



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

---

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 41

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1976

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young ): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a point of privilege of the House. My point of privilege, Sir, is that I would like to draw members' attention to the fact that at one minute to midnight tonight Newfoundland will have been a Province of Canada for twenty-seven years, and I want to extend my sincere congratulations to the only living Father of Confederation, who is sitting in the Chamber with us here today on this very fine accomplishment of bringing Newfoundland into Confederation with Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

HON. B. PECKFORD (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement on the government's policy with respect to the provision of subsidized housing in larger communities in the fiscal year 1976-1977. The objective of the subsidized housing programme, as you are no doubt aware, is to provide rental housing for low income families who do not have the financial resources to obtain home ownership. It is an on-going programme operated under a federal-provincial cost-sharing agreement. Units are allocated on the basis of need and rents are geared to the family income. At the present time 2,007 subsidized housing units are under management by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. An additional 500 units are under construction and tenders have been called for a further 141 units for Labrador City. It has been the policy of government to provide subsidized housing in the larger communities in the Province, principally those with a population of 2,500 and over. There are approximately thirty communities in the Province of this size and subsidized housing is in place or under construction in seventeen of them.

Mr. Peckford.

The government intends during the coming year to expand its subsidized housing programme, both in terms of the number of units to be constructed and the number of new communities where units will be placed. In this regard I am pleased to announce that Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation are now calling proposals for the construction of subsidized housing units in the following communities: Deer Lake, ten units; Lewisporte, fifteen; Stephenville, up to fifty units, and Corner Brook, up to fifty units.

It is also planned to call tenders in the near future for an additional fifty units in Corner Brook and up to 150 units in St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD:

Investigations are presently being carried out by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation into the need for subsidized housing in other communities of over 2,500 population. I am hopeful that tenders will be called for subsidized units in St. Anthony, Port aux Basques, and additional units in Windsor as well as other communities during the current year. It is anticipated that contracts for the construction of over 400 subsidized units will be made in 1976.

The Province has received a commitment from the federal government of \$14.5 million for the construction specifically of subsidized housing in the calendar year 1976. This commitment is subject to detail agreement on individual projects. The provincial share of capital costs will equal \$2.56 million. I do not regard the provision of standard subsidized rental housing in communities of less than 2,500 people as a viable housing option at this time. I am hoping therefore to be able to announce a new housing programme for these communities in the very near future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we on this side welcome, of course, the minister's announcement of some of the details of the housing programme which the government hope to put in hand this year. I would just like to make one or two comments on it at this stage according to the rules.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the minister made mention of the fact that the Government of Canada are providing almost all of the money, \$14.5 million out of a total expenditure of just about \$17 million for this programme. I do not know what the percentage is, but that is about six-sevenths - what is that? About 80 or 85 per cent of the money in it. I do not say that because I am particularly happy with what the government of Canada have done. My feeling there is the same as with the government of this Province,

MR. ROBERTS:

they have done much but have not done enough, because housing is one of the great unmet needs in this Province.

I think it also worthy of note, Sir, that in the subsidized housing field, of course, the government continue to incur ongoing costs because the cost of building the unit is only the initial cost and from then on there is an annual subsidy by definition. The subsidy of course varies with the income of the person or the family living in the house. The government of Canada, I believe, share three parts to one in that -

MR. PECKFORD: Seventy-five, twenty-five.

MR. ROBERTS: Seventy-five, twenty-five, three parts to one - I thank the minister - in the subsidy portion of the subsidized housing programme. I think that shows that the government of Canada, Sir, have a concern for housing and I am glad the government of this Province have taken up on that concern. I will give credit where credit is due. I think the minister has shown more initiative than most of his colleagues have. I think that housing is one of the bright spots in an otherwise dismal record by this government generally.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly interested in the plan which the minister mentioned for communities of less than 2,500. This is the great unmet need now because in many of these communities, Sir, adequate servicing is not available, adequate mortgage financing is not available, the conventional programmes do not apply and there is a great gap, and that gap is becoming more evident and more apparent. We hope, Sir, there will be an early announcement. I would hope as well, Sir, we will have the opportunity to debate the housing programme, if we ever get to the estimates of Municipal Affairs and Housing because I think it is one of the areas, Sir, where government have made moves. We will compliment them for them but we think still further moves should be made.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): The hon. Minister for Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. LUNDREICAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all I have to say I did not

MR. LUNDPIGAN:

ever expect to see the day when Your Honour, an Upper Island  
Cover, would be in a position to sit me down when you want to, and  
you have got me right where you wanted me all your lifetime. I  
want to say, in an introduction to my own statement, congratulations  
to Your Honour for, I believe, the first time assuming the  
Chair in this particular capacity.

MR. ROWE: No.

MR. LUNDPIGAN: In this particular capacity right now, as leading  
off the day.

MR. ROWE: Oh, starting off the day.

MR. LUNDPIGAN: Starting off the day and also going into the formal  
aspects of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN: I would like to announce, Your Honour, the results of the forty-fifth meeting of the Rural Development Authority. I believe this is the first time any reference has been made in the House, since I have been here at least, to meetings of the Rural Development Authority. I hope that I can make this a continuation of announcements regarding the Rural Development Authority during the coming year and the next number of years.

The Rural Development Authority, it is a programme started by this government, Your Honour, which enables business -

AN HON. MEMEFFE: It is a giveaway programme.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes, it is a giveaway programme of a sort. It is also a loan programme. But our particular aspect of it is a loan programme to small businesses which are interest free loans up to a maximum of a certain amount of money - \$15,000 we have been using as the maximum - which enables people to get off the ground in small industries, one year forgiveness, five year repayment interest free. It is a small amount of money and it has had a fair measure of success, certainly not to the extent that we are battling a thousand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is it a board of the department?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is a board of the department, Your Honour. Perhaps it is worthwhile just mentioning this in my statement, a small board made up of a number of people that are not associated with the government at all. They are appointed as members of the board, the Rural Development Board. My colleagues in Forestry and Agriculture and Fisheries are members of the board and I chair the board which speaks every two to three to four weeks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Are they non-government employees?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The people on the board are my two colleagues, myself and two outside people on the board itself. The applications and so on are assessed by the departmental staff. In any event, Your Honour, we would like to announce the approval of eleven applications for assistance made yesterday at the forty-fifth meeting of the board. This brings to

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

an amount of over \$5 million that has been made in the last three years by that Authority to approximately - I would guess, but I will announce it when the estimates are here - approximately 1,000 small businesses that have been assisted with the creation of over 3,000 jobs. There were eleven applications yesterday assisted at the meeting. Now this involves fifty-two jobs, seasonal and full time that will be created. I would like to mention some of the businesses: a carpenter shop, for example, a commercial film making operation; a logging operation; some of these were further loans to industries that are very successful and that have started to repay their monies, very successfully have built up their businesses and we are assisting them further. We are trying to harp on and assist people that have proven since the introduction of the programme their ability to succeed and have grown and developed. A sawmill and lumbering manufacturing, a bakery.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Can the minister give them geographically?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: At this stage I could not specify the areas for all of those particular ones. But when the estimates are out we can give each community where the various loans have been made. A motel, a hospitality home, a sawmill and planer mill, pulp harvesting, a furrier operation in Portugal Cove, I believe, and a farm.

MR. J. NOLAN: Will the minister permit a question? You mentioned a motel, for example. Is it the policy to encourage or to put money into a motel? I am thinking that it must cost a fair amount of money, and I am wondering percentage-wise to what extent you might be permitted in that area to help?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman has a discussion with my colleague from Fortune he will get the full details on that particular application.

Now, Your Honour, aside from this particular announcement involving the eleven applications, \$103,000 in total, fifty-two jobs, I would like to make reference to another situation where as a result of our overseas trip several weeks ago we found something which was not to my amazement but



MR. LUNDRIGAN:

certainly - if this is in order, Your Honour, perhaps somebody would like to respond to the first statement I made.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I understand the minister is about to make a separate statement quite apart from this subject. The minister is not listening.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I am listening, yes.

MR. SIMMONS: I say, that is right. This is a separate statement he is about to make. Okay, I would like to respond, Mr. Speaker, first of all on behalf of my colleagues to what the minister has had to say in relation to the R.D.A., the Rural Development Authority. I think the record will show, Mr. Speaker, that this has to be the briefest statement in terms of time lapse or words ever made by a minister in the House of Assembly. I would subject -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will stretch out the next one.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not complaining about the lack of length but the lack of information. I think it is fair to say that the statement just made then is fairly indicative of the amount of information we have been getting on the subject of the Rural Development Authority. I welcome the

Mr. Simmons:

information we have, but I just want to use this-that we have received today, I ought to say, I welcome that information. And I would like to use the opportunity to invite the minister once again to consider making available full information, which after all ought to be public information, there is nothing in the legislation which would require it to be private. It is public funding involved. We are unable on this side of the House to properly do our job in terms of adjudicating whether the money is being well or even properly spent without having access to a description of the kinds of areas in which it is being put, the kinds of areas not only geographically but in terms of job areas and category of occupation, the category of development. And we would like to have that information. We did have it, I must say, the minister's predecessor or one of them, the hon. Jim Reid, as he then was, did make it available to us, and I would hope that the present minister would see reason to follow suit. It is of tremendous help to us in determining our views on the expenditure of these monies which, as I pointed out, are public.

The minister's comment on the make up of the Rural Development Authority, of course, would bear challenging and we will do that at the appropriate time. This is not a time for debate, but his statement that the non government members are not in anyway associated with government, it is one that I would seriously challenge. If the minister means government in its strict sense he is probably right. If he means no association with the P.C. Administration then, of course, he knows full well that he is not telling the full truth when he says that, because the gentlemen concerned, while not government employed, have had a very real, and I would hope valuable association with the P.C. Administration over the past few years. It is not the time to give their names, Mr. Speaker, but I shall in Committee, the Committee of Supply probably.

I am encouraged particularly by the minister's indication that money is being put into motels, at least one motel. This I believe

Mr. Simmons:

is a departure. It is encouraging in that money in a motel is a heck of a lot better than putting money in morgues, and that is what they were doing first, Mr. Speaker. So they have moved from the dead to the living at least. But also, Mr. Speaker, it raises the question of how often you change the rules in this game without referring to the House. And now we hear that a category for which a number of people were turned down previously is now okay, and this is another thing that has bothered me about the authority, that the rules seemed to change with the day or is it with the applicant?

Mr. Speaker, in concluding

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What is that on, motels?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Are you objecting to motels being helped?

MR. SIMMONS: I am not. No, I am not. That is not the issue, Mr. Speaker. The issue is that others have applied and were turned down not because they did not qualify in other terms, but they were told it was not within the terms of reference of the authority. I say now I am glad it is within the terms of reference, but some people require an explanation. Where they the wrong kind of applicant? I hope not.

Mr. Speaker, almost anybody who checks the advertising section of the paper, and I do regularly because I am always cognizant that I should be briefed on what job opportunities are available at any given moment, God knows when a fellow will need one, but I notice at the same time that there are a lot of ads, I would say an unusually large number of ads for the sale of equipment through the Department of Rural Development. And I have checked out some of these ads, and I am told that some of that equipment, a good amount of it, as I am sure the minister will realize is coming -

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

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. House Leader.

MR. WELLS: I think the hon. member has now launched into a general debate on this subject which is contrary to the rules I am replying to ministerial statements.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): I would like to ask the hon. member if he will -

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I submit that I had not launched in a general debate, I was preambing to ask the minister a question, and I will get very quickly to the question. I know the House Leader does not particularly want to hear this stuff, but it is bearing on the point, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of ads in the paper, dozens of them selling tractors, tree harvesters, sawmill equipment. And my question, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. WELLS: That should be asked in the Question Period, Mr. Speaker, that is what the Question Period is for.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I can frame my comments in the form of questions be they rhetoric or otherwise. I am not going to ask the government House Leader how shall I frame my comments in response to a ministerial statement. And I frame them this way; will the minister indicate to the House some time soon whether the preponderance of ads in the papers relating to the sale of equipment through the Department of Rural Development indicates that there are a large number of failures of businesses that have been funded by the Rural Development Authority?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: The answer is, yes. I thought so. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would like -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): to welcome to the galleries a delegation from Labrador South, and I trust their stay in our Assembly will be enjoyable.

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I heard with real happiness the announcement made by the minister and I am sure that every Newfoundlander will be happy when he hears it. If there is one position across the floor that I would envy it is the position that the hon. minister occupies. I would tell the Premier that I would rather be in that job than in his job, Industrial and Rural, and maybe the Premier would too, Industrial and Rural Development.

The minister does not need me to tell him that we have many hundreds of men, or groups of men applying to the government for financial help to start this, that or the other little enterprise, creating one or two or three or four or five or eight jobs. When hundreds do that there are bound to be a good many failures, and he must not be discouraged by that fact, because what we lack in Newfoundland is not so much natural resources, we have a lot of natural resources, perhaps more than most Provinces, more than many provinces anyway, what we do lack is entrepreneurial skill. We have not been at that long enough to have built up a tradition of business skill, of managerial skill, so there are bound to be failures.

If I were the minister I would not be discouraged by that fact and I would not mind any attacks on me for the number of failures unless the percentage rose to be outrageously high, of course. But be prepared for a fairly high incidence of failure in these enterprises. But remember always that every single individual new job created in Newfoundland is a triumph, just as every job lost is a tragedy. Every job created that did not exist before, he who makes two blades of grass to grow where one grew before, he who creates one job that did not exist is a real patriot and a real builder with a creative purpose and a creative mission.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If I talk anymore I will want to go over there and change places with the minister.

MR. CROSBIE: No.

MR. SIMMONS: It is not that simple, is it?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am making another statement. First of all I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that there is sixty-eight hours left in the estimates, that we can spend all -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if the minister is now responding to some comments I made I would like to have the same privilege to rebut and we can get into a general debate, but otherwise I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the thing to do now and the thing which is in order to do is for him to proceed with this second statement without attempting to rebut what I have said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Your Honour, I thought I was responding to a question. The hon. gentleman asked me a question, did he not? He had a five minute preamble. He asked me a question.

AN HON. MEMBER: The answer was yes.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I am suggesting that I will spend the next sixty-eight hours on the estimates, answering questions on the Rural Development Authority and I will defend it for exactly that length of time.

