



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 57

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 1976

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MP. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am pleased to welcome to the galleries ten Grade IX students with their teacher Mr. Pandell, from the E.A. Butler Memorial High School in Robinsons and to the young students from E.A. Butler Memorial High School I extend on behalf of all hon. members a courteous welcome and the wish that you will find your stay here instructive and interesting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

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

MP. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a few short moments of the House to announce the fact that the Department of Environment this month is launching an anti-litter campaign. Our beloved Province has always been classified as somewhat dirty with respect to littering and pollution and this type of thing.

MP. NEARY: Could the minister clean up my desk while he is at it?

MP. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, there will be a short being distributed to various schools, legion groups, service clubs and so on and so forth. It is not a great sophisticated thing because of the restraint in the budget. There is very little money in my department for propaganda of this type. But all I want, Sir, is to ask if all members of the House would assist us in their own particular areas. If there are any great problems they experience in any way feel free to call the Department of the Environment and we will do what we can to alleviate some of the muck that does pile up after the winter season.

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

MP. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not need to say very much about the minister's statement except that of course we on this side of the House are delighted that the government are moving against the litter problem. But I would like to say publicly as I just mentioned to the minister when he was kind enough to come over with his own contribution to the anti-litter problem, namely three pieces of paper

MR. ROBERTS:

in connection with it which have been given to each of us, a suggestion which I think is worth looking at which had come to me from a number of students in my own district. The minister is familiar with it. But it is quite simply this, there were a number of schools in my district last year - and I have been told there are a number who would like to do it this year - who undertook as a project, a civic project to go out and try to clean up some of the areas, the roads and the public areas simply by the children going out on a fine afternoon and picking up the various bits of litter and putting them in garbage bags and then these were in due course put away at what used to be called a dump and is now called, I believe, a waste disposal site, but it is a dump by any other name.

MR. MURPHY: Still smells as sweet.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister says, "Still smells as sweet". The minister's olfactory senses and mine are different. But the problem came simply that garbage bags being a petroleum-based product are becoming very expensive. So my suggestion is simply to suggest to the minister that he might consider seeing if somewhere in the estimates the government can find a few thousand dollars - it would not take very many - possibly with a view to sending them out to schools, or letting schools have a \$50.00 or \$100.00 grant to enable them to purchase a large supply of garbage bags so that they could go. I think it would be a better use of public money than many of the uses to which public funds are put by governments here and elsewhere.

I know that to say to the students to find it is a difficult thing because, you know, the costs are not insubstantial and of course the school boards with the stringencies with which they must live cannot touch it. We solved our problem in the old district of White Bay North last year by the arm being put on the member for a contribution but I would not commend that

MR. ROBERTS:

because there are fifty-four communities in my district now and even at \$25.00 each that would be \$1,100. But I just make the suggestion -

MR. MURPHY: Bring it out to \$1,000 even.

MR. ROBERTS: If the minister wishes I will give \$1,000 if he will.

MR. MURPHY: Right. I will promise \$1,000 and you give \$1,000.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister's promise and my gift, Sir. That is typical of the Tory approach. But I will match the minister dollar for dollar now on a gift for this purpose. But I do think it is something the government might have a look at. Litter is becoming an increasingly great problem. Anybody who drives along our roads can only marvel at the number of bits of broken glass that now decorate the highways of Newfoundland and Labrador. It is something we could do without. It is something which, you know, anything we could help to clean up we should.

o o o

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, may I make a statement before you get on to that?

MR. SPEAKER: Do we have leave to revert to Statements by Ministers?

MR. NEARY: If it is not involving -

MR. HICKEY: If it is on it?

MR. NEARY: If it is not on it.

MR. HICKEY: It is not on it.

MR. NEARY: Okay, by leave.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and also thank you Mr. Member.

MR. NEARY: Any time.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that during the past week officials of my department met with representatives of Parks Canada to further discuss potential national park sites in Labrador. Parks Canada has, over the past several years, done a number of preliminary surveys in Labrador to determine the possible sites for national parks. The areas with most potential have now been identified.

MP. HICKEY:

These are the Torngat Mountains area of Northern Labrador and the Mealy Mountain area near Goose Bay. A joint planning team has been established between the Provincial Parks Division of my department and Parks Canada to carry out a detailed assessment of these sites during the coming Summer. After these surveys have been completed Parks Canada has indicated they will be in a position to make more definite proposals to the Province with regards to the establishment of national parks in Labrador including proposed boundaries and use concepts.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that before any final decision is made by the government on land areas to be set aside as national parks, there will be full and complete consultation and involvement with residents of the communities in Labrador that could in any way be affected by the establishment of such parks.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before the gentleman sits down, the Torngat Mountains, there is nobody living anywhere near there, is there?

MP. HICKEY: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is way down in the Northern Coast of Labrador. A park down there? What, for the birds and the animals?

NOTICES OF MOTION.

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

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice of motion as follows:

WHEPEAS the fishing industry of Newfoundland and Labrador is one of the Province's main industries, employing more people than any other;

AND WHEREAS most districts in the province depend directly or indirectly on the fishery for an economic foundation;

AND WHEREAS this House confines debate on the estimates to a maximum of seventy-five hours;

AND WHEREAS over two thirds of the allotted time period has been used to debate the estimates of only five of the twenty departments of

MR. CANNING:

Government that require funds;

AND WHEREAS it is now evident that the current rate of progress will not provide sufficient time for a detailed and proper examination of the estimates of the Department of Fisheries;

BE IT RESOLVED THEREFORE that this House allow an extension to the time limit specifically to provide for unlimited debate of the estimates of the Department of Fisheries.

And the resolution is seconded by the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (J. Winsor).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MP. WELLS: To a point of order, if a point of order is the proper mode in which to comment on this, Mr. Speaker. I just heard the resolution or the motion read. It would appear to me that it probably is out of order but I would like to have a copy of it and have a look at it. So I mention this fact now and perhaps Your Honour was going to consider the same point.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may. I cannot respond to the point of order because the most that the hon. gentleman for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) has done is say that he may raise one. We will have some copies provided and of course he should look at it, but I would invite the hon. member to let us know his reasons why he thinks it is out of order because I was consulted by my colleague in drafting the motion, notice of which he has given, and I believe it to be in order. It would have the effect of amending the Standing Orders, but of course that is within our prerogative as a House and it is not restricted to a member of the government to move such a motion. It does not involve expenditure and that is the only restriction.

But all I say to the hon. gentleman is I cannot reply to his point of order because he has not made one on the merits.

MP. WELLS: It was a case of giving notice really that I will raise it after I have studied it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well we have given notice of motion and he has given notice, Sir. The hon. gentleman has given notice of an objection on the grounds it might be out of order. I give notice, Sir, that I will respond to his notice of objection on the merits. And I believe the motion is in order.

MR. WELLS: And it may well be but I would like to just have an opportunity to have a look at it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair gives notice that it will listen with interest to any argument that may be forthcoming.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have answers to Question No. 365

MR. H. COLLINS:

in the name of the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), and Question No. 368 in the name of the same hon. member, 365, 368.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, in response to questions from a number of hon. members, and certainly in response to statements with regards to the issuing of some 112 so-called complimentary licenses, in keeping with my agreement to table the list I wish now to do that for the year 1974 which was the matter which the Auditor General commented on in his report.

I want also, Mr. Speaker, to table as well the list of what we consider pure and absolute complimentary licenses over and above with regards to VIP to whom those licenses are issued. I indicated, Mr. Speaker, at the time when I explained to the House that this system was used in 1974, which was before my time in the department, but at the same time it was also used in 1975. So I have here as well the list of people whose names were drawn from various regions of the Province for the year 1975 and I table those as well as the list of VIPs who were given licenses. So this should clear the whole matter up I hope.

MR. ROBERTS: Was Mr. Ramsey one of those men?

MP. DOODY: No, his brother.

MR. ROBERTS: His brother.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Prince.

MR. PECKFORD: Prince is right.

MP. HICKEY: Prince did not get a license for the Avalon, by the way.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We sent one to General Franco, we sent one to Dr. Salazar but they never came.

MR. DOODY: I am not surprised.

MP. HICKEY: We gave one to the vice-consul for Spain, Mr. Speaker, if that is any satisfaction.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And he took the place of General Franco.

MR. HICKEY: Can I assume nobody wants those now after all the uproar?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

May 5, 1976

Tape 2454

IB-3

MR. HICKEY: I am not about to start giving them out.

MR. DOODY: Maybe next year you can deliver them.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have

MR. COLLINS: the answers to a couple of more questions in the name of the same hon. member, the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), the answer to question 393 and the answer to question No. 398. I think that is just about all of the answers to questions in the name of the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). I do not know if I answered 398 of them but I answered a lot of them and I hope that they will be useful in the compilation of the next book which is being prepared.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hope so but -

MR. ROWE: Do not be nasty.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - that is not why I asked them, although it may so appear.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Sir, arising out of the tragedy which occurred west of Grand Falls last evening, of which the House is aware, then two ladies, both named Mrs. Churchill, I believe they were sisters-in-law, were drowned in a most tragic accident, could the minister to begin with, Sir, tell the House just what involvement if any his officials had? Now I am not allowed in a question to outline what I understand to be the facts, but can I say that it is my understanding that the road was under water, the Trans-Canada was under water, that is the portion that was closed for several months, and that there were inadequate warning devices given. I think that is the crux of what I have been told and my colleagues have gathered. But could we begin by asking the minister for a general statement of exactly what steps his officials took in connection with the events which led to the tragic death of these two ladies?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it was an unfortunate tragedy that occurred yesterday in the Grand Falls - Buchans region. The section of the Trans-Canada that was flooded this past winter, and was closed up until over a month ago, was re-opened a month ago when the water level on the Exploits River went down. Yesterday morning at eight o'clock Price (Nfld.) Limited informed my District Director at Grand Falls that Price (Nfld.) Limited would be lifting their dams at two o'clock in the morning on the Exploits River in the Millertown region, and they expected that the crest of the water would be reaching Grand Falls at 2:00 P.M. yesterday.

MR. ROBERTS: Twelve hours.

MR. MORGAN: Twelve hours after.

Yesterday afternoon Mr. Kevin Langdon, my District Director in Grand Falls controlling the Grand Falls region, went to the area at three o'clock, examined the water level - there was no increase - but because of the warning given by Price he assigned a foreman at Badger to keep a close watch on the situation. The foreman at Badger went to the area again at five o'clock yesterday afternoon, and again at seven-thirty. And at seven-thirty he noticed there was a difference in the water level on the river. So there were warning signs placed, yesterday evening 7:30 P.M., barricades on each side of the road with warning lights, flashing warning lights. That was seven-thirty.

At nine o'clock, or between nine and 9:10, according to the reports received the accident occurred. The foreman was back on the site at nine - fifteen and the water level was then to the point where approximately three inches of water had - up on sides of the pavement, not the middle of the road, not covered, but both sides because the highway is sort of peaked.

MR. ROBERTS: The pavement rises -

MR. MORGAN: Yes, in the middle. So there were approximately three

MR. MORGAN: inches of water on each side of the Trans-Canada in that area. Now the warning that was given to the Department yesterday morning was a sort of a normal warning given each year by Price for the past number of years. But because of the flooding situation this year there was some extra precautions taken by the District Director by having periodic checks made.

Again I would like to point out that this year the flooding of that section of highway was the first in the ten year history of the Highway. Again I repeat that although we have not got tangible evidence, there was a raise in the level of the dam, the dam itself was raised six feet in the Rushy Pond area, the Rushy Pond Brook.

Mr. Morgan.

That was raised last year, 1975, by Price (Nfld) Limited. I would like to point out also that this extension of the dam was against the - it was put there even with the objections of our department. But again permission was given by government through another government agency or another government department.

MR. ROBERTS: Was that a provincial decision or federal?

