



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

---

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 67

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 1976

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to inform the House that tenders will soon be called by the Department of Fisheries for the construction of a fish handling facility at Musgrave Harbour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: Last Fall, Mr. Speaker, shortly after assuming my portfolio, I visited Musgrave Harbour and met with the fishermen at which time it was pointed out to me the need for such a facility in that community at which time I promised that I would certainly look into the matter and hopefully be able to make an announcement after this year's estimates. This promise Mr. Speaker, too, I think, is consistent with a similar promise made a few months or a few weeks prior to that time by my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy who was then Minister of Fisheries. So today I am keeping a promise made by both of us.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, in the community of Musgrave Harbour the fishermen there landed almost three and one-half million pounds of fish, which is almost a record for a community of that size and the number of ships that were involved in the fishery. I met with the fishermen, and I must say that I was tremendously impressed with their enthusiasm and their interest in the fisheries, and the prospects they showed for the future. I do not think I have ever met a better group of people in my life involved in the inshore fishery. This facility, Mr. Speaker, will be sort of a multi-purpose facility in that we will be installing ice-making capability, unloading capability there as well, plus a building, and also a salt fish processing capability as well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A new building?

MR. W. CARTER: A new building, yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That will be extending the present one further along.

MR. W. CARTER: The present wharf, Mr. Speaker, was constructed by the federal government, and that is now being extended by that government to enable more docking space for more ships.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Extended how? What direction?

MR. W. CARTER: I have not seen the plans, and when I visited Musgrave Harbour last the extension was not started, but I assume it is an "I" shape of an extension.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It goes further off the rock.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes out and probably in.

As I say we hope this will be also a multi-purpose facility and that we will be, in conjunction with the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation, providing some salt fish processing capability in that building as well.

MR. HEARY: Will they be putting financing into it too?

MR. W. CARTER: They will, I understand, be involved, not in the building but probably in a splitting machine or some kind of, whatever the necessary facilities are for salting fish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is there to be a filleting facility?

MR. W. CARTER: Yes. I am coming to that Mr. Speaker. Once this building is completed by government it will then be handed over, in the sense, to a fishermen's committee as we do in all cases. That committee will then, in conjunction with government, negotiate with a fish processor in the area. I am not prepared now to name the company, but I can tell the House that there is a lot of interest. As a matter of fact I think it has been pretty well agreed between this large fish processor in the area and with the fishermen of Musgrave Harbour to install a filleting capability in the plant as well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The area is Valleyfield.

MR. W. CARTER: Well the hon. member said it. I did not, but I can

Mr. W. Carter.

tell the House that the plant in Valleyfield, yes, is very interested in providing that facility.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course.

MR. NEARY: Beothuck Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Beothuck Fisheries.

Some time ago the government, Mr. Speaker, announced its policy of restricting maybe the issuance of licences for feeder plant type operations in the Province. But in this case where the fish is caught in excess of forty miles from where it is processed and over what is not a very good road at the moment, then I believe that a feeder type operation is essential and indeed necessary to ensure that the fish arrive in the plant, where it will be finally processed, in a good quality.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to make this announcement. I again commend the fishermen of Musgrave Harbour for their attitude. They are a very energetic group of fishermen who helped themselves to a large extent, and I think that this move on the part of government, Mr. Speaker, is a further indication, maybe, of government's intention to promote the inshore fishery and further expresses its determination to do everything possible to ensure that our inshore fishermen are given a chance to earn a living from that industry without being incumbered by the lack of facilities that are required.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before the minister sits down. He did not complete his thought on the filleting facilities. He did not spell it out.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have had discussions with the operators of Beothuck Fisheries in Valleyfield, and I have been assured by that gentleman, Mr. Way, that he is very interested, keenly interested as a matter of fact, in providing a filleting facility in that

Mr. W. Carter.

plant. I want the House to know, Mr. Speaker, that I am not committing Mr. Boyd Way or his company to that facility, but I can tell the House that there is a lot of interest, and I am personally pretty well convinced that once the building is completed that there will be a fillering line established in the building, as I said an ice-making machine and also some facilities for unloading fish, and thanks to Uncle Ottawa, a sizeable expansion on the existing wharfing facility and breakwater facility at Musgrave Harbour.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And shed.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Good, good, good!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, it is the best news

CAPT. WINSOP:

I have heard since this House of Assembly met last November. I certainly commend the minister and if the action of the present minister is any indication of getting things done and getting it done quickly—because as he stated he did meet with the fishermen of Musgrave Harbour last Fall. I believe again sometime during the Winter there was a delegation in and it was sort of promised that this sort of a shed would be constructed and more and better facilities provided. It is amazing what one minister can do that another minister could not do. The previous minister did make some, I think, tentative promise that within a year —

MR. CROSSIE: He is carrying on what I started.

CAPT. WINSOP: Well then in that case, Mr. Speaker —

MR. CROSSIE: Pencege your remark.

CAPT. WINSOP: Yes, I am going to. In that case I will split my thanks and appreciation to both hon. ministers. But, Mr. Speaker, not more than five years ago there was but one longliner fishing out of Musgrave Harbour. That longliner had to harbour after August or September up at Wesleyville. I visited the area with the then Minister of Fisheries, Jack Davis, and we met with the committee there and other fishermen and he saw immediately that in order for Musgrave Harbour to survive as a fishing community then there must be facilities provided and provided quickly.

It was not long before there was a completely new harbour constructed at Musgrave Harbour. Today there are no less than twelve and there will probably be fifteen longliners fishing out of there this Summer. As the hon. minister —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Fifteen?

CAPT. WINSOP: Twelve to fifteen, yes.

MR. CROSSIE: At least fifteen.

CAPT. WINSOP: Yes. And as the minister pointed out this will provide the fishermen with not only an up-to-date and modern facility for the catching and curing of fish but it will also provide a source of labour which

CAPT. WINSOR:

heretofore was exported out of Musgrave Harbour to another community. I am not begrudging that other community because there lies my native home, and anything that would deprive the people of Wesleyville from making a living certainly is far beyond any wish of mine. However Musgrave Harbour now has become one of the best fishing areas along the Northeast Coast.

MR. MORCAN: Next to Bonavista.

CAPT. WINSOR: And for the past three years it has not been a failure peculiar as that may sound. You know when we think of the 200 mile limit, and we have been clamouring for a 200 mile limit, yet the 200 mile limit has not affected, really, Pogo district and I am thinking of that part of the district from Cape Freels to, well you could encompass Change Islands, I suppose. But, Sir, I am sure the fishermen of Musgrave Harbour will be delighted today when they hear of the news that now the minister has come through with his promises and has taken the advice of the previous minister to provide this facility. They will be delighted and I certainly commend him and on their behalf I sincerely thank him.

As he pointed out there were 3.5 million pounds of fish caught in Musgrave Harbour last year and that had to be trucked over a very dusty and rough road. Consequently the quality of that fish could not be anything but less than first rate. Now we hope we will be able to produce the first top grade of fish in Musgrave Harbour. It is more than a coincidence, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the federal government is about to call tender I believe tomorrow or Friday for the extension of harbour improvements there. So you see, Mr. Speaker, we really have things going now. We have a member at Ottawa who apparently is very interested and he is producing. The member for that district now is producing and that too is a very good sign.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I once again thank the hon. Minister of Fisheries. I wish him nothing but well and I am sure he will get the support of the fishermen of that area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.



MP. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly the happiest hon. member in the chamber at the moment is the former Minister of Fisheries, the hon. and gallant captain who represents that district in this House and has done for some years past. He is undoubtedly the happiest member of the House at this moment and he has every good reason to be happy. The minister, the present Minister of Fisheries, deserves the warmest possible thanks of the hon. member for Fogo district (Capt. Winsor) and the warmest possible thanks from the fishermen of that part of Fogo district and the warmest thanks from this House.

It is the latest in a series of good things that he has been doing and I think that in all probability we may take these as an earnest, only an earnest of other good things to come. He is one of the young Turks on other other side of the House, the young, energetic and ambitious ministers who are determined to get things done. God bless them and it is good for Newfoundland. And I am sure there cannot be anybody so small minded or small hearted on this side of the House as to begrudge them the credit they have earned and are earning by doing good things. That is the name of the game.

It does not really matter who does it so long as it gets done. I feel like paying high tribute to the former Liberal Administration that ran this Province under whose aegis the great improvement was put there in the first place, under whose aegis the road was built in the second place. There was no road at all there until the former Liberal Administration built it. But after you have paid high tribute to all the good deeds of the former Liberal Administration it boils down to this today that the one hon. member of this House who has summed it all up by doing the logical thing, the thing that flows from what was done before, is the present Minister of Fisheries. I do not begrudge him any praise. After all he is my boy. He entered public life -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MP. SMALLWOOD: He is. At least he was. He was my boy. He entered public life under my auspices, worked in my office, left my office to

MR. SMALLWOOD:

enter public life, sat over there where about the present member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is sitting now or somewhere along -

MR. NOLAN The Minister of Health.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Minister of Health. He was a front bencher. He was a front backbencher.

MR. NEARY: I was right behind the hon. member.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I see. Well anyway so we do not begrudge him any credit he may get. The more of this the better. Whoever is in office, whoever the government are, the more of this the better. This is what Newfoundland really needs.

I was down there last year. I talked to those fishermen. I was down there the year before last and I talked with those fishermen, and they are a fine crowd of men. If you cannot encourage Newfoundlanders like that we might as well throw in the sponge. When you have men like that, give them every possible backing. I am glad that the minister is doing that. I am sure that the hon. former minister is very happy about it as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was late coming into the House just as Your Honour was calling Ministerial Statements. I wonder if I could revert to when Your Honour called "Order" on a point of personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of personal privilege.

MR. NEARY: Which concerns, Your Honour, an article in today's morning news. The heading of it is, "Deputy Was Not Asked To Quit Says Peckford." The part of the article that I am objecting to, Sir, is, "Mr. Peckford added that he regretted statements by LaPoile MHA Steve Neary, which tended to smear Mr. Keeping." Well, Sir, I do not know how the minister interpreted my peppering him with questions about the various goings on in his department, how he related that to smearing Mr. Keeping, because Mr. Keeping, Sir, would be the last man - and I cannot allow this to stand on the public record, Mr.

MR. NEARY:

Speaker - Mr. Keeping would be the last man in this world, if I was going to smear anybody he would be one of the last. He is one of nature's finest gentlemen and in no way, shape or form -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - Sir, should the minister link his name with the other questions I was putting to the minister about consulting fees and so on. The minister must have had a warped sense of humor when he made that remark. Maybe the hon. minister was misquoted. I hope he was. But certainly there was no relationship between the other questions and the resignation of Mr. Keeping that may or may not be voluntary. We still have not had a statement from the minister. And this is always the danger when the minister does not inform the House and does not make statements. Rumors start to fly, reports start to make the rounds, gossip starts to fly around and then you hear all kinds of queer stories. And I believe the minister would be, as all ministers would be, well-advised when a deputy resigns, as the former administration did, to come into the House and say, "We regret we have to announce the resignation of our deputy minister so and so" and this will clear up the situation.

So, Sir, I want to repeat again that in no way, shape or form should that gentleman's name be associated with any of the other questions. I think there are three or four questions that I put to the minister about the enquiries, the investigations and the other things that are going on in his department.

MR. LUNDRIGAN He will be prepared to deal with that.

MR. NEARY: Well I am glad he will be.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I think I should elaborate on an article in the May 18th edition of The Daily News yesterday which made reference to the incidents of child abuse in this Province. Throughout Canada there is an increasing concern over child abuse and the number of cases being reported is on the increase. The following shows the number of cases of child abuse that were brought to the attention of the Department of Social Services for the past three years or the past two and one-half years. In 1974 there was a total of twenty cases. In 1975 there was a total of nineteen and for the first four months of this year there were sixteen. So it is very obvious, Sir, that there is an increase. Child abuse is the term used to describe severe battering and abuse, physical and emotional, of children by parents, often resulting in broken bones, burns and other serious injuries. It is quite different from the traditional kind of neglect which results in the removal of children from parental care. This Province was among the first in Canada to pass legislation dealing with child abuse. It was under the administration of the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). In March, 1969 the Welfare Act was amended, and it was made compulsory for persons who know of incidents of child abuse to report them to the Department of Social Services.

Such cases, Mr. Speaker, are usually detected by medical doctors. Children who have been abused are often brought to doctors for treatment and where suspicion of abuse exists the doctor notifies the department and an investigation is initiated. My department is as well prepared to deal with child abuse as any other department or agency in Canada. Great emphasis is placed on staff training with a view to prevention and early detection. The department conducts special seminars on child abuse for

Mr. Irrett,

all its child welfare staff. These seminars emphasize the peculiar characteristics of child abuse and provide for discussions with members of the medical and other professions. Social workers in the Department of Social Services have a very detailed set of guidelines to assist them in prevention and early detection of child abuse. A registry of abused children has been established in our department. I feel strongly, Sir, that continual efforts are necessary to create public awareness of the existence and seriousness of child abuse in this Province and of citizens' responsibility to report all suspected cases to the proper authorities. And in closing, Sir, I would like to commend The Daily News for focusing attention on this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to present a petition, Sir, that has been signed by fifty-one men, all of them now or formerly employees of two companies who had contracts for work at the Come By Chance refinery. The companies may have had other work but all of these fifty-one of our fellow Newfoundlanders worked at the refinery. They are employees of the Metropolitan Security Company Limited and Eastern Canada Towing Company Limited. The former company, the Metropolitan Security Company, I think, has many employees throughout the Province but the Eastern Canada Towing Company Limited as far as I know their only business in Newfoundland was to provide, under contract the tugs which assisted the very large crude carriers, the VLCC's and the product carriers, the Frank D. Moores and the Joseph R. Smallwood, I believe they were called, that took the finished products from Come By Chance to market.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hope they are still called that.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) says he hopes they are still called that. I would think, Sir, that after the service the hon. gentleman rendered yesterday to Mr. John Shaheen that they would probably, almost certainly forever be named that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They might change both names.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) knows infinitely more about Mr. John Shaheen than I do.

