the manufacture of barrels exporting fish from Newfoundland has been completed and whether or not the report has been acceptable for manufacturing here in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and I will provide an answer later.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has a supplementary, I believe.

MR. MULROONEY: Could the minister also take under advisement the number of barrels that we import to Newfoundland, the cost of each barrel, and whether or not it is at \$16 a barrel, whether or not the machinery that we have in Newfoundland, which is outdated, can still manufacture barrels cheaper than we can import them, whether or not -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would suggest that the hon. gentleman has a whole series, or certainly a series of questions which are not appropriate for the Oral Question period. What I would suggest is that he put them on the Order Paper or communicate them privately to the minister as a follow-up to the oral question. But a whole series of questions like that are not appropriate to the oral question period.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Could the minister indicate to the House why so many members of town councils across Newfoundland and Labrador are resigning?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the assumption or the premise on which the question is based is valid. Where are all the people resigning in town councils? I do not know of very many people who are resigning.

MR. NEARY: You can hardly turn on your radio. There is scarcely a day passes without hearing about a few.

MR. PECKFORD: I do not know. They will have to give their own reasons. I imagine each one is different, you know. I do not think the question is an extremely good one, besides it is not urgent, and I think the hon. member should do more research before he asks such a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy. In view of the Easton Report into industrial inquiries in labour relations at IOC, I have a question related to two aspects of that report related to the minister's department. Has his department taken any action with regard to the replacement of the environmental technician at Labrador City, and also increasing staff to monitor more closely the efforts of mining companies in dust control, two recommendations of that report?

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

HON. J. CROSBIE: Yes, Mr. Minister, we are advertising for a new environmental technician, I think it is called, for Iron Ore Companies Operations of Labrador City and we consider this to be of great urgency. So we are advertising now, looking for a suitable person. The second part of the question was - what was the second part?

MR. RIDEOUT: Increasing staff to monitor more closely the efforts of mining companies.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, and we are trying to increase the staff of the department and we hope to get some new positions established. But even with the positions that are established it is difficult to get mining inspectors and properly trained and qualified people. But I regard this as of the highest priority. So I hope we will be successful. So we are endeavouring to increase the numbers and to get more people for that purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Deputy Premier. In reference to and I ask this question of the Deputy Premier - I had intended to ask it if I may transfer it, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Economic Development. He was not then in the House, but he is now. Maybe I could redirect it, with your permission. Could the minister supply us with information regarding the number of companies in Newfoundland who have for whatever reasons decided to establish their head offices now in Halifax? A supplementary to that also as a matter of interest: How many Federal



MR. NOLAN: government offices have moved out of this Province, say, in the last five or six years and they too have their head offices in Halifax rather than in Newfoundland where they were previously.

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

HON. J. LUNDRIKAN: Mr. Speaker, the second part of the question I would say, I could indicate that there has been a substantial number, unfortunately, that have relocated their headquarters to Halifax or Moncton. The regional headquarters seems to be in Nova Scotia rather than in Newfoundland, as it was. I am very unhappy about that, and I am sure the member expressed the same sentiments. On the number of companies that have their headquarters moved out of here, larger companies, I could not give the answer to that question but I will take it as notice and look into it.

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

MR. C. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this question is directed to the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy. It has been indicated in his statement and to this House that the contracts have been let for the sinking of two shafts on each side of the tunnel. Would the minister indicate to whom these contracts have been let?

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I tabled a list of all supply and construction contracts on the Gull Island project to date. If we look at that we will see shaft sinking, the Cementation Company, \$7,489,000. That is at one side of the Straits; foundations and collars, Pinsent Construction, \$935,000; shaft sinking on the Labrador side, Cementation Company, \$6,420,000. There are some extra copies somewhere here if you want one.

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

MR. NEARY: Sir, I have a question for the Minister of Industrial Development. Would the minister tell the House if the ownership of Atlantic Fish Processors at Marystown has changed in the last few days, in the last week or so?

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The answer is no, to my knowledge, Sir. But in future you could direct a question of that nature to my esteemed colleague in Fisheries who is co-ordinating this with the Minister of Mines and Energy and myself, as far as the facilities at Marystown in the fish area are concerned.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Again it is related to the Easton Report at Labrador City. Has the minister's department as yet taken any action with regard to a recommendation of that report to set up an educational programme to make employees more aware of industrial diseases in that particular operation?

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MP. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in the total area in terms of the health needs and safety needs in mining there is a group of officials of three or four departments presently meeting, and the ministers will be meeting shortly, and all those problem areas will be considered, and hopefully some way found to improve the situation.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan).

MP. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, two questions, if I may, for the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MP. SPEAKER: One at a time, if I may suggest.

MP. NOLAN: All right. But I only mentioned that now because I might get the second crack in. The first is, last night in our debate on the GLTCo takeover there was a question asked in reference to how much, what is the interest rate being paid to the Bank of Nova Scotia currently. The minister said that he would find out. Does he have the answer now and could he supply it, please?

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

MP. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, you know, I am getting that information. The only reason it is not readily available is because the interest rate changes every six months. The loan was a five year loan arranged with the Bank of Montreal in U.S. dollars and the rate of interest changes every six months in accordance with the London Inter-Bank rate which changes every six months. It goes up and down like a dog's belly in the sun. So, they are getting me all that information and I will have it when I am concluding the debate. Or if I have it sooner than that, then I will give it. But I cannot give it to you right now.

MP. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MP. NOLAN: Second question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member. Has he as yet found a sponsor for his upcoming television debate and if so, did he apply to the Newfoundland Book Publishing Company to -

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

MP. NOLAN: - sponsor it for him.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MP. NEARY: I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Sir, if he yet has the information concerning the Burgeo airstrip and an airstrip for Port aux Basques as the minister promised me he would get the other day?

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communication.

MP. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, with regards to the airstrip for Burgeo we are now looking at, first of all, establishing the possibility of establishing a landing pad for helicopters, and this is mainly because of the request from the Burgeo town council. We are looking at that and we are also giving serious consideration to establishing an airstrip there as well. But first of all, the first priority would be a helicopter pad.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MP. NEARY: I have a question, Sir, for the Minister of Finance. Would the minister tell the House what action has been taken on a study that was done and the report submitted to the government a few months ago by Clarkson and Gordon concerning improvement in the registry office and the Registry of Companies and Deeds? What action has the government taken on that report?

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MP. DOODY: I have no such knowledge of any such report, Sir. I am quite sure that there must be one if the hon. member tells me that there is. If it is directed to the -

MP. NEARY: My usual reliable source of information.

MP. DOODY: That is right. Another busy breakfast session at Holiday Inn. I can check into it and take it as notice but I think that the Registry of Deeds is really under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Pogo. (Capt Winsor).

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education. Can the minister inform the House whether the government is supporting the Memorial University's request or

desire to establish a course in shipbuilding and ship repairs at that university?

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MP. HOUSE: I have to take that as notice. I have heard of it at the university but we have not received any request from the university. I will take it as notice and see if my officials received anything.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Pideout).

MP. PIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development. Could the minister tell the House whether or not the government has taken any position or made any decision yet regarding the Peid Products Plant in Bide Arm?

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MP. LINDPIGAN: Mr. Speaker, that is a question perhaps that should be directed to the Leader of the Opposition. In any event we have made a certain level of decision. I wonder if I can communicate without getting into too much difficulty. The most important interest we have is that we tried to activate some level of industrial development, or some type of development in the community in the best interests of the work force of that community. We have advised the former owner that we are not willing to participate unless he is able to provide funding himself, to amortize the monies which are owed and also to make a forward thrust himself.

We have also had an overture made, a serious overture by the representatives of the community and the local

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN:

business firm, not from the same community, and we are willing to allow those people to use the facilities for a certain period of time if they can indicate to us that they are able to provide some type of development in that community.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary?

MR. RIDEOUT: I thank the minister for a very informative answer. Could he tell me though when we could expect some public announcement with regard to the Bide Arm situation?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes, Sir, As soon as the local people that were involved in trying to bring this to the fore along with certainly a tremendous effort by the Extension Services at the University, we will be making an announcement and I hope that can be done very, very soon.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment. First of all I wonder would the minister indicate to the House whether he is aware of the results of a food prices survey just completed by the Company of Young Canadians on the Southwest Coast indicating that food costs there are 40 per cent higher than other parts of Newfoundland. First is he aware of that result, and secondly, is his department contemplating any action by way of investigating this shocking situation? And what other action the department, his Division of Consumer Affairs, might be taking with reference to this particular item?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment.

HON. A. J. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I did hear it on the air, I think from Grand Bank - I believe it was Howie Hickman, actually, I heard - and I was rather surprised that any groups, whoever they may be, conduct surveys, whatever it might be - mining or prices - without communicating with our department in any way. And I would certainly like to get a copy of the report, if the hon. member has it. But I can only take what I heard the announcer say, that prices on the Southwest Coast are 30 per cent to 40 per cent higher, whether that is factual or not I do not know, I mean I get all kinds of groups coming to me

Mr. Murphy:

telling me about prices here and there, but our department are the ones that do look after the things. And I would appreciate if the hon. member knows who this group is, or who they are, or whatever I would like for them to contact our department because I am minister of the department that is charged with the responsibility for consumer affairs. But literally we could have 5,000 groups in this Province going around, you know, What their authority is, where they get it to go into a store and check prices I really do not, Sir, so my department is entirely ignorant of any surveys other than undertaken by representatives who now, and I may state this to the House, who I am giving identification to in some way, whether it is their picture or something else, that they can go in and ask questions from different department, But as far as the survey is concerned, Sir, I will just say that I did hear it on the air, I believe from the Grand Bank station that this survey was made and prices were 40 per cent higher or whatever the case may be. But that is the only knowledge that the Consumer Affairs Department have of that particular project.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I thank the minister for his answer and as he requested I will undertake to see that the two groups will get together, his department and CYC. A supplementary: Has the minister's department done any such survey or does it have any recent information which would either confirm or contradict the findings, that part of the findings that he is aware of, that the food prices are substantially higher along the Southwest Coast than in more urban parts of the Province. Does he have any survey results at hand conducted by his department that would confirm or contradict these findings?

MR. MURPHY: This is the latest survey that we had done about one month ago, and I see here Port aux Basques, Creston, Marystown, Happy Valley, but I do not see anything else between Marystown and Port aux Basques so I do not know what was actually covered in Belleoram or

MR. MURPHY:

any other area in there. But if the member would like I can certainly get a copy of this taken off to give him some idea. It is one that I do retain here for questions. But if the member is, Mr. Speaker, anxious, or anybody, for that matter, who are interested, we have it up to date as far as we can go, and this is just about one month ago, and we are taking another survey after Christmas. But I will explain, Sir, that there is nothing we can do to roll prices back, only bring it to the attention of the federal authorities who will then step in and take whatever action is deemed necessary whatever that may be.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question, Sir, to the Minister of Tourism. Can the minister tell the House the terms and conditions of employment including salaries being made to recruits who are to be flown to the West Indies for replacements for the crew of the Norma and Gladys? Have they been offered



MR. NEARY: lifelong employment.

MR. HICKEY: There is a very simple answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, The voyage, I hope, is not lifelong so therefore the terms of employment would be for the voyage only, just for the voyage.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. SIMMONS: Is it too late to make application for a job?

MR. HICKEY: No.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Tourism.

In recent newspaper articles there has been reference to souvenirs allegedly made in Newfoundland that are actually stamped, made in Newfoundland or souvenir of Newfoundland, but the point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that often times they are made in Japan. They are imported items and they are marked souvenir of Newfoundland. I am wondering, one, how the minister feels about that if there is any rules, regulations, legislation on this matter, and what would he intend to do about it if anything?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, my staff and I have discussed this on a number of occasions and we are attempting to determine a list of items which come into the Province as Newfoundland souvenirs which indeed are made outside. With regards to the hon. member's question as to how we feel about it, obviously we are not very proud to have a Newfoundland souvenir made outside the Province. Certainly most of the things, such as dories and this kind of thing, it does not seem to be realistic for anyone to think that it has to be made outside the Province. We are attempting to come up with a list and from then on possibly supply the crafts industry with such a list in an effort to correct the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. Has the minister been in contact with the CFTC in the past twenty-four hours?

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

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I should not say I have been in contact but what I have done I wired them this morning, the Acting Chairman, Mr. Boyle.

MR. NEARY: What happened to the Chairman?

MR. MORGAN: -asking that the CRTC inform the Provincial Government, in this case my Department of Communications, their decisions with regard to the applications file for cable television in this Province, that we be informed of their decisions prior to any public announcement, number one, and, number two, prior to the applicants being informed.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, did the minister receive a reply, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MORGAN: Not yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WHITE: Supplementary -

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, all right the hon. gentleman.

MR. WHITE: I heard the minister say on television last night that he was going to ask the CRTC to inform the government before informing the successful applicant, I wonder if he could tell us why he wants this done?

MR. MORGAN: I just said that now.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, I think it is. Would the minister care to comment on statements made both inside of this House and outside of this House concerning the linerboard mill management, especially with reference to the Chamber of Commerce statement in Stephenville that the linerboard mill is over-managed and that is the reason for the troubles in the linerboard mill at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, whether the linerboard mill is over-managed or not that is a question of opinion, what the Chamber of Commerce of Stephenville would base their opinion on I do not know. It may

MP. CROSBIE: very well be that their businesses are over-managed or under-managed. We are not going about the country criticizing them as to whether they are or are not under or over-managed.

As I said in the House earlier, the management of the Labrador Linerboard Limited has had and continues to have tremendous problems that are not of their making. And therefore the linerboard mill is not a money-making proposition. It is certainly not the fault of the management of Labrador Linerboard Limited. It is the fault of the unfeasibility of the project from the start. The concept was not feasible. It is not economically feasible. You cannot have the Mill in Stephenville, depending on 600,000 cords of wood a year coming from Labrador, which is impossible to transport and which you cannot cut there anyway in sufficient volume, etc., and so on. I will not go on to all the reasons.

So the reasons that the linerboard mill has to be supported by this government is that it is not economically feasible as it stands. It cannot be, particularly because of the wood and the wood cost situation. Now I do not think that the management out there is perfect. The management there may need to be improved. I think we all can stand some improvement. But it is difficult to comment otherwise on statements made by the Chamber of Commerce of Stephenville, or politicians or whatever. It is most unhelpful. It is not easy to get top-notch management people to go and involve themselves in a career managing a company that is in the position of Labrador Linerboard. It is difficult enough anyway to attract people high up in the industry to an operation like that. I consider it to be most unfair. The hon. gentlemen could well spend their time criticizing me for under-managing or over-managing it as Chairman of the Board. And that

Mr. Crosbie:

would be far less discouraging to the people who are out at Stephenville trying to make their best with it and do a good job. So broad general statements or criticism of the management of Labrador Linerboard are most unhelpful, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I should point out that this will be the last question asked. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: In view of the statements made today, Sir, by the Minister of Social Services I wonder if the Minister of Finance could tell the House what now will happen concerning pensions to railway pensioners, constabulary pensioners, teachers who are on pension, Gander employees and so on who are on pension. Will they now get an increase in their pensions based on the cost of living or has that been postponed indefinitely also.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

HON. W. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, that is a very complex question. I would like to take that under advisement, and take a note of it, and look into it. There are a great many involved in it, and there are a great many different groups and a great many different situation and some are very complex pension schemes that I would prefer to take notice of the question and answer it at a later date.

o o o

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Time is up.

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. SPEAKER: The time period is up for Oral Questions.

MR. NEARY: Oh!

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, between members of the House it has been agreed that Private Member's Day be dispensed with today and accordingly I will call Motion 1.

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

MR. W. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this motion, or this matter relates to a resolution put on the Order Paper by the hon. Minister of Mines and

Mr. Marshall:

Energy, and is undoubtedly one of the most important resolutions that has come before this House for some period of time. It is a two-pronged resolution; number one, that this House of Assembly approves the steps taken by the government with respect - its current steps that it has taken, and endorse - the second part - is that it approves the plans announced by the government for future development. And the steps of both, both antecedent and those to come, are set forth in great detail in the statement that was set forth by the Minister of Mines and Energy.

Most of the debate to date has revolved around the first part of the prong - the first part of the fork - and this relates to the provision that the House approve the steps taken by the government with respect to its actions in connection with the development of the Gull Island project to date. With that, Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no problem in supporting these measures that were taken. We re-took an asset and we got value for it. The only real amount of dissent, even though most of the debate as I say, in this legislature in the past two days has really centered around the first part of the motion, that is, with respect to steps taken, the only real dissent against actually taking over, which was the prime thing that the government did, taking over the Churchill Falls, was voiced by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) who described it in his own colourful way yesterday as being scandalous, scurrilous - these were the words he used - scandalous, scurrilous and indefensible, and he also visited these adjectives upon the members of the official Opposition because they had supported this particular takeover.

Now I would say that these adjectives could apply in many instances to the official Opposition, but I would say not in respect to this particular step that they took. All the government in this case did was take over, really, a utility, the same thing as governments have done before in the past, the same thing that was done in British Columbia years ago. I cannot follow the member for Twillingate's (Mr. Smallwood) reasoning when he says that you should not have taken

Mr. Marshall:

it over now, but then concedes in the same tone of voice shortly thereafter that within ten or fifteen years it might have been all right to take it over. Then he went on and said, seventy or seventy-five years. Now it would seem to me if it were wrong to take it over now it would be wrong to take it over then. Really what he is saying is that BRINCO should have gotten a fair run of it, to quote his own words, and that BRINCO should have got fair compensation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, BRINCO did get fair compensation and that is abundantly proven by the fact that the stock market after the takeover of BRINCO's shares did not

MR. MARSHALL:

diminish to any great degree. Neither has this affected in any way the credit of the Province. As I say, this is a matter of really taking over of a utility, and while normally I am not in favour of government involvement in business, where you have a matter where there is a virtual monopoly with respect to a certain asset and that, like public utilities, telephones or what have you, I think that a government should be able to take it over.

The only reservation that I had ever had about it was allayed yesterday by the Minister of Mines and Energy when he indicated that the takeover, the \$165 million spent was spent really for an asset and as a result of dividends that will be received in a year or two's time, that that will adequately pay for the - will return a lot of money to the treasury of this Province. So I think it is one step that the government has taken that the government can be well proud of. It is a reclamation of our natural resources which was necessary to be taken, natural resources which are going to be used for the benefit of Newfoundlanders.

There is no doubt in my mind that the project could not have been even contemplated at all with Brinco in charge, because Brinco had the option with respect to future power development in Labrador, and while they had this option until the mid 1980's there was absolutely nothing that could be done. Certainly the government could refuse to grant them, and did refuse to grant them, various leases that they required or they requested. But by the same token they did have it tied up in an option and government had no alternative.