MR. MORGAN: It was provincial. They requested permission through the Provincial Department of Environment, but I also understand that there was some consultation with the Federal Department of Environment.

But the dam was raised with objections from the Department of Transportation and Communications. This is the first year that any flooding of this nature has occurred. And unfortunately the precautions that were taken, although they were taken by the department, did not prevent the accident. The road was closed shortly after the accident occurred. In fact around 9:30 p.m. the road was closed.

MR. ROBERTS: Nine thirty last night?

MR. MORGAN: The water level raised quite fast between - at 7:30 p.m. there was no need for any concern. There was a trip by the foreman to the area at 7:30 p.m. Upon returning between 9:00 p.m. and 9:10 p.m., shortly before the accident occurred, the water level was up to the point of over the road. So the district people were anticipating the major crest of the water to be in that area as indicated by Price to be around 2:00 p.m. yesterday afternoon. So my District Director, although he was concerned over the fact because of what had occurred this Winter past, that he did assign the foreman to keep a periodic check. The dam was raised at 2:00 a.m. yesterday morning by Price at Millertown.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, there are a host of supplementaries, and we will have to try to go at them one at a time, because I think the

Mr. Roberts.

minister's statement will naturally give rise to a number. If I could first of all just ask a quick question. The minister indicated that Price said that they would lift their dam at 2 o'clock Tuesday morning. Is that correct?

MR. MORGAN: 2:00 a.m.

MR. ROBERTS: 2:00 a.m. Tuesday morning, and twelve hours later, which is 2 o'clock Tuesday afternoon, yesterday afternoon the crest was expected to reach Grand Falls. This accident occurred a number of miles West of Grand Falls, i.e., upstream and yet - I want to be sure that I understood the minister's statement - at 7:30 p.m. last evening his officials were there, or was it 7:30 a.m. yesterday morning?

MR. MORGAN: Yesterday evening.

MR. ROBERTS: Yesterday evening. That is five and one-half hours after it was predicted that the crest would reach Grand Falls.

MR. MORGAN: At 3:00 p.m. the district director was there on the site.

MR. ROBERTS: And there was no crest?

MR. MORGAN: No.

MR. ROBERTS: So the crest was several hours later than it was expected to be because, of course, this site is West of Grand Falls and thus the crest would get to that first.

Well, Mr. Speaker, my first question is: Were there any of the minister's officials present throughout the afternoon and evening at what was obviously considered to be a potential threat or a potential danger? He has said that the foreman who is stationed or who lives at Badger was there at 7 o'clock in the evening and all seemed well, or 7:30 p.m.

MR. MORGAN: And five o'clock.

MR. ROBERTS: Five o'clock and at seven o'clock.

MR. MORGAN: And at 7:30 p.m.

MR. ROBERTS: And at 7:30 p.m. he came back. I guess he probably went home and had a bite of supper and came back at 7:30 p.m., and at 9 o'clock he came back again and at 9 o'clock things were getting out of hand or the water was rising rapidly, obviously the crest was coming, and a few minutes after 9 o'clock, as I understand it, this car with these two ladies in it left the road, fell into a very deep-ten or twelve feet of water, I understand, a very deep part of the river, and these two ladies drowned.

Well the first question: Were there any officials present, flagmen, or were there only warnings that were available? If I had been coming along the road or the minister driving from Badger was coming east towards Grand Falls, was the only warning some of these barricades or these little flashing yellow lights?

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

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, as I earlier indicated in my statement, there were warning signs placed at 7:30 P.M. yesterday. There were barricades on each side of this bad section of road, or the section that -

MR. ROBERTS: By each side the minister means East and West?

MR. MORGAN: Right, both sections, East and West sections of that section of Trans-Canada. Barricades were placed with warning lights, flashing warning lights at 7:30 P.M. Now the fact that this raising of the dams was occurring every year up until this year, it is obvious to us now that the dam that was lifted downstream in Rushy Pond Brook raised by six feet, that that raising of the dam did cause the flooding of the Trans-Canada -

MR. ROBERTS: You mean the water backed up?

MR. MORGAN: Yes, the water backed up and came back over the Trans-Canada. And this never occurred before although the lifting of the dam, the raising of the dams upstream in previous years had been carried out in the same manner as they were carried out this year. It is obvious to us now that the dam downstream which was raised six feet higher than normal, raised in 1975, caused a backing of the water to flow back over the Trans-Canada and cause the flooding.

MR. ROBERTS: So this was not the crest that came down that caused it?

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I am not sure the minister actually answered my question. He has given us a very interesting piece of information that it was not the crest coming down the river, coming East. It was the backlash, if you wish, coming back from this Rushy Pond dam apparently that caused the tragedy. But the minister, I am not sure he has answered. There were warnings placed, but I am not sure how valuable warning lights are given the fact that at 7:30 p.m. in the evening and it is

MR. ROBERTS:

broad daylight. A warning light would not be seen that far.

MR. MORGAN: There were barricades too.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, barricades as well, the construction barricades, the sawhorse with yellow and black strips. But were there any men there? Were there any officials? Was there a flag man or any employee, any official of the department? That was my question, Sir.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, at 7:30 P.M. when the foreman visited the area and placed the barricades because the potential was still there, there was no real evidence that this could occur, this flooding could occur. But for safety measures the barricades and lights were put up but there was no substantial raising of the level of water up until that time. So the crest came after, from 7:30 P.M. to 9:00 P.M.

MR. ROBERTS: It was the backlash not the crest.

MR. MORGAN: It was the backlash.

MR. ROBERTS: And no man was there?

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this matter has been raised in the House on a number of occasions in recent weeks and it is a very serious situation, would the minister tell the House if he intends to request the Minister of Justice, because we are not going to get the answers by just having a little political debate back and forth, does the minister intend to ask his colleague, the Minister of Justice to hold a ministerial enquiry or a judicial enquiry into this tragedy that took place about five miles West of Grand Falls?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the accident that occurred yesterday will be brought to the attention of my colleagues in cabinet on tomorrow morning, and we will make a decision with regard to any enquiry.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition, I -

MR. ROBERTS: Well I will yield to my -

MR. SPEAKER: I had previously indicated the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). If he -

MR. ROBERTS: I will yield.

MR. FLIGHT: Go on.

MR. ROBERTS: No, go ahead. I have a supplementary. It is the same thing.

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

MR. FLIGHT: All right, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that the Speaker would allow me, Sir, a little preamble to this question because as every member of this House knows, "during the time that the Trans-Canada was blocked and the flooding had taken place that I had rose in this House on dozens of occasions and asked questions with regard to the safety, with regard to the attention that was being paid. Well, all right, Sir, The question now to the minister is, that never mind the time of the peaking, when it came over the road, the fact is that there was a hole by the shoulder of the road ten feet deep, and the minister indicates at some point his people in Badger determined that there was three inches of water on the shoulders of the road in that valley. Knowing that there were ten feet deep pits along the side of that road, was not that enough of a hazard to cause the bringing about of the closing of that section of the Trans-Canada and using the detour that is there? Was that not enough reason for concern in view of the fact that the type of warnings that the Department of Highways have gotten over this past three or four months on the potential dangers there? How come that condition was allowed to exist?

Obviously the river peaked and the road overflowed after the Department of Highways had given their last final inspection when indeed they knew that this condition existed along the Trans-Canada Highway. And anyone, Mr. Speaker, who would go in there simply needs to drive along and see the condition.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the hon. minister I will make a brief comment. The hon. the member from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) started off by saying that he hoped the Chair would allow him certain preamble. To a large extent the Chair has an obligation to enforce the rules. I realize the hon. member represents the district and it is an extremely serious and tragic occurrence, and I did not wish to interrupt him in the middle of his presentation. I would point out that it is really not the Speaker as much as the rules that he has to go by.

The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the hon. member, these questions put to me in the hon. House of Assembly were mainly with regards to when the reconstruction or the raising of the Trans-Canada itself would occur and what plans the department had to correct the situation. That was the main gist of his questions put forward earlier. Again, I repeat, that the plans are finalized and funds approved, or hopefully will be approved by the Assembly here in the very near future, within the next couple of weeks for to carry out the raising of the Trans-Canada Highway in that area.

Again getting back to the point that when the men from my department, the foreman visited the area, if they found sufficient evidence to close the road at that time the answer is no. The decision was one of the men in the area that in their judgement at seven-thirty there was no immediate emergency. There was no indication then the water level was going to raise substantially as it did after that. But that was not their planned final inspection for the evening. The district director for the Grand Falls region assigned a foreman who is stationed at Badger to make periodic checks of this section of road throughout the evening. In fact, I understand, throughout a twenty-four-hour-period. He was there at seven, seven-thirty, five yesterday afternoon. He came back again at nine and nine-fifteen - between nine and nine-fifteen. So it was not the final inspection at seven-thirty. The foreman came back again at nine or nine-fifteen and he had planned

MR. MORGAN: to keep on coming back. But there was no indication at seven-thirty, no indication of a real emergency occurring.

MR. FLIGHT: What about at nine o'clock?

MR. MORGAN: Well the road was closed at nine-thirty.

MR. FLIGHT: After the drowning.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I think the time sequence is important, because as my colleague just pointed out the road was closed only after the accident, if I understood the minister correctly. And I would like to come back to this question of the warnings, because it is obvious the minister - or his officials, I should say - the minister is responsible but he was not on the spot, of course - were aware of a potential danger and they did make a number of visits. And if I understood the minister correctly at nine o'clock the foreman came back to the scene and saw the danger increasing rapidly and then the accident occurred -

MR. MORGAN: The danger was there then.

MR. ROBERTS: - the danger was there and then the accident occurred after that. Now the foreman was presumably on the site when these two ladies came driving along in their car and the accident occurred and thereafter. So my next question, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the only warnings given were these barricades - and even at nine o'clock at night it is getting well on into dusk, it may even be near dark officially by then - did the foreman make - apparently the foreman was on the site when these two ladies came by. Given the fact that, as the minister says, that the foreman had concluded there was a clear and a present danger on the highway, what steps were taken then? I mean, it is apparently astonishing the officials were there and the ladies came driving - maybe many cars came by, but certainly this car came by and then with the accident two people have lost their lives.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, maybe there will be need for an enquiry but I would like to add a few more facts to the questioning. The two ladies who so unfortunately were killed yesterday in the accident there did drive from Windsor to Badger approximately seven-thirty, over that same section of road, and at that time there was nothing wrong with the road. Yet they did drive over the road after the warning lights were established.

MR. ROBERTS: But they could -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if I could answer the question! These two ladies who were driving the vehicle, in the vehicle, they drove from Windsor to Badger. They went through the warning lights after they were placed there at seven-thirty. They were going into Badger planning on coming back to Windsor in the evening. It was on their way back that the unfortunate accident occurred. So the warning lights were placed there and a number of motorists contacted our men in the area informing them that they passed over the same section of road at eight-thirty yesterday evening and there was no sign of water on the highway, on the pavement anywhere at eight-thirty. So with all these facts now coming to light, and as more facts will be coming in because we have asked the motorists in the area to supply any information they may have - who went over that section of road last night - to our department. So there may be a need for further enquiry but these are some of the facts I would like to mention.

At eight-thirty yesterday evening there was no sign of water on the Trans-Canada Highway, but the accident occurred, according to the RCMP reports, around nine-ten.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the Leader of the Opposition for a further supplementary. I note that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) also wishes to ask another question.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. Obviously there is a need for an enquiry. The member for LaPoile has asked a very pertinent, important question. There is a need, I think, for some enquiry in this House too. The minister did not answer my question. Indeed if anything the more he says the more complicated it becomes because it is obvious now that at seven thirty when these two ladies drove through the area there was no indication that there was anything wrong.

MR. MORGAN: The warning lights were posted six thirty.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the warning lights were there. But they drove through and there was no water. Any reasonable person would say, well why the warning lights, I just drove through and there was no water.