MR. NEARY: Maybe they will call one "Edward Moxon".

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry? The

MR. ROBERTS: gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), Sir, has -

MR. NEARY: I was only joking.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He was only joking.

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad he was only joking. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am quite serious about this because these fifty-one men, Sir, are out of work as a result of the bankruptcy, and I use that term in its legal sense, the bankruptcy of the Come By Chance Refinery and the two companies that operated it, the Newfoundland Refining Company Limited and Provincial Refining Company Limited.

The prayer of the petition, Sir, I think states the matter succinctly and effectively. It is as follows, "On April 12, 1976 all the employees of Provincial Refining Company Limited, with the exception of five who I am told were senior management personnel, were given \$750 severance pay by the Provincial Government. Because Eastern Canada Towing and Metropolitan Security had long term contracts with Provincial Refining Company Limited, we were classified as permanent employees. During negotiations for the severance pay Premier Moores agreed that security employees and tugboat employees would receive severance pay also. This agreement was not fulfilled by the Premier for some unforeseen reason. Therefore, we the undersigned, petition the Provincial Government of Newfoundland to honour the agreement and make severance pay to us immediately." As I said, Sir, it is signed by fifty-one men.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition let me say that to my knowledge the allegations in it are correct. But I cannot speak from my personal knowledge of one allegation and that is the one that the Premier of this Province made a commitment to those men. I was not present at those meetings but I may say that the men who were there tell me that such a commitment was made

MR. ROBERTS: and in the absence of a denial I would assume it was made.

Re that as it may, the Premier subsequently saw, at my request, a delegation from the union at Come By Chance and I believe in consultation with the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, who I see is here this afternoon even if the Premier is not, agreed to review the situation and the result of that was that the men were told that the Cabinet had again refused to give them this severance pay. I am not sure if any reason was given and if it was I do not know what it was.

The fact remains, Sir, that if these men do not receive severance pay they are being treated unjustly in that they are being treated on a different basis than the other 400 or 500 employees of the bankrupt refinery operations who have received a golden handshake of \$750 each from the Government of this Province. ~~No matter the fact that these men were~~ employed by two separate entities, the fact remains that their employment was only and solely with the refinery operation and because of the bankruptcy of the refinery operation these men are now out of work and they are in exactly the same position in every way as the men who worked at the refinery, the men who were, I believe, quite properly and quite generously each given \$750 by the government in lieu of severance pay.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition. I do so with whole-hearted enthusiasm because I think that it was right to give the other refinery employees the money and I believe it is equally right to give these men the same amount of money. The mere fact that they were not directly on Provincial Refining Company's payroll, Sir, I think does not in any way relieve the moral obligation of the government to treat these men exactly alike. The whole matter, Sir, is one of moral obligation because as is well known there is no legal obligation on the part of the



MR. ROBERTS: government or anybody else to pay these men severance pay. That has been thoroughly discussed here in the House.

I support the petition, Sir. I do so in the hope the government will again consider their decision. Fifty-one men, which I believe is almost all of the men involved, at \$750 each, is less than \$40,000. That is not a lot of money on top of the \$300,000 or \$400,000 that has already been paid out. It is not a lot of money, Sir, to redress what I believe to be unfair and unjust and discriminatory treatment.

So in presenting the petition, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the government to reconsider this matter and to treat these men in exactly the same fair and equitable way that they have treated the other employees of the refinery.

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), before recognizing him, it has been drawn to my attention that there are ten high school students from McCallum in the Legislature and they are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Harvey Jackman. I know all hon. members join with me in welcoming the students and their teacher to the House of Assembly and in expressing the wish that their visit here will be interesting and informative.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I endorse and support very cordially indeed the prayer of the petition just presented to the House by the hon. the Leader of the Official Opposition. I approve. I agree. I do not see quite how anyone can disagree. At the same time I have to say how much I regret the fact that the government, though at the time I made the suggestion they did say that they would certainly consider it, but have not said a word about it since, how much I regret the fact that they did not accept my suggestion that at a cost of a couple of million dollars on a \$1.25 billion budget this year, they did not advance the money to hold the entire staff of roughly, 500 persons working in the refinery, to keep them, to keep the staff intact. Because as I said at the time it might be two or three or four months but then the new owners could pay the government back and within the one financial year, the present year, within the twelve months, the government could have put out the couple of million and got back the couple of million but in the meanwhile one have held the 500 staff of the refinery, trained, dependable, reliable personnel, held them for the new owners, whoever they may turn out to be.

I deeply regret that the government did not take that chance. They have taken much greater chances under the administration of the present Premier, under my administration. Governments have taken chances and in this kind of Province we have no choice but to take chances. I am sorry they did not take that chance.

In the meanwhile I strongly support the prayer of the petition so ably moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition. I would assume from the

MR. NEARY: prayer of the petition and the explanatory remarks, the introductory remarks made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that the reason the government is splitting hairs in this case is that these two groups were working for firms that had a contract with the refinery as compared to those who were getting paid directly from the oil refinery itself.

I do not believe there should be any distinction, Sir. The employees of these two companies, probably some of them resettled, relocated in the areas and have gone through the inconvenience and expense, the same as the employees who were directly on the payroll of the oil refinery, and I believe they should be given equal consideration to the employees of the oil refinery.

So I support the prayer of the petition, Sir, and I hope that the government will reconsider this matter.

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

MR. SIMMONS: I was holding back, Mr. Speaker, as I fully expected that we would hear from someone on the government side. I would like to hear very much what the Minister of Manpower or the Government House Leader or somebody else, in the absence of the Premier, might want to say about this subject. I believe it is a very important subject and I do not think one that needs to be treated so obviously lightly as it is being treated at this particular time by government. I would hope someone in government would indicate, Mr. Speaker, to the House what government's intentions are or if there is some particular kind there why this cannot be done, why this request cannot be acceded to. But the least we can hear-common decency requires that we have an explanation.

I, for my part, Mr. Speaker, would like to endorse very wholeheartedly the comments made by my friend and colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). Here we have fifty-one men

MR. SIMMONS: who in every sense of the term, Mr. Speaker, are victims, if I may use that term, victims in the same sense that the other 400 workers plus. These 400 or so workers were direct employees of PRC, these fifty-one were employees of two other companies, the companies that provided the tugboat services to the Come By Chance operation and the company that supplied the security backup for the Come By Chance operation.

MR. SIMMONS:

Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, except for the fact they were employed by different companies, they are in every sense in the same category as these 400 plus workers who have already received some financial recognition from the government, about \$750 each I believe. I find, Mr. Speaker, as a member of this House and as a taxpayer, I find it difficult to come up with any rationale as to why this fine line is being drawn by government. Why on the one hand the 400 or so workers are entitled because they were direct employees of PRC I would presume, and why on the other hand the fifty-one are not being entitled, not being allowed to avail of this pay in lieu of severance pay.

I would endorse what my friend from Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has said and make a strong plea on behalf of these men who after all, Mr. Speaker, have been subjected to enough hardship by the very closing of the refinery and the circumstances that have gone along with it, the drastic drop in the market value of their homes for example. They have suffered enough already and I would like to endorse the plea and indeed reinforce it and ask government to accede to the prayer of the petition. It will not cost in government terms, a lot of money but it will redress what I feel is a very real grievance on the part of these men.

MR. ROBERTS: Well said! Well said!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I feel obligated, I suppose, to support the prayer of that petition and feel that I should have a few words to say on it, perhaps because I think I know more about the situation than any member who has spoken thus far. I am not sure that the \$750 was really called by the name severance pay in the first place. The reason for that, of course, is probably a good reason. It would not interfere with the unemployment insurance benefits of the workers who lost their jobs.

MR. CALLAN:

The thing that I do not understand about it, I was at a meeting with these workers in the presence of the Premier and some other cabinet ministers where the promise was made, of course, that things would be put right with the workers and there was no distinction drawn then between tug boat operators, security, or some of the, I think there were five cooks also who are involved in this situation. I think possibly the total figure is probably fifty-six rather than fifty-one even though there was no mention made in the petition of five cooks who worked on the job.

Mr. Speaker, the reason given to the media why this money was given, the severance pay was given, was, it said it was not severance pay as such. The idea was to give the workers who were kept on an incentive to do a good job. In other words they would not do a bad job in putting the refinery in moth balls. Now that argument, of course, does not hold any water at all because some of the men who got this \$750 had already gone to the Mainland to new jobs.

MR. ROBERTS: Some had been gone I am told two or three weeks.

MR. CALLAN: Some of these tugboat operators, Mr. Speaker, were working a couple of months after some others had gotten laid-off and so on, and they were there and they were being depended on to help moth ball the whole operation. So there are so many ramifications here. I met with these gentlemen and with the Minister of Manpower and I understand that the Minister of Manpower took the problem to cabinet and it was rejected by cabinet. Now whether or not the Minister of Manpower presented a good argument for the case of these gentlemen or not I do not know. The Minister of Manpower has not spoken yet. I assume that he will speak and present the government's side of the picture.

But I thoroughly support the prayer of the petition and I hope that things will be put right for these fifty-one or fifty-six gentlemen, whatever the case might be.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. COUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 451 persons living in the community of North West River and a number of people from the communities of Goose Bay - Happy Valley. The prayer of the petition is rather lengthy, and I think is quite self-explanatory so I will restrict my comments to that and perhaps a couple of little side notes.

But the prayer reads: "We the undersigned in the electoral district of Naskaupi respectfully submit that our provincial government give immediate consideration to the upgrading and paving of the remaining section of road between North West River and Goose Bay. At present this section is in a deplorable condition which is nothing new for this area in the Spring of the year. Listed below are some of the problems and inconveniences caused by the condition of the road. (1) As there are a number of residents commuting to work daily at Goose Bay conditions at this time of the year causes lateness and loss of time. (2) High maintenance cost to vehicles. (3) Unpleasant and tiring trips to and from Goose Bay. At times taxi companies refusing to take public to or from North West River causing people to be stranded in either community. Perishable produce at times delayed causing considerable deterioration. Business firms in Goose Bay refusing to deliver goods to North West River. Transportation of stretcher patients impossible accomplished by air when weather permits. And (8), social life at this time of the year nearly impossible.

Considering the above reasons we feel it to be imperative that the upgrading and paving of the remaining section of the road to be essential this year. It affects the future growth of this community and the overall development of this area.

MR. GOUDIE.

And just in terms of information, Mr. Speaker, the road in question is approximately twenty-five miles in length. A portion of it has already been paved. Five miles were paved last year. At least the contract was let for five miles of paving but because of construction deadlines about four miles were paved. That remaining section, of course, will be finished this year. At least I hope it will be finished this year. And the remaining fifteen miles or so will have to be dealt with and that, of course, is obviously the purpose of this particular petition.

I support the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, and ask that it be tabled and referred to the appropriate department to which it relates.

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

MR. J. WINSOR: I rise to support the petition as presented by the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), and I find it a little ridiculous that such a short mileage, fifteen miles or so in a large area of the Province that has very little mileage at all, should be left unpaved causing a great deal of inconvenience to the two towns. I think it is ridiculous to say the least that more attention has not been given to that little piece of road. It is such a vast area of land. I certainly have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the petitions presented by my friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie). The road from Goose Bay to North West River I have driven over many times. They say if you drive it three times you buy a new car. The people in that district in Labrador, as we are well aware, are getting rather vocal about the situation there, the situation within Labrador.



Mr. Strachan.

Especially I feel that the Minister of Transportation and Communications has certainly a great deal on his plate in trying to satisfy all the demands of the people in Labrador in supplying the methods of transportation and communications, airstrips, paved roads, telephones and various other forms of transportation. But I think as well as considering that road just as a means of communication between Goose Bay and North West River, it should also be looked upon as an overall transportation scheme within Labrador. A number of years ago there were many attempts, and successful attempts by icebreakers to move into the North West point area through Lake Melville and icebreakers were managing to get up to North West River in the month of January. Obviously then using re-enforced vessels, ice re-enforced vessels the season in Labrador could be extended greatly and the period of time when we have to rely on air transportation of our goods could be considerably shortened.

However the vessels certainly cannot reach Goose Bay because they have to go through the narrow channels of the St. John's channels there and any icebreaker, of course, has no room to push the ice aside because it rafts in the narrow channel, and so they must, therefore stop at North West point and that is as far as they can reach. Also the channel at the Carrington Basin is also an extremely difficult channel to navigate for large ships and there has been many ideas expressed of bringing cargo and heavy freight down to North West point where it could very easily be loaded aboard larger vessels.