So with respect to the steps taken I think it will be to the eternal credit of this government in the years to come that it had the courage and the gumption to take the step it did. And the way it took it, it took it not by expropriation, not by seizing it from Brinco, but by way or agreement and the proof of the pudding, I say, that Brinco was paid a reasonable amount in its share structure in the stock market for a month or so afterwards, it shows that they

MR. MARSHALL:

got really good value for it. Their shares did not go up but neither did they go down.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to spend my time though talking about the main part of the motion because it is the second part I want to dwell on. I rather feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is rather a pity that the speakers to date have not seen what I consider to be the most significant part of the statement made by the hon. minister. This is the statement and it is a - I might just as well say it from the first that I am very skeptical about the measures that have been envisaged and have been talked about as government policy because what we are debating here is a statement, never mind the mea culpas that the opposite side was putting up with respect to their former actions, but it is a statement, the most important statement, or one of the most important statements, surely, that has been presented to this House as to government policy with respect to the development of the Gull Island project, with respect to development of the power resources in Labrador, and when we vote for this motion we vote to accept this statement.

So the fact of the matter is, if you vote for the motion you have to accept the statement. Now, the whole gist of this statement, and I think the most important part of it, is contained on pages 44 and 47. Before I read that I will just paraphrase exactly what I am skeptical about. You know, it was not mentioned by the members on the opposite side hardly at all. I do not think the Leader of the Opposition mentioned it. If he did he just turned it off. That is the fact that what bothers me is that we are spending, we are contemplating spending up to \$55 million in the next financial year. We are contemplating spending that without the source of the power for these transmission lines that are contemplated to be built having been secured from Hydro Quebec and without the financing having been guaranteed

Now page 44 of the statement of the hon. minister that he read some two or three weeks ago says, and I quote, "After



Mr. Marshall.

careful consideration of all the facts Government decided that the transmission line option is to be preferred over the oil-fired thermal/nuclear alternative, provided a reasonable arrangement for the supply of additional energy required from Churchill Falls can be negotiated with Hydro-Quebec and provided adequate federal support is forthcoming. "

Now that is an excellent statement, a logical statement to go ahead with the transmission lines provided we get the source of power from Hydro Quebec and provided that we have the necessary financing. Subsequently on page forty-seven of the same statement, forty-six and forty-seven.- I am going to quote this again because it is very important, Mr. Speaker - the minister says: "The government has therefore concluded that it should continue work on the transmission lines terminals and tunnels, but that they should be spread over a longer period for an in-service date of January 1, 1982. Instead of January 1, 1981. Government has also decided that pending receipt of assurances from the Government of Canada, regarding aid for the project and the negotiation of a suitable agreement with Hydro-Quebec for the supply of energy from Churchill Falls, expenditures and commitments from the project will be kept to the minimum possible consistent with an in-service date for the line of January 1, 1982. Further explanation of that in the next paragraph says: "A reduced programme in 1976 will enable the Province to keep its expenditures on the Gull Island project down to an amount not exceeding \$55 million a year." Consequently I read this statement, Mr. Speaker, as stating that if we approve this resolution, we are approving the possible expenditure of \$55 million this year regardless of whether we have the approval from Hydro-Quebec for the electricity, for the power, or whether we have the financing arranged.

As I say, as I read it, I will have to say this; the Minister of Mines and Energy, in his statement, has given a very clear and very concise and full and honest statement of the situation. He speaks in the statement about the risk being taken, and there is no

Mr. Marshall.

attempt whatsoever of doing anything but bringing the full facts forward, and I think he should be complimented for it. While one may not agree always with him from time to time, at least we can compliment the hon. minister for having the courage and the fortitude to put forth his view without beclouding them in any way. I trust, as I know, that other members will be given the same opportunity to express their views.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the issue here is clearly very, very clearly whether we should expend \$55 million before we have the agreement from Hydro-Quebec and before we have the financing arranged. That is the total issue. Nothing was said on the other side of the House about it - to date that is. I can understand why. I can understand why the former Premier, with good faith, certainly, as all good men have good faith, who practiced for years "Develop or Perish" in this Province, or the Leader of the Opposition who also was associated with it, and who in this very session of the House has turned around and said he sees nothing wrong with the philosophy of "Develop or Perish", or the amount of the debt does not really bother him, the size of the debt. I can see why they could not develop or spend too much time on this issue. As a matter of fact, I think to all intents they ignored it. I cannot say the same thing, Mr. Speaker, though for the gentlemen of the press in this Province. It is always unwise to talk about the press, because they too get it distorted - I suppose everyone has feelings - but I have not yet seen, although this has been before the public for about two weeks now, I have not seen any comments in the press that this is really the issue. If there is, and if an individual has I will be only too happy to retract that remark, but I have not really seen it. It certainly has not been dealt with the same regard of seriousness that I think it merits and warrants.

Mr. Speaker, before I get on to say what I want to say, I want to emphasize very clearly, and make it quite clear, that I am not against the development of the Lower Churchill. Now I say this because when I spoke in another debate with respect to the inadvisability

Mr. Marshall.

of industrial development where the source of the raw materials are not here in Newfoundland, some people here in the House, either because they did not hear or did not choose to hear, I do not know, interpreted that as saying that I was against industrial development, which is an entirely different thing in saying you are against industrial

MR. MARSHALL:

development where the source of raw materials are not here. So I want to make it abundantly clear right here and now, if I had to write it on the walls, that I am for development of the Lower Churchill, Mr. Speaker, if the cost of that project, or substantially all of the cost, can be recovered over reasonable time from consumers of that power. Now it does not mean that in ten or twenty years - of course, the consumer has to pay for the power - but it has to mean that the project itself is to be self-sustaining. But I do not think any hon. gentleman here disagrees with that premise, because the demand must justify his project and if it does not it would become, if you do not have substantially all of it being paid by consumers, it will become an unmanageable burden on this Province, cutting into monies otherwise needed for essential services, such as education and what have you, of future generations.

So let us make it quite clear, and I do not think I am at odds with anyone when I say this, that any project of this nature has to be self-sustaining. So while I agree with the development of the Lower Churchill, Mr. Speaker, I have great and serious reservations with respect to the spending of any further monies on this project until and unless, firstly, an agreement has been concluded and signed with Hydro-Quebec satisfactory as to price, satisfactory as to quantity and term, and indeed whether Hydro-Quebec is going to actually supply the power. Look, when we originally envisaged this development we talked about the development of power and the source was to be on Gull Island. Now we are going ahead with transmission lines and we agree that there will have to be a postponement on the Gull Island. We say our source now is not to be Gull Island but it is to be Hydro Quebec. I, Mr. Speaker, feel that these, before \$55 millions of dollars are spent -

AN HON. MEMBER: Is there a quorum, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Call in the members.

MR. MARSHALL: If I may continue then, Mr. Speaker, I say that before we spend this -

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please! I would ask the clerk

first to count the House.

A quorum is present, so the hon. member may continue.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I assume the quorum count should be deducted from the time, because I am going to need all of my time this afternoon. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, before I say I suggest before the \$55 million is spent, I feel quite strongly that firstly there ought to be an agreement or commitment from Hydro-Quebec satisfactory as to the price, quantity and term of the power to be supplied and this must be at least, obviously, of course, competitive or equal to the projected cost of the generation of the Gull Island power. The second thing we must necessarily have, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, is satisfactory financing and terms. There must be—and this must be a commitment, I would suggest, and not generally a generalization from the Federal Government that it is going to spend billions on power. If so I would like to know on what terms, and who is it to be spent for? Are they to give us money for the development of Newfoundland and Labrador, or are they to give us money for the development of power so it be used throughout the nation, because I very much fear, Mr. Speaker, that when the national interest is concerned in Ottawa and the Federal Government, the national interest does not extend much further than Quebec and Ontario. I think people on East and West all find that.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we have to know the terms. On page thirty-six of the statement it is mentioned that

MR. MARSHALL: with respect to the efforts to obtain financing, that the government would have preferred not giving any equity but from "the Province's point of view, receipt of aid from the federal government in the form of equity is not attractive as receiving aid in the form of grants. It is clear that the federal officials were not enthusiastic about grants for the project." They want equity.

Now, you know, that is something I would say that we would have to consider very, very carefully. As a Newfoundlander, to me, it is not that much different in giving power away to Quebec, in giving really power away to the federal government, or giving our natural resources that we bought back.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, it is not really unreasonable to ask the government to wait until what appear to be essential prerequisites are secured before we proceed. I really feel, Mr. Speaker, in my own bones, that that is absolutely necessary, that we must take enough time to be sure at least that we are making a calculated move rather than taking a gamble or a risk, and a gamble or a risk we will be taking and that is quite plainly set forth in the paper.

Now I say this, Mr. Speaker, the arguments for taking a risk to me, that I have heard to date, have a ring to me of urgency, of fatalism and almost desperation. They appear, as far as I am concerned, to overstate the points being raised. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, now I know full well the necessity of power as we all do, but I sometimes wonder if we have the problem of providing power in the last quarter of the twentieth century out of all proportion. I have to say, and I regret to say, that the statements that have been made, such as there is no future for this Province, we must be content, there is no future for the province unless we develop the Lower Churchill, unless we go ahead with it and spend the \$55 million, that is one of the justifications for the statement. There were other statements made, Newfoundland will have little or no possibility of growth or expansion,

MP. MARSHALL: it may not be exactly but essentially what the Minister of Mines and Energy said. And subsequently later on, Mr. Speaker, it was said this would be an act of faith in the Province. There were admonitions granted that if we do not take the chance we may have to accept a role we do not like, and so on.

Now these have a ring to me, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, of the type of psychology, if you like, that was practiced before with respect to "Develop or Perish" in this Province. Now that was a philosophy that we all know. We all know what "Develop or Perish" mean. The name of the policy itself really suggests it and it was practiced by the previous administration freely. And it was practiced with men of good will, men who felt that by taking these steps that this was the very best thing to be done for this Province, and the opponents of it were against it and the opposite part of it instead of develop or perish is develop or grow, weigh and walk, plan and prosper, or what have you. But what it really means is taking one's time. I think the best expression of "Develop or Perish" came from the mouth of the hon. member for Twillingate yesterday when he was talking about the Upper Churchill—that there is no need of as far as I am concerned to go into here, because the important thing is not what went on in the past but what we are going to do in the future — but when he was justifying the Upper Churchill and he said, "Look at all the jobs, \$121 million, 21,000 men employed in construction jobs," and that was a part of the psychology that the hon. gentleman believes in, I know, and what he led Newfoundland towards, and you just ask yourself the question right now, it might have been 21,000 jobs, although I do not know whether that was exaggerated or not, but take it as given, there are not 21,000 jobs now and one of our heritages, one of our basic heritages with a benefit of Hindsight, as I say, have gone off to Hydro-Quebec and we have lost millions of dollars, as the Minister of Mines and Energy has indicated in his statement yesterday.

So it is a long term, Mr. Speaker, that we have to be considering and we have to consider very, very hard and very, very much whether or not we should be expending this \$55 million without these two basic

MR. MARSHALL: understandings having been come to. Now I do not think we should. I say quite frankly I do not think that we should be spending \$55 million until we are absolutely sure that we have a good and feasible contract from Quebec-Hydro, until we are absolutely sure that we have our financing arranged.

MR. NEARY: Come over here.



MR. MARSHALL:

No, I do not need to go over there because another thing that this government brought, Mr. Speaker, that the people outside of this chamber are enjoying since the turnover is freedom of speech, and we enjoy it in the House as well as we enjoy it outside. I am not in the cabinet and I have the right to speak about something that is really, really basic, as far as I am concerned. It caused me a great deal of concern from reading over the statement and contemplating the position we might be getting ourselves into.

Now, Morgan and Stanley, Mr. Speaker, reference was made to Morgan and Stanley, for instance, the financial agents. In the statement it was implied, if not said directly, but I think it is taken as agreed, that the financial experts have said that Newfoundland cannot develop it on its own. Before it develops it on its own, it has got to have assurances with respect to a completion guarantee. What they mean by that, of course, is they have got to be assured amongst other things that the project can be not only built, but that it can be financed. Surely if the people who are talking about arranging the financing, if the financiers require this particular requirement to be met, surely we ought to, too. We should at least make sure that the financing is secured.

Other statements that have been made in defense of the spending of \$55 million that I have seen - I do not know whether here or outside the chamber - is that Quebec will have control. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not accept that. Quebec will not have control unless we give it control. This government is to be complimented for taking back control from foreigners. We do not give it to Quebec, which is really, although we are members of the same country, it is a foreign state as it were. It is another province. This power can be used perhaps - we do not know - in the not too distant future maybe this power can be used in other ways. Maybe it can be used in Labrador where the resources of this Province should be dedicated to if at all possible.

There was reference made yesterday to the improved method of ice-breaking and the opening of Labrador to commerce. There is a

MR. PARSHALL:

professor here at Memorial who has already made an invention with respect to the division of ice. He came to see me one time about six or eight months ago with a device that has been patented. It is not one of these fly-by-night adventures. This was brought in to the provincial government and I assume that the provincial government is following it through. So there are all sorts of possibilities that connote - and it does not mean that we have to, as I say, adopt any policy of panic, or any develop or perish, or any vestige of it, as far as I am concerned, and sit down and say, "Oh, Quebec will dictate our future control of our resources. Oh, if we do not get it this Province is doomed to mediocrity. Oh, we must show them that we are serious by going ahead." You know, surely to heavens we have shown the federal government we are serious by taking over Brinco. That is as much as we need.

So in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this really does not basically justify the position of the expenditure of \$55 million without at least these two prerequisites being found. Now perhaps we need also - I am not going to go much off that theme, because that is the basic thing that I want to say, and I find if you say other things they get jumbled up sometimes - but perhaps we do need in certain cases here to, in this particular instance, to take a look anyway, to stop for a moment and to consider. There have been many, many changes that have occurred. First of all we cannot develop the Cull site at the present, so we are talking instead of supplying power, to purchase power or what have you.

Perhaps we need to look at the feasibility of it. I would like the minister perhaps when he is closing the debate to address himself to the fact that - and it is not a criticism of the government, Mr. Speaker, it is not really a criticism of anyone, but it is a fact of life - the report here upon which we acted - and the government always acts on feasibility reports - put the project as being \$1.1 million in February of 1974. It has now escalated to \$2.3 million -

AN HON. MEMBER: Billion.

MP. MARSHALL: I am sorry billion, yes. The billions boggle my mind still, but we know it has accelerated greatly. Now, when this report was made on page 72 of the report it says, "The capital cost estimates and annual cost derivation shown in this report include an allowance of inflation. The escalation projects are used as a result of an analysis of historical trends indicated in Statistics Canada indexes."

So, in other words, then, they did take into account a certain amount for inflation. There is obviously, you know, there is a great appreciation in the cost which I think merits and warrants us anyway taking a very much closer look at it. I would also like to know what effect, if any, the non-realization of various industries - they use the awful phrase in this report of triggering industries. Every report develops its own jargon. They talk about, they emphasize, it seems to me, to a reasonable amount, even though they say it is necessary for our domestic consumption in the 1980's, they

Mr. Marshall:

do emphasize on page nineteen of the report that, you know, customers- a cement plant, a chlorine caustic soda plant, an oil refinery, a petrochemical complex, a pulp and paper mill, an aluminum reduction plant, Now we know there is no likelihood now in the foreseeable future of another oil refinery.

MR. NEARY: How do you know that?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, I mean, the other oil refinery is in grave difficulty, Obviously we are not going to put -

MR. NEARY: So what?

MR. MARSHALL: I would not assume we are going to put up another, you know,

MR. NEARY: Volkswagen was in difficulty last year, but they are surviving.

MR. MARSHALL: Maybe so, but Volkswagen is an entirely different thing.

All right. Well, you know, how do we know? Well, let us put it this way, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. gentleman's sake, it is a little bit less sure now than it was then. The petrochemical plant is a little bit less sure than it was then. And the question that I am asking is, whether or not these industries, whether this project is really dependent on these industries and what is the fate really of these industries?

The other question, and the final one that I would like to bring to your attention with respect to this report, is that when Churchill Falls was taken over, see, it was envisaged that before the final project release there would be \$14 million expended, and that is what you judge your risk on, \$14 million was to be expended before the final project release. Now inflation and one thing or another has gotten it up to \$39 million, and we are not at the stage of authorizing the final release we may have \$90 million or \$100 million in this particular project, Mr. Speaker, before we can authorize the

Mr. Marshall:

final release. We may have to haul back then. One thing that I am very, very sceptical and concerned about is what happens if we get in the condition - and God in Heaven! The public debt of this Province is high enough so I do not think that we can gamble - but what happens if we get into the position that we have so much money in that we cannot afford to get out, and on the other hand we cannot afford to go ahead, we cannot get the money. Now what happens there?

Three or four things can happen. Obviously you are faced with a disaster, number one. But number two, what I suggest will probably happen, we will be in a position then - you talk about them taking us seriously - we will be in position of the federal government and Quebec-Hydro, possibly being able to hold us up for ransom. I mean, we are tying a rope around our neck by making an investment of this nature to take this particular risk without the other prerequisites having been determined.

Now I could say a lot more about this, Mr. Speaker, but I think it would tend to confuse the issue. And I have given this matter a great deal of thought, a great deal of thought. And I have to say that, with a great deal of regret, with a great deal of regret, you know, I find myself unable to concur with a gamble or a risk of this nature. I really cannot vote for this particular resolution unless it be amended to provide that no further monies will be expended until and unless Quebec-Hydro have entered into a satisfactory agreement and until and unless satisfactory fiscal arrangements have been made.

MR. NEARY: You can move an amendment.

MR. MARSHALL: Just a second now. Now I have very much reluctance in doing this, Mr. Speaker, As I say, and, you know, I say this that as far as this government is concerned I have been a good supporter of this government, and I have done as much as anybody in my time as anybody on the front benches, anybody on the back benches, to bring the government to power, Now I do not say I have done any more than anybody else, but

Mr. Marshall:

I say I have done as much as anybody else. Now I am put in this position of being faced with to me, which is as obvious as the nose on anybody's face, and I mean it is not as if the hon. Minister of Mines was trying to hide it. He put it in the statement and nobody saw it, nobody seemed to see it. But I am not able to go along with a risk of \$55 million of a gamble any more than I could have, I am afraid, on the other side of the House when I was criticizing it. Now where does that leave me, see? You do not vote with the government, so you have got to vote with the Opposition. I would like to make it quite clear; whichever way I vote, Mr. Speaker, I am not voting with the Opposition. I am being put in a position on this I cannot vote with the government because they are threatening to put \$55 million at risk, and the alternative is I have to vote with the Opposition which would put \$55 million plus every single year at risk if you take the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition in this House recently to the affect that he sees

MR. MARSHALL:

nothing wrong with develop or perish, to the effect he does not care about the public debt. So it is a very onerous position in which I find myself. At the time when the budget debate went through I said that I feel that every person in this House, the backbenchers, whatever side - different with Cabinet. People in the Cabinet are bound by Cabinet solidarity, Cabinet secrecy - that we have pressing problems with us, really heavy, pressing problems that require a person to exercise their own judgment and as far as I am concerned I have to exercise my own judgment. All I am asking the government, I ask and beg and implore the government to postpone any further payments than necessary on the Lower Churchill. When I say then 'necessary' I confine them to the amounts you have got to pay to get out of contracts already entered into until: (a) a satisfactory agreement has been obtained with Hydro-Quebec, and (b) suitable financing has been absolutely guaranteed, and that there is a complete - because I think we are going to need it, Mr. Speaker. I know this will be done anyway because this is the way the government operates - but there certainly should be a complete assessment that with the new agreement with Hydro-Quebec, taking its terms and the financing and any other change circumstances since the project was envisaged, a guarantee, of course, that it is fully and absolutely feasible.