MR. MORGAN: It was a safety measure on the part of our department.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I agree, a safety measure. The question I am at is, were the safety measures adequate and I am having grave doubts as to whether they were. Because the supplementary is this, Sir: At nine o'clock, as I understood the minister's statement originally, Mr. Speaker, at nine o'clock the foreman came back to the spot, and whereas at seven thirty or at eight thirty -

MR. MORGAN: Nine - nine thirty.

MR. ROBERTS: - and that is common ground, seven thirty or eight thirty there was no danger. At nine o'clock the foreman concluded there was a danger. But that was before the accident. Then a very few minutes after that the accident came. My question is, Sir, what did that foreman do? He was back at nine o'clock. These two ladies, who at seven thirty had driven through and everything was okay that they could see apparently - the warning lights were there but no clear and present danger. At nine o'clock they came by, apparently must have passed by that foreman and the people there, no sign given to them. At nine ten they slipped off

MR. ROBERTS:

the road into this hole, this ditch. So my question is, Mr. Speaker, what action did that foreman take when he came back at nine o'clock?

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

HON. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the decisions of the foreman in the area - I asked this morning upon getting the information through the media of the accident, for a full report from my district director in the Grand Falls region. The information that is passed along to me today is to the effect that the foreman was not there when the accident occurred. He arrived shortly after the accident. Upon seeing the water condition - this was one of his periodical inspections - the road was closed immediately upon his return and seeing the conditions. But at eight thirty, I will again repeat, there were motorists who reported to us they drove over the section of highway despite the warning lights there. In fact some of the motorists were questioning why the warning lights. The road was okay. It was obvious. You could see it. It was visible - nothing wrong with the section of highway. They were wondering why we had warning lights up, flashing warning lights and barricades and they even questioned some of the officials in my department in the Grand Falls region. So at 8:30 p.m. yesterday there was no indication that there was going to be a flooding of the highway. So the flooding occurred between eight thirty and the time of the accident. Upon the arrival by the foreman, the foreman closed the road immediately. So without any further answers to any questions this is the information I have now received from my officials in the Grand Falls region as a result of my request for reports from them this morning. These are the facts. I think any further questioning at this time would be probably out of order. We could leave it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - and maybe tomorrow I could give the House of Assembly an indication here tomorrow what the government - when I say government, my colleagues and Cabinet, what we will decide to do with regards to this unfortunate accident.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am going to recognize the Leader of the Opposition for an additional supplementary. I wish to point out before recognizing him that as hon. gentlemen know, but sometimes it is if not necessary, at least useful to repeat it, that is that the Question Period, even in a series of supplementaries should be confined to giving only such information as is necessary to make the question intelligible and that when there are quite a long series of supplementaries obviously the possibility of getting into debate is greater. I draw that to the attention of hon. gentleman and ask them to govern themselves accordingly.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will make this my final supplementary for this time. But I reject and resent the minister's feeling that further questions are out of order. It may well be that he does not want further questions. But that does not make them out of order. My question is very simple, Sir. Does the minister feel on the evidence he now has, and that is all he can go by, that the action taken by his officials was reasonable and prudent, given the circumstances?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to answer that question. Again I repeat, the information I put forward to the House this afternoon is the information I have received to date. It came in around noon today from the Grand Falls office. I will be pressing for further detailed information regarding this accident. Any additional information I receive this afternoon or tomorrow morning will be passed on to the House of Assembly.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think there should be a public enquiry into this, Sir. My question is to the government House Leader, Sir. I would like for the government House Leader to tell the House whether or not when Mr. Robert Morgan was asked to assemble the MacPherson property in connection with the Aquarena for the Summer Games Committee, was he acting as an individual citizen for the MacPherson family or for the Summer Games Committee? Does the minister know what capacity Mr. Morgan was acting in?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: No, I do not.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Is the minister aware or does he know if Mr. Morgan is in any way associated with or employed with Mr. Andrew Crosbie, who is the chairman of the Summer Games Committee?

MR. WELLS: I do not know, Mr. Speaker. I think if Robert Morgan Associates or something - I think he is a consulting engineer or something like that - but whether he is employed by the Crosbie companies I do not know.

MR. NEARY: Well a supplementary question, Sir. Would it change the minister's opinion for an enquiry or an investigation into this whole matter of this land transaction if the minister knew for sure that Mr. Morgan was associated with the various people involved in the Summer Games Committee? Would that change the minister's mind in any way?

MR. WELLS: I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that that is a completely hypothetical question. I do not know.

MR. NEARY: Well a supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that a company called the St. John's Development Corporation in which a number of people who are employed by the Summer Games Committee are shareholders of that corporation, and that that corporation is owned by Mr. Andrew Crosbie and Newfoundland

MR. NEARY: Engineering, and that Mr. Robert Morgan holds 1750 shares in that corporation? Is the minister aware of that fact?

MR. WELLS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well now that the minister is aware of it, does the minister think that this is just a family affair or is there now need for a further investigation, as I have asked for for several days now in a row?

MR. WELLS: No, Mr. Speaker, I think the Summer Games Committee has given its explanation publicly and to this House. I feel if the hon. member is not satisfied then he should make whatever enquiries he wishes to Mr. Morgan or to the Summer Games Committee or whoever.

MR. NEARY: Well a further supplementary, Sir. Is the minister going to be able to get the options from Mr. Morgan or does the minister have any information? Has he been in touch with Morgan to ask for the options that he is alleged to have on this property?

MR. WELLS: Not directly, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that it would be entirely at Mr. Morgan's own discretion if he wanted to produce these options or not. These options are not registered. I enquired at the Registry of Deeds and they are not registered.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have a supplementary? If so I will permit him just one more; then I shall recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask the hon. minister if he was aware of other people who are involved in this company? Involved are Mr. Andrew Crosbie, Mr. Byron McDonald, Mr. Robert Morgan, Mr. Richard Cook and Mr. Grant Chalker who are all employees or members of the Summer Games Committee. And would that not indicate conspiracy, fraud or collusion to the minister and to the House and warrant an investigation?

MR. WELLS: What it would indicate to anybody else, Mr. Speaker - of course I do not know these names that the hon. member

MR. WELLS: has mentioned. They are familiar names, some of them as being members of the Committee, but the fact that they are members of the Committee and involved in this company is not to me, at any rate, an indication that there is fraud and conspiracy. There would have to be hard evidence produced.

MR. NEARY: Well that is why I am asking for the investigation. I cannot do it.

MR. WELLS: If there is evidence that there is fraud or conspiracy, well by all means, let him produce it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated that we are getting very close to the end of the period and that I would allow only one further supplementary and I indicated I would recognize the hon. the Leader of the Opposition next. Since we are getting so close I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) can go back to this tomorrow if he wishes to explore it further. But my question is for the minister, the gentleman for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) in his recreation and rehabilitation capacity, but a little different aspect of his ministerial responsibilities. Several weeks ago I asked, before the Easter recess, I asked the minister to let me know, or to let the House know what stadia or stadiums, if we wish, were to be built in Newfoundland this year. I have had representations from a number of communities in my district that are interested, there is also the Daniels Harbour area in the St. Barbe District and so on; could he let us know what stadiums are to be built in Newfoundland this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: I recall the question of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I have asked the officials to give me that information. I will jog their memories again this afternoon and hope to have that tomorrow.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not their memories that need jogging.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Georges. And I should point out this is the final question.

MRS. H. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. I would like to ask the minister if he can tell me if a new high school will be built in Robinson's this year to replace the very old and outdated structure that now exists?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

HON. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there is no way that I could have that information, because the information is purely the school boards responsibility. And, of course, the funding for these schools come from the Denominational Educational Committees. I have been indirectly apprised of the situation, not as a minister, as an individual. And I have been informed that there may be a possibility, but that would not be going from our department. That is the school boards decision alone.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Today being Private Members' Day we proceed to the adjourned debate on Motion 5.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLICHT: Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last Friday I had indicated that I would support the appointment of a select committee for the purpose of determining the way this Province goes in future developments. And I pointed out although I was a little reluctant to relinquish the decision-making with regard to development in this Province, to have this House relinquish it, it is because of what I consider the scattered-brained approach or the shotgun approach that the Province have seen with regards to the development of this Province. It would seem that there has been no input at all by the general public of Newfoundland up to this point in time as to what would or would not have been best, what way we should have gone or should not have gone. It is an on-again, off-again situation. It is industrial development one minute, it is resource based development the next minute. So, Mr. Speaker, it seems we do not know where we are going, and we are changing directions all

Mr. Flight:

of the time, and therefore a select committee might well sit down in Newfoundland with the people and at least advise this House as to what they have found. And if the House were to then listen to the report of a select committee they may indeed develop Newfoundland the way that people want it developed, and not the type of development that is expedient at the time.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy, his speech in this debate was considered by a great many people, indeed one of my colleagues referred to it as the doom and gloom speech, and at the time it was a doom and gloom speech. He listed what he saw was the priorities for Newfoundland with regards to development, and his priorities, Mr. Speaker, was the development of the Lower Churchill, the bringing of electricity power from Labrador into the Island, the offshore oil exploration or development, fishing, pulp and paper and mining. And, Mr. Speaker, if that speech was given today, six months after, it could not be considered a doom and gloom speech; it would have to be considered in keeping with the facts as they exist.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the Lower Churchill is beyond our ability to develop. The oil refinery at Come By Chance is closed down and bankrupt. The offshore oil and gas development, according to the Energy Board, is twenty years down the road. Some fish stocks have depleted to a point where the shutdown of that fishery has to be considered. One of the oldest and greatest producing mines in Newfoundland is about to phase out. And as for the pulp and paper industry, the linerboard mill is not the healthiest industry in the world. So where is the doom and gloom, Mr. Speaker? As I said, that speech is exactly in keeping with the situation we have in this Province today.

Now the question is, why? Why have we reached this deplorable stage in the development of our Province? Because, I suggest, Sir, the decisions made towards the development of this Province are politically motivated, and have been politically motivated. The development is

Mr. Flight:

based on political expediency, what is spectacular at the time, and what appeals to the masses at the time, with very little consideration as to what the type of development we undertake will mean to Newfoundland twenty years down the road. Could a Select Committee have done worse? I doubt it.

Let us look at the Churchill Falls, Mr. Speaker. The Upper Churchill

MR. FLIGHT:

was developed on Quebec's terms. Had it not been developed on Quebec's terms, it would never have been developed. I suggest to this House, Mr. Speaker, that the Lower Churchill will never be developed by this Province unless it is developed on Quebec's terms. Given the political situation in Quebec, given this Province's limited financial capabilities -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. member allow me? Does he insist on that word "never." If he speaks of the next five or eight or ten years, but never is a long time.

MR. FLIGHT: Never, Sir, unless there is great change in our technology within our - unless we come up with the ability to transport large blocks of hydro long distances.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no. Does the hon. member not agree that it could be developed and consumed within Labrador?

MR. FLIGHT: I am coming to that, Mr. Speaker, or at least I, you know - what I am saying, Sir, we are talking about the situation in the Province today. As it now, in my mind, as it now looks, given the situation we have in Quebec, given this Province's limited financial ability, given the Federal Government's attitude towards energy development, given the technology available today, the Lower Churchill cannot be developed -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: - unless we develop it at Quebec's terms.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, yes. Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Does any hon. gentleman in this House believe we can develop the Lower Churchill only then on Quebec's terms?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. FLIGHT: You do?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Immediately now, no.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, but in the next year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: But, but -

MR. FLIGHT: Then you are not within keeping -

MR. DOODY: Wait until we get a national, a national P.C. government in the next federal election.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, -

MR. SMALLWOOD: When will that be? When will that be?