The two members on it, Mr. Archibald from Harbour Grace and Mr. Chris Pratt -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, This is the time for making ministerial statements. The minister is now proceeding to rebut comments I have made. I can read into the record the names of the RDA people. I thought it was not the appropriate time to do it and I refrained from doing so. He is now insisting on rebutting what I have said. He is strictly out of order. The floor was given to him by Mr. Speaker so he could make a second ministerial statement, as I understand it. Now he either does that, Mr. Speaker, or he sits down.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On that point of order Your Honour, that is exactly what I am attempting to do.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! The minister can, when he is making a ministerial statement he can reply to someone from the Opposition, to their comments on that statement.

MR. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. First of all let me say I am very pleased to hear that ruling, and may I also assume from it that we have the same right to reply to what the minister has said.

AN HON. MEMBER: You have a debate now.

MR. SIMMONS: We have a debate now.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): No, you are getting into a debate there now.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, there is no such right of reply and there never has been in Parliament for an Opposition member to reply in some fashion to a comment made by a minister. Now the minister has stood up at the request of the hon. member to answer a question which the hon. member posed. As I said to Your Honour at the time it was out of order and better left for the question period. So then, of course again we get into this mess. The minister has a right to make a statement, Mr. Speaker, which I suggest that he be allowed to make.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I do not have any further comments and I hope that -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, because I think it is an important one and far beyond the conduct of the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) on this occasion. I think the House Leader made a very wise observation when he said that - I think I am quoting him correctly - we had got into this mess, which he meant that a ministerial statement had threatened to give rise to what would have been a mini debate. Mr. Speaker, I mean, the Question Period is another procedure altogether. The rules are quite clear, Sir. A minister, of course, has the right to make a statement. Gentlemen on this side, either leaders of a group or representing the leader of a group, which is the category my friend finds himself in at present, have the right to make a few comments in reply and ask a question or two. The gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) did ask a question. The minister answered it with the simple word, 'yes,' and that should end the matter there. I think my colleague and friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) was quite right, and I think the House Leader would agree with him in saying that there should be no debate. My friend raised the point of order, and made the rhetorical point that if the minister was going to debate, he wanted to, but the minister - and this is really the gist of what I am saying - the minister, Sir, was attempting to launch into a debate. We would love nothing better than to debate the Rural Development Authority, because the government have tried to hide it for the last two or three years. We are not allowed to at this time, Sir, so we will have to wait for the estimates, and we hope that Rural Development will be called early on, and then we will have the chance to expose the great unsavoury situation that exists in that division right now.



MR. LUNDRIGAN: On that same point of order. I wonder would Your Honour rule me out of order so I can get on with my next statement, please.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): I would ask the hon. minister to continue on with his statement.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Thank you. I have been ruled out of order and I can take that kind of stuff, Your Honour. I have now been around the ball game for a few years, and I understand it a bit.

I have a statement to make, Your Honour, on the Evening Telegram which was published in Newfoundland yesterday. The Evening Telegram, if anybody would have seen it, the only discouraging part -

MR. ROBERTS: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. gentleman is an experienced parliamentarian, and I give way to him, but the only way he could raise a statement on the Evening Telegram would be as a matter of privilege, Sir, and that must be raised at the earliest opportunity. The earliest opportunity is the same as the moment taken by the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who made a statement of privilege earlier on, Sir. The practice in this House is of long standing, Sir, that if a member objects to something the paper says about him or does not say about him, he raises it either in debate or he raises it when Your Honour takes the Chair at three o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, on that same point of order. If the hon. member would keep his yap closed and his mind open, he will understand that my statement is a statement quite in order on motions, and I wish to -

MR. ROBERTS: What has happened to the point of order?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: If I might pursue the matter, Your Honour, I think I will get to point -

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): He is speaking on the point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - where the Leader of the Opposition will understand -

MR. ROBERTS: Let us have a ruling on a point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - will understand that this is a legitimate statement on motions and not a question of privilege.

MR. ROBERTS: Let us having a ruling on the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): I think we are getting more or less into debate.

MR. WELLS: If I may, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member had hardly got his mouth open - I do not know nor anybody else what he was going to say. Perhaps Your Honour could listen to what he was going to say and then we can determine if it is in order or not.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): Yes, I would ask the hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development to continue.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes, Sir, the only people who might want to rise on the question of privilege on this particular paper would be the newspaper carriers, because of its bulk, but my statement is a very complimentary one. I wish to announce that as a result of our overseas trip several weeks ago we discovered, not to our amazement, but to our satisfaction that we have a tremendous army of people overseas in the various embassies, Canadian embassies, that are very, very expert in the commercial field on industries within various countries, the countries that they are stationed in, and of course, are familiar and conversant with our own country as a result of their participation overseas, as a result of being born and bred in Canada. And we were really surprised to know how professional and how competent and how knowledgeable some of our people were in various embassies on Newfoundland. It is quite a credit to us to know that over the years we have made that kind of communications. Yesterday Mr. Bob Merner was in from Oslo, and I believe met some people here in the City, and I can mention a dozen other names of commercial attachés and commercial people in various embassies who have done a tremendous job. When we were in South America not too long ago the reception we received

Mr. Lundrigan.

and the knowledge that had been acquired by people who anticipated our coming was very, very comendable. As a result of that we have in Industrial Development tried to take advantage of the expertise and we try to work with the knowledge we have of the Industry, Trade and Commerce and the minister in that department, Mr. Jamieson, to try to have those people, this army of people, put to work in Newfoundland. And yesterday,

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

I want to pay a compliment to The Evening Telegram and also suggest that they might decide on the way to offer their newsmen, their news-boy carriers - I have got two, by the way, ready to go on strike, my two oldest boys - that when they get a bulky paper of this nature they might offer them some kind of an incentive. This was a marvellous paper and I heard people stand up in the House for so many days and make some reference to the press, that I thought that it was about time that we passed on from Industrial Development what we did with yesterday's Evening Telegram. The Telegram had four sections which devoted themselves to the industrial business in the Province, the industrial business review and forecast. In that section almost every aspect of development in the Province was touched on, some negative, some references to negative aspects of our economy which gives it the authenticity that we would like to have in it in sending it overseas.

I have asked my people to send the Telegram along with the package of other materials which we will be sending on a regular basis to some twenty-five or thirty embassies in various countries. This is a marvellous production. I would like to commend whoever is responsible for it. The articles are articles on every aspect of the industry. Some of it is resumé's of activities during the year. Some of these are extracts from activities that have been reported on during the year by various ministers and various public officials, boards of trade and other people. I thought it was an indication of a tremendous work effort on everybody's part. I am sure that the Telegram staff received good co-operation from the departments as I am aware of from my own department and several other ministers. I just wanted to pass along a bouquet, with the permission of the Leader of the Opposition, and hope that his interjection today and his foot and mouth disease will terminate at the end of this session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young): The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to reply to the statement -

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no right of reply.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course there is!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if it was a ministerial statement, which I doubt, Mr. Speaker, which I doubt, but he said it was and I take his word for it, Mr. Speaker. I am still wondering what it is he tried to say but I would like to reply to it anyway. The odds are that I will make no less intelligent a stab at it than he did in making the statement. We will try anyway. I would like to respond to the statement made by the minister about what he has done with the newspaper, and I should like to use this opportunity to say what I have done with it since we are all getting up and telling what we are doing with our newspapers when we are finished with them.

I support his impassioned plea for special bonuses for youngsters who carry more than the sixteen pages on a given day. The minister is really more than ever, Mr. Speaker, onto the job at hand. If he had a couple of more departments we would hardly need a Premier, Mr. Speaker. What an abuse of the item on the agenda called Statements by Ministers. I hope this is the very last, Mr. Speaker, we see of that kind of charade that he just went through then. If he had got nothing more concrete to report to this House as to what his department is doing than the kind of nonsense we just heard from him in the last five minutes, let us hope that is his last ministerial statement, Mr. Speaker. I say that charitably to him and to this House.

MR. ROBERTS: Here is to the one 'Peckford' -

MR. LINDRIGAN: The fact that Your Honour -

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. LINDRIGAN: - I would lock him up and chop him up a little!

MR. ROBERTS: Point of order. Here we go again with the minister, combative as he is, pugnacious as he is, trying to have a debate. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am all for a debate. I am all for a debate, Sir, but I only ask if we are going to have a debate that both sides be allowed to get into it and not just the pugnacious, combative minister, the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young) The ruling on that is a difference of opinion between two members.

I would like to welcome to our galleries a scout group from Vanier School, Ennis Avenue, and their teacher, Mr. Ben Gardner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present, Sir, which while it is not

MR. ROBERTS: numerically the largest petition by far ever presented in this House, and while it may not be the most elegantly worded petition ever presented I believe, Sir, it is the most important ever to be presented in this House and I wish to say a few words in presenting the petition and I believe the Minister of Mines and Energy will say a few words and I would hope other hon. gentlemen do as well, Sir. I think the matter is worthy of comment from a number of members of this House who share what I believe will be our common concern.

The petition, Sir, comes from people who live along the Southern Labrador Coast in the communities between L'Anse-au-Clair, which is the community next to the border between this Province and the Province of Quebec, and the community of Red Bay to the north, the communities along the road. It, I believe, also carries with it the support of people in Port Hope Simpson and the Mary's Harbour, Fox Harbour area, and as well I am told that there is in the mail a petition signed by people at English Point and Forteau, another thirty-eight or forty names to be added to this.

The petition, Sir, is quite simply stated and I will read the words of it. "We as people of Labrador do hereby petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to reconsider the proposal to construct the tunnel from the Newfoundland side of the Straits and proceed with the tunnel as previously planned equally from both sides. If there is not sufficient funds to do this we demand that it be constructed from the Labrador side."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this petition came in to St. John's accompanied by a delegation of ten or eleven or twelve citizens representing councils and development groups in the area concerned, some if not all of whom are in the galleries today. Earlier this day the delegation met, accompanied by the gentleman from Eagle River and myself, met with the Minister of Mines and Energy, accompanied by one or two of his senior officials from the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation,

MR. ROBERTS: the developers of the tunnel project.

The minister will doubtless wish to say a few words on this aspect of it, but let me say that my understanding as a result of the meeting this morning, is that the premise on which the petition is based is not strictly speaking correct. I do not think the government have decided, and this is what the minister told us, to proceed with the tunnel only from the Newfoundland side. The matter is very much under review. I do not want to go into it in detail because my time is limited, but suffice it to say that the government made it clear through the minister this morning that the matter is under review, whether there will be a tunnel built at all this year, whether a start will be made at all this year and if it is to be made whether it will be from both sides of the Straits or simply one side, and if it is one side at present the thought would be to favour the island, the Newfoundland side.

Sir, the point of this petition is that the people in Labrador South, the southern part of Labrador, part now of the district of the Straits of Belle Isle and part of it in the district of Eagle River, very, very strongly and passionately reject that concept. They made their feelings clear this morning. They have asked me to present the petition in the House and I do so with pleasure and with support. Their point is clear, Sir.

The real meaning of the petition though, Mr. Speaker, and I realize I have probably gone beyond the five minutes, but if I might be allowed a second or two more, Sir; the real point of this petition is not just in the construction of a tunnel and whether it starts on the Labrador side or on the Newfoundland side and no matter where it starts both sides will have to be built and it will have to be built from both ends of the tunnel. The real point of the petition of course is the feeling which continues to grow among the people of the Mainland portion of this Province, and which was made clear again this morning,



MR. ROBERTS: a feeling of neglect by the government, and I might add by all governments, it was not confined to the present administration, a very real feeling as to whether the political future of these people of that part of our Province lies within the present political structure.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, the petition is underlain and supported very strongly by that feeling. The feeling is there that, as one member put it, "Why do we always get the short end of the stick?" That is why I support quite strongly the point that if the tunnel can start only from one side I would urge that every possible consideration be given to the suggestion that it start from the Labrador side. The feeling is there, Mr. Speaker. It is real. We cannot ignore it. We cannot pretend it is not there. I believe that as public men and women concerned with the future of this Province we must meet that feeling head on and try our best to deal with it.

I felt the meeting which the delegation had with the Minister of Mines and Energy-and I do not speak for the delegation on this, I have not sounded their views - but I felt it was a productive meeting. The minister heard us out courteously, supplied information, responded to points and questions and I believe is now cognizant of the feeling of the people in that part of the district of the Strait of Belle Isle. I commend the petition to the House, Sir, but in so doing I even more strongly commend the concern which we must all feel with the belief which is spreading and is growing in strength among many people in this Province, that the present political system is not dealing fairly and squarely and properly with their legitimate aspirations. I think, Sir, that is a subject with which each citizen of this Province should be concerned. I am concerned. I believe the minister is concerned. So are my colleagues and I hope every hon. member is. This petition, Sir, is a good way to express that concern.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. CPOSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly glad and I am sure the government is glad to receive the petition the hon. gentleman has presented. There is no question of course that the petitioners and

MR. CROSBIE:

their representatives feel strongly about this matter, particularly since I believe the delegation is nine people from Labrador South, what used to be called Labrador South. -

MR. ROBERTS: Southern Labrador.

MR. CROSBIE: - Southern Labrador - has come through difficult weather conditions to St. John's in connection with this matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I explained to the representatives of the petitioners this morning, the position is that it is the government's intention to proceed, as members of the House know from the statements made last Fall, with the transmission line and the tunnel during this present year. But as I made clear last Fall there are certain matters that have to be agreed and successfully concluded first before we can be sure that this intention will be carried into action this year. That principally involves matters which are under discussion now with the Government of Quebec and Quebec Hydro in connection with securing additional energy and other matters in connection with the whole hydro development of Labrador.

The petitioners heard a report on the Coast that - and they were told - that the government was contemplating or government was going to make a decision in the next couple of days on commencing the tunnel under the Straits by proceeding with the shaft on the Flowers Cove side of the Straits first, with the shaft digging on the Labrador side to be delayed until the following year or delayed indefinitely. But that is not correct, Mr. Speaker, and I have told them that it is not correct. All that is happening is that the engineers and the people in charge of this project are examining various alternatives as to whether they should commence both shafts on each side at the same time, or commence one shaft on one side some six months before they commence the shaft on the other side.

No recommendations have yet been made to government in that connection. When we know for sure that there is no impediment to

MR. CROSBIE:

the whole project proceeding this year there will have to be recommendations made. There are certain technical reasons which might favour commencing the shaft on the Flowers Cove side in the Fall this year, with the shaft on the Labrador side starting some six months later. These are just alternatives that are being looked at. The government has not been asked to make a decision. There has been no report on that. Therefore the matter is not yet before the government.