Now, I feel there are people in this House who agree with me. Whether there are or whether there are not, what they say in the future debates I cannot help. But all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is this, that \$55 million put at risk, with the debt of the Province being as it is, is something that I cannot - and without these prerequisites being met - is something that I cannot go along with blindly. The situation is too serious in this Province for this and I do not feel that we can do it. That does not say I am against development, Mr. Speaker. That does not say I am against the Lower Churchill. All I am asking for is a postponement until these two or three prerequisites are made. I am afraid, as I say, that we will be getting this Province in a hole. You are taking about an expenditure that, dear Heavens, is going to double or triple the

MR. MARSHALL:

debt of this Province. All I am afraid of is that we are going to get in so far that we cannot get out. We cannot go ahead unless we make other concessions. I am afraid that, I do not want to see - to coin a little play on words - that this powerful policy of the government, which is a policy that one can endorse wholeheartedly the steps that they have taken up to now, that I have to say that even though the government is very wise in its decisions from time to time, I cannot go along with sticking out our heads like this for fear that the power will cause a shock to the economy of this Province that is going to be felt by people for generations yet to come.

Now, I do not see, Mr. Speaker, why there cannot merely be an amendment to provide this, to amend the resolution would be perfectly satisfactory. But I understand I do not think it can be given.

AN HON. MEMBER: Permit a question?

MR. MARSHALL: No. I am making my point. That is what I am doing. I am making my point as I have made them heretofore. I want to say this, that - I would like to say this in closing, next to closing anyway, that as far as the statement goes, and I reiterate it again, I appreciate the statement, the frankness with which it has been made, the fact that it is pointed out that we have a risk. I certainly compliment the Minister of Mines and Energy for giving the full, complete and absolute facts and spelling them out in black and white for all to see. I do not agree that there is any relationship whatsoever between the risk that BRINCO took to develop the Upper Churchill and the fact that we should take anything near the same risk because of our public debt, because government is much different from a public company and what have you. There are many, many reasons. I do not agree that there is that analogy. But certainly I cannot agree with jeopardizing the future generations.

Now the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy when he made that statement, when he first started off, he said if this was not passed that the government would resign and he would resign, and certainly that is the last thing, Mr. Speaker, in this world that I would wish to see.



MR. MARSHALL: But I beg and implore them to see the situation as I see it. I ask them to recognize the fact that as a representative, a representative of a district in Newfoundland, that I myself cannot agree with this position that has been taken up for the expenditure of \$55 million before we are **completely and absolutely** sure as to the agreements with Hydro-Quebec and with respect to financing. Anything else as far as I am concerned is a gamble, as it said in the paper, is a risk, smacks of 'develop or perish', is tantamount of the similar policy adopted by the hon. members there **opposite which they still do not see anything wrong.** God help Newfoundland if they ever get in power again and able to practice it wholesale! This is just one isolated instance.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, that this is not the easiest thing for me to make a statement like this as a person who has been associated with the Progressive Conservative Party for a long period of time, and will be for many, many years in the future. But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot and I will not be able to vote with the government because of that part of the statement, because we are putting \$55 million at risk where we ought not to.

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

MR. NEARY: No harm to say, Sir, that this debate so far has taken an unusual course. First we heard from the Minister of Mines and Energy, who in my opinion, Sir, provided the House with a great number of facts and a lot of detailed information in connection with the development of the Lower Churchill, the construction of the tunnel across the Straits of Belle Isle and the construction of the transmission line.

The minister is to be commended, Sir. I have been in this hon. House for fourteen years now, this is my fourteenth year, going on fourteen years, and the minister is to be commended. It is not too often, Mr. Speaker, that I find myself in a position where I have to congratulate the Minister of Mines and Energy. We have had our little sparring sessions in this hon. House, Sir, and we have had our

December 17, 1975

Tape No. 744

NM - 2

MR. NEARY: disagreements, but in this particular instance, Sir, I think that the minister was genuinely and sincerely interested in providing the House with all the information that he could so that the members, the elected representatives of the people, could make up their minds which way they were going to vote on this resolution. I really believe the minister was quite genuine, Sir, in putting the information at the fingertips of the hon. members of the House, because it is a very, very important matter, Sir, as far as the House is concerned. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that we are debating it eight days before Christmas. It is too important a matter, Sir, it is the kind of an issue that we should be taking our time, that we should be getting probably more information from the minister in connection with the various aspects of the three-pronged project, the development of the Lower Churchill, the construction of the transmission line, and the tunnel.

I think it is the duty of every member, Sir, of this hon. House to participate in this debate, and if they feel in their heart that they do not have sufficient information to vote according to the dictates of their conscience, then they should ask the minister some questions, either put the questions on the Order Paper or put the questions to the Minister of Mines and Energy direct, as the Leader of the Opposition did when he spoke in the debate. The Leader of the Opposition, Sir, unlike the other two gentlemen who have spoken in this debate, did not take a position. The official, or what I sometimes refer to as the old guard Liberals, so far, Sir, have not put forward a position. The Leader of the Opposition did some fancy figure skating. He waltzed all over the place. He put some questions, and they were very good questions, mind you, put

MR. NEARY: some very good questions to the Minister of Mines and Energy but did not, Sir, and I was hoping after two-and-a-half hours and holding the Old Professor himself up until eleven thirty last night, I was hoping that before the Leader of the Opposition took his seat that he would have told the House what the position of his party is on this resolution. One thing that we can say, Sir, for the Old Professor is that there is no doubt about it, he still has the old policy and the old flag, and he left no doubt in anybody's mind where he stood on this matter of developing the Lower Churchill. Like my hon. friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), I do not think, Sir, the hon. member left any doubt in anybody's mind, any member's mind in this hon. House, where he stands on this matter.

It does not necessarily mean that we have to agree with both hon. gentlemen, but unlike the Leader of the Opposition, and I am hoping that a spokesman for the official Opposition in this House - I think it is their duty, Sir - I am hoping that a spokesman will tell us sooner or later, before this debate is over, what their position is on this important matter. Or are they just going to play the same game as they played during the forced takeover of Churchill Falls, and that is, to remain silent, to have their lips sealed?

I will tell you that up to that point, one of the most frustrating experiences that I have had in this hon. House was when I sat on the government side as a backbencher for about five and-a-half or six years. Those were the most frustrating years that I have had. But I think the thing that topped those years of frustration was when we were bound to silence.

MR. ROWE: Complete bull.

MR. NEARY: It is not bull, Sir. We were bound to silence. We were told we were not to comment on the forced takeover of the Churchill Falls Corporation, and for weeks, for weeks, Sir, there was complete silence from the official Liberal Opposition. The leader kept saying that he was going to make a statement every day. Finally they offered him time on television, and I, like my colleagues

MR. NEARY: in the caucus, were glued to the television set that night expecting to hear the official position of the Liberal Party, and all we got then was a few questions. No statement of policy, no stated position, just questions put to the government! Nine chances out of ten the gentleman knew the answer to the questions anyway, because he had been hauled out of here in the wee hours of a morning. I do not remember the exact date but the BRINCO plane arrived down at St. John's Airport and the hon. gentleman and one of his colleagues - my former colleague the Member for White Bay South (Mr. W. Rowe) - in a cloak and dagger way were ushered aboard the BRINCO plane and flew off to Montreal. Why even I did not know and I was the Party Whip. My colleague did not know.

MR. DOODY: Are you sure negotiations were not going on?

MR. NEARY: This was during the time that the takeover was taking place. I was going to call up the RCMP to send out a search party to see if they could find the Leader of the Opposition and my colleague. They were on the missing list. The poor old secretaries in the office were driven out of their minds, phone calls were coming in. We were desperately trying to find out where they were, and here they were up in Montreal being briefed by the hierarchy of BRINCO. We were not good enough! We could not be trusted!

MR. DOODY: How to oppose the government.

MR. NEARY: I still do not know what they were told. We were not briefed on their meeting when they got back from Montreal.

Mr. Neary.

Then there was the secret meeting held over at my colleague's house, the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr.F.Rowe). It was a secret meeting, Sir. Mr. Speaker, -

MR. ROWE: It has been made public.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is just as well to get our cards on the table, Sir, and I may say straightaway that I am voting - I am taking the unprecedented step of voting for this resolution, although I do not agree with the first part of the resolution, Sir, but the second part I agree with, and I am voting for it because I have the interests of Newfoundland at heart. I am not like my friend who just took his seat, although he may be quite sincere in what he says. Sir, one thing we are going to have to do is we cannot appear in the eyes of Ottawa, for instance, to be divided on this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how can the Premier, the Minister of Mines and Energy, and anybody else in the cabinet who they take to Ottawa with them, how can they go up and present a united front on behalf of the people of this Province when they have a division right in their own ranks? The official Opposition has expressed no position. Why Ottawa would say, well, look, what do you think we are, a bunch of fools here?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Why you cannot get unanimous consent of the members of your own House -

MR. HICKEY: Now you are talking.

MR. NEARY: - in behalf of their constituents and in behalf of the people of this Province.

MR. ROWE: Unanimous consent for what?

MR. NEARY: Consent to go ahead, not to interfere with the momentum of this project. Ottawa, Sir, is the one that is going to have to foot the bill.

MR. ROWE: What momentum?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. ROWE: What momentum?

MR. NEARY: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with my hon. friend, but I have also a word of advice for the delegation if they go to Ottawa, when they go - and they have already been there. And I was there recently, and I talked about this development of the Lower Churchill, not in any official capacity, but as an interested Newfoundlander. I would suggest to my friends on the opposite side that one thing they are going to have to do, a second thing, apart from getting unity within their own ranks, and this is most unusual - you know, Mr. Speaker, according to the British Parliamentary system, Sir, when a man disagrees in conscience with his own party, one of two things happen, Sir - and he can get over there and say, that they have democratized the Tory Party all he likes, and he can keep referring to the 'develop or perish' attitude of the former administration, the policy of that administration, and he can use that for a crutch if he wants to for voting against the resolution, or he can try to. He is not fooling me. He has to do one of two things, Sir. He either has to come over here with me, right here, independent, or he has to get the royal order of the boot. And he chose to make his remarks when the hon. leader of his party is on the broad of his back. I hope, Sir, that the hon. leader of that party continues to improve and get better. It will not do him any good when he turns on his television, if he has one, up in his room tonight, in the hospital, to hear that his colleague, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is against this resolution. Mr. Speaker, did they not caucus before they brought the resolution into the House? There was the place that the member should have gotten his - whatever he had on his chest - should have gotten it off. I am not telling the government or the Tory Party what to do. I guarantee you I know what I would do if I was the leader of that party, and it would not be just a little gentle flick on the wrist, because I think the gentleman has done a disservice to Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the secret meeting that my hon. friends says was not a meeting. Well, Sir, I say it a meeting because I was the one who made the arrangements, most of the arrangements, not all the arrangements, for that meeting.

---

Mr. Neary:

No, Sir! I was the one who made the arrangement. I was the one who contacted the Old Professor because the big problem at the time was -

MR. ROWE: The big problem at the time was the Young Professor!

MR. NEARY: The big problem at the time, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that everybody was uptight about poor old Joey. Is he against us? Or is he for us? Or what is he going to do? The Leader of the old guard Liberal Party then, as now, used to spend all of his time out in his office calling people up to find out what Joey was up to, what he was going to do, would he support the Liberal Party in the election and so on? He spent all of his time at it. We used to tell him, your place is in the House. No, he would not come in the House. He was paranoid about my hon. colleague, the Leader of the Liberal Reform Party (Mr. Smallwood). And finally, Sir, there was an issue on which there could be a meeting of the minds and maybe a merger of the two factions within the Liberal Party, and the issue was the proposed takeover of Churchill Falls Corporation.

So a meeting was set up over in my hon. friend's house. The former Premier of this Province (Mr. Smallwood) was invited there, because I was the one who invited him - and this is a little bit of history, Sir, for you - there was a meeting held, a private meeting held by the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Roberts) and the former Premier (Mr. Smallwood) the now member for Twillingate, a private meeting held before they came to meet with the caucus. And during the private meeting, so I am told -

AN HON. MEMBER: Was he not a member of your caucus?

MR. NEARY: No, I do not know if he was a member of the caucus. I do not think he was. This was just the caucus and the former Premier (Mr. Smallwood).

At the private meeting, I am told, the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) laid down some ground rules for the meeting with the caucus. One of the things that he specified was that under no conditions would he support the Liberal Party unless they fought tooth and nail against the BRINCO takeover. I cannot say whether there was an agreement between the two gentlemen or not, but when they came before the caucus this was the proposition that was put forward, apart from all the political



Mr. Neary:

matters that were discussed. The main issue that was put before the caucus was the BRINCO takeover and the position of the old guard Liberal Party. And the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) said that under no circumstances would he support the Liberal Party or its leader (Mr. Roberts) if they went along with the BRINCO takeover, with the Churchill Falls takeover. Now that put me in one awful position, Sir, because I was the only member of our caucus who had been suggesting both inside and outside of this hon. House that the government take over the Churchill Falls Corporation. So at that meeting I reminded my colleagues that if they adopted this position they would be putting me in a sort of a bind, that I would be sort of backed up in the corner.

MR. DOODY: No wonder they would not give you a lift up to Montreal.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, no wonder I was not whipped out of here in the wee hours of the morning. But immaterial, Sir, immaterial of my feelings, and I did not get very much reaction to the fact that I had taken this position, although I might say that I thought the whole thing was ill-timed but the principle, the principle of the takeover, Sir, in my opinion, was the right policy to follow. Ill-timed, as I say, but I do not think-if I were going to do it that would not be the psychological moment, But, Sir, I certainly agree with the principle. I agreed with it then and I agree with it now, But it did not make any difference about my feelings, Sir, The old guard Liberal Party agreed with the Old Master, and said, yes, in return

MR. NEARY:

for your support in the next election that we will fight this tooth and nail. There was an agreement reached. There was an agreement reached.

MR. ROWE: No, Sir!

MP. NEARY: Yes, Sir.

MR. ROWE: Says Neary.

MP. NEARY: Not "Says Neary" and you do not use first or second names in this hon. House my hon. and learned friend. The agreement was reached, Sir, right in the hon. member's basement.

MR. SIMMONS: Not in my presence though.

MP. NEARY: In your presence.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Sir!

MP. NEARY: Yes, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MP. NEARY: Sir, if my hon. colleague, the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) was here he would endorse what I am saying. It is an absolute fact and they can deny it now all they like. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the important thing. They had an agreement. They came to an agreement. But, Sir, the significant part about it is that for several weeks after that meeting there was complete silence. But the hon. Leader of the Opposition reneged on the agreement. My hon. colleague, who is now down there denying any agreement, remembers the frustration and the torment that we went through. We were not allowed to speak on this great issue, one of the most important issues to face the people of this Province.

MR. SIMMONS: What was the agreement?

MP. NEARY: The agreement was that the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) and the hon. Leader of the Opposition, their hearts were beating in unison. They had sat down and had a meeting of the minds and they were now on one mind about this takeover, that they would fight against it tooth and nail.

MR. F. ROWE: The first I heard of it.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, it is not the first the hon. member heard of

MR. NEARY:

it because many is the time my hon. former colleague and I sat down and cursed and swore -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well, I did, Sir. I do not know about my colleague. Because here we were silenced, our lips were sealed, and here was the leader would not take a position, would not take a stand on the biggest issue to face the people of this Province.

MR. DOODY: What kind of adhesive did they have to seal your lips?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is hard to believe.

MR. NEARY: Yes it is hard to believe but now you can see the results of it. Probably another one of the reasons I am down where I am today, and I am proud of it.

Mr. Speaker, there were weeks of complete silence. I remember some of the ministers daring the Leader of the Opposition to take a stand. This used to - you know, I am not the worst in the world, Sir, at public relations but I was right uptight. If my old ulcer, Sir, if she ever felt like erupting, that was the time. We could not say anything. The leader would not say anything. Nobody would say anything. Once in a while, you know, you would sort of get out the backhanded flick. Finally he took to the television and we all know what happened. He just put a few questions to the Minister of Mines and Energy at the time and to the government, to the Premier. He did not take a position.

Now, Sir, we see a repeat performance, history repeating itself. Still no position! So that is why, Sir, I say that this debate so far has taken an unusual twist. I hope that for the sake of the old guard Liberal Party, my old alma mater, that they will take a position. Do not be wishy-washy and namby-pamby. Do not follow the example of the government House Leader. Stand up man fashion, stand up for Newfoundland. "Breathes there a man with soul so dead, / That never to himself has said, / This is my home, my native land." Stand up and be counted! I say the same to the members, especially the backbenchers, on the government side. I should not

MP. NEAPY:

have to stand here and make this kind of a speech.

I have no doubt but the member for St. John's North  
(Mr. Carter) - is it still St. John's North?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MP. NEAPY: Will get up, Sir, he will get up and he will parrot  
exactly what the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has said.  
I will predict that now, Sir. I will make you a forecast.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is noted for his originality.

MP. NEAPY: No it will not be original. He will get up and he  
will stick the darts into the former administration, too, and he will  
try to use that for a crutch to weasel his way out from under,  
from voting for this resolution, and he will parrot practically  
exactly what the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) just  
finished telling us. Ultra Conservative, both gentlemen, ultra,  
ultra, ultra, ultra Conservative. About as Tory as you can get.  
The right of right, if you can get right of right.

MR. NEARY: They are gone off so far right, Sir, that you will soon have to send a search party out to look for them. So, Mr. Speaker, it is a very, very serious matter, issue that we have under debate. We have one leader, no position. We know the government's position. We know the position of the Liberal Reform group. They too are not completely happy about the resolution. They want to see Labrador developed, be turned into a great industrial empire. I do not think anybody would object to that. That is motherhood - that all the power be kept in Labrador to develop industry on the mainland part of the Province. Oh! It is a good thing if you can do it. But what happens to the poor, old Island? Do we move the whole population then over to Labrador? Are we going to forego the possibility of having a tunnel underneath the Straits of Belle Isle -

AN HON. MEMBER: No if we do not dig it.

MR. NEARY: Oh, that we do not dig it. You know, Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a man in this Province vindicated, Sir, about an idea -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hiscock.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: E.C.D.Hiscock.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, Eric Hiscock wanted to put a causeway across to change the Gulf current, to change the climate of Newfoundland. When I made the suggestion about building a tunnel underneath the Straits of Belle Isle, Sir, there was great halls of laughter right from one end of Canada to the other. I suggested it to be done as a make-work project, and as much labour as possible done by hand, as much of the work done by hand. You know, Mr. Speaker, I mean you know - look, boy - he is over there now, Sir, look. Sir, let me say this to the hon. gentleman, that you take the city of St. John's or Ottawa for that matter, or Montreal or Toronto and put it down in one little corner of the Bell Island mine. And most of it was done through manual labour in case my friend does not know.

MR. HICKEY: It was not solid rock.

MR. NEARY: It was what?

MR. HICKFY: It was not solid rock.