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, it was said -

MR. DOODY: Deal soon.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, yeah!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the development of this Province, Mr. Chairman. It was said, Mr. Chairman, and the government have not denied, that prior to the takeover of BRINCO, prior to the takeover BRINCO was prepared to undertake the development of the Lower Churchill. Again it would have been done on Quebec's terms but with one big catch. Here is the catch, the difference. Only the surplus to Newfoundland's needs would have had to have been sold to Quebec. If the technology is available for the Newfoundland Government to bring the Lower Churchill power into Newfoundland by transmission lines and by tunnel, then certainly it was available for BRINCO. But for the takeover the Lower Churchill might well have under development today. Newfoundland might have the energy that we require.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear! Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: We would have the benefits of jobs created by the development.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: And most important, Mr. Speaker, we would not have extended our credit by almost \$200 million at a cost of \$20 million a year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear! More than \$20 million.

MR. DOODY: Without the monkey!

MR. FLIGHT: No, Mr. Speaker, we went the spectacular route. We would buy out BRINCO. We would own the water rights. We would develop the Lower Churchill for Newfoundland on Newfoundland's terms. We would do what appealed to the masses at the time. No consideration for the great burdens that the action would perpetrate on the people of Newfoundland

MR. FLIGHT:

for years to come! Mr. Speaker, do you think a select committee concerned with the better good of Newfoundland, concerned with the long-term, the long-range developments of this Province would have recommended that takeover? I doubt it, Sir. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that all the details and all the implications with regards to that particular takeover was known to the people in this Province prior to the takeover. Every word that I have heard spoken about the Lower Churchill and about the development, I heard while the discussions were ongoing. So there are not any new facts that have come to light, you know, that now makes the BRINCO deal look bad. All the facts were there and were mulled over. If there has been a select committee maybe travelling around this Province and pointing out the facts to the people, they might have said, "Well maybe that is not the way to go." I doubt if a select committee would have had us go the way that we went with BRINCO, Mr. Speaker. But now we have to deal with Quebec. We have to get 600 megawatts to justify the transmission lines, Mr. Speaker.

Sir, four or five months ago this House gave the Cabinet, gave the government the right to spend \$55 million for the purpose of transmitting the Lower Churchill power to the Island via transmission lines and via the tunnel, a blank cheque, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, can one believe that a select committee

Mr. Flight.

would recommend, would give government the right to spend \$55 million to build a transmission line, and to build a tunnel to transport power without first having determined whether or not we have the power to transport? I doubt it.

Mr. Speaker, Quebec set the terms for the development of the Upper Churchill. Quebec will set the terms for the development of the Lower Churchill, and now Quebec is going to set the terms for the buying of the 600 megawatts of electricity we need. Well the terms that I have heard to date, Mr. Speaker, are not acceptable. In his speech in this debate, the Minister of Mines and Energy indicated that one of the great hopes for Newfoundland was having power from Labrador flow into the Island. If that is so, Mr. Speaker, then in my opinion the Quebec attitude today is one that would stifle the development of this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, I will refrain from saying in this House what I think the people of Newfoundland would say to a select committee, would tell them how they should deal with Quebec. I will refrain from that, Sir. I have no desire to be branded a nationalistic rebel or a radical. But, Sir, less significant issues, with less adverse implications on one country and one province, have caused men to become nationalistic, have caused them to become radicals and have caused them to become rebels. I am looking forward, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Newfoundland are looking forward to seeing the strings in the bow of the Minister of Mines and Energy. So much for the Churchill, and so much, Mr. Speaker, for Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, if ever there was proof that a select committee could convey to the House of Assembly how they feel this Province should be developed, I am going to refer to the Lloyds River diversion, the first time that I have actually referred to it since I have come in this honourable House other than answering a question.

Mr. Flight.

The Minister of Energy in presenting his estimates said - he looked directly at me at one point, and he said - "Now I do not want to see the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) frothing at the mouth over the mention of Lloyds River." A very unparliamentary statement to say the least, Sir. But I can assure the minister that it was not the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) who was frothing at the mouth while the controversy of Lloyds River was going on. It was not the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) who was red-faced when the decision was finally made at the outcome of the controversy. No, Sir, it was the minister's predecessor, the former Minister of Mines and Energy, and members of the front benches, his cabinet, and of top people in Hydro whose faces were red.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Lloyds River diversion and the way that this Province was going to develop it speaks very clearly and very abundantly as to why maybe we should have a select committee to go out in to this Island and find out how the people feel about the way they want their Province developed. The destruction that would have been brought about by the diversion of Lloyds River, Mr. Speaker, would boggle your imagination, and the fact is that Lloyds River was on the drawing boards, and had it not been for the opposition it received today it would have been a fact. Besides flooding King George's Lake, drying up Lloyds River, taking a chance on polluting Red Indian Lake and rendering it useless for tourist potential development, besides risking the complete pollution of Red Indian Lake, it would have wiped out what tourist potential we had left up in that part of the country. Ignoring all this, the Newfoundland Cabinet, this cabinet, had given Newfoundland Hydro the go ahead on the development of the Lloyds River. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the cabinet and officials of the Newfoundland Hydro attempted to mislead the general public of this Province in what destruction there would be. The fact is, Sir, that neither the cabinet, the ex-minister, or the officials of Hydro were aware and had any way of being aware as to the amount of

Mr. Flight.

environmental damage that would have been done by the diversion of Lloyds River, but they spent a good many hours trying to convince the people of Central Newfoundland basically that it would have no affect on the environment.

And, Mr. Speaker, that leaves me to another point that I want to make here. I sat through the debate here, Sir,

MR. FLIGHT:

when the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had made an issue of Mr. Groom's salary, the chairman of Newfoundland Hydro. Now I have got no desire at all, Mr. Speaker, to know what Mr. Denis Groom earns. I can only presume that he is being paid what it would cost Newfoundland to have a man of his qualifications doing the job that he is doing. I would suggest that I believe that the salary would be in keeping with that and therefore we need good men and if the price we are paying Mr. Groom is indicated by the market for a man of those qualifications then fine, let us pay him what we are paying him.

However, Mr. Speaker, the minister has suggested that Denis Groom was not in the political arena so therefore Denis Groom's name should not be bandied around this House. Well I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that when the controversy on Lloyds River was going on, Denis Groom projected himself very much in the political arena. Denis Groom stood up in this city, Mr. Speaker, in front of either Rotary or Kinsmen - and I do not know which - and he deliberately attempted to ridicule the people who were opposed to the diversion of Lloyds River. In doing that, Mr. Speaker, he was ridiculing the people who pay him his wages. I would want to suggest to Mr. Groom, or anybody in the same category in Newfoundland as Mr. Groom, that if they are not interested in becoming politically involved, if they do not want their salaries questioned or their roles in Newfoundland's way of life questioned then, Sir, they should leave the type of statements that they were making to the politicians or else they are going to go on the firing line.

Mr. Speaker, in trying to justify the diversion of Lloyds River the people who supported the diversion of Lloyds River went around this Province stating that it would cost \$28 million more to produce the same amount of horsepower in the diversion of Lloyds River as it would cost to produce the same amount of energy by fossil fuel. This was the justification. Therefore the people of Newfoundland were supposed to have said, well let us save the \$28 million.

MR. MURPHY: At that rate it would have cost \$28 million more -

MR. FLIGHT: More.

MR. MURPHY: To try to divert the Lloyds River than by fossil fuel.

MR. FLIGHT: No. The energy that is produced by fossil fuel over five years would cost \$28 million more than the same amount of energy produced by Lloyds River. But, Sir, it was a significant fact. Of course I realize what I am doing here, I am inviting statisticians or somebody to question my figures but it was ascertained during that controversy that Price (Nfld)'s consumption of electrical energy would increase by the same amount in the next five years as the amount of electricity that we would develop at Lloyds River. In other words, Price (Nfld) was going to use every volt of electricity that would have been generated by the diversion of Lloyds River.

The obvious question to me, Mr. Speaker, is, if Price (Nfld) was going to use it why were the people of Newfoundland told they were going to have to pay for it? Why was not Price (Nfld) going to pay for it if they were going to use it?

Mr. Speaker, if the Lloyds River controversy accomplished nothing else, certainly it must have served notice on the Government of Newfoundland that the people of this Province will not tolerate any longer the type of destruction to our environment that we have permitted up to this point in time. Mr. Speaker, our environment is being destroyed at an unbelievable rate.

I would wish at this point, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Minister of Tourism on his new hunting regulations. Certainly they are a great improvement over what we had and certainly there may be loopholes but for a man who gives the impression that he intends to improve the regulations, then certainly he has made a great try and up to this point I can only but congratulate him.

However, Mr. Speaker, the minister made this statement a few days ago in the House that but for the approach of this government, of this cabinet, of this government, to the development of tourism in Newfoundland that twenty-five years from now tourism would be dead.

MR. FLIGHT:

Well, Sir, I suggest, and I want to make it very clear I do not suggest this by design, I do not suggest that our tourism is being developed by design to do what I am going to say - but I would say this, Sir, that instead of having died in twenty-five years but for the approach of this government, that it will take twenty-five years for our tourist industry to commit suicide under the policies under which our tourism is now being developed and managed.

Thirty-eight thousand to forty thousand moose was the answer in the minister's statement when I asked a question in the House some time ago. Mr. Speaker, there are not 38,000 or 40,000 moose in Newfoundland. There are just not in Newfoundland 38,000 or 40,000 moose. This may be another reason why a select committee should go out into the Province and find out what is going on. It has to be recognized, Mr. Speaker, that I come from the Central Newfoundland area, Windsor-Buchans, Grand Falls-Bishop Falls.

Now, Sir, the Buchans plateau, the Great Red Indian Lake Valley, the Lloyds River area

Mr. Flight:

has been known over the years as being the best stocked, with the highest density of moose in Newfoundland. And, Sir, ten years ago in that country you could have seen fifteen moose in one day, and now you will not see one moose in fifteen days. Now where is the 38,000 to 40,000 moose? And I have heard for this past five or six years that is the figure thrown out by the Department of Tourism, 38,000 to 40,000 moose, and they just do not exist, Mr. Speaker. It is very questionable, Mr. Speaker, if this government should not consider closing the moose season completely, altogether for a year or two, and let our moose stocks come back. Because you do not need to be a biologist, Sir, to know that there will come a time when our moose population gets low enough, its ability to regenerate itself, you do not have to shoot every moose in Newfoundland in order to have no moose. Once the moose population gets low enough they will not have the ability to come back, and we are approaching that stage, Mr. Speaker. And I would challenge what biologists who work with the Department of Tourism to prove to this House that there are 38,000 moose in Newfoundland, to prove to this House that the moose population in Newfoundland is facing the danger of extinction. And I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker.

I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that in this new game laws the minister made no reference to non-resident hunting. None at all. So I presume we are going to have a non-resident hunting in the same sense that we have had it. Mr. Speaker, as I said, ten years ago, fifteen years ago on a day's walk from around Buchans a person could have seen fifteen moose, today he could not see one moose in fifteen days. I know what I am talking about. And, Mr. Speaker, but I will tell you what I can do now; I can take my ski-doo on any given day, and I can hit fifteen fly-in camps within one day's travel of Buchans. Now I would suggest to the minister -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Fifteen what?

MR. FLIGHT: Fifteen fly-in camps where you have to -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Fly-in?

Mr. Flight: Fly-in.

Now I would suggest to the minister that he would take the government airplane or the government helicopter or anything, do it at the expense of the Province, and pay a visit to those camps and read what is written on the walls of those camps. And it will be no trouble to understand what is happening to our moose population, Mr. Speaker. Those camps are situated in the very prime source - it is the source for years and years, Mr. Speaker, in Buchans when you went hunting you left the town and within three or four miles walk of the town you saw a moose, or ten moose, I have seen as high as seventeen moose myself in just one look, and this was the overflow that was coming out from the great ponds and lakes that were isolated from man, you see, and we were only shooting the overflow. But then came the fly-in camps, and the moose now, Sir, are being shot at their source!