I certainly understand and appreciate the very strong feelings of the people on the Coast of Labrador, their feeling that if work is to start on one side before the other that it be on the Labrador side. That will certainly be kept in mind. Hopefully work will start on both sides at the same time when it starts. So their representations are certainly being received and will be very carefully considered. When we know exactly what the position is during this year they will be informed just what the situation is. A visit will be made to both sides of the Straits to discuss what the operations are for the coming year and just how they are going to be carried out, if we can go ahead with the project as we planned to go ahead with it. Certainly

Mr. Crosbie:

when it comes time to make any decision on any proposal which may never even be made that one side be started before the other, their views and their concerns will certainly have a big bearing on any decision that is made. As I say, in that sense it is premature, Mr. Speaker, because the matter is not yet before us. And it has to be understood that the engineers and those in charge of the project have to examine all alternatives as to the best way technically and economically and to go ahead with the project.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite familiar with the Labrador side of the Straits of Belle Isle having been there in Summer and also during the Winter on a quick trip. It is a beautiful part of the Province. We realize that the people there want economic activity, and they want the jobs, and they want improved facilities and we are well aware of that, and we hope that is what they are going to get. When we know exactly what our plans are this year and that the project is going ahead, as we hope it will be, as we intend that it should, then we will set up a mechanism for communications with the people on both of the Straits, some formal device, some representation for the people down there who can meet with hydro officials and those in charge of the project from time to time, be kept fully up to date and consulted as to what they think, and what their views are on all of these questions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the delegation and the petitions can be assured, no decision has been made. It is unlikely in my view that any decision would be made that was unfavourable to the point of view they project. If the facts and the figures were such to dictate any decision in that direction we would certainly discuss it fully with them. And we are glad to have them here. We realize their concern and we are doing everything in our power to improve the relationship for the Labrador part of the Province because I am sure that we are all working in this House for the full development of all parts of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by the member for the Straits of Belle Isle, the Leader of the Opposition, in behalf of his constituents in Southern Labrador.

The prayer of the petition, Sir, makes a very, very good point indeed. And unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the delegation that went to such tremendous expense and inconvenience to come down here to the Island of Newfoundland, after listening to the Minister of Mines and Energy today will have to report back to their people that they just do not know whether or not the prayer of the petition is going to be answered. I never heard a minister before, Sir, in my life do such fancy footwork, figure-skating on thin ice, not giving a straight answer. These people came here, travelled here to the Island from the most neglected part of this Province, if there is a part of this Province, Mr. Speaker, that is neglected it is Southern Labrador!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Not Northern Labrador, not the Island of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Southern Labrador, the most neglected part of Newfoundland. And we hear rumbles of separating from the Province of Newfoundland, and so forth and I do not take this serious but these people have come with a legitimate request and they did not get a straight answer, and they are going to have to go back.

MR. CROSBIE: They got a straight answer.

MR. NEARY: They got a minister that did some fancy figure-skating on thin ice.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: They got an honest answer.

MR. NEARY: They did not get an honest answer. They did not get an answer. They have to report back to their people that they do not know whether the prayer of their petition is going to be granted or not. They are entitled to better than that after coming all of the way down here from Southern Labrador this time in the year.

PREMIER MOORES: What would you suggest, a dishonest answer?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I would give them a straight answer.

For the last two weeks in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to pry the information about that tunnel out of the Minister of Mines and Energy, and I have not been able to get a straight answer. We do not know whether it is going to go ahead or not. We do not know where it is going to start. Last Fall it was different, there was no ifs, ands and buts, no strings attached. Last Fall it was going ahead from both ends, and they set off a charge of dynamite down there, and a puff of smoke went up in the air. It was all smoke and no fire. These people deserve better, Sir. No wonder they are getting disgruntled and disillusioned in Labrador. I hope that this cruel attitude that is being displayed by the government in this particular case will soon be put to an end, and within twenty-four hours the minister should give a straight answer.

MR. MURPHY: You are not being honest now.

MR. NEARY: I am being honest, Sir.

Last Fall when we debated it in this House, I supported that tunnel, Sir. There were members on this side that voted against it. I was one of the few members on this side of the House, as a matter of fact I think I was the only one who voted in support of that tunnel and the transmission line,

Mr. Neary.

and I want to see it started. It is the obvious thing to do to link the Island of Newfoundland up with the mainland part of the Province, not because of the development of the Lower Churchill. It is the obvious thing to do anyway if we are going to own and control and develop Labrador. So, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation at all in supporting the prayer of that petition. And in so doing I have to express my disappointment of the attitude of the government - another case of arrogance, Sir, and lack of consideration for people who live in the rural parts of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, in supporting the prayer of the petition - if I can be light-hearted for a moment - there is a joke in Labrador which says the tunnel should start and end in Labrador. If this project goes ahead I support this petition that the work should be shared equally on both sides of the Straits. I understand from the minister that the final decision has not been made to consider the whole future of the tunnel. But if so, I think if there is any preference at all, the preference should be to commence the tunnel on the Labrador side. But, however, certainly the people in expressing themselves this morning stated satisfaction as long as the tunnel started equally, and the work was shared equally on opposite sides of the Straits. If this work is shared equally then I think that we could see a real joining of this Province, the mainland part being joined with the Island part, and the Island part being joined with the mainland part. If this project starts at the Island of Newfoundland side and commences from that side and progresses across then we will feel in Labrador that once again the great milking machine has been snaking across to drain the resources of Labrador. I think this administration has the opportunity now to make a real union of the two separate parts of this Province. I think they have the opportunity, and I support the prayer of the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!



MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman who just sat down said, so I say, if the tunnel is built then it ought to be built in such a way as to give at least equal treatment to both sides of the Strait, at least equal treatment. Now if that tunnel is built it will not be the first such tunnel to be built. A great many tunnels have been built in many parts of the world, not all of them that long, some of them longer. The last time I was in Hong Kong - maybe the Minister of Mines and Energy when he was in Hong Kong went through the tunnel across under the harbour. And in building these tunnels, Sir, it is quite common - happens very frequently - that the tunnel is built simultaneously from two ends towards the middle. I have always marvelled, in my own mind, at the wonderful science, the wonderful exactness, the wonderful precision, of engineers to be able to begin a tunnel under the ocean, under the water and come along miles apart and meet and not be an inch out.

MR. NEARY: They were doing it on Bell Island for years and years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the submarine mines?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

Tunnels, whether under the ocean or not, tunnels under the land - they built one in New York, an underground tunnel, a lot of Newfoundlanders worked on it, hundreds of Newfoundlanders worked on the building of that tunnel. It was a tunnel, I do not know how many miles long, to bring a supply of water down into the great city of New York. That tunnel must have been thirty or forty miles long. And it was so big and high and wide that you could drive trucks through it. It must have been fifty or sixty feet wide and thirty or forty feet high and thirty or forty miles long, and all of it underground, and all of it through solid rock, and that was built in that way. Indeed, Sir, it was built not from two ends but it was built in several sections,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

and engineering science is so good, now as it was then, that you can build them underground you might say in the dark, almost doing it blind, yet section by section can be made to meet exactly within quarter of an inch so that there is no such thing as missing. The minister of course has to say - I must say I cannot blame him for saying - he has to say that he has to be advised by the engineers. Well, if the engineers advise upon that tunnel their advice has to be, it cannot help but be that it should be built from both sides at the one time and meet somewhere in the middle. Now if the tunnel is built the very least we can do is to play it fair and square with both sides of the Straits.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOOPES: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the petition it is most unfortunate when a petition like this comes before the House that any political advantage is tried to be made of condemning one side or the other, like the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) did. But what I can say is that we are totally cognizant of the fact that the need for employment, the need for activity on both sides of the Straits is equally great. Certainly if anything the Labrador side even more so because of the lack of possibility of mobility for employment that to a lesser degree is possible on the Island side of the Straits.

But the principle, Sir, of building the tunnel large enough to not just facilitate the transmission lines, which in fact could take a fairly small tunnel, the fact that it is being designed to hopefully take traffic, not just of commerce but of people, I think, is probably in the long-term more important than bringing the transmission line itself. I think the connection for human transportation, I think the connection whereby the people on the Labrador Coast and the people on the Island side of the Straits can be in communication, I think it is very important.

It is ironic, Sir, that we now have reached a stage where contracts for the excavation, some have been let, some have not for

PREMIER MOORES:

the tunnel. As the Minister of Mines and Energy said we have to await a reply from the engineers before a definitive decision is made, plus other people we are negotiating with, like the Province of Quebec, the Federal Government of Canada and so on. It seems ironic that just a very few years ago this was looked upon almost as an impossible dream.

I know the story that during I guess the 1971 election that I often used and I know other people did as well was a story of the tender being let for the tunnel itself and the lowest bidder was \$200 million except for one gentleman - I think he was from Flowers Cove - who put in a bid for \$40,000.

MR. NEARY: I thought there was no politics?

PREMIER MOORES: This is not politics.

MR. NEARY: I see, that is not politics only when I say it.

PREMIER MOORES: Now, Mr. Speaker, the story is that when the tunnel was bid on for \$40,000 they had to go up and see what this man had in mind. He said, "Well, there are a lot of us not doing much during the Winter and we will dig the tunnel across the Straits!" The guy said, "Well first of all do you realize how long it would take you because if you did not start from the other side you would never get it finished?" The guy said, "Well, if you are in a rush we will go to the other side and get the thing going." He said, "Well, where is your engineer to make sure you meet in the middle?" He said, "Well old man, if we do not meet in the middle I guess you will get two tunnels for the price of one, will you not?" Hopefully, Sir, this one will be more properly planned and we can get job development. I would like also to support the people from the Coast in this regard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, much against my better judgement I rise to support this petition. Now the tunnel across the Strait of Belle Isle is nothing new, since as far back as 1937 a survey

CAPT. WINSOR:

was made to carry it out in connection with the Green Bay port. I do not remember it but I do have some information which was reported on a private and a confidential document dealing with that tunnel. The tunnel at that time was estimated to cost around \$15 million, and it would take three to five years to construct. Of course, with our advancement in technology it would not take that long today if we could afford to do it. But my point is, Mr. Speaker - and I will say so now, and knowing very well that I will be criticized - I would say

CAPT. WINSOR: to the delegation who came here today to meet with the Minister of Mines and Energy that they will not see that tunnel in their lifetime, and let us not fool them. Let us give them the facts, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundland cannot afford that tunnel and unless the federal government enters into the picture and finances the tunnel that Strait of Belle Isle will remain as it is today. So, therefore, Sir, in clear conscience I cannot support the petition in reality knowing that within my lifetime and perhaps within the lifetime of my children that that tunnel will not be built.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I finally got the much talked about and much publicized petition from Clarenville with respect to the hospital, and I beg your leave now to present it on behalf of 3,540, and I added my name so I guess that is 3,541 residents of the area between Bonavista and Arnold's Cove. I might add, Sir, that there are names on the petition from as far away as Burin.

This is far short of the number of names or signatures that the forerunners of this petition had hoped to get. They were hoping to get in the vicinity of 20,000 and as I said there are only 3,540.

The prayer of the petition is, and I will read it to the hon. House of Assembly, "The prayer of the undersigned residents of the Trinity Bay, Clarenville and Bonavista Bay areas showeth that the need for a hospital to serve the whole Bonavista, Clarenville area has been accepted by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. Plans have advanced to the point where a site has been cleared. The government has announced that project would be started in the Spring of 1976." I think what they mean there is the government had announced.

"All the medical doctors in the area have signed the petition calling for an immediate start of construction of the Clarenville Regional Hospital. The health care and social needs of the area have

MR. BRETT: not diminished and to these needs have been added the need for action to lessen the economic shock caused by the close-down of the Come By Chance oil refinery. We therefore pray that the government immediately proceed with the construction of a regional hospital for Clarenville and the petitioners as are duty bound will ever pray."

And then, Mr. Speaker, on the bottom of that petition is another sentence which says, "Printed and circulated by VOCM and CKVO." Now I am very much aware of the rules of the House and that I have to speak to the prayer of the petition. However, even though I know it is professionally and politically unethical to disagree with my colleagues on this side of the House, I am forced to today because I understand, I was not in the Chamber yesterday, but I understand that one of my colleagues did make some remarks to the effect that VOCM should not have been involved in this. They did not take into consideration the financial position of the government and so on and so forth.

I believe very strongly that radio station VOCM, as any station in this Province, have a right to go into the Trinity area of Trinity North, Bonavista South or wherever and to support the people in an effort like this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. BRETT: I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that that particular radio station are good corporate citizens of Clarenville and I am extremely happy that they are there. They have been very helpful to every organization in Clarenville and I have no doubt whatsoever in my mind that they will continue to be and again I say I can only compliment them.

Now I want to make a few more remarks. It is difficult to present a petition like this because I know that there are going to be people, hon. gentlemen over there, who are going to go after my hide the minute I sit down so I am going to have to be partisan. But I, as I said, I signed the petition. I realized that I had to do it before I could present it, and the few remarks that I have to make, as I said, may be

MR. BRETT: a little partisan, I will keep it as low as I can.

Sometime in 1958, I think, I am not sure, I stand to be corrected on the year, but I believe it was 1958 if that was the year of a general election, the previous administration promised not one hospital but two in Clarendville and I suppose I could end it off by saying here now, you know, who are they going to trust after this? But anyway -

AN HON. MEMBER: Two hospitals.

MR. BRETT: Two, not one but two.

AN HON. MEMBER: In the same town.

MR. BRETT: The same town.

MR. MURPHY: Different streets.

MR. BRETT: Different streets. Now obviously, Mr. Speaker, that promise was never fulfilled. I do not know why. I was not in the government. What I know of it at that time there was no scarcity of money. there was plenty of it on the go. But, as I said, the promise was never fulfilled and we were never given a reason as to why it was not.

But I became involved possibly two or three years after that in an exercise identical to this. I was at the time a very active member of the Clarendville Lions Club and we sponsored the petition then to have a hospital built in the area, and we succeeded. Unfortunately we did not have a local radio station to assist us so we had to burn our own gas and use our own time. But we succeeded in getting many more signatures than this.

The petition was forwarded to the administration of the day. I do not know to what department, if it was to the member or to the Department of Health I do not know, but it was forwarded to this building. Whether or not it was ever presented in the House I do not know, but again, I get back to the statement I made just now, no action was ever taken.

Now if I still have the time I will just very briefly give you the

MR. BRETT: history of what has happened as far as this political promise is concerned. In March of 1973 this government decided after consultation with federal officials of the Department of National Health and Welfare in Ottawa to build a regional hospital at Clarendville. I think subsequently that it was decided that there would be two hospitals built, one in Burin and one in Clarendville.

Each year thereafter funds were allocated to do the function of planning which, by the way, has been completed, to do the architectural planning, which has not been started, to prepare the site and in general to get ready for construction.