MR. NEARY: Sir, it is exactly the same, the tunnel across the Straits of Belle Isle is mining. It is the same as the kind of mining we did on Bell Island. It is exactly the same, Sir. You did not always have a seam of iron ore. Sometimes you had to go through a seam of rock for a half mile, three quarters of a mile or a mile to get at the ore. It is exactly the same principle, Sir. There is nothing new about it. And when I suggested it, the only reasons that some people laughed at it was because they did not understand the mining business. I was working for a company. I worked with DOSCO for twenty-one years, I worked with a mining company and I knew what could be done in this Province in respect of tunnelling. We got the best underground miners, Sir, in North America. You know, when they wanted to find out about running a tunnel for a transmission line, when the Newfoundland Power Commission wanted to find out, they sent a team of representatives from the Newfoundland Power Commission to Japan to take a look at tunnelling to see how they brought the transmission line - I forget the names of the places now in Japan, they brought them several miles from one spot to another. The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy might know what I am talking about - sent over a team over to Japan. Why did they not send them over to Bell Island?

MR. DOODY: They did not have the heavy voltage lines over on Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: The heavy voltage lines have nothing to do with it. It is the method of tunnelling that they went to look at.

MR. DOODY: No, it was the lines.

MR. NEARY: The lines?

MR. DOODY: Direct current transmission lines.

MR. NEARY: Well, if that is what they went for - but I was told they were going to look at tunnelling. They would have gone out to Buchans, or out to Green Bay, but certainly over on Bell Island where the whole of Conception Bay is tunnelled out, undermined. It is just like a huge city underground and it is only because people did not understand what you can

do in the way of tunnelling and mining.

MR. MURPHY: How many shafts on Bell Island?

MR. NEARY: No, they are not shafts. They are slopes on Bell Island.

In Buchans there are shafts. I am glad the hon. member raised that now, because I would like, if it is at all possible, instead of sinking shafts - and it may not be possible because of the land down there - to run a slope gradually under the Straits of Belle Isle so you could drive through whereas now you are going down, what is it? several hundred feet down a shaft and you have to use elevators and hoists. If there is no other way to do it, of course, it will have to be done that way.

So, Mr. Speaker, members who have spoken in the debate indicated that this is one of the most important single motions, resolutions, matters to come before this hon. House.

MR. NEARY: To that, Sir, I say hear,hear! But it is not time for members to be timid. There is no time for members of this hon. House, Sir, to be wishy-washy, to be cowardly. "Cowards weep, and traitors die, / We will keep the old Newfoundland flag flying high." No time, Sir. This is when you separate the boys from the men. And the hon. member is quite right that there is a gamble involved. No question about that, Sir. We are going into it with our eyes wide open. Gambling. We are going to take a chance. We are going to spend \$55 million next year. Maybe after a year or so it may be the thing will have to grind to a halt. But it is no need for us to start admitting defeat now, Sir, and throw in the towel while negotiations are going on with Hydro-Quebec and on with the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada, I might tell the hon. House, will not agree to another red cent of financing of these projects unless and until an agreement is reached with Hydro-Quebec.

Well, I mean that is understandable. They have their reasons for doing that. It makes a lot of sense. But, Mr. Speaker, we have to be optimistic. If we stop now, Sir, and all the equipment is taken away and all the contracts are cancelled it will be years and years and years before you get her started up again. And it will cost the taxpayers of this Province, Sir, a substantial amount of money to get her back on the rails again. Then we would have to pay out all kinds of fees for penalties and another \$55 million is not going to make or break us, Sir.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It could well pay off!

MR. NEARY: That is true, Sir, it could pay off, it could be just small change, and who knows, Mr. Speaker, but a year from now that oil and gas may be discovered off our coast and then instead of having to go up to Ottawa with our hat in hand begging Ottawa for a few crumbs, we might have provinces coming down here -

MR. DOODY: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: to Newfoundland looking for handouts.

MR. DOODY: Now you are talking.

MR. NEARY: I am talking as a Newfoundland, and I am talking as a man



MR. NEARY: who has, I hope, a little bit of common sense and a little bit of courage and a little bit of spunk to stand up for his Province in the crunch because that is what we are doing, Sir. We are right now at this moment at the crossroads in this Province. And Uncle Ottawa is going to have to come through unless we, through some sort of a miracle, find oil or gas off our Coast and then we will have no problem. It will be no problem at all to get people to come in here and dole it out to us. They will be down here from Ontario and Quebec looking for their handouts.

We are in a pretty fair bargaining position. We do not have all the trump cards in our hands, but, Sir, we are, as my colleague from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) pointed out, we are very fortunate in this Province that we have the largest potential of hydro development left on the face of this earth, in Labrador. And that means something today, Sir, because the other sources of energy are drying up or becoming pretty expensive, and even though the cost of developing the Lower Churchill and the tunnel and the transmission lines are escalating, and would now boggle the imagination, I am highly amused when I hear the Leader of the Opposition say it is going to cost the government \$3 billion to successfully complete these three projects.

I said to my friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) last night, if you were Premier of this Province, I said to him, at this moment how much would it cost you and your government to complete these three projects? He said \$3 billion. Well, I said, what about the Leader of the old guard Opposition, how much would it cost them? He said \$3 billion. Well I said that is how much it is going to cost that hon. crowd. But the Leader of the old guard Opposition leaves the impression that it is only going to cost the PC Government \$3 billion.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is for the people!

MR. MURPHY: Maybe they will get a discount.

MR. NEARY: They will get some kind of a, I do not know what it is,

MR. NEARY: maybe they get a coupon, I do not know.

MR. ROWE: Hit us again.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not hitting anybody again.

Many is the time, Sir, that I have had to turn the other cheek.

I am not going to turn it any more, especially when I am faced with a decision of whether I am going to vote in the interest of the people of this Province or vote along little petty, narrow, political lines. There is no way I am going to do that, Sir, it is too important an issue. The whole future of Newfoundland, in my opinion, hinges on these projects.

MR. PECKFORD: Are you for it or against it?

MR. NEARY: I am for it. As I say, Sir, I do not agree with the first part of this resolution. I think the Minister of Mines and Energy who is a past master, Sir, at wording resolutions had to get in a little bit of praise for the administration. That is the part I disagree with because, Mr. Speaker, all kinds of mistakes have been made in connection with this project. But, Sir, there is no point in crying over spilt milk. There is no point, Sir, in dwelling on the past. I know the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) last night was very, very dramatic, and rightly so, because of his involvement in the development of the Upper Churchill. But, Sir, it is no time to overdramatize the situation, no time for narrow, petty, small, bigoted, party politics, it is a time to stand up and be counted. When we go to Ottawa, Sir, - and you know, Mr. Speaker,

I am like the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), I would like to make a motion or an amendment to this resolution but I cannot do it, I am here by myself - unless I get the member of the Newfoundland Constabulary in front of me and he is not permitted under the rules of the House, Sir, or the Sergeant-at-Arms to second my amendment. There is no way I can make an amendment. But if I could do you know what I would do, Mr. Speaker? I would move an amendment to the hon. member's resolution that a special committee comprising of members on all sides, representing all

MR. NEARY:

factions of this hon. House proceed to Ottawa - once the matter of recall of the power and once the matter of the price of the extra power that we need from Quebec-Hydro, once that is settled, once all the details are straightened out - that a delegation of this House proceed to Ottawa representing all sides of the House to show Ottawa that we are united.

MR. DOODY: We would need a pretty big plane.

MR. NEARY: What do you mean you would need a pretty big plane?

MR. DOODY: To take all the factions in this House.

MR. NEARY: I would not suggest we send them all on the same plane, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a good idea because, believe me, Ottawa is just looking for an excuse not to put any more financing into this project.

The hon. the member for St. John's East today may have given Ottawa the excuse. We have seven M.P.'s up in Ottawa. I do not know where they stand on this -

AN HON. MEMBER: Six.

MR. NEARY: Six, we have six, Sir, I am sorry - I do not know where they stand on this project. We have to get their support. We have to try to get them thinking along the same lines as we are in this hon. House. We have to approach Ottawa with a united front because if we do not, Mr. Speaker, they will just laugh at us, and you will have one side, like I have seen happen, Sir, and I have seen this happen, like when the government is trying to do something and you have somebody on the phone calling up one of his buddies and saying, you cannot do that because if you do that the Tories are going to get the credit for it.

No more of this, Sir. Mr. Speaker, can I make an amendment myself?

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment has to be seconded.

MR. NEARY: The amendment has to be seconded. Well unfortunately, Sir, I cannot make the amendment but I wish I could. I can only throw it out now as an idea, a suggestion. Perhaps the Minister of Mines and Energy might wish to expand his resolution to include my suggestion that a special committee - and, Sir, this would be the most important committee to go to Ottawa since the committee went up to discuss and negotiate the terms of union,

Mr. Neary:

the terms of Confederation, before - I think in 1947 or 1948. This would be the most important committee, in my opinion, ever to go to Ottawa to show Ottawa that we are united, that we are not divided, that they cannot play partisan politics with us down here. But we also have to show Ottawa, Sir, that we are prepared in this Province to set out our priorities, that we are not going to go up to Ottawa, if we have to, if we do not discover gas and oil, that we have to go up to Ottawa asking them to give us in grants and loans \$1 billion, and then have ministers to go in again the next week, the next month, the next year and say, oh we want DREE agreements, we want ARDA agreements, and we want infrastructure, and we want golf courses in the national park, we want a national park, We have to first of all get our priorities straight. Ah, the minister agrees with me, Sir, because you are asking Ottawa to put a large amount of the Canadian taxpayers' dollar into this project. So you cannot go up looking for these little insignificant things, you more or less I suppose, Mr. Speaker, have to put all of your eggs in one basket, so as to speak. You have to concentrate, zero in on this one gigantic, huge project and forget your little infrastructure which I suppose has not brought one industry into Newfoundland in the last three or four years. DREE is set up for this sort of a thing. Over a period of twenty-five years what would it cost for Ottawa to give us \$1 billion? How much? Who are the mathematicians here in the House?

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: How much?

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: No, but -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: No, no, no,

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Over a period of twenty-five years to amortize the loan, interest free loan, pay it off, give us a grant every year for twenty-five years?

AN HON. MEMBER: \$40 million a year.

MR. NEARY: \$40 million a year, peanuts, a drop in the bucket.

We sign an agreement practically every year, a DREE agreement for \$100 million. But you have to forget that nonsense. If you are going to get serious about this thing you have got to forget these piddling little projects. Ottawa is putting into Newfoundland now I suppose \$1,250,000,000 every year, and it is all non-productive, the most of it, we do not see any benefits for it. But here is an opportunity, Sir, where Ottawa can put its money where its mouth is, and not only will Newfoundland benefit but the whole nation will benefit.

MR. MURPHY: A great concept.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MURPHY: A great national concept.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, it is a great national concept, and it is the obvious thing to do, to link up the Island of Newfoundland with the Mainland part of the Province. And the obvious thing to do is try to develop Labrador and develop the Island of Newfoundland at the same time. And the obvious thing to do is to run the transmission line up to Happy Valley, and the obvious thing to do is to run a transmission line from the Upper Churchill to the Lower Churchill. They are as plain as the nose on your face, Sir, and you would want to be some stunned if you could not see it, you would want to be some short-sighted, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, that I am voting in favour of the resolution, although I am against the wording of the first part of the resolution, and I hope, Sir, that all members of this hon. House will stand up and be counted and put up a united front and not give anybody, our enemies inside or outside of this Province, an opportunity to sabotage these three great projects that mean so much to the future of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am confronted with a very hard act to follow. The hon. gentleman spent a great deal of time baiting his former master. However, I see that he subscribes to the conspiratorial

MR. J. CARTER:

theory of society, and thinks that our enemies are lurking everywhere.

I must say I do not agree with him. First of all I would like to make one thing very, very clear, and that is that investment in power is probably the best possible investment any society can make, and particularly electric power. It is recognized as the cleanest, most efficient, most long-lasting, most renewable resource, power resource that we have.

Mr. J. Carter.

The day may come when we will require ten times as much power as we now utilize. In Europe the pattern is for using electric power to power trains, some commercial vehicles, electric heat, and appliances and gadgets of every possible description. So there is no question about it, Mr. Speaker, that power, electric power, is certainly the energy source of the future. In fact I think every time a house is built, whereas it used to be the tradition to put in a thirty amp service, and then a sixty amp service, today the norm is a 200 amp service, and if you multiply that by the number of houses, homes in Newfoundland, you can get some idea of what the domestic hydro potential is going to be. I also realize, Mr. Speaker, that any talk of the Gull Island development, or the Lower Churchill, is merely metaphysical speculation unless a great deal of money is spent to evaluate all the pros and cons. A great deal of drilling has to be done, a great deal of survey work, a tremendous amount of mapping, a staff has to be put together and housed and they have to start pricing products from all over the world, because the number of components that go into a power plant and transmission line is incredibly complex. The controls alone, I suppose, would tax the ability of an electronic's expert who graduated any less than ten years ago from a technical college.

I cannot fault the government for having spent the money that they did spend on investigating this procedure, because unless many millions of dollars were spent we would not even be able to talk about this Lower Churchill intelligently. It would be no use our going to Ottawa without having all the facts and figures at our command, because Ottawa is a hard city to bargain with, I am told, and I believe it, and unless your case is well-prepared and well-presented you are not going to get what you go looking for. One point that has been made, of course, is that in any development of the Lower Churchill, Quebec is the key and some members have suggested that Quebec is still fighting the 1929 decision that gave Labrador to Newfoundland. - or was it 1927?

MR. RIGGMAN: In 1927.

MR. J. CARTER: In 1927, I am sorry.

There are those who suggest that as recently as ten years ago the feeling was in Quebec that all of Labrador belonged to Quebec, and they would not even recognize us on the map, and that is why we had this celebrated point A, rather than at the border. Fortunately in Newfoundland the relationship with the French, since we do not have a French minority, has been extremely good, and I would suggest that there is a very large reservoir of good feeling towards French Canada and the French culture generally on which we could build, and I am very optimistic. I think it gives us great reason to be optimistic about future relations with Quebec. I think that there is a beginning there that could be built upon, and I think many of the difficulties of the past could be avoided. We still know that Quebec is the key and whatever we do we need Quebec,



MR. J. CARTER:

either to take surplus power, the extra power that the Lower Churchill will generate when it first comes on stream, or perhaps to take all the power when it first comes on stream, because the transmission line might not be completed at the same time, that is possible, or to take part of the power. We may not immediately be able to use all of the power of the Lower and the recalled power of the Upper Churchill. There are a great many possibilities. In fact the mixture of these possibilities will vary from year to year as the project goes ahead. Now I am assuming that the project will eventually go ahead. I hope it will.

So we are told - now something else, Mr. Speaker, which is very interesting - we are told that we must bring the Cull power to Newfoundland because we cannot deal with Quebec. Now you cannot have your cake and eat it too. Either we can deal with Quebec somehow or we cannot deal with Quebec. We are told that if we do not deal with Quebec we cannot develop the power. Yet we are told that one of the reasons we must bring the power to the Island is because we cannot deal with Quebec. Now there is something askew here, something that does not make any sense. It is very, very difficult to predict the future because I am told, for example, that the Mississippi River is advancing into the Gulf of Mexico at the rate of 1,000 feet every year. Now according to that in several tens of thousands of years the Mississippi River will be flowing out into space as any fool can plainly see.

MR. DOODY: How long will it take?

MR. J. CARTER: If it advances at 1,000 feet a year? So now something is wrong with that calculation. Obviously it is not going to advance at 1,000 feet every year and every succeeding year.

So we have to take into consideration the fact that circumstances in the future will change. Now somebody has suggested that any power that we sell to Quebec will affect our equalization payments. In other words, if we sell all our power to Quebec we will get less in equalization payments. If we use all the power from the

MR. J. CARTER:

Lower Churchill and the recalled power from the Upper Churchill then this will not affect our equalization payments. But of course the equalization formula, as the, I think, the minister suggested in his opening statement, can be changed, has been changed and will probably be subject to change in the future. Now I have nothing but respect for the Minister of Mines and Energy. He is one of the few ministers in this House who could take any portfolio - and I would not doubt but that he could take all portfolios at one time for a short period. Obviously there are not enough hours in the day to take all, but I would suggest that he knows more about each portfolio in this government than any single minister because his ability is staggering and his energy and his initiative and his integrity, that this document, this ministerial statement - anyone who suggests that this is less than a straightforward, careful, analysis outlining both the hopes and the fears, possibilities and the risks of this project would be doing a disservice to him. He is a great man. But great men can make great mistakes. I think that he is mistaken when he says that we should risk \$55 million in the next twelve months.

Now tomorrow night, I think it is, Ottawa is going to announce its budgetary cutbacks. Whether or not they will announce what they are going to do or what their plans are for the Lower Churchill I do not know. But I suggest that in a time of retrenchment that we have to be very careful and get an absolutely clear indication from Ottawa that they are going to go ahead in partnership with us to develop the Lower Churchill before we risk any more money on this project because I can see us standing in this House having this same argument in exactly twelve months time. Instead of \$39 million being put at risk there will have been or could be a maximum of \$94 million put at risk.

MR. J.A.CARTER: Now if Ottawa would like to share the \$55 million that is proposed to put at risk in the next year fifty/fifty, then I will go along with that. I think that this would be some evidence of their sincerity. But if they do not, if we have to put this entire \$55 million at risk as the present resolution states, unless that resolution is changed I will be forced to vote against it, with great regret. I feel that the only disloyalty possible in a matter as great as this is to the public good and therefore I will not vote against my conscience. I believe it is a mistake to risk \$55 million without adequate guarantees.

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

MR. F.WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Lower Churchill debate knowing full well, Sir, there are men - perhaps only a few, but nevertheless men - in this Chamber who have more knowledge than I do of the project and negotiations that went into the original concept and more knowledge of the project generally than I have. Nevertheless, I feel that my views on the subject may not be quite as slanted or quite as coloured by other reasons as some of the views to be expressed in this debate by hon. members opposite.

I speak in this debate also, Mr. Speaker, knowing full well that some of my views that I held before entering politics may have differed somewhat from the views of the Liberal Party and from its stated policy with respect to the Lower Churchill project and more particularly with respect to the takeover of the Churchill Falls Corporation. Again, Sir, I point out to hon. members that one enters politics not to always get his own views across but also to compromise where compromise is necessary. Therefore I feel no hesitation in saying that I am quite prepared to compromise with my colleagues in this particular matter and to support them when it comes to the general principle of government ownership of our natural resources.

But it has not always been, Mr. Speaker, that the Progressive Conservatives in this Province were in favour of the kind of action and the kind of government control they took nearly two years

MR. WHITE: ago with respect to the takeover of the Churchill Falls Corporation. Research shows clearly, Sir, and hon. members opposite may recall that back in 1951 when the NALCO - Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation - was being formed which was 90 per cent owned by the government and 10 per cent owned by a couple of consulting firms, the Progressive Conservative Opposition of the day did not like it one bit and screamed from one end of this Province to the other that it was 90 per cent state socialism.

Mr. Speaker, in this debate one must take into consideration that the resolution before the House is that the House approve the steps that have been taken by the Government of the Province so far with respect to the Lower Churchill project. Because, Sir, I was not in the House when the takeover of the Churchill Falls hydro electric development was announced I want to devote most of my speech to that particular matter during the course of my remarks today.