I have walked into fly-in camps, Mr. Speaker, and the signs, Mr. So-and-So from Michigan, Mr. So-and-So from California, the great stags, the great bulls, the number of points, the number of moose seen. And, Mr. Speaker, if we continue that route there will be precious little moose left in Newfoundland. The only people who will see a moose in this Province in a few years will be the people who can afford to fly in and look at them. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province have got a great sincere desire to have a moose population in Newfoundland twenty years from now. And I am suggesting very seriously that the government - and this may be very, very unpopular politically - would look at closing the moose season completely in this Province. Because if they do not, and if they continue to go on, and espouse the fact that there are thirty or forty thousand moose in this Province then they are doing an injustice to the people of this Province, and they are taking a chance of wiping out our moose population.

And now, Mr. Speaker, with regards to the fly-in, and with regards to the non-resident hunting, I suppose that I have to accept the fact that we have outfitters, and I could not arbitrarily recommend all the outfitters in Newfoundland be closed down, but I would suggest, Sir, that as a camp closes, as an outfitter that we have today goes out of business that certainly no other licence should be issued.

MR. FLIGHT: Because if we are looking at what the moose population of Newfoundland means to the economy of this Province, I can assure this House that having a moose stand on the stand of the road in the summer on the Trans-Canada will attract more tourist dollars to Newfoundland than having some guy coming in from Idaho and shooting a moose and going back. And if the minister does not believe me he should go to Port-aux-Basques and watch them, watch the moose hunters when they come off the boat. They come in caravans. They have their own booze. They have their own gas. They have everything. They do not stop. They leave the boat at Port-aux-Basques and they do not stop again until they arrive at their hunting lodge.

MR. MURPHY: Is the outfitting industry as active as it was around Badger?

MR. FLIGHT: Nothing like it was, Sir. Nothing like it was.

And, Mr. Speaker, again in keeping with that line I would suggest that, I do not know, maybe the minister should stand up and tell us what non-resident hunting means to the economy of this Province, and then he should compare it with the loss to the potential tourist attraction of this Province if we do not have moose to attract and wild life to attract the people in.

Mr. Speaker, you could write a book, you could go on for a week on the way the tourist potential of this Province is being destroyed. The paper companies, Mr. Speaker; three or four years ago the government of Newfoundland—and I wish the Minister of Highways was in his place because I doubt very much if he is aware of this fact that there are five miles of public, government-owned, paid for road along the Lloyds River Valley. It was built as a extension to Price Newfoundland's road, the road going to Bay d'Espoir. And, Mr. Speaker, it was referred to when it was being built as a scenic route. I guarantee you it is not scenic today! The minister or one of his representatives should go in and see what Price Newfoundland have done to that five miles of road. You have to push the trees that they cut off the side of the road. They have stripped

MR. FLIGHT: It. There is nothing left, just absolutely nothing or what would have been the five miles of the most beautiful road, in this country. And then the minister says that our approach to tourism and our approach to the protection of the environment will guarantee the success of the tourist potential of this Province!

MR. MURPHY: Where does that road cut off?

MR. FLIGHT: It leaves the Trans-Canada Highway, Mr. Speaker, at Badger. But, however, that strip of road was built. You go in and you take a look at what the paper companies are doing to the banks of our rivers. Go in and see what they have done to Lloyds River, to the natural banks of the river. Go in and see what they have done to Shanadithi River. They have wiped out any chance that this Province will ever have to develop those areas from a tourist potential point of view. We cannot rebuilt those rivers. I can take the minister in and show him miles along the bank of the river where the tractors just came in and pushed it. I can take him in and show him all sorts of ramps built out into the river and everything pushed away so that they could dump the wood into the river. Go up and take a look at Red Indian Lake today, Mr. Speaker - thousands of cords of wood floating around that lake. You take your life in your own hands to go on to the lake in a boat! The Exploits River, every river in Central Newfoundland is polluted with wood left in the water and, you know, Mr. Speaker, again you could go on and on.

The Minister of Forestry stood up here the other day, Sir, and he made a statement, something to this effect, woe to the man that leaves a stump in the woods under our new management regulations. How far out of touch can you be? How far, Sir, out of touch can you be to what is going on in this Province with regard to that type of development? Is the minister aware that there are thousands and thousands - while I am speaking right now, while I am speaking there are thousands of cords of wood drifting around Red Indian Lake. It

MR. FLIGHT: is up in the woods. It is covered with sand. It is sinking to the bottom. And more wood is being cut to replace it. Is the minister aware that in the operations the way the paper companies are cutting that thousands and thousands of cords of wood that may be not usable at a mill, maybe cannot be floated down river is being left to rot? Is he aware that there are brows of woods, brows six feet high the length of this building and twice as long left, piled, stacked and left to rot in the woods?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Does the member repeat the statement I made yesterday?

MR. FLIGHT: Yes. The minister said something that verbatim, Sir. He said something like, Woe be tide, or Woe to the man to the man who goes into the woods under our new regulations and leaves -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Under our new management policy.

MR. FLIGHT: Under your new management policy.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Does the member know how many of those now operate under the management policy.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, Sir, from what I see in Newfoundland there is none. No, Sir, but they have been talked about this last years.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Which one is that?

MR. FLIGHT: The first one is in Lewisporte. Well, Sir, I will be watching very closely and the people of Newfoundland will be watching very closely as to what effect the minister's management policies have on the type of waste that we have seen going on in Central Newfoundland, the type of destruction

Mr. Flight.

that is going on in Central Newfoundland. Tourist potential! We just saw an incident here today what comes as a result of a company like Price (Nfld) or any other corporation. I thank God for Price (Nfld). Do not everyone get the impression that I am against development in this Province, or I am against Price (Nfld). But I am saying this that Price (Nfld) could operate in this Province, and they could leave our environment as they found it, and it would not cost them one red nickel in profits. Red Indian Lake has never been sacked, never, ever been sacked. The wood is just dumped in, and it is left to the mercies of the tides and the winds to get to Exploit's Dam where it is driven down on the main river . What type of an approach is it to forestry management and protection of the environment with an eye to tourist potential development, when a company can control the biggest river in Newfoundland by a series of dams without even letting the Government of Newfoundland know what they are doing? We saw a result of that today, and we will hear more about that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him whether he knows - I do not know - but does he know whether the legislation passed in 1905, giving concessions and rights to the original A.N.D. Company give them those rights to do the very thing he is now referring to?

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question. I can say this, Sir; I do not care personally what the legislation of 1905 said, if it is a fact, and what I am telling you is a fact, that no legislation should permit that. If that is a fact, that legislation should be changed. I do not know if it did. I suspect it did.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If there is such legislation?

MR. FLIGHT: To this point, if there is such legislation - Mr. Speaker, the fact is to this point in time - and I mean to this point in time -

Mr. Flight.

the paper companies in Newfoundland have become powers unto themselves. It is unbelievable! You have to be there to see what they are doing. They are controlling the woods roads, the access roads. They decide when to open the roads to the general public.

AN HON. MEMBER: Their roads.

MR. FLIGHT: Their roads? Not always their roads!

All right, Mr. Speaker, how about a situation like this where you have about a forty mile road, thirty miles of which was built on the Roads to Resources scheme, one-third, one-third, one-third - the federal government one-third, provincial one-third and Price (Nfld) one-third - and at some point that programme ran out. So then Price was forced to build the rest of the road on its own and then they said, "Oh this is our road now," so they put a gate across.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A gate across where?

MR. FLIGHT: At the end of the roads to resources, the part that was built.

But then the government in their wisdom went in to the end of the road, the fifteen miles of the road that Price controls, and they built out of the public chest, they built five miles of road, extended on the Price Newfoundland road. And if Price so decides now not an individual gets in on that road because he has to pass over ten, fifteen miles of road that is owned privately by Price.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On whose land are the three sections of the road built?

MR. FLIGHT: Well, it would be on Crown land or it would be on land on which Price Newfoundland has timber rights. It could well be on Reid's land. Some of it is on Reid's land, because it runs along right on the beach of the lake.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we stand up, we talk about a select committee. There is no evidence at all that if legislation

Mr. Flight.

comes in to this - we seem to be isolated from the feeling of the people in the Province. There is no evidence that the people out there have any input in to decisions that are made in this House. They question why is that there is no control over the type of thing I have just pointed out. They question why is it that there is new forest management regulations, but we do not see any evidence of it. And, Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time. You know, I am not the first person who has pointed this out. I have attended meetings in my home town where some of the major politicians of the day have been there, some of the top cabinet ministers, and this has been pointed out, and they have acknowledged it, but they obviously did nothing about it. So a select committee - if this House is not prepared to recognize the desires of the people of Newfoundland, then maybe the only way to go is with a select committee, with an understanding that we will abide by some of the recommendations of a select committee. I intended, Mr. Speaker, just for the Minister of Forestry's information -

MR. FLIGHT:

I went off on a tangent there -

AN HON. MEMBER: No holding back.

MR. FLIGHT: No, right. I want to inform the House that I am saving my observations with regards to the forest management regulations and what is happening in our forests in this Province until the minister's estimates come to the floor. If they do not come to the floor, Mr. Speaker, I will get them in the budget debate. But if I have anything of any importance -

MR. ROUSSEAU: I can give the hon. member a little bit of information Sir, answer the questions and give the information for you, if I may for one second?

MR. FLIGHT: Yes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We do not have right now forest management policy regulations until we get each individual unit done. Okay? The first unit has now arrived, the Lewisporte unit. They are done up by looking at the wood we have and trying to ascertain the annual sustainable yield. When that comes in the officials take a look at it, then it comes to my desk for approval. The first one is the one for Lewisporte. It has not even officially reached my desk yet. That is the first management policy. We will have nine, hopefully, done sometime during this year. That is the first one. We have none yet - I am sorry, we have one, the Lewisporte and another one that may be in since that. Then we look at them, then they are approved and then they become management units and regulations go under them. Right now we have none that have been approved by the minister and that is what the regulations state.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I accept the hon. minister's explanation and I want to make it very clear that I have no desire to question the minister's motives. I think his concern is as great as mine. But I will say this, Sir, that the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) at one point in his great presentation on the offshore gas and oil indicated to the House Leader - and he did not do it in a derogatory way - he said, "Sir, I feel that you are ignorant to the facts. I

MR. FLIGHT:

feel that you have not been getting the information that you should have. "And I would suggest to the minister that that is quite possible in the forest management. I would suspect, Sir, that most of the forest management that we will see will be the control of the sawmills, control of the small operators, regulations that will regulate their cutting and the way they cut and where they cut. But I will be waiting, Mr. Speaker, and the people of the Province will be waiting to see what control is placed on the great paper companies with this new management.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if the type of control that the people of Newfoundland envision should be on those paper companies is not there, then there will be very little sympathy for the type of forest management that would only control the individual who goes into the woods and the forests of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, while thousands of cords of wood has been allowed to float around Red Indian Lake and drift and sink to the bottom, a Newfoundlander cannot in the same country go in and cut enough lumber to build a house. Does that make sense? Does it make sense that a man in Newfoundland today cannot on any timber concession held by the paper companies not be permitted to cut a log. But still the same company can allow hundreds and thousands of cords of wood over the years to sink to the bottom to rot. The biggest need we have in this Province today from a social need is the need to provide housing. Now where is the justice, Mr. Speaker?

Maybe someone in this hon. House - and I will yield the floor to anybody who can clarify this for me - I understood up until this point in my life, but I have become very well aware that it is not so now - but I understood as I grew up that every Newfoundlander in Newfoundland, everyone, had the right to cut a house, could go into the woods and cut 10,000 feet of lumber to build a House. But that is obviously not so. I do not know if it was a written -

MR. ROUSSEAU: I do not know.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, Sir, the fact is right now that a Newfoundlander -

MR. ROUSSEAU: On Crown lands you could cut for your own needs -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The basis of that is the three mile limit, three miles reserved from the salt water inland for the people to go and cut almost at will.