Now the site work was completed during the Fall of 1975 and I know what people are saying about that. But it was the intention of government to start construction this coming Spring. Now the unfortunate part about it, and it does not give me any pleasure any more than it does anybody else on this side of the House, it does not give me any pleasure to say that we are unable to fulfill our wishes and our desires.

Now I hope the Opposition will not make too much political hay out of it, because as I said both sides have promised it, the only difference is that that side promised two, we only promised one.

MR. MURPHY: Yours is the most recent one.

MR. BRETT: I have to point out.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): I wish to advise the hon. Minister of Energy that his time has expired, unless it is the wish of the House that he continue.

MR. BRETT: I wonder could I have another couple of minutes by leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): By leave.

MR. BRETT: I just wanted to point out, I will probably be a little faster, that we along with the other provinces are finding it necessary to cut back on those services. It is a well known fact



MR. BRETT: by now that we have to close down 200 hospital beds. This is being done in consultation with the Newfoundland Medical Association. Everybody is aware of the fact that the federal government is cutting back on the cost of Medicare and I think it is fair to say that everyone in Newfoundland, the Atlantic Provinces, in fact all across Canada is very much aware that the service departments of governments are taking more and more of our total revenue, and I do believe that the Opposition are equally as concerned as we are to that extent.

Personally I want to see that hospital as much, I suppose more than anybody, if for no other reasons for political reasons, but I am a resident of Clarenville and I know what it is to have to drive to St. John's. But at the same time, as a responsible member of this government, I realize, and I have to go along with my government in this action, if we do not take some firm steps to put the Province on a firm footing then we will not remain solvent. We had to take some very unpopular steps and one of the ones that we had to take was not to continue with the building of these hospitals.

In closing, Mr. Speaker,

MR. BRETT:

let me reiterate that I support the petition, and I trust that the financed position of our Province will improve in the not too distant future so that we can build that hospital.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: Sir, I ask that this petition be placed upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER(Mr. Young): The hon. member for Bale Verte-White Bay.

MR. T. RIDGOUT: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House in support of the petition. I am not rising to go after the hide of the hon. member. We are very pleased that he presented it and we are very pleased and wish to compliment radio station VOXM that they circulated the petition. It is not important who did it. I think the concept of the petition, the idea behind it, is important and we certainly support that.

I think, Mr. Speaker, speaking in support of this petition, that the petition itself brings out the contradiction in government policy with regard to hospitals and hospital expansion that we are now faced with following the budget of only a few days ago. It is very difficult to rationalize how we can embark on a programme of hospital expansion and hospital construction, yet at the same time be able to justify closing down a couple of hundred hospital beds throughout the Province. That to me seems to be a contradiction and I cannot see how it can be justified. If the hospital at Clarendville is necessary, and I am sure it is, if the hospital at Burin is necessary, and I am sure it is, if the hospital expansion at Grand Falls is necessary, and I am sure it is, then how can we cut back a couple of hundred hospital beds and still maintain that as government policy?

Also in supporting this petition I want to note that only a week or a couple of weeks ago, I believe it was, I noted that the medical experts of the Bonavista Peninsula had made their wishes known to the Minister of Health that that hospital was certainly needed for that area. Again, I know

MR. RIDEOUT:

we are in a programme of restraint but we certainly support the hospital, we support the petition and we call upon the government to take it under proper advisement.

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

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, just a word or two in support of the petition. My colleague from Baie Verte-White Bay has said just about everything that needs to be said, but I would just like to rise and support the petition in view of my particular interest in that area over a number of years. The minister did not mention in presenting the petition that of the 3,514 at least a couple were - 3,514? Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: 3,501.

MR. SIMMONS: 3,501. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say that were it not for me he would only have 3,500 names, because he will find that my name is one of the names on that petition. I am very proud to say that that is the case because I support very much the prayer of this petition and the urgent need for a hospital. I take strong exception to what the member from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) had to say last night on this particular subject. I am pleased to hear the minister divorce himself of those comments completely by saying that he commends what VOCM has done. I commend what VOCM has done and it is the kind of community leadership we could do a lot more with in this Province. I am glad to see that one of the media took this initiative and they are to be commended, notwithstanding what the member from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) said last night. I am not one - I do not know why the minister was so apprehensive - I am not one who would want to take the hide off him on this particular matter. I believe he needs all our sympathies over here, Mr. Speaker. He must be in the most awkward position of anybody in that administration at this particular time. My sympathies are with him, and I believe I speak for my colleagues. I do not want to take the hide off him. I want to

MR. SIMMONS:

sympathize, empathize, pity him if necessary, because he has been placed in a most awkward spot. He in good faith told his electorate that this thing was all go. He has to go back and tell them otherwise. I say he needs the sympathy of all concerned. I cannot tell from his comments -and it is not important whether I can tell, but I hope his constituents can tell - I cannot tell for sure whether he supported the petition because, Mr. Speaker,

MR. BRETT: You could not have been listening.

MR. SIMMONS: No, I listened very carefully, Mr. Speaker, and I listened to the explanations and I listened to what happened in 1958. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that if we have the kinds of serious illnesses they have been experiencing out there in some instances in the last few weeks, where people have not quite made it to St. John's in the ambulance, and the minister knows what I am talking about, then the relatives will not be too concerned what happened in 1958. They will not be too concerned about that. But what they will be concerned about is what is being done right now to meet the need. Mr. Speaker, I say I am not sure he supported the petition, because the petition is very pointed as I heard it. The petition says we deserve a hospital now, we need one now. The most I could hear from the minister is that he had rationalized in his own mind

Mr. Simmons.

that a delay could be justified, And I would put it to him that I, as one of the petitioners, and I believe I speak for the other 3,500, do not buy that argument, that we cannot have any further delay on the hospital in Clarendville or the extension in Grand Falls, which particularly affects my own district, the Bay d'Espoir part of it. We cannot have a delay insofar as the Burin hospital is concerned, and I find it a little disappointing today that the member for the district has not seen fit to more enthusiastically align himself with the prayer of the petition he was obliged to rise and support. If he had difficulty supporting it, Mr. Speaker, let him give it to one of us, and we will gladly get up and support prayer of the people who formulated and signed that particular petition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just one final comment. I hope before this item passes, and we move on to another petition or some other item of business, I hope we will hear from the Minister of Health on this, and I would hope that his position is considerably different from that one set out by the member for the area. I would hope that the Minister of Health will be able to say that not only does he support the prayer of the petition but that he is looking for ways to get the thing back on track at the earliest possible opportunity. We support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I take pleasure in being able to say that.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear! Well said.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of the petition in so much as that it affects several communities in my own district, communities without the services of a hospital. Even though they have services of a doctor, they do not have the services of a hospital, and they indeed were looking forward to being provided with this most important service, and I feel compelled to support the minister and will support him in all his efforts in trying to get a hospital for that area, for the Clarendville area. I sympathize with him, as my hon. colleague just mentioned, the situation that he must

Mr. Lush:

be in at the moment having been in a situation of promising the people a hospital and having to renege on that idea. It is unfortunate. He alluded to the fact that they were promised two hospitals before. The situation is, of course, that two wrongs or even three wrongs do not make a right, and once we have raised the hopes, the aspirations and the expectations of people, I think we can all expect as to what will happen once these hopes and dreams and aspirations have been dashed. It is unfortunate, but again I do sympathize with the minister and support the petition and say that he certainly has all of my support in any efforts to try and rectify the situation. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I believe that a big new hospital at Clarenville is badly needed. I do not doubt that for a moment. I am sure it is badly needed, and I am sure also that the big new hospital proposed for the Burin Peninsula is just as badly needed, and that an expansion to the great hospital that we built in Grand Falls is desperately needed now also. And indeed, Sir, as you look about our Province today, you can see so many needs, things that are needed and needed badly and needed, some of them, desperately. The needs are universal. They are everywhere in spite of the fantastic things that have been done in these twenty-seven years ending tonight, in spite of that the fact remains that the needs of the Province are fantastic,

Mr. Smallwood:

and I am very conscious of those needs, but no more conscious than I am at the moment of the fact that we have not got the money to do it. Without building at Clarenville and Grand Falls and the Burin Peninsula, without building the desperately needed new library at the University, without building the residence for the Technical College, without doing this, that and the other thing desperately needed, obviously, admittedly, undeniably needed in Newfoundland, without doing any of that we still are being asked in this House to give the government authority to spend \$1,250,000,000, \$1,250 million. If it were not so tragic it would be sad, it would be humorous, it would be funny, it would be comical that we talking about \$1.25 billions .

So if my friends in Clarenville--and I have dear friends there, I always had dear friends in Clarenville, always did, I hope I always shall-- if my dear friends and other friends and others who are not particularly my friends in and around Clarenville and the whole area to be served by a hospital in Clarenville, if they have to wait a year or two--they say that misery loves company-- there would be so many people in Newfoundland, in so many parts of Newfoundland that have got to wait, whether they like it or not, because there just is not enough money to go around, that they are going to have to wait a year or two or maybe three, if that is the case, well it is too bad. But we have got to be men, we have got to be man enough everyone of us to face the fact that Newfoundland cannot afford to build everything that is desperately needed. Oh we can go ahead and plunge and end bankrupt in a year or two or less than two years.

When the Premier goes there, if he goes next time to New York to raise another \$50 million, and is told by the money lenders, "Well look, you know, we like you, we like the look of you, we like the sound of you, you seem to be a grand fellow, you are in the British tradition, you are a good solid Canadian, but really we do not think you are credit-worthy now for any more money." If he meets that kind of a reception, that is worse than not going ahead with those hospitals this year. Of course, we back the hospital. 'I am with the minister

Mr. Smallwood:

in this. I think, he wants the hospital. He would have to be a little crazy in the head as the member for that constituency if he did not want the hospital, if he is not bitterly disappointed that it cannot go ahead this year. I am with him in both these, I want the hospital, and I am disappointed too that it cannot be done this year. I do not believe it can. I do not believe there is going to be the money for it.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, if I may, just a few words on this.

I notice the hon. member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) suggested that there might be some question as to whether the hon. member from Trinity North (Mr. Brett) was indeed in support of the petition. I can say unequivocally as far as we are concerned on this side of the House, and to the hon. members across the House, to the constituents in Trinity North, and to the people of this Province that there is no doubt that the hon. member from Trinity North supports fully the concept of a hospital, and I am sure that he is bitterly disappointed, as we all are, with things that we have lost during this year. Unfortunately he is not able to get up and speak a second time on a petition, but I sat around when the decisions were made with him, and we sat around at other places and we talked, and I can assure this House and assure the members of the constituency of Trinity North and all other constituencies that the hon. member from Trinity North put in as big a battle for that hospital as anybody, and I think they should feel proud of him.

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In support of the petition let me begin by saying that I think this is the first time in my few years in the House that I have ever heard of a major petition such as this one - it is signed by, what? 3,500 people, of the citizens of the area to be served by the new hospital - it is the first time I have ever seen such a major petition presented that the minister of the department concerned has not responded. I would hope that the Minister of Health will say a few



Mr. Roberts:

words on it. He has a habit of trying to hide behind the curtain of silence, and that may, he feels, serve him well, but, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it serves the House well or the people well, and I submit that it does not serve his colleague the Minister of Social Services, the gentleman from Trinity North very well. I hope the Minister of Health would say a few words.

We have already said we support the petition, and I do not need to say that again. But what I do want to say in supporting it, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a very real issue of public morality raised by this petition. Now I do not know anything about the two hospitals that we are promised to which the gentleman referred. They were not promised while I was Minister of Health. That is all I do know. I

MR. ROBERTS:

do not know what was done when the gentleman from St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) was Minister of Health or the gentleman from Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman) was Minister of Health or the late Dr. James McGrath was Minister of Health. I do not know about that. I know many hospitals were promised and I know that many were built. I know that several were not built. What I do know - and this is the concern which people expressed with this petition - is not just that the promise was made and has not yet been kept - and I will be charitable and put it that way because I believe when the gentleman from Trinity North (Mr. Brett) made the commitment he believed it. I have no doubt at all on that point, Mr. Speaker. I do not think he made the commitment falsely or with any intent to deceive or anything like that. He is not like that.

But how can we square his belief, Sir, and his knowledge, which we accept, with the fact that the government now are talking of cutting back 200 beds? You cannot have both, Mr. Speaker. Either we have sufficient hospital beds in this Province, in which case we do not need to build more, or we do not have sufficient, in which case we do need to build more. The Minister of Health should make this point very clear, Sir. And I serve notice now that if ever we get to his estimates, if ever he has got the political courage to bring his estimates into this Committee, and when we sit in Committee and defend them, that will be the central question, Sir. The government are cutting back hospital beds on one hand and on the other hand they are telling us they are going to build new hospitals. Sir, there can be nothing more inconsistent than that.

In supporting this petition, Mr. Speaker, I hope the people in the area get the hospital because they need it. It is one of the areas where the need is greatest for improved acute care hospital facilities. Clarendville is a central town. It is only, what, an hour and a half, two hours from Bonavista town on one side and a couple of hours from Marystown on the other. It should have priority even over

MR. ROBERTS:

those two hospitals. It is obvious that if the hospital is to be built, Clarendville has a very great need comparable with the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area, comparable with one or two of the medical stations, they call them the public health centers, that should be built throughout this Province.

We very much hope its goes ahead. I can understand why the government have brought in a period of restraint, and we have not been heard to say that the government should ignore the advise and warnings of the financial community. What I do say, Mr. Speaker, and what I say again, is that there is an inconsistency which must be cleared up and only the Minister of Health can clear it up. If it is not cleared up, Sir, if he cannot explain why the government on one hand promise new hospitals, and on the other hand proceed to close six out of every 100 beds that we now have, a total of 200 acute care beds to be closed, then, Sir, the Minister of Health stands convicted of a serious, serious dereliction of duty, Sir, and that should not be tolerated.

So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, the minister will now rise and in supporting this petition, as I believe he would, that he will clear up this unfortunate situation and that he will set the record straight. They cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker.

MP. NEARY: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. I am sorry do you want to speak on that petition.

The member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Another petition, Mr. Speaker.

This is a third or fourth petition, Mr. Speaker, from my district on the same matter of upgrading and improving roads. I might say even though it is the third or the fourth petition, even counting the petition which I shall now present today, that I am talking about less than twenty-five miles of road really.

This petition, Mr. Speaker, which I present on behalf of 191

MR. LUSH:

residents of Canning's Cove, the prayer of this petition is that the government repair, upgrade and pave the road from Musgravetown to Canning's Cove. I will read the petition a little later because I think that there are things in it that need to be said.