There has been much said, Sir, in recent months concerning the deal originally obtained by the government of the day with respect to the development of Churchill Falls. Was it a good deal or was it a bad deal?

Hon. members opposite, particularly the Minister of Mines and Energy, has been noted for suggesting during the past three years that the Churchill Falls development and the subsequent contracts dealing with that development with Hydro-Quebec was a sellout of our resources by the government of the day. He has charged that we gave away Newfoundland's rights, we gave away the rights of our children to prosper and to benefit from our natural resources.

It should be pointed out, Sir, in this House that ten or fifteen years ago Labrador was not a promising prospect for development in this country or even in the Western Hemisphere. It had virtually been unheard of and at one stage during the 1930's Newfoundland at the time, and even Canada, according to my research, considered selling Labrador. One proposal even came from the Germans.

MR. WHITE: Most hon. members know full well the history of BRINCO. They have been told time and time again by the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), vet, Mr. Speaker, I feel that few members have so far grasped the kind of negotiations that went into the original Churchill Falls agreement.

Putting BRINCO together itself, in my opinion, was a monumental task and I am sure most

MR. WHITE:

people in the House would agree. Just look at it, Mr. Speaker. Back in the late 1950's and early 1960's getting twenty or more of the major corporations in the world to undertake an investment in a remote part of Canada hitherto before unheard of was an undertaking that would be viewed with awe, even in the present day. So we all know that some of those major corporations who were put together to form Trinco, to develop Labrador consisted of corporations such as the Potchchilds. They, incidentally, financed the British purchase of the shares of the Suez Canal at one stage. The British South Africa Company, Prudential Insurance, Pio Tinto and Imperial Chemical Industries Limited, which at the time was the sixth largest company in the world outside the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard so much about the so-called bad deal that Newfoundland received from the original Churchill Falls agreement that I took to seeking out independent viewpoints on this particular matter. Some hon. members may remember a particular little booklet that I have here. This booklet, Forced Growth, it is called which came out in 1971 detailing some of the major undertakings of provincial government in Canada. The book, Sir, was written by Philip Mathias. Mr. Mathias, for the information of hon. members opposite, was at that time an assistant editor of The Financial Post and has written on business affairs both in England and in Canada. For the six years prior to writing the book he had been involved in the field of government-assisted development efforts for The Financial Post in Canada.

I remember reading this booklet some years ago as a newsman since the name Philip Mathias was drawn to my attention. Newsmen in the gallery might remember that Philip Mathias was The Financial Post writer who broke the great Churchill forest industry in Manitoba some years ago in the pages of The Financial Post. Taken into context, the time it was written, Mr. Speaker, in the late 1960's and in 1970-1971, this book should be able to give us all an impartial opinion, an unbiased view of exactly what the Churchill Falls project

MR. WHITE:

meant in those days taken into context the times, of course.

First of all Mr. Mathias writes that both Brinco and the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) entered the agreement with remarkable vision. He detailed the project from the start. I would like to read you just a little bit of what he says about the original deal. He says, "The Churchill Falls installation will be the biggest hydro-electric installation in the Western World. (We must remember this was written in 1971.) The total cost, \$1 billion, is about ten times the total gross expenditures of the Government of Newfoundland in 1966, the year the colossal earth and concrete works of Churchill Falls began. What cash incentives of any significance could Newfoundland offer to this giant? Wisely it offered none and has reaped nothing but profit. But development of the Falls has not been without difficulty for Newfoundland. The hardy, leather skinned fishermen of the wind-swept Newfoundland outports can say with pride that Churchill Falls has gone ahead through the imagination and statesmanship of the Premier that they have voted for for twenty years."

"The hon. Joseph P. Smallwood - I read from the book - steered the project through an ancient and bitter border dispute with Quebec, past a long standing federal ban on power exports over high tax barriers and between the dangers of nationalization on the one hand and unrealistic assistance on the other. When Newfoundlanders look around Canada at other development projects involving governments they will have to admit that Smallwood's achievement was remarkable indeed!"

I might point out that the gentleman who wrote that book is famous for picking things apart, Mr. Speaker, rather than complimenting things. That was from an independent voice, Mr. Speaker, no axes to grind, no friends to cater to, no company commissioned him to do a book. It was a complete independent view. Not only that, Sir, but Mr. Mathias wrote about five major projects in Canada when he wrote this book. They ranged from the P.E.I. fish

MR. WHITE:

plant story that I am sure the Minister of Mines and Energy remembers, Saskatchewan pulp mills, Nova Scotia's heavy water plant and of course the Churchill Forest Industries project in Manitoba that I mentioned a moment ago. All of these projects, Sir, were monumental undertakings.

As the author points out, Sir, each of the five cases chosen for his book represented the single biggest development in the recent history of each province investigated. He concludes the most successful is the development of the mighty Churchill Falls in Labrador by a largely British-owned consortium. Newfoundland, he says, will reap nothing but profit from Churchill Falls through its development though its development was agonizing at times.

Mr. Speaker, I am content to believe that within reason, given conditions at the time, the Churchill Falls power project was a credit to this Province. When studied in terms of other projects being undertaken in the days when Brinco started Churchill Falls, it was a credit to the Province indeed. The suggestions, Mr. Speaker, being made by hon. members opposite that Churchill Falls, the deal itself in the first place was a bad deal, just does not wash in my opinion. Of course it is a bad deal if you compare the negotiations at that particular time and the contract signed with information we have available today. Who, Sir,



Mr. White.

in the late 1950's and early 1960's would envision the kind of energy crisis we are facing today? Who, Sir, in the 1950's and 1960's could recognize then the kind of inflation taking place in the world today? Who, Sir, would recognize then the monumental growth of Newfoundland to the extent that within a few years we will need much of the power for our own consumption? I am sure, Sir, in the days when the original Churchill Falls project was negotiated, and the government of the day was trying to bluff Quebec into signing, that maybe they would have called that bluff, Newfoundland would have called the bluff and gone ahead and brought the power through Newfoundland and through the Maritime Provinces as was suggested at the time. I have also heard, Sir, outside and inside this House, many lame excuses for the step which the government took in March 1974 when it bought out the shares of the Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation, or some of the shares.

Why did they decide to do it, Mr. Speaker? Was there conclusive proof that this Province could develop the Lower Churchill in such a way that it would be more beneficial to Newfoundland than if BRINCO undertook the task? Or, Sir, was it for another reason, Mr. Speaker? Was it an undertaking by the Conservative administration, Mr. Speaker, to flex its muscles? Up to that point they had done nothing dramatic in this Province, Mr. Speaker. They had undertaken no great achievements. All they had done, Sir, was complete projects that had been undertaken by my colleague's, Sir, on both sides of me when they were the government of the day. They were content to go down, I maintain, and officially open the Churchill Falls project then. They were content to take a ride on the QE II and officiate at the opening of the Come by Chance oil refinery. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that their urge to meddle in just about everything that the former administration had touched and their political thinking led them to, partially led them to make the move they did with respect to BRINCO and Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation. Their dream, Mr. Speaker, of picking apart everything that had been put together in this Province prior

Mr. White.

to their coming into office reached even into the corporate board rooms of one of the world's largest corporations, BRINCO. That undying desire to pick apart something that had been put together before they came into office, and the inflation at the time, dulled their view of the Churchill Falls deal. What justification, Sir, did they have for taking over this project? Was it because most other provinces in Canada had suddenly taken over control of their hydro electric developments? I suggested at that time, Sir, not quite enough research had gone into that particular aspect of the takeover. That may remind the members of this Chamber that the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario was founded in 1906 and even in the 1960's it had not taken over full control of all hydro in that province. Hydro-Quebec formed in 1944 only recently obtained almost full control of the hydro development there. New Brunswick Electric Power Commission, Mr. Speaker, was formed in the 1920's, and it was a gradual drawn out approach to taking over the power development in that Province. Yet here, Sir, we were faced with the government who plunged into it up to its neck. I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that it was combination of factors, none of them as sound as they should have been, that went into the decision by the administration of this Province to take over Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation.

I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the present Minister of Mines and Energy, in his haste to back up some of his statements with respect to Churchill Falls, probably did a great deal of persuading the Premier of the Province to go along with such a deal. I also have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. minister's colleagues in the cabinet at the time, particularly the member for St. John's East, who sits on the backbench today, also had an impact with respect to the government's decision to go ahead and take over Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation. Mr. Speaker, we should not forget

Mr. White.

the role I think was played by the young St. John's lawyer, the radical armchair Liberal whom my friend, the member for Burin - Placentia West, has already taken care of. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our present Premier is not the first Premier to have been talked into something during his term of office. It was good salesmanship on the part of the present Minister of Mines and Energy, I suggest, that went a long way in the final decision that this government took in March 1974. How much research had gone into the determined attempt by the government to take over Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation come hell or high water? The firm of Teshmont-Zinder, or which was actually a joint study of two consulting firms, of the two firms together was taken to determine how best the Lower Churchill project could be developed. It is obvious, Sir, from the recent book that was put on our desk a few days ago by Phillip Smith, the story of Churchill Falls, that the government were determined from the start to take over Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation and simply wanted Teshmont-Zinder to back up their belief. Did Teshmont-Zinder Sir, have a vested interest in reporting to the government that they wanted to know anyway?

MR. WHITE: Is it not true, Sir, that Teshmont has probably gained millions of dollars from the decision by the government to take over Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation? Is it not true, Sir, that Teshmont are still involved with this particular project and earning money from it? Is it not also true that Teshmont are still bringing in experts from England and other places to become involved in this development? Of course it is true, and only a few weeks ago I met one of those new recruits on an airplane and he informed me that he was indeed being brought into Newfoundland as another expert on the development of the Lower Churchill project for an indefinite period of time.

Mr. Speaker, in this new book that we got a few days ago, my contention that the Progressive Conservatives were determined to take over the Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation even during the election of 1971, and the subsequent election in 1972, is borne out. The author says, Sir, that even when the Premier and the present Minister of Mines and Energy and the former Minister of Mines and Energy went to Montreal on February 27 to discuss conclusion of the Teshmont-Zinder Report, it was obvious then that they intended to take over the Churchill Falls Power Development. Even then, Sir, the government would hardly listen to common sense. And let me read you something.

The author was talking about Harry MacDonald who, of course, was the President of Churchill Falls at the time and has since gone back to practicing law in Ontario. So MacDonald reserved this judgement then for a later date. "He did, however, tell the Premier that the company had serious reservations about the sets of figures purporting to show how much cheaper it would be if the scheme were carried out by the government rather than a private company and that private study by Teshmont-Zinder. Because the calculations seemed to be based on different formulas he said, the comparison they were supported to provide was a distorted one. For instance, while the figures for the private company included a component for a corporation tax, it was not taken into account in the comparison that most of this tax would ultimately be returned to the Province. In short the figures

MP. WHITE: obviously showed a bias towards public ownership."

"MacDonald did not know how right he was," says the author. "The whole meeting in fact was merely an academic exercise because by now the die had been cast and the company's days were numbered." And even the financial study, Mr. Speaker, undertaken by Burns Brothers and Denton cannot be considered to be impartial. Are not Burns Brothers and Denton the official fiscal agent of the Province? Have they not gained admirably from being associated with the Newfoundland Government down through the years. Even the buying of shares, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, put a great deal of money into that particular organization. Were they not to gain again, Mr. Speaker, if they were associated with the government that would be borrowing more than \$1 billion to finance the Lower Churchill project. I suggest that Burns Brothers and Denton were also biased in their reporting to the government because they as well have a vested and had a vested interest. The entire area of consulting firms, Mr. Speaker, commissioned by this government and others needs to be looked into very carefully. Even in this House already since the session started I have been listening carefully to some of the things people have been saying under their breath.

The other day I heard the Minister of Finance, in reference to a remark by the member for LaPoile with regard to consulting firms, say that some consulting firms might recommend other feasibility studies and form companies to do the studies themselves. Consulting firms always have a vested interest, Mr. Speaker, particularly if they see a chance where they can get involved themselves and make money. Of course they were recommending, Sir, Teshmont-Zinder and Burns Brothers and Denton, were recommending that the government take over and develop the Lower Churchill project. Why not? They could do nothing but gain from it. Why did they not bother to explain, Mr. Speaker, to the government of the day that they needed markets for the power they were going to bring into Newfoundland? Why did they not explain to the government, Sir, that only

MR. WHITE: markets would back up the necessary financing for the Lower Churchill project. The \$3 million study undertaken by BRINCO before Teshmont became involved on the Lower Churchill project was probably a little more realistic in the sense that a private company usually uses its own people to conduct a study of that magnitude and a private company, I maintain, has to make sure that its feasibility studies are in the best interest of the company and they are not going to go into something head on and lose a barrel of money and bungle the project in the meantime. It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that BRINCO would not make that particular study, \$3 million study, available to the government but I will go into that at a later date and I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I do move that this House do now adjourn until three o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: This House is now adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

DECEMBER 17, 1975.

DEC 17 1975

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy, in reply to the Question No. 83 (Hon. J. R. Smallwood, Twillingate) Order Paper No. 1. November 24th, 1975.

QUESTION 83 For some account of what has resulted from the modified concession and claim-staking system developed to encourage "a much higher degree of mineral exploration than has been the case in the past", as announced in the Speech from the Throne on January 31, 1973.

ANSWER Numbers of mining claims recorded by years as shown

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Claims</u>
1970	9
1971	42
1972	35
1973	490
1974	1,455
1975	<u>2,475</u> to date
TOTAL	4,506

Number of Miner's Permits Issued

<u>Year</u>	
1970 individual permits	14 company permits 15
1971 individual permits	16 company permits 14
1972 individual permits	22 company permits 14
1973 individual permits	31 company permits 17
1974 individual permits	59 company permits 30
1975 individual permits	150 company permits 29

An estimate of the amount spent in staking claims can be made by assuming that the cost to stake one claim is at least one hundred dollars. At this rate, the increased claim staking activity



has meant an estimated total expenditure on claim staking only of not less than \$442,000 on the island portion of the Province. An additional \$ 44,200 has been paid directly to the Government in fees for recording claims.

Additionally, to maintain these claims in good standing requires the equivalent of at least \$500 worth of expenditure on exploration per year.

DEC 1 1975

Question No. 84

Honourable Mr. Smallwood (Twillingate) - To ask the Honourable Premier to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What has been the outcome, if any, of "the detailed study... to identify the opportunities which exist for the further processing of minerals within the Province, to retain a maximum employment opportunity," as set forth in the Speech from the Throne on January 31, 1973

Reply:

The study on the potential for further processing of mineral commodities in the Province was one of a number of mineral development planning studies conducted under the Canada/Newfoundland Mineral Exploration and Evaluation Agreement. The study was conducted by D. Wm. Carr and Associates, Ltd., of Ottawa, who submitted the final report on October 29, 1973. The report is a 1300 page, 3 volume document.

Fourteen mineral commodities were included in the terms of reference for the study. In terms of their potential for further processing the consultants divided these into the following three broad groups:

Short to Medium Term Potential

- Limestone
- Peat Moss
- Salts
- Iron Ore
- Gypsum
- Fluorspar

Long Term Potential

- Pyrophyllite
- Silica
- Copper-zinc-lead-cadmium
- Barite
- Zinc
- Tungsten
- Asbestos

Little Potential

- Magnesite

The report identified a number of general constraints to further processing which affect the potential of all these commodities. Chief among these are the lack of infrastructural, particularly transportation, facilities, and the fact that many deposits are held by companies under long term concessions, licences or leases.

The only specific action taken so far, directly following the further processing report, is a study on the Newfoundland market for peat moss and peat moss products, now nearing completion. For many of the other commodities, e.g., limestone, responsibility for any immediate action lies with private companies, and, in some instances, awaits market improvements.

In a more general sense, the Government is preparing legislation on mineral land tenure and taxation designed to redress the mineral rights situation over the longer term. Also, provision has been made for funding of specific studies on mineral commodities in our proposal to DREE for a new five-year Mineral Development Program.

DEC 17 1975

Question: 120

Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy for a statement showing what diamond drilling was done by the Government, where, number of feet in each location, and amount of money expended in each of the financial years 1970-1975.

Reply:

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Deposit</u>	<u>Footage</u>	<u>Cost</u>
1970/71	-	-	-	-
1971/72	Aguathuna	Limestone	1123'	\$10,287.81
1972/73	Aguathuna	Limestone	1406'	\$12,880.38
1972/73	Boswarlos	Barite/Celestite	10 short holes	\$ 4,927.09
1973/74	-	-	-	-
1974/75	La Scie	Quartz(Silica)	1841'	\$26,431.33

DEC 17 1975

Question: 121

Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy for a statement showing what diamond drilling was done by private Mining Companies, where, number of feet in each location and amount of money expended, in each of the financial years 1970-75.

Reply:

The attached table gives the total footage drilled by each company in each of the years 1970 to 1974 inclusive. Detailed data as to drilling locations, footage per location, and costs are not readily available. No data is yet available for 1975.



GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR  
DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND ENERGY

ST. JOHN'S

1

To: Director Mineral Lands & Mines  
From: Chief Inspector of Mines

Summary of companies and diamond drill footage per year as follows:

1970

New Jersey Zinc	4,901
Noranda Exploration	3,512
Gullbridge	6,265
Newfluor (Alcan)	3,144
Cominco	10,513
Rambler	25,292
Flintkote	1,385
Allied Investors Syndicate Ltd.	2,643
Nalco	4,181
Norlex	159
M. J. Boylen (Advocate & Rambler Areas)	11,018
Canadian Refractories	2,996
Brinex Lab	20,422
Island	30,280
L. M. & E	73,480
IOCC	9,580
Long Lac	12,350
Cera	33,181
	<u>255,302</u>

1971

Consolidated Rambler	22 holes	8,591	East Zone & Old Rambler
	93 holes	<u>33,909</u>	Ming Mine
		42,500	
Flintkote	38 holes	4,462	
Cominco	20 holes	4,438	
Alcan (Newfluor)	8 holes	5,536	
Noranda	23 holes	13,985	
Brinex	18 holes	5,244	
		<u>76,165</u>	
Asarco		51,675	
IOCC		13,314	
		<u>141,155</u>	

1972

Newfluor (Alcan)	15,462
Brinex	3,971
Rambler	7,008
Noranda	3,703
Kerr Addison	1,894
Colchester	1,841
Allied Chemical	6,725
Nalco-Cera	6,837
Hooker	2,280
Asarco	32,941
	<u>82,662</u>

1973

Rambler	37 holes	35,916
	29 holes	31,389
Flintkote		1,721
Hooker		1,506
Asarco		8,923
Newfluor (Alcan)		4,774
Brinex		4,517
Noranda		9,972
Nfld. Zinc		36,206
Kerr Addison		15,299
		<u>150,223</u>

1974

Cominco		248
Asarco Inc. (Buchans Area)		14,195
	(outside area)	3,857
Brinex Kitts		5,555
	Deer Lake	3,000
International Mogul		5,793
Kennco Explorations (Western) Ltd.		1,604
Flintkote		3,459
Alcan (Mine Area) (Newfluor)		4,983
Rambler		39,778
Noranda		4,476
Cera		7,782
		<u>96,394</u>

Less John's Manville and Carroll (J. LEE) submission.