MR. FLIGHT: Right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That goes back at least 100 years.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Perhaps the hon. member will allow me to remind him that he has approximately two to three minutes left.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is all I need. I will just say, Mr. Speaker, I believe that a person could make - any member could spend a week talking about reasons why a select committee would be in the better interests of this Province. Again I have no desire to relinquish the authority of this House to make decisions in this Province, but at the same time I see no evidence that this House and the decision makers, policy setters in this Province are paying any attention to what the people outside of this House are saying, Sir. Unless we find a way to recognize the Province as they exist, and stop being isolated from the people in this Province whom we have been elected to govern then what choice do we have, Mr. Speaker?

Before I sit down there is one other point I would make too, Sir. It is obvious now we have run down to within twenty-odd hours left for the estimates, less than twenty-odd hours, fifteen.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the district I come from, the three departments that they are most concerned with - all the departments are important - but here are the three: Forestry and Agriculture, Municipal Affairs, and Tourism. It is very doubtful, Mr. Speaker, if those three departments' estimates are going to come to the floor of this House. Now what do you think:

MR. F. WHITE: Either one, either one.

MR. FLIGHT: Either one. Now what do you think that the people in my district would say to a select committee if they sat down and said, "Look, what do you think? Do you think that we should be allowed seventy-five hours to debate the estimates?" What do you think they would say, Sir? Seventy-five hours on debating the estimates with the government having at its disposal, and the hon. House Leader - am I having a hard time making myself clear to you because you are, you know -

MR. DOODY: No. I find it incredible.

MR. FLIGHT: You find it incredible. Yes, Sir, and I find it incredible that you would support such a despicable thing as perpetrating on this House seventy-five hours of debate of which your government, of which your ministers will use half it. It is despicable, Mr. Speaker. I will not get a chance to debate the departments that concern my district. I can tell this hon. House that if a select committee sat in Newfoundland right now they would be told in no uncertain terms that this is not acceptable. It is a shameful thing. If the government is going to have the seventy-five hours then certainly the time the government uses up should be deducted from the seventy-five hours. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion that a select committee be appointed to look into the future direction this Province takes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Pearl.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the debate that has gone on here on the motion made by the hon. Leader of

MR. N. WINDSOR:

the Opposition. Many valid points have been made from both sides of the House I feel. However, I do not think that a select committee to study the prospects for economic growth and development is necessary. Indeed I feel that the appointment of such a committee could in fact impede the progress of development in this Province. We have seen many examples, Mr. Speaker, whereby committees were established and studies were commissioned on a particular problem. In many cases the study was necessary and the report of the committee has been a very valuable document and contributed greatly to the orderly and proper solution to the problem. However many times this is not true and progress has been impeded or at least decisions deferred pending the report of the committee.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that a study such as that proposed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would be a monumental task which would take years to complete, and perhaps years of discussion before any implementation of any recommendations arising from that study would come about. We have a good example of this, Mr. Speaker, in this area at the moment currently under consideration. That is the St. John's Urban Region Study which covers the area generally referred to as the Northeast Avalon which is defined by an imaginary line running from Holyrood to Witless Bay and all that area lying to the Northeast. This area, Sir, is the subject of one of the most exhaustive studies ever undertaken in this region, or in this Province in fact. I would like to deal with this for a few moments, Sir, and subsequent studies which have arisen from the recommendations of that study because economic growth and development cover a much broader range of subjects on the establishment of industry and creation of employment opportunities. In fact to attract industry to an area it is necessary to provide development of residential and commercial areas, recreational facilities, municipal services, social services, schools, churches, hospitals, an efficient transportation system, et cetera. The St. John's Urban Region Study was presented in late 1972 or early 1973 and was covered in three major headings - the

MR. N. WINDSOR: regional plan, the municipal services plan and a local government report. The Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing made a concerted effort to familiarize both the general public and concerned agencies and groups. And to receive public input a commission was established under the chairmanship of Mr. Alec Henley, and a series of public hearings held, and to aid persons and groups in preparing their presentations on this report a series of newspaper articles outlining briefly in plain, simple language the findings of this study and the recommendations thereby was published and I think that everybody in this Province have had, or at least in this area who would be interested, have had ample opportunity to study the recommendations in the report and the material it contains.

The Henley Commission, Sir, has completed reports on the regional plan and the municipal services plan. I understand also that the presentation of the commission's final report, its report on local government which covers financing and related matters, the report, Sir, is pending, I would think.

Well, Mr. Speaker, nearly four years have passed since this report was tabled, first presented and the data on which this report was compiled was collected back in 1971-72. The study was designed to cover a twenty year period. Now better than twenty per cent of that time period has elapsed and this report is not yet adopted in its entirety and no appropriate legislation or regulations have been passed.

It is true, Sir, however, that the study has had a definite effect on planning and decisions made in this area in that many of the recommendations have been accepted on a tentative basis. Those which are least controversial have been utilized and decisions have been based on them. I wish to point out, Sir, but I would like to congratulate the government, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs in particular, for recognizing the problems as outlined in the study, for making decisions based on the facts presented by the report which could not

MP. N. WINDSOR: wait for the final adoption of the report. An example of this, Sir, is the establishment of the St. John's Urban Region Water and Sewer Board. The decision to form this board was based first of all on the assumption that the regional plan would be adopted - and I will get into more specifics on the reason why that assumption would have to be made later on - and in accordance with the recommendations of the report that the municipal services plan would be adopted, and also that the local government plan would be accepted or at least some form of regional government or an improved system of local government would come about. This, Sir, is a major step in the realization of better regional co-operation and provision of services in the most efficient and economical manner possible.

But, Mr. Speaker, the St. John's Urban Region Study is merely a master plan, in fact a proposed master plan at this time, because it has not yet been formally adopted in its entirety or as amended. As a result of this study it was possible to identify those provinces which were of top priority, which could become critical or were almost critical at the moment. Subsequent studies have been carried out on regional water supply system, regional sewage disposal system, and regional solid waste disposal. In addition the Department of Transportation and Communications has done in-house studies on transportation problems, and many meetings and discussions and public debates have been held on the necessity for an improved transportation system in this area which serves a central core of this Province, in fact we have one-third, just about, of the population of this Province living within a fifty mile radius of St. John's.

It has become evident, Sir, that a regional water supply system is imperative in order to eliminate critical shortages that have been

MR. N. WINDSOR: experienced by the City of St. John's in recent years and which will very likely be experienced this year in view of the very mild winter, a somewhat predictable I would think, dry summer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that figure correct, one third of our population?

MR. N. WINDSOR: Well, just about a third. Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That takes in out at Whitbourne, Bay Roberts, Clarke's Beach.

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is right. Yes. There are approximately 150,000 people living in the metro area, in fact in the area covered by this. In fact the report as stated worked on the assumption that 148,000 people lived within the St. John's Urban Region area, that is the Northeast Avalon, that is the line from Holyrood to Witless Bay.

The 1971 census came out or was tabled after this report was compiled and they then revised their data. The 1971 census had a figure of 140,000 people living in this immediate region. So you go within fifty miles which takes you, as you said, to Clarke's Beach, then you would have certainly one-third of the population of this Province living within fifty miles of the city, and the city of course being the central core of this region, the heart of this whole region, Conception Bay South now developing as a sub-regional centre, and you have your main axes of development leading from the harbour to Conception Bay South. If you look at any developments that are taking place or have taken place in the last few years, you will see a natural trend, primarily because of topographical reasons and ease of servicing and availability of servicing, extending from the harbour in that area, plus to the northeast, the northeast development area.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But surely, if the hon. member will allow me, surely when you leave metropolitan St. John's, and you leave Conception Bay

MR. SMALLWOOD: South.you area really running out of large numbers of people. You have the Southern Shore, You cannot get as far as Placentia. You can get about as far as Whitbourne, you can get down maybe as far as New Harbour. So in the Trinity Bay, the Southern Shore and the Placentia Bay side, you know, you are running out of people. You are talking about Metropolitan St. John's and Conception Bay South, what is one-third of 540,000?

MR. N. WINDSOR: It is about 180,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: 180,000.

MR. N. WINDSOR: You have 150,000 within this area.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You might stagger it.

MR. N. WINDSOR: I did say almost one-third within this region or approximately one-third within fifty miles.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. N. WINDSOR: This water supply, Sir, is not only needed for St. John's and the immediate surrounding area, or the area serviced by the existing water supply system of Windsor Lake, and proposed expansion areas but certainly the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) will, I am sure, agree that it is critical that a water supply and sewage system be provided for that area.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was critical ten years ago.

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is right.

MR. MURPHY: Why did not John Mahoney build it up, the same thing five or six years ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We figured six, seven years ago it cost \$150 million to cure that terrible problem. It costs more now.

MR. N. WINDSOR: And, Sir, anybody who has been involved in development of the St. John's area is well aware that impending developments have been deferred, at least impeded, because of the shortage of water. The City has said they will not permit any more private development until a firm commitment for the provision of water from Bay Bulls is provided. Very fortunately now of course that project is well underway

MR. N. WINDSOR: and the Minister of Municipal Affairs could correct me but I would think water, at least the first phase of that system will be in operation early in 1977, or the summer of 1977.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get to the key of this. I would like to point out that the administration of these projects and other projects have been handled by the Technical Advisory Committee to the St. John's Urban Region Water and Sewer Board, a committee comprised of technical advisers from the various agencies within the region on a strictly voluntary basis, and I also, Sir, would like to take this opportunity to compliment that committee. As a former member of that committee I know how hard they are working and what a valuable committee it is. These are all people with very responsible positions and as a result of at least a half a day, normally a day per week they are spending on the affairs of that committee, they have to put in long hours to fulfill their obligations to their own employers.

But, Sir, the decision on the future form of regional government has not been made, and a decision on where the responsibility for operation and maintenance of these systems will lie when completed has not been made. The

MR. N. WINDSOR.

Technical Advisory Committee is proceeding without the advantages of permanent staff and without any knowledge of the destiny of the system as to ownership, operation and maintenance, administration, financing and so forth. The same is true, Sir, of sewage disposal. Again development is being curtailed because of the inability of the existing system to accommodate increased flows, and again work is proceeding on the design of a regional system to alleviate the problem. But, Sir, how do you design a sewage system, when you do not know the probable nature of development in a contributory area? Indeed, you do not know how big the contributory area is, because you have, for instance - the main one under consideration now is the Waterford Valley trunk sewer, which is perhaps the biggest sewer system that has ever been conceived for Newfoundland. The existing sewer was built, I think, back in 1963 or 1964. I think it is a forty-two or a forty-eight inch sewer. It was designed to last twenty years. Now, Sir, just ten years later that sewer has reached its capacity, and why? Was there a mistake made? No, of course, not. The reason that the life of that sewer has only lasted one half of the expected is simply because a plan was not available for development, a plan that was followed, or that you really could not predict the amount of development that has gone on in the western area of the city, the expansions in New Town and Mount Pearl. Nobody predicted the development of Mount Pearl, and the matter has come to light.

But, Sir, we need a master plan now, an adopted master plan, approved, agreed upon, restrictions laid down on the basis of that master plan and followed through. Developments must conform to that, Sir. You must know what percentage of your area will be industrial, and what will be the likely contribution to a sewage system by any industrial area. What percentage will be commercial? What percentage will be residential? And then will it be low density residential? Will it be medium density? Or will it be high density? It is absolutely impossible to design a sewage system without some knowledge of what is predicted for an area. Now at the moment,

Mr. N. Windsor.

fine, we have a proposed plan, and design is proceeding on the basis that this plan will be adopted, or at least what will take place will be very, very similar to it, and you have other considerations. We have a large area in Brookfield Road which is designated and has been frozen for agricultural purposes, but will it stay that way? That is probably a question that will not be answered for some time. The hon. minister, of course, feels it should and many more of us do as well. But will it? Will the pressure of development supersede the wishes of members of government? Will lands be sold and be allowed to develop? These are major questions when you are designing any kind of a system, whether it be a water system, a sewage system, a transportation system. These are answers you must have. If you do not have them then you make assumptions, and when you make assumptions your design is only as valid as your assumptions.