The people in my district, Mr. Speaker, have been in the habit of having petitions presented to government, I think, for a number of years, and the hon. Minister of Transportation who represented in the old district of Bonavista South many of the communities in my district presented several of these same petitions. Certainly the one I am presenting today, I think, he presented in this House, a similar petition, a year or so ago. These people are a very persevering people, a very patient people. They have been watching pavement laid down around them, all around them for years and years and hoping that one day that they too will get pavement, that they will get their roads paved.

As I present this

Mr. Lush:

present this petition today, Mr. Speaker, as there is a very volatile situation right now in Canning's Cove, The people there have picketed the road there. They started yesterday morning and went on through until last night and still have their pickets there today protesting the deplorable conditions of the road. But more than protesting the conditions of the road, because I think it is only normal to expect that road to be bad at this time of year even though this year I think they have been a little worse than in other years because of years of neglect and because of the kind of weather that we had this particular Winter, more than protesting the condition of the road I think they are protesting in an effort to get some sort of decision from government as to when they can expect something done to the roads, whether they can expect something done this Summer or in the Fall or next year. It seems as though they never know what will happen. So I think the protest is more of a nature of trying to get some sort of a decision from government.

But, Mr. Speaker, the roads are in a terrible condition. I would like to read what the petition says. It says, "Whereas the two and one-quarter mile stretch of road from Musgravetown to Canning's Cove is very winding and hilly;

"And whereas this section of road has been condemned as to dangerous for the use of school buses;

"And whereas this road is still used to transport pupils from Canning's Cove to the high school in Musgravetown, because they are offered a higher standard of education there;

"And whereas this road is used by all people who travel to and from Canning's Cove, and who take lumber and fish from the community;

"And whereas Canning's Cove is still a growing community as proven by the number of new housing starts in recent years;

"And whereas young people should not be discouraged from building their homes in a rural community because of poor roads;

Mr. Lush:

"And whereas there is an alternate route that could be used to give the community a good and safe road, the voters of Canning's Cove do humbly pray that our hon. Premier and his government will take the necessary action to provide Canning's Cove with a new, standard, paved road that will link it with the paved road in Musgravetown."

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition, and in view of the remarks that I made earlier that the present Minister of Transportation when he was a member, a backbencher, that he presented a similar petition. I do call upon him today to support this petition, and the people of that area are counting on the minister to show or to demonstrate his sincerity by supporting this petition. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Are there any further petitions?

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

HON. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications, one of a number which I have to ask him during the day. But let me begin, Mr. Speaker, by asking him with reference to conditions in the Quirpon area of my constituency, the area North of the communities of St. Lunaire and Griquet, where the minister, I think, knows there have been substantial numbers of people picketing on the roads, picketing over the condition of the roads. Could the minister tell us, Mr. Speaker, where the matter now stands, could he tell us what steps have been taken to correct the situation? Included in that status report could he tell the House, please, Sir, about the tractor in Quirpon, which is 50 per cent of the equipment available to look after the roads in the area, which has been broken down since Friday past and as of half an hour ago was still broken down in Quirpon, although the minister told me yesterday, I have no doubt that he had been so

Mr. Roberts:

informed, the tractor was back in operation. Could he bring us up to date on it, Mr. Speaker, and then we will see where we go from there. It is a very serious situation. It is very aggravating to the people who live in those communities.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

HON. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the situation as of yesterday morning. The situation was then, and it was yesterday afternoon, that the tractor we used in grading the roads in that area was not in working condition. The mechanics in the area were attempting to get the machine working. However, I understand that if the problem still exists with regards to mechanical difficulty on the tractor itself, we would arrange to have a new machine move into the area or a machine from some other part of the district, a machine from the Northern Peninsula be moved to the area today.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on that. I am grateful for the information. Could the minister indicate to the House what further steps can be taken? It is good to know a machine can be moved in to replace a machine that has been out of operation for five or six days. What I am seeking is an assurance, if he will give it to me, Sir, that enough equipment will be moved into the area to open the roads. The children have been out of school for a week. Public feeling, not unexpectedly, runs high and there is very deep concern and a very deep and real feeling that the department are not doing their job. I do not say I share that feeling. I would like to hear what the minister has to say and I ask him if he would give us a commitment that whatever measures are necessary within the means at his disposal - there is a substantial amount of equipment in the area - whatever measures are necessary will be taken to get that road opened. It is under six to eight inches of water now because - I know I am out of order, Mr. Speaker, but if I could be permitted. We had a heavy snowfall and then a thaw and then a frost and now another thaw and the result is the water has not drained off the road. What is needed are machines to go in and ditch the road and allow the water to drain off and then what is left of the roadbed will be there and trucks and buses and cars can go back and forth. Could the minister give me that assurance please, Sir?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I give the assurance to the hon. gentleman the same as I have given to the people today, for example, in Canning's Cove, the people in Markland, the people in Bonavista South district, in the Plate Cove area, the people out in St. Vincent's, to Trepassey, in all sections of the Province where we have a situation where the frost is now coming out of the ground and we are having a really difficult time in keeping the roads in a decent condition. I can give the assurance to the hon. gentleman, the same assurance as I have given the other places around the Province that the Department of Transportation and Communications Maintenance Division is doing everything possible to



MR. MORGAN:

keep these roads serviceable and passable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Yesterday I brought to his attention the problem with the road in St. Phillips. Actually I adjoin districts with the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. P. Winsor), there is split jurisdiction there in some ways. We have a situation on a road there - I know that a number of people called the minister and I might say, if I may, Mr. Speaker, that they received great consideration from the minister from the reports that I have received. I brought the matter to his attention and what happened was, as he has pointed out, we have a road where it just was not possible for people to get there in their cars. They were down in the mud using four-wheel drives trying to get them out. I know what a problem it is this time of the year. I am wondering if he would be good enough, if he could, to give us a report on that situation as of this moment if he has it available.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I assume the hon. gentleman is referring to the Dogberry Hill Road.

MR. NOLAN: Yes.

MR. MORGAN: I did receive inquiries yesterday afternoon and yesterday evening from residents on that road and from the hon. gentleman. Again we are doing everything possible to keep the road passable and today we are trucking gravel and material on the road, and by this afternoon, or by the time the work shift ends today the road should be passable.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South. A supplementary?

MR. NOLAN: I would just like to thank the hon. minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: A question for the Minister of Mines and Energy. Could he tell us the situation concerning the requested funding for the Labrador Resources Advisory Counsel?

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

MR. CROSBIE: This matter is currently before the cabinet. As soon as a decision is made I will make a ministerial statement, that is, if it is favourable, and try to keep it all quiet if it is not.

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

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, on the same subject and first of all a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy. I would would the minister be in a position to indicate to the House what the government's plans are now for the Labrador Resources Development Corporation? The minister will recall that there was a token amount in the budget last year. I am wondering if the government will be taking some initiatives to get this corporation off the ground in the new fiscal year?

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

MR. LUNDPIGAN: Mr. Speaker, at some point in the near future we should be able to make some kind of a statement, a positive statement. I am not sure it will necessarily satisfy the exact letter of the law as far as the corporation is concerned. There might be some modifications, changes, but there will be some response and I would say of a favourable nature.

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

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Health. In relation to the question asked last week about the proposed opening of the Carbonear General Hospital, does the minister have a more definitive answer this week?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: I can say that the new Carbonear Hospital will be opening, and I hope it will be accomplished in a matter of days, certainly weeks. Meetings are now taking place between the officials downstairs and the administrator and the board in Carbonear. So within a few days that should be a reality.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: A question to the hon. Minister of Justice.

In view of the fact that the citizens of Hermitage, Seal Cove, Sandyville, Gaultois are inconvenienced by having to travel approximately eighty miles to attend court, would the minister tell us if he has plans to have court held at Hermitage in future?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I received representation quite recently from the town council of Hermitage asking if accommodation could be - assuming accommodation is available - if the magistrate who normally looks after Harbour Breton, and who is responsible for the Harbour Breton magisterial district, could hold court whenever there are sufficient cases pending. I have asked the magistrate responsible, Magistrate Stone, to let me have a report. It was a dual request. And also the second part of the request from the town council was that I enquire as to whether there could be an increase in the number of patrols from the Harbour Breton detachment of the RCMP, and I am now awaiting reports from both, and as soon as I do the Hermitage Town Council will be advised and the hon. gentleman. I do not think sufficient time has elapsed for me to get the reports in yet.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Tourism. He may not be able to give this information off the top of his head but I wonder would he undertake to indicate - as a word of warning I am back to his pet project called Cabot Group 4 again - I wonder would he undertake to get the following information. I would like to know the total amount of money that was dispersed by government, by his department I ought to say, on behalf of his department, to Cabot Group 4 for each of the last three fiscal years, 1973-1974, 1974-1975 and 1975-1976? I am just looking for a total for each of those years on behalf of his department.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I obviously cannot tell the hon. member. But certainly when my estimates are going through, this information will be available. I will attempt to get it in the meantime, but certainly one way or the other the hon. gentleman is quite welcome to the information.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and it is to ask the minister if he is in a position as this time to give the House a report on recent discussions or negotiations that I believe he held in the last few days concerning the possibility of a home warranty programme for this Province and perhaps for the Atlantic area? And is he in a position now to bring us up-to-date on this situation?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, yes, I am in a position to perhaps be somewhat more definitive than recent reports might indicate. There was a meeting held in Fredericton in the last couple of days between the Ministers of Housing, responsible for housing for the Atlantic Provinces,

Mr. Peckford.

and there were representatives from all the provinces, both as ministers and both from the industry. The industry presented us with a proposal of an industry sponsored home warranty scheme, home warranty and insurance scheme for the Atlantic region, which they would sponsor with no cost from government. Now we have given our approval in principle to the general guidelines as outlined in their proposal, and we have told them that in seven days we shall give them formal written approval of the general proposal brought forward. We asked them that within forty-five days or less they present to us a more detailed proposal outlining, for example, not the principles of the plan or the scheme, but rather outlining for us the structure of the organization, administrative organization, that would look after this programme. Where the regional office would be? Would there be provincial offices? The budget for

MR. PECKFORD:

the operation of this scheme so we could see all the dollars and cents that were involved, and that if they were willing to do that in forty-five days or less, we would as ministers of Atlantic Canada responsible for housing respond to them in forty-five days or less with our approval to begin the plan. It is hoped by all the ministers and by the industry that this can be done, perhaps both the two forty-five day periods can be done perhaps in one forty-five day period so that we can be in a position in the Summer to announce the plan. It is also hoped that formal agreement to the whole scheme can be given here in St. John's as the final meeting of the industry and of the ministers. So I anticipate that we shall have a home warranty and insurance scheme, based on the Alberta experiment of a year old now, in place by the Fall.

I should also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the co-operation of the home building industry in this Province has been absolutely fantastic. Mr. Harold Pyan the president of the St. John's Home Builders Association, and Mr. Ralph March accompanied me to Fredericton. They are very much in the forefront of the home building industry in the Atlantic Provinces and Canada, and they are on the home building steering committee for the Atlantic Provinces right now who are going to put together the final package.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to attempt to go into too much detail on this because I know it is a bit tricky. If the minister is in a position to answer, I would appreciate it. I compliment him, by the way, on the information he has given thus far, and his effort in this regard. One of the problems in a home warranty would be if you have for example a problem, one of the people who worked on the home will come and say, "Look that is the plumber, or that is the electrician, or that is the people who put in the foundation or whatever." Is there a way, does the minister envisage a way to tie all this together? I know how tricky it is.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, we do envisage a way that all parts of the structure and of the house will be covered under that scheme. Most of this other work that is usually done on houses anyway is subcontracted, so therefore the main contractor is still responsible. So we hope to be covered on that one particularly, that all aspects of the house - in Alberta it has not been a problem. They have been able to iron out those sticky details, where one could pass it off on the other and still nobody being responsible. It should add to the overall degree of standards of housing in the Province because what will happen, builders are going to have to be registered under the plan and government and many other agencies are going to be saying, 'Unless you are registered under this plan we do not want to have anything to do with you.'

MR. NOLAN: You will not give them mortgage money?

MR. PECKFORD: That is exactly the point. In Alberta they used it on a voluntary basis, and the plan took off to such an extent that they did not have to bring in any mandatory controls. The marketplace itself governed it to such an extent that nobody could get mortgage money unless they were going to have a builder who was registered under the plan.

MR. NOLAN: Good.

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this question is for either the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment or the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I am not sure which minister to address the question to, because they cannot seem to agree as to which one of them has the responsibility for administering this particular aspect of the public accounts. But the question, Sir, is how much of the \$250,000 has been disbursed, the \$250,000 that was collected one dollar per shot on the license plates last year, how much of that \$250,000 has been disbursed to AMM, Marine Metals? For what purpose have the disbursements been made? At what point of their contract have the AMM, the Affiliated Marine Metals - just for what reason

MR. FLIGHT:

have any disbursements of that \$250,000 been made to that company to this point? Either one of the ministers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MP. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Tourism, perhaps one of the other ministers could answer this if the Minister of Tourism is not back in time. My question is, will it be necessary for hunters in this Province to successfully complete a hunter safety course to qualify for a small or large game license for the autumn of this year?



MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there are voluntary efforts already underway through some staff of my department to have people take a hunter safety training course. Certainly is not required by law or regulation at the moment. The matter is under consideration in terms of whether or not that is necessary. I might say there is a great feeling among a great number of people that this should be the case and it is a matter that is under consideration at the present time, but no definite decision has been made.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this is in a sense a supplementary to my first question, and this question is directed to the Premier. Would the Premier advise the House as to which one of the minister, the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment or the Minister of Transportation and Communications, is indeed responsible for the administration of that fund?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, only too gladly. I am in the process right now of - I understood that environmentally one department was responsible; and as far as the collection of the automobiles and delivery, the Department of Transportation and Communication. But after reading today's Telegram, as I am sure the hon. member did, I will have more detail for him tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Collins): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the hon. Premier. Will the hon. Premier tell the House, or could he give some indication to the House, of when the three by-elections will be held in Ferryland, Exploits and Bonavista North? And if the three elections will be held at the same time or will they be held separately? And while the Premier is on his feet would he indicate to the House whether or not legal action will be taken against those people who deliberately violated the Elections Act in September?