December 5, 1975

DEC 17 1975

Question: 122

Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy for a statement showing the total volume and value of all gold produced at Buchans since it began operations.

Reply:

The requested information on the total volume and value of all gold produced at Buchans since it commenced mining operations is not available to the Department of Mines and Energy. However, Report Number Two of The Industrial Inquiry Commission into the Dispute between the United Steel workers of America, Local Union 5457 and American Smelting and Refining Company, Buchans Unit submitted to Government on August 9, 1974 contains the following information on gold production at Buchans.

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>GOLD PRODUCED (oz.)</u>	<u>VALUE GOLD</u>
1962	8265	\$288,559
1963	6920	241,269
1964	7088	247,553
1965	6909	241,238
1966	6107	213,165
1967	6463	233,524
1968	6225	262,093
1969	6043	233,680
1970	4874	187,172
1971	2935	144,672
Total 1962 to 1971	61829	2,292,925



DEC 17 1975

Question: 126 (Order Paper No. 1, November 24, 1975)  
How many mines inspectors are employed by  
the Government; how many needed to be employed;  
what effort is being made to obtain them?

Answer: At present one Inspector is employed (Electrical/  
Mechanical Specialist) and a Chief Inspector.  
Two have been engaged and are expected to take  
up their appointments in January, 1976. One  
vacancy still exists and a candidate remains to  
be interviewed. The latter candidate applied  
in response to the last advertising campaign.

DEC 17 1975

QUESTION 127. HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate)  
ORDER PAPER No. 1 NOVEMBER 24, 1975

The subject of Deer Lake oil shales is one of the matters the Energy Resources Division of the Department of Mines and Energy has recently reviewed.

Oil shales of the Deer Lake region were examined in some detail several years ago by Dr. David M. Baird (now Director of the National Museum of Science and Technology in Ottawa). Dr. Baird led a five man party which spent a month examining outcrops of shale around Deer Lake. He also critically reviewed the results of previous investigations. He reported,

" In the Deer Lake region in the exposures examined by the writer no beds of oil shale greater than three feet thick were observed. Most are not greater than one and a half feet thick. Further, no beds of high quality were seen. Some give off a highly petroliferous odor under medium heat, but yields of a few gallons to a ton in beds of shale which average only 18 inches in thickness show immediately that no commercial deposits occur in the region examined."

Richard Farley, Provincial Petroleum Geologist, re-examined the outcrops in the summer of 1974. He found nothing to contradict Dr. Baird's conclusions. Further, he advises that the shales he saw were significantly less rich than other oil shales he has worked on in northern Canada.

DEC 17 1975

- 2 -

File

In light of these assessments, considering that the very large and very rich oil shale deposits of Colorado, Wyoming and Utah have yet to be mined commercially, and mindful of the fact that the open pit mining necessary to exploit such shales would almost certainly result in massive destruction of the environment in one of the Province's prime agricultural and recreational areas, the Minister of Mines and Energy does not consider any further investigation of Deer Lake oil shales to be warranted at this time.

DEC 17 1975

QUESTION 178 HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate)  
ORDER PAPER No. 1 NOVEMBER 24, 1975

The only oil or gas exploration carried out on a dry land portion of the Province during the past three years was the drilling, by the Union Oil Company and Brinex, of an exploratory well in the Anguille Mountains at 47° 57' 40" North Latitude, 59° 14' 00" West Longitude. That well, drilled in the fall of 1973, reached a total depth of 7,581 feet. It encountered no indications of either oil or gas.

DEC 17 1975

QUESTION 129. HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate)  
ORDER PAPER No. 1 NOVEMBER 24, 1975

A total of 478,047 feet have been drilled in fifty-one wells during the search for oil and gas within the jurisdiction of the Legislature offshore. Details of the wells are given below, and their locations are shown on the attached map.

DEC 17 1975

COMPTON, HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate)

No.	Operator	Well Name	Latitude
1	Pan Am-Imperial	Tors Cove D-52	44° 11' 14"
2	" "	Grand Falls H-09	45° 28' 19"
3	Amoco-Imperial	Eider M-75	45° 34' 55"
4	" "	Murre G-67	46° 06' 20"
5	Tenneco et al.	Leif E-38	54° 17' 30"
6	Amoco-Imperial	Gannet O-54	45° 03' 55"
7	" "	Puffin B-90	44° 39' 13"
8	Elf	Hermine H-94	45° 23' 29"
9	Amoco-Imperial	Petrel A-62	44° 51' 06"
10	" "	Shearwater J-20	44° 29' 36"
11	" "	Bittern M-62	44° 41' 56"
12	" "	Kittiwake P-11	44° 40' 49"
13	" "	Heron H-73	44° 02' 27"
14	" "	Jaeger A-49	44° 28' 02"
15	" "	Cormorant N-83	46° 02' 45"
16	Mobil-Gulf	Adolphus 1 K-41	47° 00' 39"
17	Amoco-Imperial	Gull F-72	44° 11' 25"
18	" "	Merganser I-60	44° 49' 36"
19	Mobil-Gulf	Adolphus 2K-41	47° 00' 41"
20	Amoco et al.	Tern A-68	44° 27' 13"
21	" "	Mallard M-45	44° 14' 46"
22	" "	Razorbill F-54	45° 13' 25"
23	" "	Sandpiper J-77	45° 36' 38"
24	" "	Sandpiper 2J-77	45° 36' 39"
25	" "	Heron J-72	44° 01' 34"
26	" "	Osprey G-84	44° 43' 29"
27	" "	Egret K-36	46° 25' 38"
28	Eastcan et al.	Leif M-43	54° 17' 46"
29	" "	Bjarni H-81	55° 30' 29"
30	Amoco et al.	Spoonbill C-30	45° 49' 06"
31	Mobil-Gulf	Flying Foam I-13	47° 02' 42"
32	Amoco et al.	Pelican J-49	45° 28' 35"
33	" "	Brant P-87	44° 17' 00"
34	Mobil-Gulf	Bonniton H-32	45° 51' 27"
35	Elf et al.	Emerillon C-56	45° 15' 05"
36	Amoco et al.	Coot K-56	45° 45' 42"
37	" "	Twillick G-49	44° 18' 26"
38	" "	Carey J-34	45° 23' 32"
39	BP-Columbia	Bonavista C-99	49° 08' 06"
40	Eastcan et al.	Gudrid H-55	54° 54' 30"
41	Amoco et al.	Egret N-46	46° 25' 56"
42	Mobil-Gulf	Dominion O-23	47° 22' 49"
43	Amoco et al.	Skua E-41	45° 20' 23"
44	Mobil-Gulf	Adolphus D-50	46° 59' 05"
45	Amoco et al.	Phalarope P-62	45° 11' 50"
46	Eastcan et al.	Freydis B-87	53° 56' 14"
47	" "	Snorri J-90	57° 19' 45"
48	Mobil et al.	Cumberland B-55	48° 24' 13"
49	Eastcan et al.	Karlsefni H-31	58° 52' 15"
50	BP-Columbia et al.	Indian Harbor M-52	54° 21' 52"
51	Eastcan et al.	Cartier D-70	54° 39' 02"

\* Suspended depth. Completion of drilling expected in 1976.

DEC 17 1975

<u>Longitude</u>	<u>Total Depth</u>
52° 23' 42"	4,834'
52° 00' 03"	5,250'
51° 56' 42"	11,582'
49° 09' 38"	10,949'
55° 05' 52"	3,557'
52° 38' 10"	10,000'
53° 42' 28"	15,425'
54° 29' 55"	10,720'
52° 54' 15"	6,384'
52° 46' 53"	7,647'
51° 10' 14"	15,683'
53° 31' 46"	11,647'
52° 25' 41"	12,000'
50° 21' 01"	3,079'
48° 58' 02"	10,369'
48° 22' 04"	4,065'
52° 26' 32"	8,205'
52° 22' 49"	6,245'
48° 22' 06"	12,000'
53° 09' 01"	13,743'
52° 07' 22"	11,555'
52° 08' 22"	10,286'
51° 41' 02"	2,635'
51° 41' 01"	11,566'
52° 26' 09"	4,535'
49° 27' 23"	11,397'
48° 50' 22"	11,000'
55° 07' 20"	6,165'
57° 42' 06"	8,252'
49° 04' 06"	9,046'
48° 46' 31"	12,084'
52° 36' 42"	4,260'
52° 42' 19"	11,771'
48° 19' 32"	10,000'
54° 23' 17"	10,750'
52° 08' 32"	11,600'
51° 21' 32"	4,270'
52° 35' 03"	12,104'
51° 14' 28"	10,325'
55° 52' 32"	9,311'
48° 51' 47"	9,000'
48° 18' 28"	13,116'
48° 52' 26"	10,626'
48° 22' 29"	12,093'
51° 24' 11"	10,373'
54° 42' 35"	7,592'
59° 57' 44"	10,531'
50° 07' 58"	13,571'
51° 46' 42"	10,774' *
54° 23' 50"	7,753' *
55° 40' 29"	6,322'

DEC 17 1975

Question: 131

Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy what if any effort has been made recently to bring about development of the magnesite deposit in Central Newfoundland.

Reply:

The magnesite deposit, located at Great Bend on the Gander River, is controlled by Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation as it is within the concession area held by that company under the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Act, Act. No. 88, 1951, as amended. The Government has no recent information on the company's activities, if any, with respect to development of the magnesite deposit.



DEC 7 1975

Question: 132

Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy what is the present status of the salt deposit that was discovered by the American company, then known as Hooker Chemicals.

Reply:

Following the termination of their concession agreement, Hooker Chemical Corporation was issued ~~with~~ five development licences in the St. George's Bay area, on July 25, 1975. These licences were valid for a five-year period. Subsequently three of the development licences were surrendered and the remaining two were assigned by Hooker to Forsters Petroleum Limited, a subsidiary of Hooker. Rentals on the two licences have been paid up to July 25, 1976.

November 24, 1975 - ORDER PAPER # 1

DEC 17 1975

Question: 133

Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy what, if anything, has been done to discover other deposits of salt.

Reply:

No salt exploration has been conducted recently in the Province apart from the work conducted by Hooker Chemical Corporation - Forsters Petroleum Limited.

November 24, 1975 - ORDER PAPER # 1

DEC 17 1975

Question: 134

Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy for the names of all mining companies that come into the Province to do prospecting, and especially developing, in each financial year 1970-1975.

Reply:

Attached is a tabulation showing the mining companies which have held Miner's Permits in each of the years 1970-1975 inclusive.

COMPANIES HOLDING MINER'S PERMITS WHICH ALLOW PROSPECTING ON

CROWN LANDS

COMPANY	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Cominco	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
New Jersey Zinc Exp.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Big Nama Creek Miners Ltd.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Terra Nova Properties Ltd.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Colchester Mines Ltd.	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Gullbridge Mines Ltd.	✓					
Consolidated Rambler Mines	✓	✓	✓			✓
First Maritime Mining Corp.	✓					
Falcolbridge Nickle Mines	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kambridge Mines Ltd.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Rio Algom Mines Ltd.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Rio Tinto Canadian Exp. Ltd.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
McIntre Porcupine Mines Ltd.	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Quebec Sturgeon River Mines	✓					
Noranda Exp.Co.Ltd.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Radex Minerals Ltd.		✓				
Commodore Mining Co.		✓			✓	✓
Nfld. Min. Ltd.			✓	✓	✓	✓
Advocate Mines Ltd.			✓	✓	✓	✓
Anglo Nfld. Industrial Res.			✓	✓		✓
Nfld. & Lab. Corp. Ltd.				✓	✓	✓
B.P. Minerals Ltd.				✓	✓	
Brinex				✓	✓	✓
Ferr Addison Mines Ltd.					✓	✓
Asarco					✓	✓
COMEX Mines Ltd.					✓	✓
Nfld. Zinc Mines Ltd.					✓	✓
MM & B.					✓	✓
Tack Corp. Ltd.					✓	✓
Atlantic Analytical Ser.					✓	✓
Atlantic-Richfield Co.					✓	
Westfield Minerals					✓	✓
Union Carbide Exp. Corp.					✓	
Asarco Exp. Corp. Ltd.					✓	✓
Asarco Corp. Ltd.						✓



2-48-72. 1017 411

TABLE

VALUE OF MINERAL PRODUCTION, NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR, BY MAIN GROUPS, 1949 to 1972

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>Metallic Minerals(\$)</u>	<u>Non-Metallic Minerals(\$)</u>	<u>Structural Materials(\$)</u>	<u>Total(\$)</u>
1949 .....	24,495,099	1,405,033	1,683,483	27,583,615
1950 .....	22,914,618	1,290,361	1,619,068	25,824,047
1951 .....	28,953,585	1,966,477	1,490,381	32,410,443
1952 .....	27,689,163	2,539,824	2,283,326	32,512,313
1953 .....	27,969,110	2,748,906	3,062,606	33,780,622
1954 .....	36,747,105	3,071,511	3,079,417	42,898,033
1955 .....	61,742,786	2,921,203	3,798,967	68,462,956
1956 .....	76,698,185	3,652,962	3,997,859	84,349,006
1957 .....	77,372,187	1,831,730	3,478,346	82,682,263
1958 .....	60,099,277	1,737,429	3,158,048	64,994,754
1959 .....	65,808,402	2,098,795	4,249,799	72,156,996
1960 .....	78,925,679	2,225,362	5,486,082	86,637,123
1961 .....	83,883,928	2,457,555	5,277,226	91,618,709
1962 .....	93,283,793	2,497,958	6,077,209	101,858,960
1963 .....	124,213,236	6,538,913	7,044,558	137,796,707
1964 .....	166,169,266	9,995,362	5,988,028	182,152,656
1965 .....	188,172,863	13,043,166	6,341,598	207,557,627
1966 .....	225,338,474	12,973,669	5,707,943	244,020,086
1967 .....	246,911,563	14,122,548	5,331,038	266,365,149
1968 .....	286,729,864	16,177,369	6,804,761	309,711,994
1969 .....	235,096,050	15,742,263	6,097,624	256,935,937
1970 .....	327,078,458	18,455,678	7,669,882	353,204,018
1971 .....	316,423,850	17,591,712	9,415,716	343,431,278
1972 .....	261,012,538	19,319,798	10,278,131	290,610,467
1973 .....	335,830,947	25,324,894	13,350,411	374,506,252
1974 <sup>P</sup> .....	411,235,000	28,860,000	13,414,000	453,509,000

Source: Canadian Minerals Yearbook.

DEC 17 1975

Question: 136

Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy for a table showing for each year beginning with 1950 the total value of all minerals produced in the Province.

Reply:

See attached table.

QUESTION 138 MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate)  
ORDER PAPER No. 1 NOVEMBER 24, 1975

The Minister of Mines and Energy has taken note of the comments of an official of BP on the long delivery time required to get goods into the Province.

The Department of Mines and Energy, who are in constant contact with the offshore operations have been keenly aware of this problem for a long time. In conjunction with the Department of Industrial Development considerable efforts have been made to impress local business of the need for prompt and timely service in the very costly oil business.

Local business, I am happy to say, have responded well to this challenge.

However, the basic problem arises from the lack of our adequate freight service from the mainland - a problem which has long been the source of much inconvenience and cost to the Newfoundland consumer.

It is our hope that pressure from the oil companies for better service will force the Federal Government into some action in this area. This will result in benefits not only to the oil companies, but to all sectors of the Newfoundland economy.



QUESTION 675. MR. NEARY (Lapointe) - ORDER PAPER -  
ORDER PAPER No. 9 DECEMBER 4, 1975

Almost all areas off our coasts hold some prospect for oil or gas, and at various times during the last ten years virtually every portion of Newfoundland's and Labrador's continental shelves and slopes has been examined in the search for hydrocarbons. Most significant exploratory activity has of course been the drilling of fifty-one wells as detailed to this House in reply to Question 129.

The early stages of this exploration activity were conducted under a series of grants, agreements and understandings entered into by the previous administration. These agreements were not issued for a specific period. Areas subject to such agreements are shown on the attached map entitled, "Provincial Permits Issued Prior to 1974".

Since passage of The Petroleum and Natural Gas (Amendment) Act, 1974 no company has been allowed to undertake any petroleum exploration activity without securing an interim permit from the Province. Unlike interim permits issued by the previous administration, however, these interim permits have been granted only for specific programs to be conducted in a particular area within a limited time. The period for which they have been issued has normally been twelve months, and they have conferred neither ownership nor production rights. All such interim permits presently in force are shown on the attached map entitled, "Term Interim Permits Outstanding on December 15, 1975".

The two maps mentioned above together detail all offshore oil and gas rights which have been granted by the Province and which are currently in force.

*Handwritten signature*

DEC 17 1975

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 24TH

1/75

QUESTION 449 What new water systems were placed in the Province  
in each of the financial years 1970-75, and the  
capital cost of each?

449 NEW WATER SYSTEMS (1970-1975)

<u>MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ADMIRAL'S BEACH	-	130,000.	-	36,000.	-	-	166,000.
ARNOLD'S COVE	-	295,000.	-	-	-	-	295,000.
BADGER'S QUAY-VALLEYFIELD- POOL'S ISLAND	70,000.	70,000.	55,000.	230,000	-	-	425,000.
BAIE VERTE	-	495,000.	-	-	-	-	495,000.
BELLBURNS	-	35,000.	25,000.	-	-	-	60,000.
BELLEORAM	-	-	-	-	40,000.	-	40,000.
BERRY HEAD	-	-	-	-	100,000.	-	100,000.
CARMANVILLE	-	120,000.	140,000.	-	125,000.	-	385,000.
CHANNEL	-	-	-	405,000.	-	-	405,000.
COACHMAN'S COVE	-	-	65,000.	50,000.	-	-	115,000.
COOK'S HARBOUR	-	35,000.	70,000.	-	30,000.	-	135,000.
DANIEL'S HARBOUR	-	50,000.	50,000.	-	-	-	100,000.
ENGLEE	-	-	-	100,000.	-	-	100,000.
FLOWER'S COVE	-	-	-	70,000.	-	-	70,000.
FOGO	-	580,000.	-	-	-	-	580,000.
FRESHWATER	-	-	-	-	200,000.	65,000.	265,000.

449 NEW WATER SYSTEMS (1970-1975) (Con'd)

<u>MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
GANDER	-	-	-	-	630,000.	50,000.	680,000.
GASKIERS - POINT LA HAYE	-	-	-	-	80,000.	-	80,000.
GOOSE COVE EAST	-	65,000.	-	60,000.	80,000.	-	205,000.
GRAND BANK	-	-	600,000.	-	90,000.	-	690,000.
GRAND LE PIERRE	-	-	-	-	40,000.	60,000.	100,000.
HANTS HARBOUR	-	580,000.	150,000.	600,000.	-	200,000.	1,530,000.
HEART'S CONTENT	-	450,000.	-	-	-	-	450,000.
HOWLEY	-	50,000.	90,000.	-	-	-	140,000.
ISLE AUX MORTS	-	-	-	-	200,000.	250,000.	450,000.
KING'S POINT	-	125,000.	-	50,000.	50,000.	-	225,000.
LA SCIE	-	-	-	-	50,000.	-	50,000.
LEWISPORTE	-	-	-	-	124,000.	-	124,000.
MARYSTOWN	-	-	-	-	425,000.	100,000.	525,000.
NEW PERLICAN	-	400,000.	-	-	-	-	400,000.
NIPPER'S HARBOUR	-	70,000.	130,000.	75,000.	-	50,000.	325,000.
NORTHERN ARM	-	-	-	-	58,000.	-	58,000.
PARSON'S POND	-	70,000.	-	-	-	-	70,000.
PASADENA	-	450,000.	-	-	-	-	450,000.