Solid waste disposal, Mr. Speaker. An exhaustive study was undertaken and a number of recommendations put forward, but because of varied public opinions we have not seen a start on the construction of any new facilities. My colleague, the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment and officials of that department have looked at possible alternatives and are endeavouring to reach a solution which will be regionally acceptable. However, this problem is further complicated because of the uncertainty of the future form of local government and the distribution of responsibilities. Sir, how can the Department of Environment decide if we should have one major solid waste disposal system. If we do, who will pay for it? What agency do we have to collect funds from everybody contributing to that facility? Will it be the town of Mount Pearl paying St. John's a certain amount of money for use of their facility; the town of Conception Bay paying so much, the towns of Torbay and Flatrock and Pouch Cove paying to the city of St. John's? Will it be owned by the city of St. John's? Or will it be owned and operated by the provincial government or the St. John's

Mr. N. Windsor.

Metro Board? These are decisions that must be taken. Or shall we provide a system or a facility just large enough to handle the city of St. John's and let the city own it and build it? And should Mount Pearl have one? God knows where, because there is no land in Mount Pearl to build anything. And should Conception Bay have one, as they do now? Should that be kept? Should that be upgraded and enlarged as pressure is put on it? And should all these other towns have small incinerators or small solid waste disposal sites? Sir, these decisions cannot be taken by the minister or his department or anyone else until a firm decision is made on the future of the local government in this region.

And regional transportation, Mr. Speaker. Completion of the Harbour Arterial Road, construction of the proposed outer ring road, across town arterial, bifurcation roads, the widening of Kenmount Road, Topsail Road, Prince Phillip Parkway, LOGY, Bay Road, Torbay Road, all top priorities, Mr. Speaker, all very important. But how can you place priorities on these when you do not know what or where will be the major trend of development and what will be the density development? How can you anticipate traffic flows and problems when you do not know what the development will be? How can you construct these facilities, Mr. Speaker, the tremendous amount of money that is going to be required in the future to build these facilities. We are not going to build them overnight. It is going to take a tremendous expenditure of money. Who will be responsible for finding this money? Who will administer the construction projects, and who will maintain these roads when they are completed? Again it comes back to the key question: What form of government will we have here? But, Sir, the government has shown, of course, its concern for transportation in this area. The Harbour Arterial Road is progressing. The commitment has been made as announced recently on the Prince Phillip Parkway.

AN HON. MEMBER: Plus transportation subsidy.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Plus transportation subsidy, right.

Mr. N. Windsor.

There has been a start made on the Conception Bay by-pass. The right-of-way, I think, is acquired and cleared, another very important road. But, Sir, this programme of development must be continued and even intensified within, of course, the limitations of financial constraints.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again the key to orderly development of the St. John's urban region is a strong system of local government. Whether a system of regional government be adopted, whether existing local governments be expanded, whether there be more local governments, whether existing local governments disappear, whether a system of regional boards, such as the St. John's Water and Sewer Board, which perhaps it is a permanent board or perhaps it is a temporary board. I do not think the minister can answer me that question. The board, Sir, is trying to build a multi-million dollar water and sewer system, and every day the question comes up: Who are we building it for? We need staff. We have a system that will be on stream, as I mentioned, hopefully in the Summer of 1977, the first phase of it. Who will operate that? Who will pay for it? Who will collect monies from users of water? Who will distribute the water? Who will maintain the system? Again this question cannot be answered until a form of local government is decided upon, because you do not know how many local governments you are dealing with. Or whatever the decision, Mr. Speaker, a decision must be made so that the development of community services can continue along the most appropriate route and with utmost expediency and efficiency. Sir, I believe in the future of this Province, and I believe that the present day government will provide the guidance and leadership necessary to reap the greatest possible benefits from the tremendous potential we have available. But, Sir, I do not feel that a select committee will serve any useful purpose in this regard. What we need is action, a decision on the future of local government in the St. John's urban region and following that decision action in the form of implementation of the many recommendations we have before us in these reports. Therefore, Sir, I cannot support the motion made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition for the formation of

Mr. N. Windsor.

a select committee to study the prospects for economic growth and development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I should congratulate the hon. member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) on his, I am sure, maiden speech. I do not think he had spoken before at any great length.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. WINSOR: It is a bit awkward having to follow such a masterful dissertation against what I am about to say.

Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of the motion put before this hon. House by my colleague, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and of whose team I consider myself a responsible member, who has had a close association with my constituents for nearly a quarter of a century. I feel this exposure has given me some expertise in their way of life, and the way they want to go. Even so I would be wrong to think that I, therefore, am qualified to make decisions affecting their future and their children's without

MR. J. WINSOR:

some further down-to-earth dialogue with them on possible ways to improve their lot, the prospects for economic growth, the development of the assets, resources both human and natural, the different skills which they have developed over the years. Mr. Speaker, there is no master catalogue of these attributes available to this hon. House as far as I can learn which could lead government to make masterful decisions leading to the orderly economic growth and development of all areas of our Province. If so this government would have done it in such orderly fashion. However it is somewhat like 'pin the tail on the donkey'!

In view of the fact that we do not have a resume or a fact sheet on many areas of this Province with regard to types of development best suited to foster and encourage the way of life most desired by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, I submit that a select committee go to the people, determine their views, give them a chance, some input in deciding their own futures. They are much important to be left to cold decisions made by a cabinet, in turn guided by a highly paid civil service who, capable as they are, cannot know the desires of our people, area by area, community by community. They cannot write the catalogue of skills which are a basic resource.

A select committee travelling through our Province today would be able to gather information from older people, who may not be highly educated but have a wealth of experience, and young people who have benefited from standards, new standards in education which has produced a breed of young people who are well able to formulate new ideas and concepts of how they want to go, quite capable of developing surprising initiative and who are not going to permit this or any other government the luxury of toying with their futures.

I stand with my colleague, the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning) when he stated that we are being autocratic rather than democratic. Let a select committee get out to the people, let the

MR. J. WINSOR:

people speak as well as vote. Let them speak to the committee. Let the committee collate the information they most assuredly will gather. Let us not procrastinate because I fear that many look on the work in this hon. House as a mockery and not as it should be, a forum for the advancement of the well-being of the people.

Many avenues of private endeavor, skills passed on from generation to generation, new skills acquired through university trades and technology, vocational and a vastly expanded and improved educational system can be called upon. We are expected to supply the leadership. Let us do it. The motion is a thoughtful one, right for the times, and my hon. colleague did not present it to fill in time. He knows the need for this type of dialogue with the people who put us here. Mr. Speaker, the people have waited too long for positive action.

Frustrations have a habit of initiating violent reaction. For the present government it has already been rejection. There are more of us on this side of the House since the last election. It is time for them to look to their laurels. A select committee might help relieve some of their frustrations as well. These frustrations are currently surfacing in Labrador, and my colleague, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) has very ably presented the case for Labrador. Are we going to be unwise enough to ignore the plea for recognition as being a part of this Province? We would be remiss in our duty to this House if we ignored his sounding of the warning bell.

There are many people on this Island and in Labrador who from year to year live in hope that some day their government will reach out to them and to each community with a realistic and futuristic plan to help them pull themselves up from frustration into the light of progress and reasonable prospects for an improved way of life. I feel that we are just marking time from one sitting to the other waiting for the paycheck to come along. Many of our people cannot do this. They have to get out and scrounge in a less than orderly

MR. J. WINSOR:

fashion to provide for the needs of their families. I am talking of the basics only. It is high time that we gave more thought as a governing body to these basic down-to-earth problems of the people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of misery to be heard travelling through your district. I am fully aware that we cannot cure all the ills and have total, satisfying prosperity. As it is said, "The poor will always be with us." However I also feel that much can be done to assist these people at the local level to be more productive than they are. It is not enough to wait for them to come to us. We should be getting out to them - by we I mean government - not just a flying visit overnight, but spend some time at it, use your imagination, use some real concern for your fellow man.

Some communities are tops at handicrafts but have difficulty marketing this. We can buy all kinds of Japanese and Chinese handicrafts in the marketplace, but very little home produced items. What I have seen produced in Newfoundland can compete with the imported product any day. In fact, it is far and away superior in quality.

Fish farming, for instance, on the Southwest Coast has some prospects. It is difficult to get down to the grass-roots type of industry in 1,000 small settlements when your sights are set on huge industries like oil refineries and oil wells. In the meantime, they can only employ so many specially trained personnel. We have thousands who have no training in modern technology but have inherited basic skills which should be an important segment of our gross provincial product on which our economy depends.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion that a select committee be appointed to enquire into thoroughly and report back to this House positively on the economic prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador as presented by my colleague, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I would like to move the previous question, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member repeat that?

MR. NEARY: I would like to move the previous question.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

MR. ROUPE: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has already spoken in this particular debate, so I do not think he is in order in moving to call the question. If any other hon. member wishes to speak he may do so.

MR. NEARY: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, the question has been put.

MR. POWE: Mr. Speaker, I still maintain that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has spoken in this particular debate and in rising now he is speaking a second time on debate. There may be other members wishing to speak. The government can easily shoot it down by voting for it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Whether the motion of the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is in order or not obviously the Chair has not acted on that motion but it is simply a result of its own initiative which it must when nobody else rises, to put the question. The question has been put.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I speak to the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On the point of order: Much as I detest having to disagree with my hon. friend and my friend, I feel that when an hon. member has spoken to a debate he has spoken, and I do not think he can speak again even to move a motion. Now that has been demonstrated scores of times in this House and of course in all deliberative assemblies. I do not know what to say about what the Attorney General has said, namely that the motion has been moved and put. Now I do not know what we are going to do about that, but I do not think it was in order for the hon. gentleman to move, to speak at all. He had already spoken.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. If it was out of order for me to move the previous question, Your Honour, then I withdraw it, but Your Honour has already put the question. So the House has to deal with the question. Your Honour can ignore the fact that I made the motion but Your Honour did put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: No. I just asked was the House ready for the question. I think I will recess the House for five minutes for a decision. I now declare the House recessed for five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. H. YOUNG): Order, please! Due to the fact that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has already spoken in the debate, therefore his motion is out of order, and I will recognize any other hon. member. The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of this very important motion put by the Leader of the Opposition, and Sir, I would like to refer to the preamble to the particular resolution before I get into my remarks. The four major 'Whereases' of the resolution suggest that there is great concern about the future of our Province, and there is increasing concern, secondly, about the rate and growth of development of Newfoundland and Labrador; and thirdly, there is increasing concern about the kind of growth and development which should be encouraged in Newfoundland and Labrador; and fourthly, that there is public interest that our citizens be afforded every opportunity to participate in the growth and development of Newfoundland and Labrador. The fourth 'Whereas' of the preamble there suggests, of course, the need for a select committee to travel throughout the Province. But the other three points, Sir, about the future of our Province, the rate and kind of growth of development on the one hand, and the increase and concern about the kind of growth and development on the other, affects and is the responsibility of mainly fifty-one members, counting the Speaker, fifty-one people in Newfoundland, and these are the elected representatives of this House. Of course, Mr. Speaker is not in a Cabinet position, he is not in a policy making position, so really there are fifty individuals, fifty elected representatives who determine the future of this Province. Now I do not say they get in, you know, a closed room and make decisions. Obviously, it is done in consultation with experts and the civil service, experts both within the Province and from without, but it is mainly the elected representatives of the people who determine the future of our Province, and determine the rate of growth and development of the Province, and who determine the kind of growth and development of this Province.

Mr. Rowe:

Now, Sir, what I am trying to lead up to here is the importance of fifty members - I will keep saying fifty-one - the importance of fifty-one individuals who have the future of this Province virtually in their hands. Now we can get into all kinds of argumentation about, you know, what the government says goes, and the Opposition really does not have an input. But really, looking at it broadly, there are fifty-one elected people who are responsible for the rate and the kind of growth and development, and the future, generally speaking, of this Province.