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

PREMIER MOORES: There are a lot of questions there in the one, Mr Speaker. I think the answers are, yes, maybe, probably and unlikely.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the hon. Premier. Would the Premier tell the House if Newfoundland is going to join with Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island in approaching the Government of Canada to ask to have electricity subsidized in this Province as well as in Nova Scotia and P.E.I. I think they are talking about a subsidy on oil?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member well knows all the Eastern Provinces at the present time are receiving what he refers to as a subsidy from the Federal Government. It is an equalization of oil prices because of the subsidy paid to or the prices that have to be subsidized from the wellhead in Alberta. The situation is that P.E.I. and Nova Scotia have the first and second highest petroleum and energy costs in Canada, Newfoundland is third. We have already stated our position to these provinces and to the Federal Government and we will continue to do so, that if there is any plan for equalized prices and subsidies for the provinces that need that sort of assistance, we certainly require the same as anybody else.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Could the minister indicate please what work his department intends to do this year on the road between L'Anse-au-Clair and Red Bay in Labrador South?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, all the work to be carried out in the capital account of my department will be outlined when the estimates are debated in the House.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications, This comes as a result of a number of representations I have had with respect to layoffs in the minister's department. Could the minister indicate why, for example, a man of twelve years experience with the Department of Highways or Transportation and Communications who, say, is a heavy equipment operator is laid off, and individuals who

Mr. Rowe:

Have been with the department for a much shorter period of time  
these individuals are kept on?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS) The hon. Minister of Transportation and  
Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, my department is now in the process  
of laying off the Winter maintenance crew. We have had three  
shifts of men in most parts of the Province, and now with the  
Spring upon us and the Summer approaching we are laying off men,  
we are giving them notice under and strictly in accordance  
with the union agreement whereby we have to give thirty days notice  
to seasonal and temporary employees, and ten days of notice to  
others. We are now

MR. MORGAN:

giving notice of layoff which would become effective April 27. The layoffs are strictly in accordance with, and I repeat, strictly in accordance with the union agreement. In some cases although a man with twelve years seniority total with government, he may not have the seniority in the position as equipment operator and therefore he gets laid off and according to union agreement.

MR. F. ROWE: So he can work his way up and still get laid off.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Manpower, Sir, if he would give us an updating on the strike in Churchill Falls? Has the minister yet decided to appoint an industrial inquiry into that dispute?

MR. F. MAYNARD: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not decided to appoint an industrial inquiry up to this point in time. As I said a few days ago, I have kept my options open. It is my right under the Labour Relations Act. If and when an industrial inquiry is decided upon I will make the appropriate announcement to the House.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. In light of the fact that during Newfoundland's twenty-fifth anniversary celebrations the hon. the Premier has said that the high school drama festival started that year would continue, and in light of the fact that it is not going ahead this year, could the minister tell us if there is any chance that the festival will resume in the future or is it now a dead issue?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, if I may I would like to answer that question. The high school drama festival is one of the desirable programmes of any of its sort in the Province. I would suggest the appropriate time to get the full detail on that position will be during the estimates.

CAPT. F. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the hon. the Premier. Forgive me, Sir, I may have to use a little preamble. It is a noted fact that his Minister of Rural Development has been going hither and thither looking for contracts for the Marystown shipyard. In the light of what the hon. Minister of Fisheries said today in a press release or on the radio, after the 200 mile limit is enforced then the government,

CAPT. WINSOR:

as I understood it, would be buying ships, surplus trawlers from the U.K. Now is this or is it not a policy of government to buy those ships rather than get them constructed at Marystown?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the hypothesis that these hon. gentlemen took is absolutely inaccurate. I am confident that the Minister of Fisheries did not say this. What I think he probably might have said was that with these European fleets some, I think it is, 1,200 ships that are going to be available. We can build at Marystown I think it is four or five per year. I am not sure. I think that is the maximum, if I remember correctly, four I think it is. If we are going to take full advantage of the 200 mile limit, and I do not think enough pre-planning has gone into this, particularly at the federal level because they seem to be preoccupied with bilateral agreements and trying to get the 200 mile limit as they should, but there are other departments in the Federal Government that now together with the Provincial Governments should start taking a commercial look at it, meetings with the union employers and the governments to see if we cannot get a commercial posture established. I am quite sure that the Minister of Fisheries did not suggest that we buy ships from any one given point. I think, Sir, what he is suggesting is that we will have it as a total package from Eastern Canada when the time comes, but certainly there would not have been a specific allegation of that sort.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In the light of what the Premier has said is it not now time to get specifications and plans ready for the number that the shipyard can construct at Marystown rather than wait until we get the 200 mile limit?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, that has already been done. The whole gambit of exactly what is going to be required and how fast we can do it will be the subject I hope of a fairly lengthy debate in this House within the next few weeks. At that time certainly we will spill out what has gone before.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A supplementary question on that. When the Premier speaks of the numbers of ships, fish catching ships that could become needed in the future based presumably on the institution of the 200 mile control zone, is he thinking only of the draggers and the fish catching vessels that are now in this Province or can be built in this Province? And is he deliberately leaving out the rest of the Canadian Atlantic fishing fleet that exists now and is likely to exist to meet the demand if, as and when the 200 mile limit is established?

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

PREMIER MOORES: No, Mr. Speaker, I said provinces, Eastern Canadian Provinces, when I made the comment. One of the things I should mention to probably clarify the scope and the volume of what we are talking about - when I say, we, I mean the Canadian situation - is that - and it was mentioned in the budget, the figure - there are some two million tons of deep-sea fish presently being caught, less than 400,000 by Canada and less than 200,000 by Newfoundland. So in Newfoundland and Labrador's case we caught one-tenth of what is presently being caught offshore. Now irrespective of how much we would like to stop all fishing, from a straight protein food demand point of view in the world, and from a conservation point of view, there is no way that you are going to get Canadian or any other agreement that all fishing should stop. So the thing is how do we maximize that fishing that will be allowed to our Province's best advantage.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): This will be the last question. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Premier if he is in a position at this moment to make a definite statement - to be quite specific - on those who are going to be laid off, the 300 people who were mentioned in the budget speech? Can the Premier tell us where these layoffs are going to occur?

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

PREMIER MOORES: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the Premier indicate to the House when he will be in a position to put the minds of the public servants at ease and be able to make an announcement where these layoffs are going to take place?

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

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, other than what was in the budget the answer still has to be, no, until further information is obtained.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question. Would the Premier tell the House if there will be any layoffs as a result of the new telephone system that was installed in Confederation Building recently? Will there be any switchboard operators or any people displaced or laid off because of this new system?

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

PREMIER MOORES: I have no idea, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

This being Wednesday, Private Members' Day,

Motion 9. The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West had adjourned the debate.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, in rising to continue from a week ago I am wondering if I can remember where I left off. A certain gentleman in London one time, who was in the Hyde Park area, was giving a speech from a soapbox, and during his speech he said something that was against the law, very much against the law, and he was nabbed by the police and put in jail for five years, And when the five years were up, and he was released, he immediately made his way back to the park, Some of his friends were still there, and he jumped back on his box, and he said, "Fellows, as I was saying," he said, "when I was so rudely interrupted by the police five years ago," and he continued. Mr. Speaker, even after a week I do not think I can just pick up exactly where I left off as well as that.

Mr. Canning.

Mr. Speaker, I was to the point of - when it was six o'clock, and I had to rise - to the point where I was going from one part of this resolution to the other defending myself for saying that I would vote for it.



MR. CANNING:

Mr. Speaker, the part I think was down to:

"WHEREAS there is an increasing concern on the part of many of the citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador about the future of our Province;"  
Now, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of that and we all are.

"AND WHEREAS there is an increasing concern about the kind of growth and development which should be encouraged in Newfoundland and Labrador;"  
Again I am sure there is no doubt that everybody in this House, on both sides of the House, realize that.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the recommendation is of course, that a select committee of the House be appointed to travel throughout the Province, meet with the people and discuss the future, or discuss the development that may take place or should take place, how it would take place and whatnot. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would have to support this. My experience of many years has shown me that time and time again in different areas there were industries started, industries set up, there were projects set up, there were wharves and breakwaters set up and whatnot that were carried out without any connection with the people, engineers going in, sometimes federal, sometimes provincial, carrying out a project. And before very long you would hear the people saying, "Well, I do not know why they are building it there because it should be somewhere else."

I can give a few specific cases, Mr. Speaker, of public works, and I can give you a specific case of a fish plant. And then I can come to the last few years and give you a few more specific cases where there were big mistakes, costly mistakes made because the people of the area who knew the area, in some cases it was fishermen or seamen who knew where a breakwater should go, or where an island should be torn down or built up. The first one that comes to my mind, Mr. Speaker, is the atrocious expense, the terrible expense of destroying an island off Port aux Basques while preparing that harbour for the ferry.

MR. WHITE: Forge Island.

MP. CANNING: What was the name?

MR. WHITE: Forge Island.

MR. CANNING: I remember, Mr. Speaker, that engineers went in there. They decided they would blow up the island and carry it away to improve the harbour. Of course the island was a shelter from prevailing winds. After the island had gone, they had destroyed it, taken it away, they discovered that the harbour would be too rough for the shipping, the types of ships that had to go in there, the ferries. Mr. Speaker, they had to bring it back again. They had to bring back the island and rebuild it. I do not remember the cost now, but it was a pretty costly affair and a big delay on the growth of Port aux Basques.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman allow me. Does he know for a fact that that happened? I have been hearing it for years that it did happen, but I have no knowledge of it. Is he the same as myself, just heard this for years and does not really know, as I do not know, whether it happened or not? It sounds so completely crazy, that they blasted the island out of the harbour to make room for ships to manoeuvre and having done so discovered that the shelter that the island had provided was now badly needed and had to put the island back again. Is that actually true? Did it happen.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member Burin-Placentia West.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, all the proof I got, I was not there when they took it down and what was going on, and I was not there when it was brought back, but I am pretty well certain that is exactly what happened. You know I was not actually there, physically there, but it is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell them another that I do know. I came home from Ottawa to the Province. I cannot give the year. I do not do as much research as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

Mr. Canning:

Mr. Speaker, I was coming from the mainland of Canada, a trip by car one Summer and went into the hotel in Port Aux Basques and had dinner. There were a group of men there coming home from some part of Nova Scotia where they had been fishing. They recognized me. One of them came over and asked me was I the member for Placentia West. I said yes. "Well," he said, "I am from Harbour Breton." I said, "Yes, glad to meet you." I asked him where he was coming from, so he asked me over to the table to meet his friends, there were five or six of them, deep sea fishermen. He said, "What do you think of the salt fish plant they are building in Harbour Breton?" "I do not know," I said, "It is a good idea, I suppose. What do you think of it?" "Well," he said, "they should not be building it there." He said, "A salt fish plant! We want the fresh fish plant." He said, "We do not have any near fishing grounds, we have no inshore fishery here worthwhile." Anyway I could not defend what was being done because I did not know Harbour Breton, and I was not quite familiar with the fishing grounds as I would be of Placentia Bay. So I said, "Is that so?" "Well", I said, "how many are fishing there?" He said, "There is nobody fishing there, shore fishing. We are deep sea fishermen", he said, "Its mad." He said, "Well, you know, the fishing grounds are not there, we have not got the inshore boats." He said, "We are deep sea fishermen, most of us go away." Well, I thought that he was probably of different belief, politically belief than I was, and being a bit critical. But, Mr. Speaker, he was right. I think when the Provincial Government of the day decided to put a salt fish plant, a modern salt fish plant in Harbour Breton, if they had gone up to the people, discussed it with the people, instead of making a decision in Cabinet, I think they would not have built it. It was never used, not extensively, I do not know if it was ever used at all. It was a big expense. I would say that the minister of that day went up, and I would say talked to the merchant of the place, and the merchant gave him some advice, perhaps he was interested in getting rid of some land or something, gave some idea for it. So he

Mr. Canning:

told him a salt fish plant would be all right. Well, we brought the land and he sold it, but the salt fish plant was no good to the people of Harbour Breton.

Mr. Speaker, a few years afterwards we did build, I think, the government built it, I believe, a fresh fish plant built at Harbour Breton, and ever since it is a very prosperous place. But I am just giving this -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. member -

MR. CANNING: Certainly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - yield again for a moment?

MR. CANNING: Sure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am very interested in this. John T. Cheeseman was chairman of a royal commission, and Eric Jones was a member of it, he was a magistrate at the time, I forget who the third one was, and they investigated the fishing conditions on the Southwest Coast. They made certain recommendations that the plants should be built at, I think, Harbour Breton and Rose Blanche, and the government went ahead and built them. Now the one at Harbour Breton, that is there now, the frozen fish plant is the one that was built by the government. Who built the salt fish plant before? Was that not private enterprise?

MR. CANNING: By the government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that the one the late Ches Crosbie built?

MR. CANNING: The government built it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He built a large plant there.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Provincial Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For salt fish?

MR. CANNING: Under the late hon. John Cheeseman. He was in -

MR. SMALLWOOD: John Cheeseman.

MR. CANNING: All right, Mr. Speaker. But say if I am mistaken and the government did not build it, I would be surprised if a businessman did it, a good businessman did it, because he would be going in there at a great risk, he would be going in there to make money, and I think he would be -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was it at Harbour Breton or Belleoram that Ches Crosbie built the big fish plant?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Belleoram.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Belleoram.

MR. CANNING: I do not think the Crosbies had anything to do with that. Now that we have mentioned it, it was the Crosbies in Belleoram I can assure him the good business people like the Crosbies would not go up into Harbour Breton and build a salt fish plant, There is no fish coming to salt.

MR. CROSBIE: Right on!

MR. CANNING: Add another! They are putting me off.

MR. CANNING: At the present moment, and this is no reflection on the present Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, up in - I am not sure if it is in the shipyard in Marystown, if they are up on the dock or they are down beside the dock or if they are in Little Bay, but there are three multi-purpose boats up there. They were built about three years ago, over three years ago. They have been on the dock there ever since. I do not know what happened but anyway they were kept there and they were tearing out ceilings and putting in something else - some mistakes were made. They cost \$700,000, roughly \$700,000, perhaps more.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nothing to do.

MR. CANNING: They are still lying up. There are two Harmon boats out in Little Bay.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. member yield and I could clarify in that respect.

MR. CANNING: Oh, well I will tell him where they were up to a few weeks ago.

MR. ROBERTS: You do not have to yield to him.

MR. W. CARTER: Would you mind yielding? One of the ships to which you are referring and saying that it is now tied up in Marystown, in the month of March delivered 118,000 pounds of fish to the fish plant in Burnt Island in Port au Basques. So it could hardly be tied up in Marystown if it is fishing and delivering fish to these communities.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, that is the latest on her. I probably would have - no, I would not. I did not know that. But I would have said that one of them had a trip.