449 NEW WATER SYSTEMS (1970-1975) (Cont'd)

<u>MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
PETERVIEW	-	50,000.	-	-	-	-	50,000.
PLACENTIA	-	50,000.	-	-	-	-	50,000.
POINT OF BAY	-	-	-	-	-	50,000.	50,000.
PORT AU CHOIX	-	430,000.	65,000.	-	-	-	495,000.
PORT AU PORT WEST-AGUATHUNA	-	125,000.	-	-	-	100,000.	225,000.
PORT SAUNDERS	-	-	-	-	50,000.	-	50,000.
RAMEA	26,000.	-	-	-	-	-	26,000.
RENEWS-CAPPAHAYDEN	-	-	-	-	100,000.	-	100,000.
RIVERHEAD	-	100,000.	-	-	80,000.	-	180,000.
RUSHOON	-	-	-	-	-	100,000.	100,000.
ST. LUNAIRE	-	-	-	86,000.	-	-	86,000.
SANDRINGHAM	-	50,000.	-	-	-	-	50,000.
SALVAGE	-	-	-	-	-	80,000.	80,000.
SANDY COVE	-	-	-	-	65,000.	-	65,000.
SOUTH BROOK, H.B.,	40,000.	-	-	-	-	70,000.	110,000.
SOUTH BROOK, H.E.	-	-	-	-	-	300,000.	300,000.
SPRINGDALE	-	-	-	-	150,000.	-	150,000.

449 NEW WATER SYSTEMS (1970-1975) (Cont'd)

<u>MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
STEADY BROOK	-	95,000.	-	-	-	-	95,000.00
STEPHENVILLE	-	40,000.	-	-	-	-	40,000.00
STEPHENVILLE CROSSING	-	-	-	50,000.00	-	-	50,000.00
SUNNYSIDE	-	120,000.	-	-	-	-	120,000.00
TRITON-JIM'S COVE-CARD'S HARBOUR	-	-	-	-	-	55,000.	55,000.00
UPPER ISLAND COVE	-	-	225,000.	-	-	-	225,000.00
WESLEYVILLE	-	-	60,000.	-	-	-	60,000.00
WOODY POINT	-	-	-	80,000.	-	-	80,000.00
	\$136,000.	\$5,130,000.	\$1,725,000.	\$1,892,000.	\$2,767,000.	\$1,530,000.	\$13,180,000.00

DEC 17 1975

QUESTION 450

What new sewer systems were placed in the Province in each of the financial years 1970-75, and the capital cost of each?

450

<u>NEW SEWER SYSTEMS (1970-1975)</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
BRIGUS	-	-	-	-	-	300,000.	300,000.
CATALINA	-	-	-	-	400,000.	-	400,000.
CLARKE'S BEACH	-	-	-	-	100,000.	-	100,000.
CROW HEAD	-	-	25,000.	-	-	-	25,000.
DEER LAKE	-	-	360,000.	-	-	-	360,000.
ENGLEE	-	-	-	-	65,000.	-	65,000.
MILLERTOWN	-	50,000.	-	-	240,000.	-	290,000.
PASADENA	-	-	-	-	-	500,000.	500,000.
PETERVIEW	-	-	-	50,000.	-	-	50,000.
ROBERT'S ARM	-	-	-	-	-	475,000.	475,000.
ST. BERNARD'S	-	-	-	-	250,000.	-	250,000.
ST. MARY'S	-	55,000.	-	-	-	-	55,000.
UPPER ISLAND COVE	45,000.	50,000.	-	-	400,000.	330,000.	825,000.
	<u>\$45,000.</u>	<u>\$155,000.</u>	<u>\$385,000.</u>	<u>\$50,000.</u>	<u>\$1,455,000.</u>	<u>\$1,605,000.</u>	<u>\$3,695,000.</u>



DEC 17 1975

QUESTION 451 What new water-and-sewer systems were placed  
in the Province in each of the financial years  
1970-75, and the capital cost of each?

451 NEW WATER & SEWER SYSTEMS (1970-1975)

<u>MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>1970</u> \$	<u>1971</u> \$	<u>1972</u> \$	<u>1973</u> \$	<u>1974</u> \$	<u>1975</u> \$	<u>TOTAL</u> \$
APPLETON	-	-	-	400,000.	-	440,000.	840,000.
BAIE VERTE	-	229,000.	-	-	297,000.	-	526,000.
BAY ROBERTS	-	3,000,000.	-	-	2,500,000.	-	5,500,000.
BISHOP FALLS	-	-	-	50,000.	-	-	50,000.
BONAVISTA	-	700,000.	325,000.	1,000,000.	1,000,000.	1,000,000.	4,025,000.
BOTWOOD	-	275,000.	130,000.	50,000.	100,000.	-	555,000.
CARBONEAR	-	-	363,000.	200,000.	-	-	563,000.
CAPE ST. GEORGE-PETIT JARDIN	-	-	-	-	-	250,000.	250,000.
CATALINA	-	500,000.	-	770,000.	-	125,000.	1,395,000.
CHANNEL	-	125,000.	-	-	-	-	125,000.
COX'S COVE	-	-	-	-	-	341,000.	341,000.
CLARENVILLE	500,000.	-	-	750,000.	1,000,000.	700,000.	2,950,000.
CORNER BROOK	300,000.	1,000,000.	500,000.	200,000.	400,000.	165,000.	2,565,000.
DEER LAKE	300,000.	-	-	135,000.	-	-	435,000.
DOVER	-	-	-	-	-	350,000.	350,000.
DUNVILLE	-	125,000.	70,000.	-	-	-	195,000.

451 NEW WATER & SEWER SYSTEMS (1970-1975) (Cont'd)

<u>MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ENGLEE	-	500,000.	-	-	-	-	500,000.
FLEUR DE LYS	-	300,000.	115,000.	170,000.	200,000.	120,000.	905,000.
GILLAMS	-	-	-	-	-	100,000.	100,000.
GRAND BANK	150,000.	-	-	-	-	-	150,000.
GRAND FALLS	-	-	-	80,000.	-	2,000,000.	2,080,000.
HAMPDEN	-	-	-	-	-	40,000.	40,000.
HAPPY VALLEY	75,000.	-	-	-	-	-	75,000.
HARBOUR BRETON	70,000.	-	-	-	-	-	70,000.
HARBOUR GRACE	-	-	312,000.	440,000.	-	-	752,000.
HARE BAY	-	450,000.	600,000.	408,000.	-	-	1,458,000.
HAWKES BAY	-	-	-	-	-	200,000.	200,000.
HEART'S DELIGHT	-	-	-	-	-	600,000.	600,000.
HEART'S DESIRE	-	-	-	300,000.	-	-	300,000.
HOLYROOD	-	-	-	300,000.	-	-	300,000.
INDIAN BAY	-	-	-	-	200,000.	65,000.	265,000.

451 NEW WATER & SEWER SYSTEMS (1970-1975) (Cont'd)

<u>MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
LAWN	-	300,000.	250,000.	-	-	-	550,000.
LITTLE CATALINA	-	-	-	-	300,000.	-	300,000.
LOURDES	-	-	-	-	-	150,000.	150,000.
LUMSDEN	-	315,000.	500,000.	150,000.	-	-	965,000.
JERSEYSIDE	120,000.	-	-	-	-	-	120,000.
McIVERS	-	-	-	-	-	100,000.	100,000.
MILLTOWN-HEAD OF BAY D'ESPOIR	-	300,000.	1,000,000.	-	-	-	1,300,000.
MOUNT MORIAH	-	-	300,000.	-	-	-	300,000.
MOUNT PEARL	-	150,000.	-	-	-	-	150,000.
MUSGRAVE HARBOUR-DOTING COVE	300,000.	325,000.	325,000.	500,000.	-	-	1,450,000.
NEW PERLICAN	-	-	-	120,000.	90,000.	-	210,000.
NORRIS ARM	-	-	-	-	2,200,000.	-	2,200,000.
OLD PERLICAN	-	-	-	-	300,000.	200,000.	500,000.
PETTY HARBOUR-MADDOX COVE	-	-	-	-	-	625,000.	625,000.
PLACENTIA	-	-	-	1,100,000.	-	-	1,100,000.
PORT BLANDFORD	-	-	-	-	200,000.	200,000.	400,000.
PORT SAUNDERS	-	-	40,000.	-	-	-	40,000.
POINT LEAMINGTON	-	-	-	-	-	250,000.	250,000.
PORT UNION	-	300,000.	-	400,000.	250,000	100,000.	1,050,000.

451 NEW WATER & SEWER SYSTEMS (1970-1975) (Cont'd)

<u>MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
RAMEA	-	625,000.	-	-	-	-	625,000.
RED HARBOUR	-	135,000.	-	-	-	-	135,000.
ROBERT'S ARM	-	-	-	-	400,000.	-	400,000.
RODDICKTON	743,000.	-	-	200,000.	250,000.	370,000.	1,563,000.
ROSE BLANCHE	-	-	-	-	-	625,000.	625,000.
RUSHOON	-	50,000.	-	-	-	-	50,000.
ST. ALBAN'S	-	400,000.	450,000.	100,000.	320,000.	-	1,270,000.
ST. ANTHONY	-	-	-	-	100,000.	-	100,000.
ST. GEORGE'S	-	-	-	2,800,000.	-	-	2,800,000.
ST. JOHN'S METROPOLITAN AREA BRD.	-	765,000.	-	-	250,000.	250,000.	1,265,000.
SEAL COVE, W.B.	-	400,000.	-	150,000.	-	-	550,000.
SOUTHERN HARBOUR	-	-	-	-	920,000.	-	920,000.
ST. VINCENT'S	-	-	-	-	-	370,000.	370,000.
SPANIARDS BAY	-	750,000.	-	600,000.	-	240,000.	1,590,000.
SPRINGDALE	-	-	-	100,000.	-	-	100,000.
STEPHENVILLE	-	231,000.	100,000.	-	-	-	331,000.
TERRENCEVILLE	-	-	-	-	550,000.	400,000.	950,000.
TREPASSEY	-	730,000.	-	-	-	-	730,000.
TRINITY, B.B.	-	-	-	-	-	300,000.	300,000.

451 NEW WATER & SEWER SYSTEMS (1970-1975) (Cont'd)

<u>MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
TRITON-JIM'S COVE-CARD'S HARBOUR	-	-	-	-	1,815,000.	-	1,815,000.
TWILLINGATE	860,000.	-	90,000.	100,000.	-	-	1,050,000.
VICTORIA	-	-	-	500,000.	2,330,000.	-	2,830,000.
WABANA	150,000.	-	-	-	-	-	150,000.
WAREHAM	-	180,000.	200,000.	-	-	-	380,000.
WESLEYVILLE	200,000.	-	-	50,000.	120,000.	100,000.	470,000.
WHITBOURNE	-	900,000.	93,000.	-	-	-	993,000.
	<u>\$3,768,000.</u>	<u>\$14,060,000.</u>	<u>\$5,763,000.</u>	<u>\$12,123,000.</u>	<u>\$16,092,000.</u>	<u>\$10,776,000.</u>	<u>\$62,582,000.</u>

DEC 17 1975

QUESTION 473 A list of water, sewerage, or water-and-sewerage contracts that have been let; the amount of the contract in each case, that have not as yet been completed; how much money will be required to complete them.

TOWN	CONTRACT	CONTRACTOR & CONTRACT VALUE	CONTRACT AWARD DATE
Grand Falls	Regional Water. Contract "A"	Adams Construction \$336,235.00	Aug./75
Grand Falls	Regional Water Contract "B"	Dart Construction \$623,840.00	Aug./75
Grand Falls	Regional Water Contract "C"	Dart Construction \$390,868.00	Aug./75
Grand Falls	Regional Water Materials	Stanton Pipes c/o Heap & Partners \$1,004,702.00	July/75
Grand Falls	Regional Water Materials	Smith Stockley	July/75
Grand Falls	Water & Sewer Ext. Materials	Crane Supply \$51,575.00	Aug./75
Grand Falls	Water & Sewer Ext. Materials	Arnico Canada Ltd. \$84,343.00	Aug./75
Grand Falls	Water & Sewer Ext.	Dart Construction \$384,456.00	Oct. 8/75
Basie Verte	Newtown	Hewlett Services \$240,450.00	July 30/75
Lewisporte	Auxiliary Watermain	Notre Dame Const. \$74,240.00	April 14/75
Point Leamington	Water & Sewer Phase I	Stockley & Burry \$164,486.00	July 28/75
Burin (DREE)	Burin Services Contract # 5	Ken White Ltd. \$491,965.00	March 27/75



TOWN	CONTRACT	CONTRACTOR & CONTRACT VALUE	CONTRACT AWARD DATE
Burin (DREE)	Burin Bay Arm Salt Pond Water Services	Babb Construction \$67,110.00	March 2/75
Burin (DREE)	Burin Sideroad Services S.L.S. & Force Main	Finns Paving & Excavating \$110,875	March 2/75
Bonavista	W & S Phase III Contract I	Short's Construction Ltd. \$422,900.00	July/75
Bonavista	Supply Materials Phase III Part A.	Heap & Partners \$113,019.84	
Bonavista	Part B	Crane Supply \$45,604.42	
Bonavista	Part C	Crane Supply \$52,713.82	
Bonavista	Phase 4 Contract I	Short's Construction Ltd. \$148,977.00	Oct: 7/75
Terrenceville	Water & Sewer	M & M Engineering \$961,745.00	July 29/75
Channel - Port Aux Basques	Watershed Ext.	Pelley Enterprises \$152,480.00	July 23/75
Freshwater, PB	Water System Improvement to Storage tank.	M & M Engineering \$236,380.00	July 23/75

TOWN	CONTRACT	CONTRACTOR & CONTRACT VALUE	CONTRACT AWARD DATE
Isle Aux Morts	Water Ext. # 2	Avalon Construction \$259,485.00	Aug. 15/75
St. Alban's	Sewage Treatment Plant	Industrial Systems \$129,703.00	
St. Alban's	Sewerage Lift Station	Flygt Canada Ltd. \$43,500.00	Aug. 11/75
Rocky Hr. (Gros Morne Prov. Authority)	Sewage Treatment Plant	Ken White Ltd. \$326,219.00	
Norris Pt. (Gros Morne Prov. Authority)	Norris Pt. Land Assembly	Adams Construction \$237,729.00	
Cow Head	Municipal Services Contract # 2	M & M Engineering \$237,560.00	
Rocky Hr.	Phase I Street & Services	Dart Construction \$441,129.00	
Clareville	Supply of Water & Sewer Pipe Contract A	A. Heap & Partners \$72,681.84	July/75
Clareville	Contract B	B. Crane \$15,642.72	July/75
Clareville	Contract C	C. Crane \$16,405.52	July/75
Clareville	Water & Sewer Phase IV Contract I	Len Singleton Ltd. \$219,524.00	Aug. 26/75
Clareville	Water & Sewer Phase IV Contract II	Len Singleton Ltd. \$109,107.40	Aug. 5/75

TOWN	CONTRACT	CONTRACTOR & CONTRACT VALUE	CONTRACT AWARD DATE
St. John's	Regional Water Contract 2	McNamara \$1,988,690.45	July 30/75
St. John's	Regional Water Contract 3	C. Kavino Bros. Construction Co. \$1,438,635.00	July 30/75
St. John's	Regional Water Contract M2	Don Benson \$193,239.11	July/75
St. John's	Regional Water Materials	Canron \$3,220,703.90	Fall/74
Victoria	Water & Sewer	Lundrigan's \$853,678.00	May/75
South Brook, Hall's Bay	Water System	Pelley Enterprises \$156,940.00	Aug. 26/75
<del>Bonavista</del>	<del>Paving</del>	<del>Viking Construction \$242,625.00</del>	<del>Aug. 27/75</del>
Old Perlican	W & S Contract II	Southern Construction \$169,773.75	Aug. 26/75
Trout River	Water Supply & San. Sewer	Viking Construction \$1,399,397.20	Aug. 1/75
Brigus	Sewerage System	Grant Engineering \$406,575.00	Sept. 8/75

CONTRACTS AWARDED SINCE DEC. 3, 1974

APPENDIX V

TOWN	CONTRACT	CONTRACTOR & CONTRACT VALUE	CONTRACT AWARD DATE
Spaniard's Bay	Contract # 5	Lundrigan's Ltd. \$213,140.35	Sept. 8/75
<del>Harbour Grace</del>	<del>Street Paving</del>	<del>Finn's Paving \$173,831.10</del>	<del>Sept. 9/75</del>
Dover	W & S Contract # 1	Avalon \$214,356.00	Sept. 15/75
Upper Island Cove	W & S	Babb Construction \$207,961.00	Sept. 15/75
Clovertown	W & S	Keans Sand & Gravel \$264,213.05	Sept. 15/75
Gander	Water Supply Main	Viking Construction \$447,621.81	Sept. 24/74
Rocky Harbour	Street Services Phase 2	Dart Construction \$441,000.00	June
Cow Head	S.T.P.	M & M Engineering \$83,000.00	
Pasadena	Sewer System	Town Council Forces \$500,000.00	
Parkers Cove	Water System	Town Council Forces \$78,000.00	
Shoal Harbour	Water System Phase 1	Lapa Sand & Gravel Ltd. L. C. Excavating \$20,000.00	Sept. 1975

TOWN	CONTRACT	CONTRACTOR & CONTRACT VALUE	CONTRACT AWARD DATE
Catalina	W & S	Town Forces \$125,000.00	
<del>Conception Bay South</del>	<del>Paving &amp; Excavating</del>	<del>Modern Paving \$250,000.00</del>	<del>Complete</del>
<del>Deer Lake</del>	<del>Paving &amp; Reconstruct ion</del>	<del>Western Construction \$150,000.00</del>	<del>Complete</del>
<del>Coude</del>	<del>Paving</del>	<del>Modern Paving \$170,000.00</del>	<del>Complete</del>
Hampden	Water & Sewer		No tenders received
Hant's Hr.	Water System	Town Forces \$200,000.00	Project Management
Indian Bay	W. & S. Continuation	Town Forces \$65,000.00	
Lourdes	Water & Partial Sewer	Town Forces \$150,000.00	
Marystown	Water System Creston North	Town Forces \$100,000.00	Project Management
Mount Moriah	W & S Continuation	Town Forces \$400,000.00	
Nipper's Hr.	Water System Continuation	Town Forces \$50,000.00	Project Management
Port Au Port West - Aguathuna	Water System Continuation	Town Forces \$100,000.00	Project Management