MR. STRACHAN:

I think that a road system between Goose Bay and North West River should be looked upon not only as a narrow pathway or a single laned road or just a means of transportation for the people from the community, but it should be also fitted into the overall transportation scheme trying to tie Labrador together as it comes into the early 1980's.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I too join the previous speakers in supporting the petition for the paving of that stretch of road from Goose Bay to North West River. It was during my term as member for that district that we saw fit, the previous administration saw fit, to put a bridge across the Goose River. I was honoured by having that bridge called the Earl W. Winsor Bridge and I hope the name is still visable.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who put the name on it?

CAPT. WINSOR: I said I was honoured by the previous administration -

MR. SMALLWOOD: But who put the name on it?

CAPT. WINSOR: Well if we have to be specific the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) took part in that and christened that bridge.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that part of the coalition 'Earl'? Is there a coalition now?

CAPT. WINSOR: Not by champagne but it was on the return trip when the Churchill Falls sod turning ceremony took place.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If it was not from champagne it was Bristol Cream Sherry.

CAPT. WINSOR: Well that came after. It was not served on the bridge. However, Mr. Speaker, not only did the previous administration build the bridge across the Goose River but they built the road from that river all the way to North West River. Now having done that the least that this present government can do is to upgrade and pave that road because, Mr. Speaker, there is not a mile of paved road outside of Churchill Falls. Throughout that whole stretch of communities

CAPT. WINSOR:

there is not a mile outside of the area of Churchill Falls and through the communities of Goose Bay and Happy Valley. Of course a lot of the paving that took place, a lot of the paving that is in at the Goose Bay itself, was put there by the federal government and the USAF.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think there is no area more deserving of a paved road. They are paying the same taxes as we are and they have a very limited area or distance in which to drive their cars. As the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) said you drive over it three times and your car is demolished. So I understand too that since this administration have taken over the road has become very deteriorated and if they do not soon do something about it they may have to reconstruct a whole new road. Of course this is not only because of the local traffic. This is caused by the heavy traffic caused by the woods operation in the area, I would suspect.

MR. STRACHAN Your bridge is falling down.

CAPT. WINSOR: My bridge is falling down? Well London Bridge was falling down. It was sold. So who knows?

MR. ROWE: Winsor Bridges are falling down.

CAPT. WINSOR: Now the Winsor Bridge is falling down. What a calamity! What a calamity and what a shame on the present government to see my name going in repute because of a lack of a few dollars. So I would urge upon the Minister of Communications and Transportation to give sympathetic consideration to this request and if he wants his name to go down in history -

MR. ROBFETS: We will name the bridge after him.

CAPT. WINSOR: - then he will have to do some major work, road work, in the Labrador area because, Sir, it is badly needed. I support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I would like to take a moment, Sir, to join with the hon. members in supporting the petition presented by the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) in trying to persuade his colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications to reconstruct and pave the stretch of road between North West River and Happy Valley.

Mr. Speaker, one very important point that may have escaped the hon. gentleman is the fact that this would probably be a good year to start on road paving in Labrador because we will soon see the inaugural trip of the William Carson starting a service between St. John's, Lewisporte, and Happy Valley. Now Mr. Speaker, whereas before it was rather difficult to get the equipment and to get the asphalt and the material and so forth necessary to pave this road, now the minister can call public tenders and contractors all over the Island and all over Labrador for that matter--there may be somebody in the area who can do the job, I do not know. But at least there can be competition now and there is no problem in moving the equipment and the material and supplies into Labrador. So this is another aspect of this whole matter that must be taken into consideration, Sir, and I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) will be able to persuade his colleagues and the government to do something with that road this year.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to stand in support of the petition put forward by my colleague, the hon. gentleman from Naskaupi. It is always a pleasure to support a petition from that part of the Province, whether it be for transportation needs or any other needs.

The road referred to in the petition by the 400-plus residents is a road that was not neglected, as mentioned by a spokesman

MR. MORGAN: in the Opposition, by this government. Just last year the problems of transportation were recognized fully by my predecessor, my present colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, where the tenders were awarded and were carried out for five miles of reconstruction and paving on that same road. There at present remains fifteen miles of gravel road and indeed I was down over the road there approximately three months ago with my friend and colleague, the member for the area, and saw the condition and recognized the need for some corrective action to be taken.

So in continuation of the policy put forward by my predecessors in this department we fully recognize the importance of adequate transportation means in Labrador, and I will be continuing in developing policies and continuing efforts to improve and to make sure an adequate transportation system is established in Labrador, whether it be two airstrips, which we are now working on, or improving road conditions. So I am indeed pleased today to inform the hon. gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) and inform this House of Assembly that tenders will be called within a matter of weeks for the total reconstruction of that road from North West River to Goose Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. MORGAN: Just a few words more, Mr. Speaker, when the House of Assembly closes I will be only too pleased to travel to Labrador with both my colleague on this side of the House of Assembly and my colleague in the House of Assembly in Opposition, from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), to travel to Labrador with them and look at the transportation needs and to put my efforts in that direction over the next number of months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to add my support to the prayer of the petition and welcome the announcement by the Minister of Transportation and Communications. As the minister suggested the government call tenders last year for five miles of road and indicated that we would try in three years to do that. But some suggestion has been, you know, it is nice to start on the road system in Labrador and to spend some money on it. I doubt very much if my colleagues on this side of the House are aware of the figure and I would like to let the hon. House know on both sides. I would think that \$2 million worth of work was contracted for in road work in Labrador North, Labrador South and Labrador West last year. It is a figure that is not well known. So there was quite a bit of work that went on in Labrador. Some of the upgrading on the Labrador South Road and, of course, this road in North West River and some other smaller work along the coast, which was not enough, and some over in the Western part of Labrador.

So certainly I am very pleased to see the continuation now of an expenditure on the road system in Labrador. It is certainly greatly needed and I have great pleasure as I say, Mr. Speaker, in both supporting the petition of my hon. colleague and friend from Naskaupí (Mr. Goudie), and also welcoming the good news of my colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from approximately 600 residents of the Goulds. This concerns, Mr. Speaker, a proposed incinerator for the Shoal Bay Road. If I might elaborate for a moment, the House might recall that a couple of years ago it was proposed to put a major regional dump in the Goulds - Kilbride area and that met with strong opposition from the residents and the idea was abandoned. What is proposed this time is an incinerator which will serve five communities, Mobile, Petty Harbour, Bay Bulls, Goulds and, of course, the Maddox Cove area also. At any rate this was done or the plan arose from a committee of representatives of the various towns, Mr. Speaker, in consultation with the Department of Provincial Affairs and Environment. However, although all the steps were carried out and taken in discussing this matter and in planning for this matter, it has met with the complete opposition of the residents of the Goulds and more particularly, of course, the residents of the Shoal Bay Road area. It is not just a matter, Mr. Speaker, of saying, "No, we do not want the incinerator there." It is a matter of being prepared to discuss with the department and with the town council alternative sites which the residents believe are present in the area and which could fill the bill admirably, and in particular Mr. Speaker, a site midway between the town of Goulds and Bay Bulls which is on the main road, the main highway and also has the advantage of not being near any settled community. There apparently is the space there and an excellent site for such a proposed incinerator.

So I would support the petition, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. ROBERTS: What is the prayer of it?

MR. WELLS: Well the prayer of it actually is so simple, a petition to stop a proposed dump on Shoal Bay Road. So I have to elaborate to deal with the matter.

Mr. Wells.

As I say I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and commend it to my colleague, the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment and would ask him to explore with the citizens and the town councils of the various communities other alternatives, and in particular the alternative site between Bay Mills and the Coulds.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Speaking, Sir, for my colleagues I should like to support very strongly the prayer of the petition which was presented by the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) in his capacity as the member for that district, the district of Kilbride and signed by so many hundreds of his constituents.

I think the request, Sir, is a perfectly comprehensible one and I think it is a very reasonable one and I am very pleased to see that the petitioners have gone beyond the usual step of just saying we are against it and have taken the further and very welcome step of suggesting either in their petition or through the agency of their member an alternate solution to the problem. Because I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is the nub of the matter. Whether we like it or not garbage is generated. I saw, I think it was in The Evening Telegram the other day, that whereas a few years past one pound per person per day was being generated in the Metropolitan St. John's area, it is now four pounds per person per day or some very significant increase. The garbage must be disposed of and since we have come at long last in this Province to the point where we recognize that it must be disposed of in an ordered way and not the traditional way of just throwing it in the land wash-in how many of our harbours around this Province, Sir, does one look at the land wash and see rusty tin cans floating back and forth or look at a bank



Mr. Roberts.

just at the edge of a community, over a bank or in a hole somewhere and see, you know, a festering mass of garbage? Well we are beyond that now and in area after area we have organized bodies. Indeed we have a form of quasi municipal government that is called a Waste Disposal Committee that has as its sole purpose the handling of waste disposal areas.

Mr. Speaker, we have not gone far enough and this petition, I think, brings the matter very directly to the point. Equally in point would be the incredible situation which is continuing to exist down in St. John's East Extern at the Robin Hood Bay, the dump used by the city of St. John's. The government, Sir, particularly the Minister of Provincial Affairs, who is not here unfortunately, the government have fallen down. They have almost abdicated their responsibility in this matter. The government, Sir, must assume the responsibility for ensuring that adequate waste disposal sites are made available and that they are used properly. It has gone far beyond any municipality. The problem, I think, out on the Shoal Cove Road - and I have had quite a lot to do with people from the area who have come to me - the problem there is that the municipalities as the member said have followed all of the required steps. They have done all that they ought to have done according to the rules and according to the law. But they

MR. ROBERTS:

still have not met the need. What is needed, Sir, is a minister who will seize hold of the issue and who will take it upon himself, with the help of his officials in any expert advice he needs, to make sure that adequate waste disposal sites are made available, that they are used and that they are used properly. It is not enough, Sir, to take a hands-off attitude. One could make quite bad puns about hands off the garbage and all that. But, Mr. Speaker, the point is that with respect to the Robin Hood area, the Robin Hood Bay Area, would be the clearest one, the government have just in effect washed their hands of it. And I do not mean to mix the metaphors. It is not the sort of subject that I want to try to be funny or witty about.

Yet that cannot do, Sir. We do not have a metropolitan government in the St. John's area. The Metro Board does not have the authority for this type of thing. What we need in the absence of such a government is an authority - and it can only be the government that will come to grips with the matter, that will lay out an area and that will say, "All right that is the regional dump area." The problem is getting worse and worse and worse every day. It will continue to get worse. It will not go away. So in supporting the petition I say to the minister who introduced it that I quite agree with the approach which his constituents have taken. I think it is the right one and I say, Sir, that I hope he and his colleagues will seize hold of this issue and will deal with it in the way they ought. It is something, Sir, where the government have a responsibility and they must exercise it.

The present minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment is abdicating it completely and that, Sir, cannot be accepted. It cannot be tolerated. It goes far beyond matters of beautification or social concern. It is very quickly, Sir, going to become a matter affecting the health conditions of people and that, Sir, would be much too late. So in supporting the petition I call upon the government to assume their proper responsibility and to do what must be done for

MR. ROBERTS:

Shoal Cove, Shoal Cove Road, but also, Sir, for Robin Hood Bay and for the whole area around the metropolitan St. John's area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEADY: Mr. Speaker, judging by the number of phone calls that I got from people in the Goulds area in the last ten days I would say Mr. Speaker, the feelings in connection with the proposed Shoal Bay dump, were running very, very high indeed. One thing the hon. member did not indicate to the House when the hon. member presented the petition was this came as a complete surprise and a complete shock to the people in the area, that there was going to be a dump established along the Shoal Bay Road. The people had no idea at all. As a matter of fact, Sir, it leaked out. I would not be a bit surprised but one of the members of the council who was at the meeting leaked out the information. That is how the people got wind of it.

And the next day on radio - as a matter of fact I was doing some research in the registry office to see if the land had been purchased and who purchased the land when the story broke on the radio by one of the same gentlemen who called me to complain about this dump. As it turns out it was an incinerator. But the people were not informed and this is the main point, Sir. It was rather regrettable and the minister did not mention this point either - that the Minister of Municipal Affairs had granted permission to the Goulds town council, which has a complement normally of seven councillors, had given the town council approval to operate with three members. They were down to three members, Their complement through resignations or people leaving the area or something, their complement was down to three. So they were operating with less than a quorum and met with the other representatives in the area and took this major decision. I think, Sir, it was very unwise of the Minister of Municipal Affairs to give the council

MR. NEARY:

that authority, the three remaining members. They should have had by-elections and filled these vacancies and then take these major decisions.

So I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that as a result now of the furor and the fuss that has been kicked up by the people in the area that justice will be done and that the member for the district will be able to get together with his colleague, the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment and persuade the hon. gentleman and his officials to go down and pick out a site for this incinerator somewhere halfway between Coulds and Bay Bulls. I think that is the area which the residents down there favour for the location of the incinerator.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word of support to the prayer of the petition inasmuch as the prayer is simply seeking consultation with the Department of Provincial Affairs and Environment, for the purpose of discussing an alternate site.

I feel obligated to come to the defence of my colleague in his absence. I do not think it is quite fair, Mr. Speaker, to place the blame on my colleague. I realize that the minister is responsible in the general way for all the actions of all his staff but to say that my colleague, or to suggest indeed that my colleague, was not prepared to meet or was not interested in meeting with the people of the area, I do not think is a valid comment. In filling in for my colleague I will assure my colleague the Minister Without Portfolio that I will immediately look into -

MR. NEARY: Who said he was not prepared to meet with them?