MR. W. CARTER: A trip! She has had a dozen trips!

MR. CANNING: I would have said she had a trip out of Fortune. I would have told you what she brought in. I could have told you what the men made. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear there was one of them, because I can assure you that she is after costing more than \$700,000 because they had to strip down one of the others to keep her going when they went out on their trial runs. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not the quality of the ship or what that boat, what happened to her, where she is at the moment. But I can assure you whoever is responsible for planning that boat, that can take three

MR. CANNING:

men, perhaps four, three men can handle her, and we should have known that it was going to cost \$700,000. They were trying to solve the problem of a multi-purpose boat for the fishermen of the Southwest Coast, I can assure you if you had to go to the fishermen who had to take her on, if they had to go to the plants that have to even charter her - I am sure they will not sell her to them - they would not be there. \$2,100,000 for three small boats. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if he had asked advice of the fishermen in that area, the people who fished for thirty, forty, nearly fifty years on druggers, know the inshore, the outshore fishery, I am sure these boats would not have been lying up for almost three years. There should be more than one of them sailing at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, I said at the beginning, it has not anything to do with the present Minister of Fisheries. He was not here.

MR. ROBERTS: It was Roy Cheeseman -

MR. CANNING: I do not know but I can assure him - I think this, that he would need to go up to the people in Grand Bank or Burin or Fortune somewhere to get advice on that boat for the people who had to use her. Imagine a man taking on inshore fishery, that is what they are, pretty near shore, \$700,000 - forty years of ago, who can ever own it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What size -

MR. CANNING: They carry about, I think 80,000 pounds. The boat when it works it is a good boat. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that we can get a multi-purpose boat a lot cheaper than that. If we do not we cannot build it, we cannot afford to build it.

Mr. Canning.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that we should form this select committee from the House. We do not have to keep running around all year, but, Mr. Speaker, when something comes up like this, like we are going to build a plant or are going to change some mode of operation, I think they should get out and talk to the people who know. Mr. Speaker, I could go on with the public works and with bridges the government wharves were built without any consultation with the people, some of them were never used, but that is unnecessary. Most people here who live in the outports, up around the Southwest Coast, and around the Northeast Coast saw an awful lot that was going on down through the years.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have heard seven or eight years ago, you could hear right across the nation that the young people wanted to get involved. You have heard the Tory Government that they were going to have the people involved - there was no more dictatorship around here - they were going to get out. They did get out a few times for a few Cabinet meetings, I believe, in one or two places, and had a good, big dinner, but, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen were not at those.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think, it is a very good resolution. I think there was thought put in it, farsightedness, I think, and I think probably the Leader of the Opposition looked back on - even in his day, and the government that he was with - when we went ahead with certain industries, and put them in certain places, or built something else here or there without consulting the people who had to use them, to live by them, live from them, if you would not talk to them, who are you going to talk to?

Mr. Speaker, I go further back. I just thought of my good friend, the Minister of Forestry at the moment who I got in my mind. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the birch plant, as we heard down through the years about, and we often hear again, the big mistake, I wonder if the people who planned that had gone down where the birch was and talked to the people down in White Bay? I wonder would it be out on the back of St. John's, hundreds of miles from the birch, so far from



Mr. Canning.

the water. Mr. Speaker, the cost of that birch after it landed in St. John's between that and the plant could make it uneconomical. It could be the difference between it paying and not paying. Of course, it should not have gone out there. It should have gone down in White Bay or some other area, down where the birch was, because I can assure you we have noticed in this Province since that birch is pretty widely used right up to today. It is a very important product. Mr. Speaker, I would not advise anybody to set up a select committee to go up and talk to town councils or joint town councils or business people, but go up to Grand Bank or go up to Burin or Marystown and tell the people you are coming-- we are hoping to do something for here, we are hoping to be able to help the plants to sell your fish to the mainland fresh instead of the frozen fillets we are sending out -- you sit down with them, Mr. Speaker, and they will tell us the way to go about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am all for it. I think -- you take like the people of Labrador. We still have them here this afternoon. I am sure that a select committee from the House of Assembly would be welcome in the far part of Northern Labrador, where up until now or even today they did not hear what was going on in the House. Half the people down there never saw -- I could not say they never saw a member, they saw the one who went down to get elected. They saw him when he went back again perhaps in some cases.

CAPT. WINSOR: Not in Northern Labrador.

MR. CANNING: In some cases, I say. I know that, too, from past experience. I know fellows who went down to Labrador and got elected in the party that I was with, which I am proud of. They went down and got elected, and went back afterwards. They did not go back the second time.

MR. MURPHY: His lost his map.

MR. CANNING: Well, now I am not too familiar with Labrador, but I hope there is a select committee to go into Labrador I would be one

Mr. Canning.

on it, because what I would find down there would be people with the same conditions I suppose from every viewpoint that I found out in Placentia Bay when I went out there twenty-six or twenty-seven years ago or however long ago, without facilities and everything else.

MR. CANNING:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are fifty people in this House. We may have a lot of ideas. We may have hundreds of ideas, but I can assure you there are a lot of ideas outside of this House. People have ideas who do not have the opportunity to put them across. When I think of all the stupid mistakes that governments make, Tories and Liberals, federal and provincial, when I think of the ones they make, and they have made - Boy! It has been a long time now, twenty-four years in this House! I tell you I have seen a lot of fine politicians and I saw some darn stupid ones. I saw some great policies, saw them put forward, come to reality. But I saw an awful lot of poor ones. I saw an awful lot of blunders.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do remember, after the week, that my time is just about up. There is not much more to say on it, Mr. Speaker, but I would say it would be a move in the right direction to appoint a select committee of this House and get out and talk to the people who have to support the ideas we have, the people who have got to learn them, the people who produce and keep us here. Now, Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I hope I do not offend you by reading my preamble until I get a head of steam up. In addressing myself to the subject of this motion, that is especially the part, "NOW BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that a select committee be appointed to enquire into and to report upon the prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador," I should clarify some points and statements attributed to me in the past which would seem to indicate almost a rejection of this motion rather than its support.

We in this Province, both the Island portion and the mainland part called Labrador, have seen over the past ten or fifteen years a surplus, a very surfeit of studies carried out by individuals, task forces, committees, and by commissions. In fact, Sir - I have said before

MR. STRACHAN:

and say again - that we, and especially in Labrador have been studied from our backsides to our noses. Also I think that at that time I said it in less polite terms. We have been inundated with reports and findings which have been read, discussed briefly and thrown aside to collect dust at considerable cost to the taxpayers. Some of these reports stay with us but I contend these are few in number. If we look closely to find a reason for this, we discover that it is because these few reports have managed to capture to the spirit of the past of this Province, assimilated it and digested it well, and incorporated it into a forecast for the future.

It is only too clear that planning for the future can only come about by a study of what we are, a fine assessment of our very fabric and an embodiment of this together with all the other outside factors affecting us, so that we can distill the solution which has meaning and can be applied in our society. Far, far too often solutions to our economic ills are touted and sold simply because they have worked elsewhere. Again they fail, and fail miserably, because they have not been adapted to take into consideration the very geography of this Province, its environment, the character of its people, let alone take into consideration its very unique political and economic structure.

The reports and committees which have had lasting influence are few and far between. They have done so - and I have said - by marrying our past, that is what we were, to what we are now, our present, and distilling from the marriage a direction for us to follow in the future. Only in this way do I contend that we will ever be able to plot a course which will make sense to this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that now, right now is the time for us to take our heading, to check our marks, as a fisherman would say, and plan our strategy.

MR. STRACHAN:

Nowhere, and I emphasize nowhere else in this Province does this need to be done more urgently than in that portion of the Province called Labrador. Mr. Speaker, we are being lulled. We are in a vacuum. We have no direction. We have no heading and this despite the fact that we in Labrador face what will be in the next ten years possibly the most traumatic years of our lives. In fact the next ten years may be not only the most traumatic years for Labrador, it may also be for the very political fabric of this Province, unless very soon the wheels are set in motion to tie once and for all this great Province into one.

This is a very tall order when simultaneously the government is faced on all sides with recession and restraint. But it can be done with imagination and foresightedness. I am afraid, and heartily sorry, that these are qualities which are sadly lacking. I notice in the short time that I have been in the House that there tends to be a general ignorance about the situations and conditions in Labrador. Many times I feel that it is not an ignorance which shows, but because the members opposite in the House are ill-advised on many situations. I notice in the House certain disparaging remarks about my line of questioning, for instance, last week on the caribou regulations to the Minister of Tourism. Some members opposite express disbelief when I raised the question of export licenses for Labrador. I ask you, Sir, if someone shot a moose in the West Coast of Newfoundland and had to file an export permit in order to transport it by car from Corner Brook to St. John's, I am sure there would be quite a bit of fuss. I have with me here as an example the game export permit required to export wild caribou meat, wild game, from Labrador to the Island portion. We talk of separatism and in issuing statements like this we feed the very people who are thriving on it. Many Labrador people pick up these kind of examples and tout them constantly.

MR. NEARY: Does the hon. member mind reading that document.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes. "The Department of Tourism, Wildlife Division, Game Export Permit. In accordance with the provisions of regulation (59) of the wildlife regulations the following person is hereby authorized to accept

MR. STRACHAN:

from such-and-such a person of, for instance Nain or Uopedale, for conveyance to St. John's the following meat or parts thereof of big game, lawfully taken under license No. 123, card number so and so."

MR. NEARY: What do they think, they are a foreign country?

MR. STRACHAN: That is right. "This permit is to remain with the meat or parts thereof until the shipment reaches its final destination. Upon reaching its destination the permit is to be forwarded to the nearest wildlife officer." It must be remembered that the minister is only -

MR. MURPHY: Is "export" written on that anywhere?

MR. STRACHAN: I just read it - "Game Export Permit".

MR. MURPHY: "Export" is written on it then.

MR. STRACHAN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Incredible! Absolutely incredible!

MR. MURPHY: No. Well, it is not incredible.

MR. STRACHAN: On this kind of topic I first only feel that the minister himself has been ill-advised, I think, rather than anything else, by members in his department. I think another point I could raise here was that the recent regulations, up until he changed them two weeks ago, stated that the meat could only be eaten by the person whom it was consigned to. Nobody else could eat it. I do not know how you can enforce that, unless every wildlife officer is going to sit in every kitchen and watch that the meat is only eaten by the person it is consigned to.

However, that is not the topic of my discourse, but I was just using it as an example of some of the situations which are created and which do feed the situation in Labrador, sometimes innocently, sometimes subconsciously, sometimes due to ill-advice. It is this situation which I feel must be solved and must be tackled almost immediately. There has also been, I think, some questions about our role and the particular kind of questioning that we ask. I believe that to question and to probe and to embarrass are, to my mind, totally legitimate roles for members in Opposition.

MR. STRACHAN: However, I would feel that if to embarrass was the sole purpose of the line of questioning, the be-all and end-all of the questions, then one would merely be dabbling in our political machine for the sole purpose of personal political gain or notoriety. That I totally discount as being cheap, publicity oriented, shallow politics containing no depth, warmth or understanding.

No, Mr. Speaker, I contend that what we are trying to do is to point out to people who ought to know better, this very House, that they are heading on a course of disaster of a size and magnitude that they have no comprehension of, and which, unless it is pointed out at a sufficiently early stage, in a forceful enough manner, will cause nothing but grief and anguish to this Province.

We are not there in Labrador to be bought off by nice, sweet colonial answers which will keep the minions in the far distant corners happy and secure in the knowledge that they are being well taken care of in the far distant capital. We are there, and I trust that I am able to do that, to awaken your stumbling minds to a restlessness which is giving early indications of being alarming. Only by a great change in attitudes, spirit and understanding, can this restlessness be lightened and removed.

But let me, Mr. Speaker, get back to the main gist of my presentation and that is on the need for planning. I want to address my remarks, especially in the light of the impending development of offshore oil and gas, and I often ask the question as to whether Labrador is going to get oil or whether Labrador is going to get turmoil.

Off the shores of Labrador a number of wells have been drilled and have shown considerable sign of hydrocarbons. Hydrocarbons is the euphemistic name used by the oil companies to indicate oil and gas. Only eleven wells have thus far been drilled. The distance between the southernmost well and the northernmost well is over 800 miles. The southern most well, Cumberland, to the northern most well,

MR. STRACHAN: Karlsefni, is a distance from the eastern boundary of British Columbia to the western boundary of Ontario. In other words, the oil fields, or the exploration fields cover the Provinces, the distance of the Provinces of Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

MR. ROBERTS: Only eleven wells in -

MR. STRACHAN: Eleven wells in that distance.

Of the eleven wells, four of them have obviously shown good sign. The northernmost, Karlsefni, was drilled to a distance of 10,700 feet last year, and -

MR. MURPHY: How far north is that one?

MR. STRACHAN: Karlsefni is off Saglek which is about 140 miles north of Nain. The Snorri well encountered oil and gas - or encountered hydrocarbon; sorry, as the oil companies would say - at 10,000 feet and the Snorri well is off Hopedale.

The Gudrid well also hit hydrocarbons at 9,000 feet off Makkovik and the Bjarni well off Cartwright at 8,000 feet. We are therefore fairly well assured that the gas is there. Also the drilling company has not indicated that oil is present. But if we follow the general pattern we can accept the fact that oil is present. What happens, of course, is that the oil is contained in a dome; at the head of the dome is the gas.

PREMIER MOORES: They have got conics there.

MR. STRACHAN: The Premier corrected me there and indicated there were conics.

MR. MURPHY: There is nothing between Cartwright and Makkovik.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, Cartwright; one well off Cartwright, and another well off Makkovik. Well they have not drilled. They have drilled a number of times but they were too far out and they had to suspend.

Now whether there will be a commercial development or not will, of course, depend on whether oil is there in large enough quantities to make extraction and the transportation of it commercially feasible. In order to present the picture fully and to illustrate the tremendous difficulties oil companies face, let me describe briefly the geographic and climatic situations existing off our Coast.



MR. STRACHAN:

Let me start first of all with late Fall, which by northern standards is the last week in September, and for October and November we experience extremely high winds and stormy seas. Occasionally some years we get an Indian Summer, but most years it is extremely stormy. Oil rigs experience great difficulty in 400 or 500 feet of water trying to stay over the location because of the yawing and the pitch, so they generally have to let go and by that time move out. - then, of course, November and early December there is a freeze up, and the sea freezes up all through January - for a distance of forty to fifty miles out from the coast. Sometimes the sea beats the ice in to the headlands and the bays, and off the bays the ice extends for forty miles. However, this ice often can get broken up so that ice platforms, or drilling rigs on ice platforms, such as the ones in the Beaufort Sea, cannot work off Labrador. All through Winter then drilling must be suspended until early May in the South and mid-June in the North, often into July, before the ice breaks up, and the ice moves on. Sometimes it can be August before the ice moves off, as it was seven years ago, because it depends on, of course, offshore winds, Sir.