TOWN	CONTRACT	CONTRACTOR & CONTRACT VALUE	CONTRACT AWARD DATE
Port Blandford	Water & Sewer Continuation	Town Forces \$200,000.00	Project Management
Port Union	W & S Continuation	Town Forces \$100,000.00	Project Management
Roddickton	W & S Continuation	Town Forces \$370,000.00	Project Management
Rushoon	Water System	Town Forces \$100,000.00	Project Management
Triton-Jim's Cove-Card's Harbour	Water System Continuation	Babb Construction \$55,000.00	
Triton-Jim's Cove-Card's Harbour	Card's Hr. Island Water System	Babb Construction \$95,000.00	
Fleur de Lys	W & S Continuation	Town Forces \$120,000.00	Project Management
<del>Colliers</del>	<del>Paving</del>	<del>McNamara \$175,000.00</del>	<del>Early October</del>
Appleton	Pumphouse, intake & associated works	M & M Engineering \$269,500.00	Oct. 10/79
Robert's Arm	Sanitary Sewer Phase II	Jones Construction \$292,925.00	Oct. 8/75
Trinity	W & S Contract I	Babb Construction \$240,819.00	Oct. 8/75

TOWN	CONTRACT	CONTRACTOR & CONTRACT VALUE	CONTRACT AWARD DATE
<del>Paradise</del>	<del>Street Paving</del>	<del>City Paving \$64,100.00</del>	<del>Oct.</del>
Placentia	Water Feed Main	Metro Engineering \$119,597.00	Sept. 25/75
Petty Hr, - Maddox Cove	Water & Partial Sewer	Southern Construction \$308,880.00	Oct. 7/75
<del>Clareville</del>	<del>Street Paving</del>	<del>Viking Construction \$215,220.00</del>	<del>Oct. 8/75</del>
<del>Mount Pearl</del>	<del>Street Paving</del>	<del>City Paving</del>	
<del>Grand Falls</del>	<del>Street Paving</del>	<del>Pannecon \$245,370.00</del>	<del>June 1975</del>
<del>Grand Falls</del>	<del>Street Paving</del>	<del>A. G. Hunt</del>	<del>August 1975</del>
Cape St. George	Water & Partial Sewer	Town Forces \$250,000.00	project management
St. Bernard's	Water & Sewer	Town Forces \$250,000.00	project management.
Hawke's Bay	Water & Sewer Improvements	Town Forces \$200,000.00	project management
Heart's Delight Islington	Water & Partial Sewer	Town Forces \$600,000.00	project management

CONTRACTS AWARDED SINCE DEC. 3, 1974

APPENDIX V

PAGE 9

TOWN	CONTRACT	CONTRACTOR & CONTRACT VALUE	CONTRACT AWARD DATE
Cox's Cove	W & S New	Town Forces \$341,000.00	Project Management
Cillian's	W & S New	Town Forces \$100,000.00	Project Management
Grand Le Pierre	Water Supply Improvement	Town Forces \$60,000.00	Project Management
<del>Ile Aux Herbes</del>	<del>Paving</del>		
<del>Marystown</del>	<del>Paving</del>	<del>Pennecon</del>	<del>Completed</del>
McIvers	W & S (New)	Town Forces \$100,000.00	Project Management
	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$ 25,927,289.34</i>	



level crossings.

Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Transportation and  
Communication for a statement showing for each financial year  
1970 to date, the total expenditure of DREE money on building or  
rebuilding or paving highways in this Province.

Q414

ANSWER TO QUESTION #419 ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR TWILLIGATE  
DIRECTED TO THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND  
COMMUNICATIONS APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER OF NOVEMBER 24, 1975

DREE

1970 - 1971	\$13,060,529*
1971 - 1972	\$23,718,697*
1972 - 1973	\$28,265,578*
1973 - 1974	\$18,034,119*
1974 - 1975	\$20,414,116
1975 - 1976 (to 30 November, 1975)	\$16,913,885

\*included in Public Accounts under head XX

DEC 17 1975

Question No. 8, Order Paper November 24, 1975

Honourable Mr. Smallwood (Twillingate): To ask the Honourable Premier to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

How many persons are on the staff of the Premier's Office; their total combined annual salaries?

Answer: There are at present twenty-one persons on the staff of the Premier's Office. Their total combined annual salaries is \$258,550.

DEC 17 1975

Question No. 11, Order Paper November 24, 1975

Honourable Mr. Smallwood (Twillingate): .To ask the Honourable Premier to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What is the present status of the project to build a pulp and paper mill at Come By Chance?

Answer: At the moment there are no plans to build a pulp and paper mill at Come By Chance.

DEC 17 1975

Question No. 19, Order Paper November 24, 1975

Honourable Mr. Smallwood (Twillingate): To ask the Honourable Premier to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

For a statement showing the numbers of persons coming into Newfoundland as settlers (including returning Newfoundlanders) and the numbers of persons who left Newfoundland to reside elsewhere in each financial year 1970-75.

Answer:

Immigration, Emigration, Net Interprovincial and Net Migration  
1971-72 to 1974-75 for Newfoundland

	<u>Immigration</u>	<u>Emigration</u>	<u>Net Interprovincial</u>	<u>Net Migration</u>
1971-72	756	3,500	±1,200	-1,500
1972-73	743	2,700	- 200	-2,200
1973-74	1,114	2,700	-2,600	-4,200
1974-75	996	2,200	± 700	- 500

Source: Unpublished Data, Population Estimates and Projections Division, Statistics Canada

01.0 17 1975

Question No. 20, Order Paper November 24, 1975

Honourable Mr. Smallwood (Twillingate): To ask the Honourable Premier to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Whether there are statistics of alcoholism in the Province; if so to table them.

Answer: A study of this problem is presently underway and the results should be available early in the New Year. At the present time preliminary estimates indicate approximately 2% or 10,000 people. This figure will be verified when the results of the study are made available.

UFC 17197

Question No. 21, Order Paper November 24, 1975

Honourable Mr. Smallwood (Twillingate): To ask the Honourable Premier to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

For the names of all persons in the Office of the Premier who are engaged in Public Relations, and their salaries.

Answer: Mr. Gerald Korbai, the Premier's Press Secretary, is the only person in the Premier's Office engaged in Public Relations. His present salary is \$21,660.

DEC 17 1975

QUESTION NO. 29 - ON ORDER PAPER OF NOVEMBER 24th, 1975

ASKED BY: Honourable J.R. Smallwood

ASKED OF: Honourable the Premier

LIST THE NUMBER AND TOTAL PRICE OF BOOKS ADDED TO THE LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY IN EACH FINANCIAL YEAR 1970-75

FINANCIAL YEAR	NUMBER OF BOOKS	COST
1970-71	48	\$ 803.30
1971-72	69	884.22
1972-73	72	972.14
1973-74	117	1,227.43
1974-75	178	2,261.74



DEC 1 1975

Question No. 41, Order Paper November 24, 1975.

Honourable Mr. Smallwood (Twillingate): To ask the Honourable Premier to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

List the names of all persons who travelled on the Government plane, other than Ministers, civil servants or patients for medical treatment and their attendants in each financial year 1970-75.

Answer: The Director of Air Services advises that on instructions from the former Premier, a manifest of passengers travelling on the Government aircraft was not kept. The only records that are kept are the names of those requisitioning the aircraft and the number of passengers on each flight.

Question No. 47 - Honourable Mr. Smallwood (Twillingate)-  
To ask the Honourable Premier to lay upon  
the Table of the House the following  
information:

Describe briefly the availability or  
unavailability of land at the City of  
Wabush and at Labrador City for public  
or private housing.

Answer - Labrador City - The availability of land at that  
place for private housing is a matter between any  
prospective private builder and the Iron Ore Company  
of Canada.  
In the matter of land for public housing, Newfoundland  
and Labrador Housing Corporation has completed  
negotiation with the Company for land to accommodate  
141 units. Design of the units is complete. Pre-tender  
notices for the 141 units have already been published  
in the press.

Wabush - The availability of land for private housing  
is a matter between any prospective builder and the  
mining company at that place.  
Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation has done  
preliminary planning and preliminary negotiation for  
272 acres of residential land of which 80 acres will  
shortly be transferred to NLHC for servicing. The 80  
acres on which design is complete, will provide  
serviced lands for up to 270 units and will be  
available for public or private housing. Pre-tender  
notices have been published in the press for the  
servicing of the 80 acre project.

December 12, 1975

DEC 17 1975

#372

HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

Table a statement shwoing the incidence of Cancer in Newfoundland in each of the financial years 1970-75.

ANSWER:

Information is available only for  
calendar years

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>NUMBER OF NEW CASES</u>		<u>TOTALS</u>
	<u>MALE</u>	<u>FEMALE</u>	
1970	688	470	1158
1971	649	455	1104
1972	707	551	1258
1973	680	603	1283
1974	711	598	1309
1975	Not yet available.		

DEF 17 1/2

HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

A statement showing the numbers of graduates of the Medical College of Memorial University; where are all of these graduates at present, at what are they engaged?

ANSWER:

Graduating Class 1973 - 23

General Practice in St. John's.	2
General Practice outside St. John's.	9
Residency Program in St. John's.	1
General Practice outside Newfoundland.	3
Residency Program outside Newfoundland.	7
Unknown.	<u>1</u>
	<u>23</u>

Graduating Class 1974 - 41

General Practice in St. John's	2
General Practice outside St. John's.	16
Residency Program in St. John's	5
General Practice outside Newfoundland	1
Residency Program outside Newfoundland	14
Unknown	<u>3</u>
	<u>41</u>

Graduating Class 1975 - 52

All are in Internships - approximately one half in Newfoundland

#374

DEC 17 1975

HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

The number of deaths from heart failure in each of the financial years 1970-75.

ANSWER:

1970	1,049
1971	985
1972	1,001
1973	1,113
1974	Not yet available
1975	Not yet available

DEC 17 1975

#378

HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

Are there any medical students studying abroad at Newfoundland Government expense, the number, where, and why the Government defrays any part of their expenses for such study?

ANSWER:

There are no medical students studying abroad at Newfoundland Government expense.

DEC 17 1975

#380

HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillington) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

A statement showing the various estimates made from time to time of the capital cost of the new hospital at Twillingate; and the latest estimate of the probable cost to completion, including furnishing, equipping, etc.

ANSWER:

September, 1971	\$4,500,000 (based on preliminary plans only)
September, 1972	\$5,400,000
March, 1974	\$7,000,000
March, 1975	\$7,300,000
Cost to complete	\$7,500,000

DEC 17 1973

HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

Table a statement showing the numbers of persons living 70 miles or more from the nearest medical doctor; 50 miles or more; 20 miles or more.

ANSWER:

70 miles or more	425 <sup>1</sup>
50 miles or more	3,400 <sup>1</sup>
20 miles or more	31,000 <sup>1</sup>

1. 1971 population census

The 425 persons 70 miles or more from a doctor are all living in communities in Labrador.



HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Health for an estimate of the grand total contribution that the Government of Canada will have made toward the capital cost of constructing, furnishing and otherwise equipping the new Memorial University hospital.

ANSWER:

The total contribution by Ottawa for the combined hospital-teaching facility will amount to \$35,000,000 consisting of:-

Health Resources Fund	\$30,000,000
Furnishings and equipment shareable under the Hospital Insurance Program	<u>5,000,000</u>
	<u>\$35,000,000</u>

DEC 1 1 1970

HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

What was the infant mortality rate in each of the financial years 1960-70?

ANSWER:

<u>CALENDAR YEAR</u>	<u>RATE PER 1,000 LIVE BIRTHS</u>
1960	36.0
1961	37.7
1962	39.9
1963	38.3
1964	31.1
1965	31.1
1966	28.1
1967	28.6
1968	24.1
1969	21.4
1970	21.8

DEC 17 1975

#397

HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

What is the maternal mortality rate in each of the financial years 1960-75?

ANSWER:

Deaths from maternal causes, and rate per 10,000 live births,  
Newfoundland

Year	Births	Maternal Deaths	Rate
1960 .....	15,173	16	10.6
1961 .....	15,591	11	7.1
1962 .....	15,064	5	3.3
1963 .....	15,443	7	4.5
1964 .....	14,680	6	4.1
1965 .....	14,740	5	3.4
1966 .....	14,084	2	1.4
1967 .....	12,844	3	2.3
1968 .....	12,820	3	2.3
1969 .....	13,000	-	-
1970 .....	12,539	5	4.0
1971 .....	12,767	1	0.8
1972 .....	12,898	2	1.6
1973 .....	11,906	2	1.7
1974 .....		Not yet available.	
1975 .....		Not yet available.	

DEC 17 1975

HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What proportion of the practicing medical doctors in the Province are native born Newfoundlanders?

ANSWER:

The Medical Register for 1975 lists 580 doctors who are fully registrable in the Province and, of these, 162 or 28% are native born Newfoundlanders. There are 117 provisionally registered physicians working in the Province, of whom only one is a Newfoundlander.

DEC 17 1975

HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

What is the full capital cost of constructing and equipping the hospital at Churchill Falls, what financial costs if any were paid for by the Government, and what contribution did the Government make toward the operation of the said hospital?

ANSWER:

Construction and equipment - \$800,000  
Amount paid by Government - 300,000

Government's contribution toward operating costs:

1969	\$ 86,510
1970	85,933
1971	115,903
1972	89,471
1973	83,952
1974	82,461

DEC 17 1975

HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

Table a statement showing the incidence of Tuberculosis in Newfoundland in each of the financial years 1970-75.

ANSWER:

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>NEW CASES TUBERCULOSIS NOTIFIED PER 100,000 POPULATION</u>	<u>REACTIVATED CASES TUBERCULOSIS NOTIFIED per 100,000 POPULATION</u>
1970	45.4	5.6
1971	35.8	6.1
1972	35.2	5.3
1973	30.7	3.3
1974	26.7	3.9
1975	Figures Not Yet Available.	

DEC 17 1975

#408

Honourable Mr. Smallwood (Twillingate) - to ask the Honourable Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

A statement showing the numbers of medical doctors brought into Newfoundland from England, Scotland, Wales, the Republic of Ireland, Northern Ireland and other countries for the total period of 50-75.

ANSWER

The information required to answer this question is not available.

The Newfoundland Medical Board was asked for assistance but they could not provide the details requested. The Registry maintained by the Board records new registrations by Medical School and not by country of origin.

DEC 17 1975

#411

HONOURABLE MR. SMALLWOOD (Twillingate) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

Is the certification of pharmacists in Newfoundland generally accepted by other Provinces as being professionally adequate?

ANSWER:

The certification of pharmacists (educated in Newfoundland) is not generally accepted by other Provinces as being professionally adequate because Newfoundland does not have a basic four year core curriculum. However, a recent study by the Association of Pharmaceutical Faculties of Canada has found the present course of study to be professionally adequate.

The Department of National Health and Welfare does and has employed pharmacists from Newfoundland, and recognizes them to be competent professionally.



DEC 17 1975

MR. NEARY (LaPoile) - To ask the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

- (1) Who are the members of the Board of Governors of the St. John's General Hospital Corporation?
- (2) How many meetings were held by the Board of Governors in the calendar year 1974, and each month this year to date?
- (3) What salaries, wages, or other remuneration are paid to members of said Board?

ANSWER:

- (1) G. Campbell, Eaton, M.C. (Chairman)  
James G. Barnes, B. Comm., M.B.A.  
H.V. Hollett, Esq.  
Mrs. D. House  
Francis P. Duff, M.D., L.M.C.S., F.R.C.S. (C)  
R.D. Moore, Esq.  
John P. Henderson, B. Eng.  
James Templeton, Esq.  
Ian Campbell, B.A.  
Ray Clancy, Esq.  
Lamont, (Lal) Parsons, Esq.  
George Stentaforde, Esq.  
Esau Thomas, Esq.
- (2) In 1974 the Board met on 11 occasions and to date in 1975 there have been 12 meetings. The Executive Committee of the Board meets weekly.
- (3) NIL.

DEC 17 1975

Answer to Question 642 - Order Paper No. 8/75

---

Question should be directed to the  
Municipal Authority.

DEC 5 1978

Answer to Question 643 - Order Paper No. 8/75

---

DEC 5 1978

No study made by this Department

DEC 17 1975

Answer to Question 644 - Order Paper No. 8/75

---

No study made by this Department.

C O N T E N T S

December 17, 1975	Page
<u>PRIVILEGE</u>	
Mr. Crosbie protested news reports in <u>The Evening Telegram</u> of December 17 concerning costs of the Lower Churchill project.	1874
Mr. Neary protested press reports of Mr. J. Rannie's reaction to Mr. Neary's statements in the House concerning the Marystown Shipyard.	1874
<u>ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN</u>	
Answers were tabled to Questions Nos. 83, 84, 120, 121, 122, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 134, 136, 138, 675, 449, 450, 451, 473, 419, 8, 11, 19, 20, 21, 29, 41, 47, 372, 377, 374, 378, 380, 386, 389, 396, 397, 400, 403, 373, 408, 411, 655, 642, 643, and 644.	1876
<u>ORAL QUESTIONS</u>	
Fatal highway accident at Burin. Mr. Neary, Mr. Morgan.	1891
Establishment of a mining school. Mr. Flight, Mr. Crosbie.	1892
Buchans as a superior site. Mr. Flight, Mr. Crosbie.	1893
Development of St. John's harbour. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Morgan.	1894
Barrels in which fish is exported. Mr. Mulrooney, Mr. W. Carter.	1894
Resignation of members of twon councils. Mr. Neary, Mr. Peckford.	1895
Environmental technician at Labrador City and stricter monitoring of dust levels. Mr. Rideout, Mr. Crosbie.	1896
Businesses moving their headquarters from St. John's. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Lundrigan,	1896
Contracts for shaft drilling. Mr. Flight, Mr. Crosbie.	1897
Ownership of the Marystown fish plant. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	1897
Educational programme on industrial diseases at Labrador City. Mr. Rideout, Mr. Collins.	1898
Interest rate on bank loan to purchase CFLCo. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Crosbie.	1899
Airstrips for Burgeo and Port aux Basques. Mr. Neary, Mr. Morgan.	1900
Report on the Registry of Companies and Deeds. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	1900
Course in shipbuilding at Memorial University. Capt. Winsor, Mr. House.	1901
Reids Products plant at Bide's Arm. Mr. Rideout, Mr. Lundrigan.	1901
Public announcement on the situation. Mr. Rideout, Mr. Lundrigan.	1902

C O N T E N T S - 2

<u>ORAL QUESTIONS (continued)</u>	Page
Query as to ministerial awareness of a Southwest Coast prices survey conducted by the CVC, and action contemplated. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Murphy.	1902
Surveys by the minister's department. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Murphy.	1903
Salaries and conditions of employment for those flown to the West Indies to crew the <u>Norma and Gladys</u> . Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	1904
Souvenirs of Newfoundland being made in Japan. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Hickey.	1905
CRTC decision on cablevision for Newfoundland. Mr. White, Mr. Morgan.	1905
Linerboard mill management. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	1906
Fiscal restraint and planned increases in pensions. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	1908
 <u>ORDERS OF THE DAY</u>	
Motion one. (The Gull Island project.)	1908
Mr. Marshall	1908
Mr. Neary	1929
Mr. J. Carter	1949
Mr. White	1955
Adjourned the debate	1966
 <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>	 1966