MR. HICKEY: The suggestion was made that we have washed our hands of the whole garbage situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: This is my interpretation, Mr. Speaker, of what was said. We can get Hansard and check it if we wish.

MR. NEARY: By whom?

MR. HICKEY: It is immaterial, Mr. Speaker, by whom. We are not deciding one's fate or anything. I do not think it is so important that we figure out who said what? And also the charge or the statement by the Leader of the Opposition that the government has washed its hands of the entire garbage situation in the City of St. John's, that is not necessarily true, Mr. Speaker.

As one who is keenly interested in the future of the Robin Hood Bay and the overall decisions that would be made with regards to this problem, I can certainly say that this administration has not washed its hands of the situation.

MR. ROBERTS: What has the government done?

MR. HICKEY: The government has taken a number of steps,  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Name one.

MR. HICKEY: And you know I am not going to get into a debating  
deal with the Leader of the Opposition. I can certainly point out  
to him very quickly that this government has done a darn site  
more than the former government did with regards to this problem.  
It is not so simple, Mr. Speaker, to sort this matter out. The  
City of St. John's has a responsibility. The Provincial Government  
is not totally responsible to bear the cost of the disposal of  
garbage for the City of St. John's. Is there any hon. member  
suggesting that?

MR. ROBERTS: : No.

MR. HICKEY: It is not so simple at all. It is not so  
simple at all, Mr. Speaker, to say, "There is the site. We do  
not give two hoots as to how much it is going to cost to crate  
the garbage to the site. Let the City pay for it." It is  
not just that simple. So I say to my hon. friends opposite  
that this government has indeed not washed its hands, nor  
has it washed its hands of the Robin Hood Bay situation and they  
can be sure of that, Mr. Speaker. There has been statement after  
statement after statement made with regards to that disposal  
site. It is going, it is going and one of those days, Mr. Speaker,  
I am going to be very happy and proud to say it is gone.

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

MR. RIDFOUT: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add my support to the  
petition presented by the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells)  
and I would like to say that we support it thoroughly. We are  
not suggesting from this side that the City or the Provincial  
Government has total responsibility for doing away with the  
garbage of the City of St. John's. We are not naive enough  
for that. We believe that there has to be a sharing of responsibility.

MR. RIDGOUT: There has to be a collective responsibility in this particular area and all we are saying is for the government to sort of put its action where its mouth is and show us by some firm action what they are prepared to do about this particular problem. The Leader of the Opposition has suggested that that has not been the case to this point. From our knowledge we can only say that that is true and that is our stand. That is our point. We support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALIAN: Mr. Speaker, about a month ago, I think, I presented a petition here in this House and in so doing I made the suggestion that I would just as soon that nobody else bothered to support it because it was wasting the time of the House. Twice this afternoon though I feel obligated to stand and support, first of all, of course, a petition on behalf of the refinery workers earlier, and now this one in connection with garbage disposals and incinerators.

MR. NEARY: The government are experts on garbage disposals.

Mr. Callan.

Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with the 600 petitioners. They are suggesting that the dump should not be located in the community or near the community but to be located outside. Two weeks ago I attended a council meeting in Chance Cove where it was outlined to me the need for an incinerator in that dump at Chance Cove which is in close proximity to the community, and there were good, logical, sensible reasons given why an incinerator was needed for that area. Jack's Pond Provincial Park used the dump and with no incinerator the garbage just piled up. Bellevue Beach Provincial Park was using that dump, Bellevue Beach Lounge, chicken take outs, all the residents of Chance Cove and so on. And it was brought to my attention at that meeting that in the community of Chance Cove rats were coming down from the dump where - of course, without an incinerator the garbage just piled up and so on and rats were breeding - these rats were coming down into the community and presenting problems, naturally, for some of the residents. So here is a logical reason why a dump should not be located too near a community and, of course, it also points out the need for the most modern garbage disposal and that, of course, in this case, is an incinerator.

Unless the government, and unless we are prepared to do all we can to try and keep our Province clean and healthy, of course, and do so with actions, you know, rather than having Municipal Affairs come back as they did by the way in the case of Chance Cove - a request was made for the incinerator and government came back and said, "No, an incinerator costs \$50,000 or \$60,000, use the one at Sunnyside," which, of course, I totally disagree with - so, as I say unless we are prepared to do something concrete to educate the public to the need for, you know, clean, healthy communities and a clean, healthy Province then all we can expect is that things will happen like another incident which I observed yesterday. On the way into St. John's yesterday I had some trouble



Mr. Callan:

with the car. I pulled off on the side of the highway there and there on the side of the highway was a bag of garbage just lying there rotting, of course, and about twenty feet away from that was a dead dog which to me - you know, we have heard the song, A dead skunk in the middle of the highway - well this was a dead dog on the side of the highway, and it appeared to me that the dog had just been probably killed or died at home somewhere and whoever owned it disposed of it in the simplest way, at least, by just throwing it out of the car on the side of the highway. And unless, as I said, unless we are prepared to support petitions like the one just presented for **cleaner, better, healthier communities and better dumps with incinerators and so on, the most modern, up-to-date** dumping facilities then all we can expect is the incident such as the one I **observed yesterday.**

So I support the prayer of the petition and I hope that the government acts on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. GOUNIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a second petition and before presenting it I feel there should be, at least, one brief explanatory note and make reference to a petition which was presented in the House last week. One could possibly in some ways contradict the other I suppose. I presented a petition last week on behalf of a number of senior citizens of Happy Valley - Goose Bay dealing with the **Paddon Memorial Hospital in this community and this petition is being presented on behalf of 1,180 residents of the Happy Valley section of the town as opposed to the town of Happy Valley - Goose Bay.**

The prayer is brief: "We the undersigned citizens of Happy Valley - Goose Bay strongly protest and completely disagree with the government's apparent decision to move the medical facilities from the **Paddon Memorial Hospital to the**

Mr. Goudie.

former U.S.A.F. Base Hospital. We feel this move will seriously inconvenience all citizens and in particular put a heavy and serious burden upon senior citizens. We seriously hope that you will reconsider and meet with local citizens on this serious matter." That, Mr. Speaker, is the prayer of the petition and as I drew attention to a petition earlier I think the citizens of Happy Valley feel that the move now is definitely going to take place and this is probably their last chance of voicing their objections to that move. I support the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, and ask that it be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition I think it bears out what I said when I supported the petition presented by the hon. member when he presented a petition for the senior citizens' home. And the intent was or the prayer of that petition was to take the Paddon Memorial Hospital and convert it into a senior citizens' home, which is not a bad idea. However I did state in supporting the petition that I was not convinced that the people of Happy Valley were all that happy about having to move the medical facilities from Happy Valley to Goose Bay. And, of course, now, Sir, 1,100 signatures attached to that petition bears out that there is some truth to what I had surmised. The hon. member finds himself in a precarious situation right now. You know, having to bring in one petition to contradict the other is not a pleasant task to have to do. However, I certainly support the petition as presented because, Sir, that hospital, that **Paddon Memorial Hospital is a very fine building of very fine construction.** And it would serve as a good senior citizens' home with some moderation, some remodeling.

MR. HICKMAN: Which is it going to be, a hospital or a senior citizens' home?

CAPT. WINSOR: Well, according to the hon. member he is in a predicament now where he cannot say. You know, he is the elected member down there and he has got 1,100 - what strategy now are you going to use to get the hon. member off the hook? He is on a hook now. So you cannot straddle both sides of the fence. You know you either got to sit on the pot or get off it. So I feel sorry for the hon. member because, as I say, it is a precarious position. However, I have an awful lot of friends in Happy Valley, and I support that petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STRACHAN: In supporting the prayer of the petition I would like to refer back to the previous petition which the member presented. I can understand the dilemma, the position he finds himself in. But if you remember when I supported the first petition I stated quite clearly that I supported it only on the basis that the decision had been taken to move the hospital and that if that decision had been taken then there was very little else to do but support the petition to have the present Paddon Memorial Hospital turned into a senior citizens' home. However, I am concerned, and I stated then, and I state again now that the difficult situation that the member finds himself in, and many other people find themselves in, should surely have been overcome simply by proper consultation with the council of Happy Valley - Goose Bay and the proper consultation with the Health Committee which, as I understand, was set up particularly for this purpose and had been very active. Reverend Buckle in Happy Valley had been extremely active in objecting to the move as far back as last November, I believe, and they feel that the decision has been made to move the hospital over the top of their wishes. I can well imagine the difficulty the member must find

Mr. Strachan.

himself in in trying to handle this situation. I do not know if the Minister of Health wishes to respond to this but I know within Happy Valley - Goose Bay there has been a considerable amount of accusations that the minister did not consult with the Health Committee and, therefore, find out the feelings of the people of the area before the decision was taken.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a bit of a quandary in this matter. It was under my administration that the hospital was built and I had the honour to open it in quite an attractive ceremony, public ceremony, attended by a very large number of the people in that part of Labrador. I hate to think of the building just being closed and perhaps moth balled. Yet if the other building is a more suitable hospital, why should it not be used? Obviously for the sake of the people of that part of our Province the best facilities that are available to them are the facilities that ought to be used and they appear to be the hospital recently vacated by the Armed Forces.

MR. NEARY: We had the same situation in Stephenville, if you remember.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. The hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) reminds us that at Stephenville we had spent substantial sums of money to build a hospital and that then the Americans pulled out and we found ourselves heirs to a very fine hospital building. We had to decide. It was a very practical decision to make. Would we just hang on to the hospital that we had built at Stephenville Crossing - which, in fact, was the second one there I believe, if I remember right. There were two hospitals at Stephenville Crossing, the second being a portable building that we brought in from Montreal and assembled in place at Stephenville Crossing, now would we just hang on to that and go on using it or avail ourselves of the opportunity, suddenly dumped in our laps when the Americans pulled out, the opportunity to use a much larger, much better, much more convenient hospital, not at Stephenville Crossing but at Stephenville itself?

Our decision we did not hesitate to make. We made it. We choose the larger hospital. Then arose the question, what would we do with the old hospital which we had put there? What would we do with it? There was a powerful movement and I believe it was His Excellency, the Bishop of St. George's, Bishop O'Reilly,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

if I remember right, who rather initiated a movement to have the vacated hospital at Stephenville Crossing used as a home for old people. I do not think that that was ever done and frankly I am not aware at this moment of what is the present status of the former hospital at Stephenville Crossing.

MR. NEARY: Welfare officers use it but there is a new senior citizens' home at Stephenville Crossing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes and that is my recollection, that everybody involved rather turned down the idea of using the old hospital as a home for elder people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hate the thought of a hospital that I was instrumental in getting built and that I opened just being closed up and moth balled. I would like to see it used, put to good purpose. Now that is one part of my mind. The other part is very much concerned with my honourable and genial smiling friend who has so little to smile about these days, the Minister of Finance. I am perhaps as much concerned as he is or perhaps even more than he is over the finances of this Province. I would say that if that hospital could be moth balled, laid aside, kept in shape, kept in condition for another couple or three years and spend nothing on it except the bare bones costs of keeping it from deteriorating, if that could be done and move into the large new hospital, that would be the wiser course for the government to take, in the light of the desperately serious condition of the public purse. And that is a desperately serious condition which very few honourable members of this House grasp or understand or appreciate or are very much interested in knowing.

So if I were a member of the cabinet, if I were the Premier of this Province, I would be torn, as is the honourable member, the hon. gentleman, the member for the district is torn, he must be torn, I would be torn much more if I were a member of the cabinet than I am. But I am of two minds. I think I would lean in the direction of

MR. SMALLWOOD:

economizing. I think I would. In fact I know I would.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am pretty sure that all hon. members realize that the decision to obtain the U.S.A.F. hospital in Goose was taken some time ago and it was a difficult decision to make until one examined the financial implications. The extension which had been planned, and people in Happy Valley were looking forward to it I know, the extension which had been planned to the Paddon Memorial in Happy Valley would cost a minimum of \$11 million in 1965 dollar terms, \$11 million to put the extension on the old Patton Memorial which would be required to meet the health needs of that region of Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. minister allow me to interrupt him to ask him a question? Can he give the House some assurance that whatever is done, the attempt of Newfoundland to honour the name of the late Dr. Paddon will not be lost and that in some way his name will be preserved officially and formally?

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I will come back to that. But to continue in finishing what I was leading up to, the cost in 1965 dollars to extend the old Paddon Memorial in Happy Valley, 1965 dollars now, Mr. Speaker, was \$11 million. The same time we were wrestling with this problem, along with the needs of other areas of the Province, along came the U.S.A.F. hospital available to us. Of course we would be crazy, we would be less than responsible, if we did not take a look at it. Mr. Speaker, we are not setting any precedence. The first hospital in Gander was a military hospital. That was the first one in Newfoundland which was taken over from the military. The Janeway at Pepperrell was a military hospital and the one to which the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) just referred in Stephenville was a military hospital. It is nothing new we are doing here. It is a marvellous facility with a potential for eighty beds. The Paddon has twenty now and we were talking about an expansion or an extension

MR. H. COLLINS:

of twenty up to forty. Here is a facility with a potential for eighty beds. We will be opening forty. We have had federal health officials go in, architects, engineers, medical people, to look at it and they tell us that the building is good for at least twelve or fifteen years. It is well equipped, the ultimate in every type of equipment which one would wish to find in a hospital.