Meanwhile as soon as the ice moves off the icebergs start to move down, and so these pose a problem to passenger ships, cargo ships and, of course, especially to ships on a fixed location. So we have also problems with the icebergs for the ships and also, of course, a pipeline laid on the bottom is an immediate danger because the icebergs gouge and scrape along the shore digging quite deep trenches and, therefore, would rupture the pipeline coming ashore. So there must be a different type of technology developed for Labrador compared to elsewhere in the removal of oil and gas, and there has been considerable talk of various techniques, and as I understand it, there has been talk of one lateral drilling process which is drilling down from the nearest point of land and tunnelling at right angles and drilling out until you hit the concentration of oil and gas. The technology involved in this is tremendous,

Mr. Strachan.

because one has to devise a gearing arrangement for tunnelling a drilling shaft thousands of feet down and turning it and then drilling out for something in the distance of thirty or forty miles. Therefore, the oil companies must devise a new technology, and with great skill, and using this tremendous technology they will, in my opinion, bring this oil to shore. The only factor governing whether it does come ashore will be the quantity discovered and available to be piped. I do not believe that technology is a stumbling block provided international quantities are available.

We now have to shift from the rather localized problem of getting at this oil to see how important this oil is to us both nationally and provincially. Our Province, Canada, and the whole world faces a grave energy crisis. In the short term we are faced with major oil supplies coming from regions of the world in which there is great political unrest, if not explosive political situations, especially in the Middle East and South America. In the long-term we face an ongoing crisis as we watch our technological civilization burn up its nonrenewable resources at an ever increasing and alarming rate. Decisions about oil cannot be avoided or postponed. Possibly under our seabed, forty to eighty miles off the coast of Labrador, are vast reservoirs of viscous liquid on which we and modern industry depend so much, not only nationally but internationally. These reservoirs, when they are fully delineated, need to be tapped as soon and as economically as possible. To hold any other view is being totally removed from the realism of this world. I have heard expressed many, many a time in Labrador that, why spoil Labrador? Why not leave the oil and gas there? And as far as I am concerned it is a totally romantic and out of touch view.

MR. ROBERTS: It is a luxury that we cannot afford, the world cannot afford.

MR. STRACHAN: The question I ask is that if we do have to remove it, then what do we want? Do they want this oil coming into Labrador or do they want the problems facing Labrador when it does get there? If the

MR. STRACHAN:

oil and gas is present under the seabed, then we as a Province and as a nation have no alternative but to remove it and convert it to the much needed fuels we so desperately need. To feel that we need never exploit it is overly romantic and to live in a dream world. To say to the oil companies who have spent vast millions in search of it that now that they have found it they are not to be allowed to bring it up from the deep is to live in a world of make-belief, to be a Peter Pan or an ostrich with one's head in the sand. Of course we need it and we need it badly. But I contend, Mr. Speaker, that that is not to say that this Province and more specifically the people of Labrador have no choice at all. That is not to say that this government or any other government should hand over the people of the Labrador Coast on a plate to be totally at the mercy of the international oil companies concerned only with profit, or at the mercy of remote government departments whose only considerations are economic and whose only wish is to make this a "have" Province in economic terms.

What we are asking for - and hopefully we may never have to demand it - is for reasoned, controlled development in which the needs and the wishes and the future of those most affected by such a development are guaranteed; controlled development, not uncontrolled development; and development controlled not only by big government but development controlled by little people; controlled development to safeguard the future of the Labrador Coast by protecting the environment, its traditional economies, simple as they are, its way of life and its culture. Why in this age of so-called enlightenment should people who have been ignored for hundreds of years right up to the present be suddenly swept aside, see their land torn apart and their future destroyed in the headlong rush of others to satisfy this greedy world's needs? Do they not also have rights?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: Should they not also be consulted? Why can they not also be given some form of local control so that those things which are important to them can be protected and maintained? To most everyone else moving in as strangers the land and the way of life has little value. Indeed, to

MR. STRACHAN:

most outsiders there is a general disbelief that the land or the climate can hold any pleasures for the people living there. As beauty lies in the eye of the beholder, so for the people of the Coast who do not see a wilderness but see an ever changing pattern rich with wildlife and a way of life with a closeness found in few other places. It is therefore a time for long-term planning by the government of this Province and a time for it to place its trust in its people and allow them some measure of control over their destiny.

I am not stating that this government abdicate all its responsibilities to local authorities. They neither yet have the skill- and let us face it - nor the education, nor the information, nor the means to assume such control. The result would be chaos. But what I am clearly stating is that there is another level which needs to be interjected into the scheme of things, and that is the level of local control over their environment, their destiny and their future. It cannot and must not be left only to a Federal Government, a Provincial Government and multi-national oil companies to decide the fate of so vast a region, so unique a region, and so voluble a people. Included there must be a local authority with some bargaining strength, not beggars to pick up the crumbs, but to take part in a sensible, reasoned process of decision making so as to lessen the force of the impact, to make them co-partners, in a true sense of the word, with a feeling of worth. Feeling that we will be left with nothing but coastal ghettos, backward in every sense, looking continually to a government centred in St. John's to take care of them, hoping that some of this new found wealth will find its way back to them to compensate them for all that they have lost and given up in the provincial and national interest. How then can this be done? I contend that this can only be done by examining the problems, the solutions, the good things and the bad things, as they have done elsewhere, and adopting them, changing them and molding them into our fabric so that we progress rather than regress. I may even go so far as to say that after gaining experiences elsewhere that we also can come up with our own unique solutions, our own methods which can be as praised and as heralded as those found elsewhere.

MR. STRACHAN:

In order to do this we will have to sum up all our imaginative skills, drop a great deal of our ingrained, hidebound beliefs, and place our trust and our faith in the people of this Province to assist us and help us to come to terms with this ominous technology and this tremendous impact.

In the Shetland Islands, where we just returned from, the local people, in the lack of a clear national policy, took the parliamentary process into their own hands and designed a system of disturbance fees which have ensured their continued benefit from the oil long after the wells have dried up and the companies have gone off elsewhere.

Before I describe the disturbance fee concept, I should indicate that the oil companies experienced great difficulties with the central government in Britain because the oil developments hit with such rapidity that no clear-cut and long-standing policies have been worked out, leaving the oil companies in a vacuum insofar as understanding what the national energy policy would be. In fact, it was only in 1975 four years after discovery, and the same year the pipeline along the seabed was being laid, before the British government had sense enough to form an offshore policy making council which had teeth and real power.

I say that we are somewhat in the same situation because we are faced at the moment with a federal and provincial dispute over the ownership question of the seabed. And the oil companies are faced, not knowing exactly who the owners are, who they should be bargaining with in the future. In such a vacuum, small groups and local authorities are generally forced to try to fill in this vacuum. In the island groups of Orkney and Shetland Islands, each with their own local authorities they pursued their own courses designed to lessen socio-economic impact and to lengthen the terms of benefits of oil-rich developments.

Oil production has a short period of high intensive labour. When the pipelines are being laid, the huge tank farms being built,

Mr. STRACHAN:

the tanker facilities being built and so on, the work force required for a short number of years is in the thousands. Then when all is over the oil flows and everyone leaves, except a small work force. The local communities affected experience great changes with influx of large numbers of people with all its related problems, shortage of homes, shortage of recreational facilities, shortages of catering services, shortages of adequate hospitals and many other needed services. Local people cannot compete and often become mesmerized and confused by it all. They feel the tremendous impact of it, yet cannot fully participate. In the end they know that it is all going to go away again like a bad dream, and they can return to their way of life.

But can they? Aspirations have changed, their needs have changed, and the land has been irreversibly changed. They have experienced a tremendous influx of a huge work force which has no roots there, with entirely different values, values not dependent on preserving peace and quiet, not dependent on valuing land as a balance of nature. The Klondike days hit these small communities and with no planning, no strength through local ownership. They cannot control this huge work force. To people who have to experience this for the benefit of the provincial and national interests, some compensating form of payment for such impact must be made. This impact payment, called disturbance fee, will also help them to contend with this development. It will mean that they are not poor cousins, that they also can compete with the strangers, albeit it in different ways, but at least be competitive instead of facing total submersion.

It is also, I believe, financially in the provincial interest to allow local authorities some bargaining strength through direct ownership of land, or if not that, through some regional planning control vested in them. They can then meet the oil companies with strength and obtain suitable compensation for the regional impact,

MR. STRACHAN:

upheaval and damage done, not only environmentally, but socially and economically. This Province will still obtain its source of revenue from these companies, this being little affected

Mr. Strachan:

by such disturbance payments to regional authorities.

I should mention here that -

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may; I am just wondering now if we cannot call it ten minutes slower than it is, if the gentleman has only five or six minutes to finish. I would hate to see him have to clue up in two or three minutes, if he can finish -

MR. STRACHAN: No I cannot do it in two or three minutes.

MR. MURPHY: - instead of adjourning until next week, if he could go on. That is all, if the House would give him permission.

MR. STRACHAN: I can carry on next week. You can listen about Labrador next week as well as this week.

MR. MURPHY: No but we would love, I say it is so interesting. That is what I am saying, that you be allowed to continue on and not call it 6:00 o'clock, you know.

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. member will speak next week anyway.

MR. MURPHY: Whichever you want, but I wanted you to continue on it is so interesting.

MR. STRACHAN: I just could not believe it.

MR. MURPHY: It is amazing, you know, how I appreciate sensible things.

MR. ROBERTS: What are you doing in the Cabinet today?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is amazing!

MR. NEARY: What are you doing on that side of the House?

MR. ROBERTS: Keep going 'Ank'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MURPHY: You know, as I say with the permission of the House, if he has only five or ten minutes -

MR. STRACHAN: I will carry on.

But let me discuss this concept of local people being co-partners in an oil and gas development, because this is where I think that I differ from the opinion expressed by the Minister without Portfolio. How does one -

MR. ROBERTS: Do you want to adjourn it now because the Speaker has to leave the Chair at 6:00 o'clock. If you adjourn the debate next



Mr. Roberts:

week you can pick up that idea and carry on.

MR. STRACHAN: Well we can wait until next week.

MR. MURPHY: If I may ask one question, first. I heard a gentleman from Shetland Island actually on CBC in an interview, did you have any slides or anything that actually took place. Did your committee at that time garner any of those?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, but I do not have them.

MR. MURPHY: No, I am wondering would they be in your possession sometime?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: I see. I would just like to know because I would like to have a chat to you about them.

MR. ROBERTS: Just move the adjournment, 'Ian', and then you will have the floor when they call it next week.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I do move that this House to adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, April 1, at 2:00 P.M.

On motion that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday at 2:00 P.M.

C O N T E N T S

<u>STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS</u>	PAGE
Mr. Peckford made a statement on the provision of subsidized housing in larger communities.	4275
Mr. Roberts commented.	4277
Mr. Lundrigan made a statement on the Rural Development Authority.	4280
Mr. Simmons commented.	4282
Mr. Smallwood commented.	4286
Mr. Lundrigan made a statement on the edition of the <u>Evening Telegram</u> which carried the publication's annual supplement on industry and commerce in the Province.	4290
Mr. Simmons commented.	4294
 <u>PRESENTING PETITIONS</u>	
By Mr. Roberts in behalf of residents of the Labrador coast between L'Anse-au-Clair and Red Bay asking that should work on the Straits tunnel be limited to a start from only one side this year, that construction commence from the Labrador side.	4296
Spoken to by:	
Mr. Crosbie	4299
Mr. Neary	4303
Mr. Strachan	4305
Mr. Smallwood	4306
Premier Moores	4307
Capt. Winsor	4308
By Mr. Brett in behalf of 3,541 residents of the area between Bonavista and Arnold's Cove asking that a hospital be constructed at Clarenville.	4310
Spoken to by:	
Mr. Rideout	4315
Mr. Simmons	4316
Mr. Lush	4318
Mr. Smallwood	4319
Mr. Rousseau	4321
Mr. Roberts	4321
By Mr. Lush in behalf of 191 residents of Canning's Cove asking for the repair, upgrading and paving of the Musgravetown-Canning's Cove road.	4325
 <u>ORAL QUESTIONS</u>	
Road conditions in the Quirpon area. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Morgan.	4327
Steps to be taken. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Morgan.	4329
Road conditions in St. Philips. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Morgan.	4330
Funding for the Labrador Resources Advisory Council. Mr. Strachan, Mr. Crosbie.	4330
The Labrador Resources Development Corporation. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Lundrigan.	4331

C O N T E N T S - 2

<u>ORAL QUESTIONS (continued)</u>	PAGE
Carbonear General Hospital. Mr. R. Moores, Mr. H. Collins.	4332
Magistrate court at Hermitage. Mr. Winsor, Mr. Hickman.	4332
Cabot Group 4. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Hickey.	4333
Home warranty programme. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Peckford.	4333
Responsibility for such a programme. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Peckford.	4335
Affiliated Marine Metals. Mr. Flight.	4336
Hunter safety course. Mr. Callan, Mr. Hickey.	4337
Administration of the fund to remove wrecked cars. Mr. Flight, Premier Moores.	4338
By-elections. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	4338
Equalization of oil prices. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	4339
Red Bay-L'Anse-au-Clair road. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Morgan.	4339
Layoffs in the Department of Transportation and Communications. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Morgan.	4339
Strike at Churchill Falls. Mr. Neary, Mr. Maynard.	4341
High school drama festival. Mr. Hodder, Premier Moores.	4341
Query as to whether implementation of the 200 mile limit would result in the purchase of surplus European fishing craft or the construction of a new fleet at Marystown. Capt. Winsor, Premier Moores.	4341
Preparation of the shipyard for such an eventuality. Capt. Winsor, Premier Moores.	4342
Role of the Canadian Atlantic fleet. Mr. Smallwood, Premier Moores.	4343
Layoffs in the public service. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	4343
Layoffs resulting from installation of a new telephone system in Confederation Building. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	4344
<u>ORDERS OF THE DAY</u>	
Private Members' Day	
That a Select Committee be established to enquire into and report upon the prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador, including the prospects for economic growth etc. (continued)	
Mr. Canning (continued)	4344
Mr. Strachan	4356
Mr. Strachan moved adjournment of the debate.	4370
<u>ADJOURNMENT</u>	4370