Now is it wise then for this government in this day and age -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Are they leaving the equipment?

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hospital has been left intact for us. We have it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They will not. They ripped out everything, even the pictures, the wires at Fort Pepperrell

MR. H. COLLINS: Well we got in on this early and made sure that that did not happen. The hospital is intact.

Did we make the right decision, Mr. Speaker? Here is a well equipped hospital with a potential for eighty beds at a cost of one dollar to this Province and we have worked out an agreement with the Ministry of Transport in Goose whereby all the maintenance will be done free of cost with the exception of any minor interior maintenance, like maybe moving a partition or moving a door or something. Snow clearing, heat, light and so on all provided free of charge. Stack that up, one dollar, eighty bed hospital, stack that up against, at least now in those days, at the time we are living in now, \$15 million or \$16 million for another twenty beds. The decision, Mr. Speaker, was easy.

However after taking that decision we realized that there will be some concern and some unrest and some dissatisfaction in terms of the people at Happy Valley because the hospital is right down in their midst. Now the new hospital is over in Goose Bay which is not too far away. It is not much further than from the East End of St. John's to the West End of St. John's, certainly no further than from



May 19, 1976

Tape 2814

IB-5

MR. H. COLLINS:

Glenwood to Gander or from Musgrave Harbour to Gander and over a paved road. So, Mr. Speaker,

MR. COLLINS: It is normal, I suppose, that people would, you know, express some displeasures but I think in terms of what the government was faced with we had no alternative.

Now the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) says that there was no consultation. Now when one gets up in this hon. House and makes a statement he should know what he is talking about. There has been consultation. There has been meetings with Reverend Buckle and I am the joker who met with him, if he wants to call me a joker. I have met with the ICA -

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. minister joker.

MR. COLLINS: The hon. Leader of the Opposition just came in and he is the biggest joke in Newfoundland.

The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) says that there has been no consultation, there has been no meetings and they cannot get a meeting and the press has been saying that. I suppose he reads the paper and he figures everything in the papers is factual and we all know that is not so. There has been meetings, in fact, there are other meetings to take place. The hon. member who represents that fine section of the country, he and I are going into Maapy Valley - Goose Bay next Wednesday? Next Wednesday, the 28th. of May, to meet with the very groups to which the hon. member refers, to meet with them again.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that we have made the right decision. I am convinced it will be in the best interest of the people in that area. With regard to Dr. Paddon's name on the old Paddon Memorial, there was a petition presented here by my friend a couple of weeks ago suggesting that the old building, the old hospital should be used as a senior citizens' home, extended care facility or whatever. That was received and my colleague the hon. Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation undertook at that

MR. COLLINS: time to receive recommendations from the people in Goose Bay - Happy Valley as to what use that building should be put to. Once that suggestion has been made I am sure that my colleague will entertain it. And I am also sure that the Paddon name will remain on that particular building.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act," (Bill No. 63), and a bill, "An Act Respecting the Retirement of Magistrates." (Bill No. 62)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Community Sales) Act." (Bill No. 61)

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago, or a couple of weeks ago in one case, the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) asked questions regarding policies on education and I notice he is not in the House, I thought he was here. He was here earlier.

MR. ROBERTS: He has given up in despair of ever getting the questions answered.

MR. HOUSE: The first one was regarding the sabbatical leave for teachers, what their policies were, what criteria they used. I am informing the hon. member and this House that a procedure followed, As you know the committee was set up in accordance with the provisions of the collective agreement and comprised two representatives of the NTA, two representatives of the Department of Education and one representative from the Federation of School Boards.

Applications were invited through the medium of the NTA and departmental publications, and applications were received from

MR. ROUSE: seventy teachers, and from that seventy, two people had to be selected. The committee set up as their criteria the guidelines and, of course, this is what the hon. member was interested in, the guidelines, and the guidelines were first of all the teacher qualifications and the people that we would give this leave to were people who did not have an undergraduate degree. We took into consideration the experience, the professional and the academic achievements, the accessibility or lack thereof of existing university programmes to the teachers. For instance somebody living away from where off-campus courses were offered would receive more recognition than those who have accessibility to these courses, and efforts made by the teacher to upgrade his qualifications in the past. And, of course, comments and observations were made by the school board officers also.

Now the information on which the Committee made its decision was received from three main sources. I think the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) said that one person was only asked to provide where he lived. There were three main sources and they were the teacher's application, that provided by the school board, and the information that we have on the teacher. This information is at the Department of Education and also at the NTA office. So that is the answer to that first question.

The second question regarded the government policy on free text books. The free textbook policy was implemented a couple of years ago and completed last year when we gave pupils free text books up to grade eight. But the policy that we initiated at that time was not rigidly enforced, the guidelines, because we were supplying a quarter of the textbooks every year, so every four years you would have a turnover. So it was not rigidly enforced because we did not know how the textbooks would stand up. So it is our intention this year to enforce the twenty-five per cent annual replacement and anything in addition to that will have to come to the minister or the Deputy Minister.

MR. HOUSE: The reason we cannot enforce it rigidly is, we do not know how the books stand up. For instance spelling books may only last two years rather than the four that we had projected because they are very well used books. With regard to replacement of those that are willfully damaged by students, school boards have been advised it is their responsibility to collect the cost of this willfull damage and, of course, it is their responsibility in the final analysis. We will not replace these that are willfully damaged unless they come within the quarter that we replace every year.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have some answers to some of the questions. I will read the question and a number instead of the whole of it because it will take quite a while.

Question No 522 as asked by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) question No.516 as asked by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), question No. 314 as asked by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), question No.306, the same hon. member, No. 305, No. 300, No. 287, question No. 12, question No. 286, and 285, 284, 278, 273, question No.77, question No. 37, 316, 427, asked by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), question No.491, as asked by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan).

I have a number of other questions, I will have the answers in a couple of days, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on April 8th. there was a question asked verbally by the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) about beaches. "What beaches are there in the Province from which sand and rock can be removed or cannot be removed, and if this is still going on from beaches in the Province, is a permit granted or required " and so on.

MR. CROSBIE: Now you have to have a permit, Mr. Speaker, from the Department of Mines and Energy and I have a number of lists here of beaches. There are 600 and I want to deal with each beach. I want to answer this question fully and completely. So there are 600 beaches, starting with Middle Cove, that is located near St. John's, the maximum permit you can get for the Middle Cove Beach is five cubic yards, but you can get a permit to take material from Middle Cove. Salmon Cove, Mr. Speaker, in Conception Bay -

MR. DOODY: Would that be one year or one person or is there a number of -

MR. CROSBIE: This is an individual permit, you know, one person can get one permit for five cubic yards maximum.

MR. NEARY: One a year or one a week or one a day?

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know how many a day. I suppose if you lined up you could get 100 a day, although I doubt it. I do not think there would be enough on the beach to permit that. The regulations

Mr. Crosbie.

permit a permit up to five cubic yards in Middle Cove. Salmon Cove in Conception Bay is banned. Northern Bay is banned. Crockers Cove, Carbonear East, one cubic yard is permitted. Carbonear Beach is banned. Near Powells Brook in Carbonear South, banned. Lance Cove, Bell Island, banned. The beach in Bell Island, you can get a permit for twenty cubic yards.

MR. NEARY: Go on. Is that a fact?

MR. CROSBIE: In any event, Mr. Speaker, I will not read the whole list. There are twenty pages.

MR. NOLAN: Could we have a copy?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, well I have got eighteen or twenty copies of this here. So anybody who is interested, it shows the beach, where it is located, whether it is banned to remove any material or whether it is restricted.

MR. NEARY: What about Greppes Nest over on Bell Island?

MR. CROSBIE: About which?

MR. NEARY: What about Greppes Nest?

MR. CROSBIE: No, I do not see it mentioned here. But I am sure that most places must be mentioned.

And then it shows what the maximum permit is, if you can get a permit.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. CROSBIE: No, because I will not know the answer.

Normally, permits for small quantities will normally be issued promptly. Requests for large quantities may require a prior inspection.

MR. NOLAN: What is the requirement for restoring the beach after you have obtained materials?

MR. CROSBIE: Well there are supposed to be strict requirements. Some beaches you are only allowed to use shovels. You know, the permit

Mr. Crosbie.

says you can only remove with a hand shovel, and some you are allowed to use a loader. It depends on the beach, and it is supposed to be put back in proper condition.

So anyway, Mr. Speaker, there are eighteen or twenty copies here for any members who are interested, and about 600 beaches are dealt with.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before Your Honour calls the Oral Questions, and before the House finishes with the Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given may I ask the Government House Leader; (a) May I expect to get answers in the remaining part of this session, which I hear by rumour is to be a couple of weeks or so, to 218 questions that I have asked, of which I have given notice, and that have appeared on the Order Paper, to which I have not had answers. I have had answers, including those today, to 230 questions, but I am waiting on answers to 218 more? Am I likely to get these answers during the remainder of the session? And if not - and it is now going on six months since I asked them, which is a fair amount of warning or notice - if not, can I be assured that I will get them in a week or two or three after the House closes? - 218 important questions.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, it is a question perhaps best asked of the individual ministers, but I realize that is difficult to do. I can only say this. A lot of questions, as the hon. member says, have been answered. Various ministers have staffs of people working, and some of these answers cannot be lightly given. They have to be thoroughly researched and the answers taken out of the -

MR. ROBERTS: The ones where there are Crosbie's statement on government policy.



MR. WELLS: So they are working on it. I say that quite seriously, and I am hopeful that by the end of this present session that most of the answers will have been given, but I cannot guarantee on behalf of the government that any individual minister will be able to get all the answers ready. But the majority of them, I would hope, will be.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I be permitted, Mr. Speaker? I do not know if it is in order for me to say -

MR. ROWE: Are we on Oral Questions?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is before coming to the Oral Questions.

MR. WELLS: But we are on Oral Questions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No!

MR. SPEAKER: I recognized the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). And the question has come up whether we are on Oral Questions. Actually when it started I called, Oral Questions. The hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) then said, "Before we get on Oral Questions."

MR. NEARY: Then asked an oral question.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, but I am counting this as Oral Questions. This is in order as Oral Questions. The hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), I believe, had a supplementary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well only to thank the hon. Government House Leader, and to tell him that before the House met and before I was a member of this House, I got far more answers and far more promptly than I am getting them now that I am a member.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, there was obviously a moral in that most recent comment.

Mr. Speaker, a question, please, for the Minister of Finance in his capacity as President of the Treasury Board. Would

Mr. Roberts.

he say, Mr. Speaker, whether the government have increased the salary of the secretary, equivalent to deputy minister, of the Treasury Board from \$34,500 a year, which is the amount shown in the estimates, to \$40,000 a year, an increase of \$5,500 per annum?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I cannot say that that is absolutely accurate, but there certainly has been an increase from \$34,000 on up toward that figure. I cannot pin myself down to that question.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I realize, you know, that it is unreasonable for me to expect him to have these here.

Would the minister please table a list showing in respect of his deputy minister, who has had an increase of \$5,500, the Assistant Deputy Minister, Revenue, who has had an increase of \$4,000, the Assistant Deputy Minister, Expenditures, had an increase of \$2,400, the Secretary of the Treasury Board has had an increase of \$5,500 and any other deputy ministers - I could name a number of others - the date on which the increase was approved and when it became effective?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: I would not think that that information could be made available. It comes out in the salary details.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may. I have a further supplementary. The problem is, Sir, that the salary details for all of these four officials I have named are incorrect in that they show the Secretary of the Treasury Board getting \$34,500, when in fact he is now being paid \$40,000 a year, I am told, on what I believe to be a good authority, an increase of \$5,500. So it is not in the salary details. That, Sir, is the problem. That is why I asked for the list.

MR. DOODY: That is actually what I said. I said I see very little problem with it since they will all come out in the salary details eventually. If not in this one, then in a subsequent one. I did not say that they were in this one.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Tourism, Sir, and ask the minister what has happened to the Silver Anniversary gift that was given to this Province by the Government of Canada in the way of a Tourist Interpretation Centre for Port aux Basques in 1974? What has happened to that project?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, to be very specific with the hon. gentleman, a number of things have happened. Number one, there was quite a delay because we had not confirmation in writing from the federal government that the money was available from the federal government, that the money was available. We had a promise, a word of mouth, sort of, and one does not go and do anything to incur expenses until you have it in writing. And I am sure the hon. member remembers a meeting with him, and a delegation from Port aux Basques, where this was pointed out. Having gotten that out of the way, and having gotten confirmation in writing from the federal government that money indeed was available, we proceeded in an attempt to get the project underway. We had a drawing which was prepared by Public Works, a proposal for the Interpretation Centre which took the form of what they call a mamateek. Time had elapsed and we were concerned as to the escalation of cost so we did a check on that, because not only was the Interpretation Centre for Port aux Basques involved, but there were a number of smaller ones along the highway which was part and package of that programme. We had to make sure how far we would go over the estimate, if indeed we could go over, and what the requirements would be

Mr. Hickey.

from the point of view of provincial funds. And there was the problem of location, and there were a number of views as to location, and I am sure again my hon. friend is well versed in that. That matter has now been sorted out and the location will be the site of the Annie Coady. That seems to be quite acceptable. At least my staff tell me that everything is in order with regards to that. The only problem remaining, - and I might say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that a firm of architects - and I do not recall who - were appointed to look after this project. We have gone back to them now, because I for one did not like the proposal of a mamateek. I did not, however, make any arbitrary decision just based on my own views. During a visit to Port aux Basques I had a number of people who had made representation to me, and a number

MR. HICKEY:

of other people from other parts of the Province have expressed the same concern. So for that reason I felt that my own views and my own affairs of proceeding with that type of building had some validity. So we have now gone back to the architect and we have asked him for a couple of other proposals in terms of designs. I am told that this should not take too long. My own staff, the engineer in the development section of tourist services, have provided the information, I understand. As soon as this is done we will make a final decision as to the type of building, design, etc., and then we should be ready to call tenders. In any event I think I can say to my hon. friend that the project will eventually and finally get off the ground hopefully within thirty days. This is what we are pushing for.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What the minister is saying then, sending it to the architects to have it redesigned will not delay the specifications and the calling of tenders and the awarding of the contract for the tourist information centre, that the actual construction will get underway early Summer, within a few weeks, say?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful and we are pushing for a final decision to be able to call a tender within thirty days. I think I have to say in all fairness to the hon. member that it is my understanding, and certainly it is my understanding simply based on - I have not asked anyone this - but it is my understanding based on what I know about calling tenders, that we could not call a tender now even though we do not see any great change in cost and we do not see any great change in terms of size of the building. But I do not think that it would be fair, indeed I do not think it would be possible, to call a tender and expect a contractor to give a price without having a fair amount of information in terms of design, because the design obviously would affect the cost and certainly would affect the price that the contractor would quote. Therefore it is my view that we

MR. HICKEY:

will have to wait until we make a final decision as to the design. Then we are all ready to call a tender.

MR. NEARY: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A further supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The minister indicated that the new tourist interpretation centre in the gateway town of Newfoundland would be on the site of the Annie Coady. Will the minister tell the House if the Annie Coady will also be left on that site?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would doubt very much that it would be left on the site. What is to become of it I cannot answer. It is a pertinent question. I will certainly take it as notice and find out from my staff as to what they suggest to be done with it.

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

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for - and possibly this may be answered in two parts, by both the Minister of Tourism, who I believe is now acting Minister of Provincial Affairs, and possibly, maybe for further elaboration, by the Minister of Transportation because it refers to a meeting that apparently was held today concerning a construction project, a housing development in fact, on Topsail Road West of Park-Le. A notice appeared in the paper six weeks ago inviting comments on the development by the council of Paradise. I understand that one letter, and one letter only was written concerning that, and that was written by me, asking about if 500 homes, for example, are built what is the situation on traffic on the Topsail Road which is already severe, the sewerage problem that obviously will be there, and how it will be handled, the schooling and so on. Although I understand that the town of Conception Bay in whose jurisdiction it is not, incidentally, municipally, but apparently they had a meeting with the ministers concerned, or two ministers this morning, and I am wondering what information they can provide regarding that project?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: I can give the hon. gentleman some answers to the portion of the question that applies to me.

MR. NOLAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I just cannot hear the minister responding. There is too much noise in the House.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that I will attempt to provide some answers to the portion of the question that applies to my department and also to the Department of Provincial Affairs and Environment. First of all,

MR. HICKEY:

as Minister of Tourism I can inform my hon. friend that we have plans for the area of Topsail Beach as I have indicated to him and as he is well aware. From that point of view I have to take the position that there is no way that I could see approving of or allowing, certainly without the strongest representation to the people, whoever they might be with regards to the draining of sewage and based on that, no matter how pure or how little pollution might well be in it having come from a sewage treatment plant, into a river which eventually ends up running into Topsail, into the water at Topsail Beach. The reasons for that are quite obvious. Mr. Speaker, as I said we have plans to develop that area. It is a very fine area and attracts a great number of people for a fairly large season of the year. One could only assume that there would always be the threat of pollution and always a danger, because all it would require would be for the sewerage system to break down. So from that point of view we would be opposed to that.

From the point of view of the environment aspects, directly having met with the people involved I have been in touch with the staff in the environment section and I have asked them for a report as to, one, if permits have been granted; two, what considerations have been given to the matter that I have just alluded to; and also what alternatives there are and what changes in cost that might be involved with regards to the contractor who proposes to build the homes. It is natural that a construction company would be conscious of cost, and so for that reason I would like to see the difference in cost as to one system versus the other.

But in short, Mr. Speaker, from my point of view I cannot see the project going ahead with the drainage going into the river that runs through Topsail Beach.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. And just as a matter of information, hopefully to the minister, I understand that while it was the original intention to have, one, a sewage treatment plant and running



MR. NOLAN:

into the river that he has outlined and very rightly so, that since they have taken another look at it - and I believe the sewage treatment plant will be located in another area now, up around maybe somewhere close to the steel mill in Octagon or something like that - but that was the latest information I heard.

Now the other side of the thing that I addressed to the Minister of Transportation is, if there is a development of 500 homes, and if in the initial stages it is going to be 150 homes, this is going to add a considerable traffic flow there in an already very difficult area, as I am sure he well knows. The people involved in some instances suggest that there is going to be a road from Manuels Bridge up to the access road. True. That is fine. But when? So I am just wondering what the minister's approach to this particular development is insofar as he knows about it at the moment, the Minister of Transportation.

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

MP. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the meeting this morning was with the Conception Bay council and my colleague, the Minister of Tourism and acting Minister of the Environment and myself met with them. They were mostly concerned with the pollution potential. Of course we are concerned as a department with the increased volume of traffic it will mean in the area. Looking at the fact that this year we will be carrying out surveys for the Conception Bay by-pass to take the load off the old Conception Bay highway, well, that is only an engineering survey to be carried out this Fall and Winter, hopefully completely by next Spring. Then of course we are looking at the Conception Bay access road down to Manuels Bridge from the highway. But that is only engineering work. We have done the engineering work on the other access, but that depends on what assistance we obtain from Ottawa before we can commit ourselves to carrying out that work. So in the meantime the old Conception Bay Highway, the capacity right now, I would say, is limited. We are concerned over the increase in the volume of traffic.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health under whose department Vital Statistics come. I am wondering if there is any legislation proposed with regard to the issuing of birth certificates throughout this Province? I think it is fair to say that there are probably hundreds of people throughout the Province, people, of course, sixty, sixty-five years of age who want to get their birth certificates, They have never had one, They want to get them for the purpose of old age pension and what have you, and under the present legislation it is almost impossible in some instances to get a birth certificate. I am wondering if probably any consideration has been given to changing legislation regarding that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: I do not know if legislation has got too much to do with it. I presume what the hon. member refers to is the difficulty experienced by some elderly people in obtaining a birth certificate from the Registry by virtue of the fact that the birth was not registered by the clergyman, or whoever, in the church at the place of birth. There is a procedure which can be followed in terms of obtaining affidavits from people who would know, would remember of the birth. Sometimes that poses problems because they might have passed on, but that procedure seems to work reasonably well. I have been made aware of several cases in the not too distant past whereby that procedure has been followed and the certificate has been issued.

If the hon. member has some specific cases I would certainly be interested in discussing it with him and see if we can bring it about. I know it is very important because in order for a person to obtain his old age pension sometimes a more definite proof of birth is required than one might have. But there is a procedure for dealing with that.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the procedure

MR. CALLAN: and so on but under the present legislation or rules or what have you, an affidavit is no good. Mr. Dewey, who is the Registrar, on a couple of occasions I have been after a birth certificate now for one gentleman for the past three months and I cannot get it, so perhaps the supplementary question should be will the minister see to it that this gentleman gets his birth certificate under present legislation?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly do everything in my power if the hon. member will let me have the name.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A supplementary to the hon. minister, Can he tell us when it became necessary by law, and in fact became the practice, for all births to be registered in the Registry of Birth, Marriages and Deaths, and from what date may people be reasonably sure they can get certificates of their birth? Is there a starting date after which all births are registered in the department of the government dealing with that kind of thing, or how far back must you go before you have to turn to clergymen, and where do you leave off getting the information in the government and then have to go beyond to the clergy? Is there a cut off date?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would undertake notice of that but I certainly will undertake to get the information.

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I could not reply to the Minister of Health during his reply in support of the petition from the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), but I would like to phrase it in the form of a question. He implied that I was naive to regard the information from the newspapers as being factual, so I would like the minister to reply whether he did actually have any consultation with the Town Council of Happy Valley - Goose Bay concerning the move of the Paddon Memorial Hospital?

MR. ROBERTS: In what form was it taken?

MR. STRACHAN: My information comes from the horse's mouth and not from the newspapers.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that Reverend Buckle had anything to do with the Town Council in Happy Valley. I think the hon. member used the name of Reverend Buckle on two or three occasions, and Reverend Buckle happens to be the Chairman of the Health Council in that area. There have been meetings with Reverend Buckle. With regard to the Town Council, we have endeavoured to set up meetings on two or three occasions, and I suppose for some reason and those people are busy men and have not been able to come to St. John's and have not been able to arrange a meeting otherwise until now. But on the 8th, we are going in. There has been

Mr. Collins:

no meeting with the Town Council. But the hon. member made specific reference to Reverend Buckle who is the Chairman of the Health Council and we have had meetings with him.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Is this a supplementary?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the Happy Valley-Goose Bay Town Council and the Health Committee. Did the minister ever request a meeting with the Happy Valley Town Council?

MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) followed by the hon. member for Bay Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I realize this is rather a broad question that I am putting to the Minister of Fisheries, Sir, but it is a very important question, a very historic day in the history I suppose of Newfoundland and Canada, and I am referring to the document that was signed in Russia today between the hon. Mr. LeBlanc, the Federal Minister of Fisheries and his counterpart in Russia in connection with the 200 mile management zone. Would the minister indicate to the House what this historic document will mean to Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

HON. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am not able to answer the hon. member's question because regretfully the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa has not seen fit to take this Province, certainly not the Minister of Fisheries in the Province, into his confidence with respect to the terms and the contents of that agreement, but I am assuming it is one of the bilateral agreements that the minister is talking about. I think he has already signed one with Poland or he is about to, or I believe he already has with Norway, and I believe Portugal. I think today he is signing one with Russia, and I presume this will be an agreement whereby it is going to be agreed to by both parties, that that country will be permitted to fish certain species off our Continental Shelf that are determined to be surplus to Canada's needs. But the exact wording of the agreement or its

Mr. W. Carter:

contents or its possible implications for the Province, I am afraid I am unable to comment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the minister indicate in any way, shape or form—I realize the minister has not been taken into the confidence of the Federal Minister of Fisheries for some strange reason, — is this a forerunner to the 200 mile limit, or will this in actual fact be the 200? This is the impression I am getting from news reports that this is a 200 mile management zone. Is that the same thing, you know, that we are trying to achieve it for?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I understand this is probably a forerunner to the official declaration of the 200 mile limit. I think this is the Federal Minister's ambition.

MR. NEARY: But this is not it yet, We are not satisfied with this.

MR. W. CARTER: No. I think this is the Federal Minister's plan to maybe negotiate bilateral agreements with the fishing nations of the world who frequent our waters, in anticipation of a formal declaration of a 200 mile limit, which we hope will be certainly no later than January 1, 1977, and I hope the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa will keep that date in mind as well.

MR. NEARY: Well, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One further supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate then that the new agreement signed in Russia today now opens up the way for foreign countries to land their fish catches in Newfoundland and have them processed in Newfoundland fish plants; does the minister have that information?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: No, Mr. Speaker, that agreement will not open up the way for that because, as the hon. member knows I am sure, there will be amendments required to the Federal Coastal waters, I think it is called The Coastal Waters Protection Act or Fisheries Act, but certain amendments will be necessary.

MR. NEARY: But LeBlanc said today it would.

MR. W. CARTER: Well maybe he has already made the changes, but my understanding of it is that under the existing laws of Canada that a foreign nation is unable, is not permitted to land its fish stocks in our port for processing. Indeed I think if the minister wanted to enforce that act to the letter that it is doubtful if a ship, if a foreign ship, for example, could even enter the harbour without special permission from the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: When will we get this agreement that was signed today? When will the minister get a copy of that?

MR. W. CARTER: I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, I understand that even though the Government of Newfoundland is not represented at the meetings in Russia -

MR. NEARY: We should be.

MR. W. CARTER: We should be; of course, we should. But I have my reliable sources of information, and I am hoping that by tomorrow this time I will have the contents of that agreement.

MR. NEARY: Will the minister table it in the House when he gets it?

MR. W. CARTER: I am not sure if it will be right for me to table it, and certainly I will be very happy to answer any questions on it and reveal what information I can gather in the meantime.



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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Health. In view of the recent statement by the spokesman for the Hospital Association that the proposed bed closures in this Province may well adversely affect the standard of patient care despite the establishment of the Monitoring Committee, and in view of the fact that the Hospital Association has called upon the minister to warn the public of this, could the minister tell the House what steps his department has taken or is proposing to take to carry out this suggestion?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: The suggestion to warn the public, Mr. Speaker? I do not suppose there was an issue in recent Newfoundland history that has received more press coverage than the restraints programme which has been imposed on the hospital system in Newfoundland. It has been in the news the last two or three weeks, and there were numerous statements made by myself in the House and outside. And with regard to the Review Committee which has been established, that committee, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, will be adequate in terms of deciding whether the restraints will have any undue,adverse affect on the quality of health care. The purpose of that committee, of course, is to feed information to me as the minister, and I in turn to the government, and we will watch the situation and take whatever action might or might not be necessary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice that I wish to debate the answer to that question under 31(g) tomorrow evening. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The time has passed.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, just as a matter of clarification could I ask Your Honour this question? You have to give notice before 4:30, and of course, it is past 4:30, Will Your Honour still accept the notice?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not have the Standing Orders in front of me



MR. SPEAKER: I believe a written notice must be in to the Speaker by 4:30 Thursday.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: This being Private Members' Day, the adjourned debate on Motion 11, which was adjourned by the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Before I adjourned the debate, Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, I made reference to the fact that Newfoundland has indeed made quite a large contribution to Canada in that, I believe, in excess of 70 per cent of the Continental Shelf which contains some very wealthy resources was brought to Canada as a result of our uniting with that country. And that, Mr. Speaker, leads me to maybe make reference to a question that was asked me a moment ago by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), when he questioned me as to the agreement today being signed in Russia by the titled minister, by my federal counterpart, the contents of which will be very important to Newfoundland.

I am alarmed, Mr. Speaker, that our government was not invited by the federal government to have any input whatever in that agreement. If we think for a moment of what is happening; today, there is going to be an agreement signed that could have very serious ramifications on the future of our Province, especially when you realize the importance of the fishing industry and the important role it is going to play in our future social and economic well-being.

When you realize, Mr. Speaker, that the resource that is today being negotiated, this position of the marine resource that is being negotiated today, was brought to Canada by Newfoundland when we became a province of that country back in 1949. I think, Mr. Speaker, if for no other reason, that fact alone would justify the Province having some input into that agreement, or indeed, any agreement that is going to have such far-reaching effects on our

MR. W. CARTER: Province. It is incredible and it is hard to believe. It is an outrage.

MR. NEARY: It is an outrage.

MR. DOODY: It is incredible but it is true. It is not unusual either.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Not even informed, let alone participating.

MR. NEARY: I could not believe it. I had to go across the House and say, "Is this true or are you just coddling me or what?" I could not believe it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Not even informed. Am I correct in that?

MR. W. CARTER: No, there has been no personal or private or formal or any other kind of - informal - or any other kind of dialogue, liaison between the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa and the provincial Department of Fisheries concerning this very important agreement that is being negotiated today in Russia.

MR. NEARY: It affects this Province more than any other province in Canada.

MR. W. CARTER: It affects this Province, Mr. Speaker, more than it does any other province, certainly in Atlantic Canada, in that the total export value of fish going into the American market, for example, Mr. Speaker, coming from Newfoundland, represents around \$120 million, out of a total for the entire country of \$436 million. Therefore Newfoundland is making quite a substantial contribution to the exporting of groundfish and other species to the American and other markets. Consequently I believe we do have a very important industry here and we are playing a very major role in the development of that industry, certainly in Eastern Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I had some notes here but I cannot seem to - summing up some of the responsibilities, some of the jurisdictions that had been vested in the hands of Ottawa under the British North America Act, following Newfoundland's entry into Confederation. For example, and I am referring to these notes because it is being said almost every day by news commentators and others that the provincial Minister of Fisheries and the provincial Department of Fisheries and other provincial politicians are always blaming Ottawa

MR. W. CARTER: for the shortcomings of the fishing industry, for the various problems that we are encountering, and the fact that our fishermen are not able to make a decent living from the industry. We are being charged and accused of trying to pass the buck, as it were, to lay the blame on Ottawa's shoulders. Well, I can tell our critics, Mr. Speaker, that if we do that it is for a very good reason, the reason being that most of the responsibility, a large percentage of the jurisdiction having to do with fisheries does, in fact, rest in Ottawa, as provided for under the British North America Act.

For example, Ottawa is responsible for management of the fish stocks, including, of course, the declaration of a 200 mile limit. They are solely responsible for biological research of the fisheries. Licencing of fishermen, licencing of boats, conservation, that is their responsibility. Price support - by that I mean support given fishermen and processors when there is a slump in the market or something else that would cause the price in the markets of the world to become depressed and thereby reflect on the earnings of our plants and of our fishermen.

Unemployment insurance benefits to fishermen is solely and purely a federal responsibility. The construction and maintenance of wharves and harbours, breakwaters, slipways and haul-outs -

MR. LUNDRIKAN: We almost have to take that over every day in Rural Development even.

MR. W. CARTER: That is right. Your know, their performance, Mr. Speaker, in that area has become so bad that we have had to assume some of that responsibility ourselves as a Province. For example, we have built slipways that are normally the responsibility of Ottawa.

MR. W. CARTER.

My colleague here, the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development almost daily is providing assistance to fishermen and to fish plant owners to enable them to provide facilities that are the responsibility of the Federal Department of Fisheries or the Environment or Small Craft Harbours. They are responsible as well for the fisheries development activities. The Industrial Development branch of that department is responsible for the promotion or, at least, for the ongoing promotion of fishery development. Federal fisheries, the federal government is responsible or certainly will be almost solely responsible once they bring in their new market licencing programme, they will be responsible for the marketing of fish. Bounties on boats, for example; federal bounties on boats are the responsibility of Ottawa. But, Mr. Speaker, to sum up in that area Ottawa controls almost lock stock and barrel, as the saying goes, the fishing industry in our Province and the direction in which it is going. I contend that a lot of this jurisdiction should revert back to the Province, because I believe that we are much better equipped.

MR. NEARY: Providing we can get the cash.

MR. W. CARTER: Providing we can get the cash. And Ottawa has a responsibility there too.

MR. ROBERTS: But when the minister says, revert -

MR. W. CARTER: Revert back to where it was prior to 1949 maybe.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. There is no provincial government that has this jurisdiction now.

MR. W. CARTER: Because fishery does not affect any province as much as it does Newfoundland. So maybe for that reason it is more important to us to have more jurisdiction than what it would be to other provinces.

Getting on the subject, Mr. Speaker, of small craft harbours. I remember in Ottawa we had to put up some hectic fights in the various Standing Committees to get Ottawa to accept some responsibility

Mr. W. Carter.

in the provision, in the maintenance of small craft harbours. My colleague from Grand Falls who was then my colleague on the Fisheries Committee in the House of Commons can recall, as I am sure I do, some pretty knock them down, drag them out arguments that we had with first the Department of Public Works and later with the Department of the Environment, who, under their Small Craft Harbours division assumed the responsibility for that area of their responsibility.

It is rather ironic, Mr. Speaker, that this year - I do not have the figures here in front of me but I can quote them reasonably accurate, I think. This year, for example, Ottawa will be spending on small craft harbours in our Province - that is on wharves, breakwaters, split-ways, dredging, harbour developments generally, landing facilities - they will be spending slightly in excess of \$4 million. And if you look up the Federal Department of Public Work's estimates, for example, in Ottawa, as I did in other years, but not this year, you will find out that there is probably more money being spent this year in the city of Ottawa -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, could we have a quorum call?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Quorum call. I would ask the law clerk to count the House.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I believe you can forget that, Mr. Speaker. There are sixteen here now.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, but they have left. They called a quorum and walked out.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): A quorum is present.

The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: The member for the fisheries district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, Mr. Speaker, called a quorum and then walked out to ensure that there was no quorum, and there still was so his little ploy did not work.

MR. SIMMONS: On a point of order.

MR. W. CARTER: We can expect a point of order now.

MR. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS: On vicious attacks the least he could do is wait until I am in the House. Mr. Speaker, we were listening intently to the minister. Only six of his colleagues could stand him. I think the least we could have is a quorum in the House during these times. I have a perfect right to call a quorum at any time I want to. I resent the minister's insinuations about what he had to say a moment ago.

MR. W. CARTER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I suspect, Sir, that the hon. member deliberately tried to, maybe, disrupt my frame of thought.

MR. SIMMONS: You had no frame of thought.

MR. W. CARTER: I happened to be talking about Ottawa, to be criticising Ottawa, his friends in Ottawa, when he decided to break up, if you want to call it that, the tenor of my remarks and hopefully bring it to an end.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister was making no remarks.

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

MR. SIMMONS: His colleagues could not even stand it. Only six of them were listening to him.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): On the matter of the point of order, I think it is clear that we are dealing with a difference of opinion between two hon. members. So I would encourage the hon. minister to continue.

MR. W. CARTER: Getting back to what I was saying, Sir. If you were to check the estimates in Ottawa, the Federal Department of Public Works you will find that there is more money being spent this year on the provision of cafeteria facilities for federal civil servants than what there is being spent in Newfoundland on the provision of small craft harbours for our fishermen, and that has been a common

Mr. W. Carter.

occurrence. I recall back in 1974, the increase there of small craft harbour's vote then to, I believe, around \$6,000. And, you know, they expected us to get on our knees, hands and knees and give thanks. But that year they did actually spend more money on the provision of cafeteria facilities than what they spent in Newfoundland on small craft harbours, and the same situation I am sure exists today.

Mr. Speaker, I think, Sir, that the figures will prove that there must be a greater awareness on the part of Ottawa, on the part of the Department of Environment and Fisheries, Small Craft Harbours, there must be a greater recognition on their part of the need for more facilities in our Province if we are going to give our fishermen a chance to earn a living from the fisheries. That is one thing they have to accept. That is their responsibility, and there is no reason at all why the Newfoundland Government - even if we could afford it - should be expected to assume that responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, getting back again to the fisheries. I am very happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is quite apparent on the basis of information that we are getting with respect to market prices, and the abundance of fish, that 1976 could be a very good year for the fishing industry. For example, I am told that the price of cod blocks has increased considerably on the American markets. It is gone, I think, now from a low sixty cents a pound to a high eighty cents a pound, and the prices of other species have increased proportionately. I am told as well that in many parts of our Province we find that there is an abundance of fish. For example, parts of my riding have had quite substantial landings in the past few days, and I think we should all keep our fingers crossed that the situation will continue, because the fishing industry is very important to the development of rural Newfoundland and certainly it is our ambition to do everything possible to ensure

Mr. W. Carter.

that people engaged in the industry will be given every chance to earn a living for themselves and their families.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we have to do in the industry - and this is something that I am setting out to do, but I am sure it is going to take many, many years - is to change the image of the fishing industry. We have to ensure that our fishermen are given their rightful place in our society, and are treated like first-class citizens. And I regret to say that in many cases, in many areas, that is not the case now. I regret to say that in many respects our fishermen are not given the status of first-class citizens. They are not being given a chance. In many cases they are being subjected to almost being indentured, as it were, to fish merchants, to gear suppliers, and are forced to almost mortgage their souls to get enough gear to enable them to go fishing. And this I believe, Mr. Speaker, must end, and unless we can bring that to an end and make fishermen more independent of that kind of an attitude then I am not sure that we are going to succeed in making the industry one that will attract, especially, our young people.



MR. W. CARTER:

We have to find ways and means to change that attitude, that attitude of the people towards the fishing industry. I am afraid that Ottawa will have to play a very major part if that is to come about. The fact that Ottawa keeps saying that fishing accounts for, I believe, a mere two per cent of the GNP of Canada while in Newfoundland it is nearer probably - what? - fourteen per cent.

MR. ROBERTS: Even more than that. In fact it has been our work force.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes but the point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that the mandarins in Ottawa, the Ottawa oriented, upper Canadian oriented Bureaucrats and politicians are sometimes inclined to fluff off the fishing industry and those engaged in it because of the fact that it only accounts for such a small percentage of Canada's Gross National Product.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the minister include Mr. LeBlanc in that?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. LeBlanc, Mr. Speaker, leaves a lot to be desired too. I will give the man full marks, I am sure. I have a lot of respect for the minister but I can sense something that is happening to him in the past year maybe. First when he assumed that portfolio he appeared to be quite interested, to co-operate and to develop a good liaison with people of other parties in other Provinces. He appeared to have a genuine interest in the fisheries, in trying to find a way to upgrade, to uplift the lives of our fishermen. But I can sense in recent months - and this has not happened only since I assumed my portfolio but certainly before then - that I believe that the Upper Canadian clique have gotten through to him and I am not sure now that his heart is in the same place that it was a couple of years ago insofar as the fishing industry and our fishermen are concerned.

Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, must be made accept its responsibility to the fishing industry if our industry is to thrive and to allow those engaged in it an opportunity to make a living and to stay in it. We

MR. W. CARTER:

must find a way to, as I said before, get our fishermen more independent. That is why we are now looking at a gear subsidy programme to replace the existing programme which is anything but satisfactory, anything but equitable. With that in mind last Fall we appointed a Committee, the Department of Fisheries, who working along with people in the gear supply business and fishermen did a complete study on the existing gear subsidy programme.

We found that it was very inequitable and lent itself to a lot of abuse. The committee then set about to make certain recommendations for maybe its abolition and a new gear subsidy programme altogether or certainly some very necessary amendments to the existing programme. With that in mind I wrote a letter to every fisherman in the Province, 15,000 of them, setting forth our ideas and asking them for their views. We had a fantastic response to that letter and I am pleased to say now, Mr. Speaker, that within a very short time I am hoping to be able to announce an entirely, maybe a completely new programme altogether in the matter of gear subsidies.

Our ambition is to devise a programme where the subsidy will go to the fisherman, where the subsidies will end up in the hands of our fishermen, and thereby give them that little more independence from the village merchant or from the gear supplier and enable him to go out and buy his gear on a competitive basis. That, I believe, is very important. Like I said I am hoping to get a new programme in place before too long.

Mr. Speaker, I think my time on this debate has pretty well come to an end and others will probably want to speak on it so I will not monopolize the rest of the time of the day.

MR. SIMMONS: Is the minister in favour of the select committee?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, that goes without saying, I think, that I am not in favour of the select committee. I believe that you have members in this House who are, certainly if they are not they should be, quite capable and competent in making their constituents views known

MR. W. CARTER:

to the government and making the wants of their fishermen known to their minister and to their government.

We intend this year, Mr. Speaker, to spend money on several things that are new as far as fisheries are concerned. For example, we are having a very serious look at the small boat design. We are spending money on having maybe new ideas, changes, incorporated in the existing longliner designs that we have bearing in mind that you cannot possibly have one design, one boat, that you can hope to have meet the needs of fishermen from all over the Province. As I have said before, for example, a boat that is designed for the Northeast Coast of the Province will not necessarily suit the needs of fishermen on the Southwest Coast. By the same token boats designed for the South Coast might not necessarily meet the needs of fishermen who fish off the Coast of Labrador or up off Port aux Choix. So consequently we are taking a look at maybe coming up with several new designs having regard for the areas for which they are intended.

That I think will be an important programme and I think that it is something that we will have to be guided by, certainly, before we approve any loans or anymore boat designs for fishermen in our Province.

We are having a serious look this year, Mr. Speaker, at the caplin stocks and the potential development of that fish. And we are going to spend money on experimentation in that area. We are also going to be looking at the herring industry for example, Mr. Speaker, because that is one aspect of the fisheries that I think - and this is backed up by people who are much more knowledgeable in the industry than I am - the herring stocks I think offer great promise in the future, future promise in the industry and those engaged in it.

For example this year fishermen in my district, St. Mary's- the Capes, who were seriously involved in the herring fishery have made themselves substantial sums of money. I think with a little

MR. W. CARTER:

encouragement and the proper development and with the setting of sensible quotas, I think that our fishermen can very well make a good living, or certainly go a long way towards augmenting their income from the fisheries by involving themselves in the herring fishery. So we are going to be looking at that this year.

We are going to, this year, come up with what we hope will be a more practical design for the fishing barge which is now operating in Smokey, Labrador. As hon. members might know down there we have a barge that is being operated by the Newfoundland government, owned by the Newfoundland government and being operated, I believe, in conjunction with the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation. That has been very successful. I think last year, for example, there were in excess of 3,000 quintals of fish landed on that barge and processed. The barge was not designed for the purpose for which it is now being used but certain modifications have been made to it thereby allowing its use. But certainly with the new design and better facilities, ice making facilities, better, maybe, accommodations for fishermen, we believe that that can play a very major role in the future development of the Labrador fishery.

MR. STRACHAN: Would the minister tell us whether the barge is safe. As I understand it the barge itself received a great deal of ice damage this winter.

MR. W. CARTER: As I said, Mr. Speaker, the barge was not designed for the purpose to which we are now using it, for that purpose. It is safe I would think but it is a cumbersome operation. For example the barge is not self-propelled. To move it you have to tow it with another boat, a tug. The boat that we are talking about designing now, the barge, will be mobile. You will be able to move it from one community to another. Maybe, for example, before it freezes in in Labrador it could be moved, maybe, up on the Southwest Coast, somewhere of the Province, and anchored and used for the same purpose. But it has got unlimited possibilities.

MR. DOODY: Was the present one damaged this year?

MR. W. CARTER: The present one I think is slightly damaged. It did I think go ashore, driven ashore by ice. But certainly it is being investigated. The extent of the damage is now being investigated and we hope to have it in operation again this year.

MR. W. CARTER:

I have been requested by fishermen from the district of my friend from Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), Harbour Breton, who have come to me with a very serious problem in recent weeks concerning the lack of resources, for example, in their fish plant, a plant that is owned and operated by B.C. Packers. I have had several talks with that company and I might add that that company, Mr. Speaker, owns and operates several plants in the Province, at Isle au Mort, Change Islands, Herring Neck, I think it is, and Harbour Breton. Tomorrow morning meetings are taking place in St. John's at my request with the owners of B.C. Packers and officials of the Department of Fisheries at which time we are going to impress upon them the need for increasing their catching capability in that area and thereby increasing the man hours that will result in the fish plants that they own and operate in our Province.

I do not mind confessing or saying, Mr. Speaker, that I am not satisfied that that company is doing as much as it should be doing and can be doing in their operations in our Province. I sense maybe some indifference on their part, some indifference and some reluctance maybe, to get too heavily involved in the catching area of the fishing industry. I believe at the moment, for example, their catch fleet has now been reduced to three boats in Harbour Breton,

AN HON. MEMBER: There is one on dock.

MR. W. CARTER: And there is one on dock. I am not satisfied with their performance, Mr. Speaker, as a corporate citizen of our Province and I intend to use whatever device I have at my disposal. And bearing in mind that the plants are owned by that company without any government loans or mortgages or involvement it is going to be difficult for me to crack the whip.

MR. ROBERTS: That Western empire is bigger than normally owned.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes. I can assure the House and my hon. friends opposite whose districts are affected that we intend to use whatever device we have at our disposal to ensure that B.C. Packers accept

MR. W. CARTER:

their responsibility to the people of Newfoundland, to ensure that the plants for which they are responsible are utilized to the fullest extent. Tomorrow meetings will take place in the Province. They were invited here at my request to sit down with our people and to try and find a way to increase their productivity in the Province.

That situation, Mr. Speaker, is not peculiar to Harbour Breton or to Isle au Mort or other plants operated by B.C. Packers, but it is one of the problems that we are facing in the Province insofar as the dwindling fish stocks are concerned and the effect they are having on our fish plants. That is why, of course, we get back - and I shall conclude on this note - we get back to the dire necessity, the absolute urgency, of a declaration on the part of our Canadian government of a 200 mile limit to protect our resource and to allow that resource to be replenished. I contend that we are too late now. That action should have been taken years ago. But certainly if it is taken now we can still bring about the necessary replenishment of the stock and its management and control. I think it is awfully important and I know I speak for every member in this House, both sides, and indeed, I suppose, for all Newfoundlanders, when I say how vital it is that the Canadian government accept its responsibility and declare without any further delay a 200 mile limit to protect our resource.

I believe that that resource belongs to Canada. As a Newfoundlander I take pride in the fact that that is one of the great resources that we gave to the Canadian nation when we joined it in 1949. That is another thing, I believe, in which all Newfoundlanders should be proud, that without Newfoundland Canada would not have the need for a 200 mile limit because indeed it would not have a Continental Shelf or, at least not, to any extent. I am told that almost thirty per cent of Canada's Continental Shelf is that which belonged to Newfoundland. I think we can all realize, Mr. Speaker, - and I hope that the politicians in Ottawa realize - the contribution



MR. W. CARTER:

that we made to Confederation by conveying that great resource to the people of Canada. I hope now that they have the good sense and the responsibility to ensure that that resource is protected for future generations, indeed for existing generations of Newfoundlanders. Because without that kind of action on the part of Ottawa then I am afraid all we are doing - we can build our fish plants in Musgrave Harbour or Burgeo or any other part of the Province but without that kind of conservation and management then it is all for nothing, it is money wasted. That I think will be a very, very sad day for our Province because you are not just talking about the lives and livelihood of a handful of Newfoundlanders who are maybe engaged in the fishing industry, but you are talking about the future prospects and the continuation of our Newfoundland way of life in many hundreds of our Newfoundland communities that will not survive without a fishing industry. That is why it is so important.

Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members for bearing with me. I will have more to say on the fisheries on the debate that will follow the - well it will be on tomorrow I presume, the budget debate. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I opened the debate on the motion and according to the rules if I speak now I close the debate. I am quite prepared to do it if hon. gentlemen have said all they wish to say but if there is any member who per chance has not said what he wishes to say on this motion, I will forebear for yet another - we will come back at it again next Wednesday. I do not know whether everybody who wants to speak has spoken.

MR. NEARY: Could we adjourn now.

MR. ROBERTS: I will adjourn if the government - it will be a blessing from all points. It is such a lovely evening, indeed we should have called off the government today as of nine o'clock this



MR. ROBERTS:

morning and taken a day off. I will move the adjournment, Your Honour, if that is in order and we will come back at it again next Wednesday.

MR. NOLAN: Probably be accused of having another hockey game.

MR. WELLS: Well I do not know where that came from, this hockey game business. I listened to the tapes, there was nothing there on it.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker -

MR. ROBERTS: I got it from the Telegram.

MR. WELLS: Is that so? Well that is fine.

MR. ROBERTS: I was not here.

MR. WELLS: Were you not? It was in the Telegram? Absolutely untrue. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at two o'clock in the afternoon and that this House do now adjourn.

Motion that the House at its rising do now adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at two o'clock, carried.

Contents

May 19, 1976	Page
<b>Statements by Ministers</b>	
Mr. W. Carter made a statement concerning construction of a fish handling facility at Musgrave Harbour.	8196
Spoken to by:	
Capt. Winsor	8199
Mr. Smallwood	8202
---	
<b>Personal Privilege</b>	
Mr. Neary objected to a segment of an article which appeared in <u>The Daily News</u> .	8204
---	
<b>Statements by Ministers (continued)</b>	
Mr. Brett made a statement on incidents of child abuse.	8206
<b>Presenting Petitions</b>	
By Mr. Roberts in behalf of 51 tugboat workers formerly employed at the Come By Chance refinery seeking severance pay which other refinery workers had already received.	8207
Spoken to by:	
Mr. Smallwood	8212
Mr. Neary	8212
Mr. Simmons	8213
Mr. Callan	8215
By Mr. Goudie in behalf of 451 residents of North West River and Happy Valley - Goose Bay asking that the road between the communities be upgraded and paved.	8217
Spoken to by:	
Mr. J. Winsor	8218
Mr. Strachan	8218
Capt. Winsor	8220
Mr. Neary	8222
Mr. Morgan	8222
Mr. Rousseau	8224
By Mr. Wells in behalf of some 600 residents of the Goulds who object to the site selected for a regional dump, and who recommend another site.	8225
Spoken to by:	
Mr. Roberts	8226
Mr. Neary	8229
Mr. Hickey	8231
Mr. Rideout	8232
Mr. Callan	8233
By Mr. Goudie in behalf of 1,180 residents of the Happy Valley area who do not wish to have the facilities of the Paddon Memorial Hospital transferred to the former U.S.A.F. Base Hospital	8235
Spoken to by:	
Capt. Winsor	8236
Mr. Strachan	8237
Mr. Smallwood	8239
Mr. H. Collins	8241

Notices of Motion

Mr. Hickman gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce Bills Nos. 63 and 62. 8245

Mr. Rousseau gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce Bill No. 61 8245

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

Mr. House responded to questions asked earlier by Mr. Lush. 8245

Mr. Hickey responded to Questions Nos. 522, 516, 314, 306, 305, 300, 287, 12, 286, 285, 285, 284, 278, 273, 77, 37, 316, 427 and 491. 8247

Mr. Crosbie responded to a question asked April 8 by Mr. Nolan concerning beaches and what amounts of sand and rock can be taken therefrom. 8247

Oral Questions.

Answers sought to questions on the Order Paper. Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Wells. 8250

Increase in the salary of the Secretary of Treasury Board. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Doody. 8251

Query as to whether a list of senior officials who received major wage increases would be made available. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Doody. 8252

Silver Anniversary gift. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey 8253

Query as to whether construction on the tourist information centre will start this summer. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey. 8255

Query as to whether the Annie Coady will remain on the same site. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey. 8256

Housing development on the Topsail Highway west of Park-Le. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Hickey. 8256

Traffic problems posed by the housing project. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Morgan. 8259

Availability of birth certificates for people 60 years of age and older. Mr. Callan, Mr. H. Collins. 8260

Registry of Births, Marriages and Deaths. Mr. Smallwood, Mr. H. Collins. 8261

Query as to consultation between the Department of Health and town council of Happy Valley concerning the move from the Paddon Memorial Hospital. Mr. Strachan, Mr. H. Collins. 8261

Query as to whether the Minister of Health sought a meeting on the matter with the Happy Valley - Goose Bay town council. Mr. Strachan, Mr. H. Collins. 8263

Query concerning the impact on Newfoundland of the agreement concerning the 200 mile offshore management zone agreed upon by Russia and Canada. Mr. Neary, Mr. W. Carter. 8263

Oral Questions (continued)

Query as to whether the agreement is the same as the 200 mile limit. Mr. Neary, Mr. W. Carter. 8264

Query as to whether the agreement opens the way for foreign countries to have their catches processed in Newfoundland plants. Mr. Neary, Mr. W. Carter. 8264

Closure of hospital beds. Mr. Rideout, Mr. H. Collins. 8266

Mr. Rideout expressed dissatisfaction with the answer and gave notice that he wished to debate the issue on the adjournment. 8266

Orders of the Day

Private Members Day

Motion 11

That a Select Committee be established to enquire into and report upon the prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador including the prospects for economic growth.

Mr. W. Carter (continued) 8267

Mr. Roberts adjourned the debate. 8282

Adjournment 8283