And I want to get on to the subject of the function of these fifty-one individuals and the attitudes of the people towards these fifty-one individuals. Sir, this is not a very good time for politicians, not only in this Province but throughout the world. People are cynical, people are sceptical, people are suspicious, and generally speaking, I would submit that the average citizens' and the average electors' attitude towards politicians is, to put it kindly, negative. Some of them think we are a bunch of ripoff artists, some of them think that we are in this Assembly for our own personal good, to become rich overnight, to get into a position of power and influence for our own benefit. And, of course, there are many contributing reasons for that, local and national and international. You know, to mention very briefly the Watergate situation, the Sky Shops situation, the judge situation. And so that I will not be accused of being political I will not mention any reasons for suspicions, scepticism, cynical attitudes and negative attitudes towards our politicians in this particular Province.

But, Sir, I do know that the majority, and I say the majority of the fifty-one members sitting in this House of Assembly are sincere, hard-working individuals who are here for only one purpose, and that is to serve their district and to serve their Province to the best of their ability. Now I realize that in every institution and in every Assembly and in every group of people you are bound to find your bad apples. There may be bad apples sitting here on either side of the

Mr. F. Rowe:

House this very day. But generally speaking everybody is in this -

MR. NEARY:

We may be sour but we are not bad.

MR. ROVE:

- because of the fact that they wish to do something for their district and for their Province. And, Sir, I find it very depressing, very, very depressing when day after day, after day, after day, week after week, month after month, and now year after year I find myself, and I am sure hon. members on both sides of the House, find themselves never completing a day's work, never being able to finish what they set out to do, not because they spend time in the coffee shop or reading newspapers, but the job is just so horribly demanding that we can never finish our work. I do not think I have experienced since I have been elected, now I only have been elected since 1972, the same as many members here, I have never felt satisfied that I have completed one day's work to the satisfaction of my constituents or anybody else. And do not forget that we have a number of responsibilities to our constituents, to the Province, our parties, you know, our parties obviously have policy and we stand for something, so there is party work involved. There should be an enormous amount of research carried out by individual members in this House in preparation for the estimates, for the Budget Speech, for the Throne Speech, for the various pieces of legislation, and we do not get time to do it. So we just do not have time to do our research for the House of Assembly, to generalize, for our district, for our party and that sort of a thing.

Now but in spite of this the peoples attitudes are, I would suspect, and probably in some cases justifiably so, very negative towards politicians. Now, Sir, I think one of the reasons for this is the fact that a politician's job is not necessarily a full-time job. Now I am just going to run down through the House, and I do not want anybody to jump up on points of order because I am going to go right around the House, and I have not even checked with the individual members. But from what I can gather the member for St. John's East (Mr. W. Marshall) is not - and I will start going around that way - is not a full-time member of the House of Assembly. He

MR. F. ROWE:

is a full-time member of the House of Assembly in the sense that he is here most of the time but he is not a full-time M.H.A., okay, or member. The member for Mount Scio (Dr. R. Winsor) is not a full-time member. The member for Bay of Islands (Mr. L. Woodrow), I do not know.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE: I am going to go right on -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: No, on a point of privilege.

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

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of privilege. The hon. member can go around the House all he wants to. We can go around the Province all he wants to. He can go anywhere he wants to. There is no such thing as part-time members of the House of Assembly. There are no such things as half-time members of the House of Assembly. I am just as much a member of the House of Assembly as anyone else. I claim to be no more than anyone else and no less than anyone else. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that it is appropriate, for whatever means or whatever purpose the hon. member is making this allusion and analogy. I have heard him inside - out of context, as it were - that it is appropriate to cast as I take it any kind of analysis as to the membership or the type or the quality of membership of one member in the House over another.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has obviously not made a point of privilege whatsoever. The most that it can be classified as is as a difference of opinion between two different members. I am not accusing the member of doing half a job. I am trying to point out one single thing. What I am trying to point out is the need for full-time members. I am about to indicate to this House, from my knowledge, how many members are not full-time members, that is not their full job, only as a member for the district. Then I want to follow that up with an argument for the necessity for full-time M.H.A.s. It is not casting aspersions or negative words to any member.

MR. F. ROWE:

I can go around and do the exact opposite. I can name the people who I feel who are full-time members and say the rest are not. So it is obviously a difference of opinion between two members and is not a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.

MR. WELLS: I have a point to make on that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I think, you see, this is a small House. Everybody in this House is known to everyone else and we are known to our constituents. They know precisely who is full-time and who is not full-time. I think the hon. member is making a mistake in that the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) point is well taken. All of us who sit in this House - now if somebody does not turn up and could not care less about their duties in the House, well that is another matter. They may not be a full time member - but a great many members, I am one of them, I work outside this House but I am here when this House is open my place is here. I am here and I rank my attendance with anybody's in this House. So I am a full-time member. I may not be, Mr. Speaker, a full-time politician. I think that is what - if the hon. member wants to comment on who is a full-time politician or not, that is fine. But we are all members of this House. Those of us who come here and sit here are full-time members.

Now everybody known who does what anyway in this small Province and this small House. I think it is unnecessary, but if he wants to comment on whether we should all be full-time politicians or not, I think that is quite a different matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. MARY: Sir, I am inclined to agree with the hon. gentleman who just took his seat, Sir, that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) does have a valid point of privilege, Sir, because recently, within the last year or so, there was a committee, an independent committee appointed, I think it was in Nova Scotia, to study the members' salaries and expenses.

MR. NEARY:

They came to the conclusion that there was no such thing as a part-time or a full-time politician. The same thing happened recently concerning the city council here in St. John's. They followed that precedent and came to the conclusion that you do not classify politicians as part-time or full-time. Whether or not they do their job that can only be decided by the electorate when they get a chance to go to the ballot box. So I think the member is rather skating on very thin ice and is using a very dangerous argument. I would say, Sir, that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) does have a valid point.

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I have listened very carefully to the three members who have spoken to this point of privilege and their points are very well taken indeed. But they do not constitute a point of privilege in any sense of the word whatsoever. Now the hon. the House Leader probably came up with the best suggestion, that is that I refrain from using the words, you know, 'Members of the House of Assembly' and say 'full-time politician'. That is probably a appropriate term to use. But in no way have any members raised a point of privilege on this matter. It is just a difference of opinion between various members on either side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): I feel the hon. member from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has made a valid point of privilege, and I would ask the hon. member if he would more or less rephrase his remarks.

MR. ROWE: I cannot hear you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel that the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has raised a valid point of privilege. I would ask the hon. member if he would rephrase the remarks somewhere.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your ruling. I do not wish to challenge it because I cannot - well, I can - but I might remind Your Honour

MR. ROVE:

that in ruling on something that it is sometimes appropriate to give a citation. As a matter of fact, I think an hon. member could ask for a citation when a Speaker makes a ruling. But I will not ask for a citation at this particular time. I will take the track as mentioned by the hon. the House Leader.

The point is this. Without naming people, I can see one, two, three, four, five, six, and on this side of the House seven, eight, nine, ten - I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are twelve members in this House, or more, who are not full-time politicians, who have to work in some other capacity in order to keep themselves and their families alive. I, myself, in the third year that I was elected - for two and a half years I tried to live on a member's salary, you know, that we got at that particular time like we are getting now. I could not do it. I had to go and do some other form of work to make up the difference. It affected my capacity to work as a politician. I did not serve my district as well as I should have. I did not research for the House of Assembly as well as I should have. There are hon. members opposite who probably - well I will use an example if I am not again picked up on a point of privilege - lawyers on the other side who are losing money, an awful lot of money, by virtue of the fact that they have offered themselves for election and have become elected and are serving their Province, have lost money, which is just as hard for these individuals as some other individuals going into debt. Now that is not the real point that I wanted to get on to. The point that I wanted to get on to, Mr. Speaker, is this, is that I very, very strongly feel that every elected member should be a full-time politician, completely full-time, completely full-time.

MR. ROWE:

Every working hour of the day should be devoted to work related to their party, the House of Assembly, or their constituency. I think that it is time, because we are the people who determine the kind of development and the direction of development and the future of this Province. That is not a part-time job. It is simply not a part-time job. I would submit, Sir, that if a select committee travelled this Province, and were given some indication of the responsibilities of MHAs, that they might have some very valuable suggestions as to how an MHA should function or a politician should function in this Province with respect to staff, expenses, with respect to how you would go about checking to make sure a person is full-time, and probably the people of this Province might suggest some sort of a commission headed up by Senators or former politicians who have served in this Province, a commission to study and enquire into all aspects of the function of elected representatives in this Province.

MP. NEARY: Senators would be a great crowd to do that, would they not?

MR. ROWE: Well, if the hon. member has something against Senators let him get up and talk about it instead of taking sideswipes.

MR. NEARY: They should be abolished.

MR. ROWE: Some Senators as it happens, Sir, happen to have been premiers of provinces and happen to have been ministers in provinces and happen to have been leaders of oppositions in different provinces.

MP. NEARY: So what?

MR. ROWE: So what! They might happen to know something about what is involved in the functioning of a politician.

MP. NEARY: They should learn what to do with the Senate first to make that function.

MR. ROWE: Well, okay, Mr. Speaker. If I can be permitted to speak without interruption. The hon. member does not have an opportunity to speak now in this debate because he has already spoken, so he is trying to interrupt and make his points that way. But I think that the people of this Province want to see full-time politicians, people

MR. ROWE:

who will devote all of their working hours in the service of this Province.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You do not think there are actually people as foolish as us fellows, do you?

MR. ROWE: Well this is why, Sir, I think an idea of a commission to enquire into all aspects of the functioning of politicians in this Province may not be a bad idea.

AN HON. MEMBER: What we need is a code of ethics in the House.

MR. ROWE: And this is something else, a code of ethics. But, Sir, I hope my point is well taken. I do not know why everybody was so anxious to jump on points of privileges and all this sort of a thing. I have been travelling this Province as a teacher, as a university prof, and now more lately as a politician, and the general feeling is that we are just sitting in here when the House is open hauling in our money, and then when the House adjourns and closes that is it, nothing to do. I am sure every minister opposite, and every ministerial assistance of some kind or parliamentary assistant would feel quite differently.

I know members in Opposition, who do not have a civil service behind them, would love to be able to spend twenty-six hours a day, twenty-five hours a day researching for this House. I am sure the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) would love - he has demonstrated already that he is capable of doing quite a bit of research on his own. I would love to see what he would do if he had a research staff and if he had more money to travel the Province.

MR. NEARY: Give me your research grant and your staff and I will straighten out this Province in six months, single-handed!

MR. ROWE: Well I mean if the hon. gentleman from LaPoile could prove that I might take him up on it. We will have to caucus over that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOODY: The hon. member for Channel is looking busy over there.

MR. ROWE: Okay, Now that I have that particular point hopefully made, I would just like to use one example to indicate the types of things that this Province should get involved in, and the people might be able to indicate to a Select Committee to improve the prospects for this Province. And I think I could use one example and that is in the Nain area. In the Nain area-and I wish my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) was here to give me additional information - but in Nain, or off Nain there is an island, I understand, which is composed, virtually, almost wholly and solely, of labradorite. What is it called?

CAPT. WINSOP: Taper Island.

MR. ROWE: Taper Island, And this administration has designated labradorite as the mineral emblem for the Province. Now, Sir, that sounds fine and dandy, an act designating labradorite as the mineral emblem for the Province. But what does that do in itself to help this Province? Absolutely nothing, absolutely nothing. However, if the people had an opportunity through a select committee to indicate the types of things that can be done with this particular mineral to set up a little industry in that area, to employ great numbers of people and bring money into this Province through the sale of jewellery, etc., well you can polish this particular mineral up, make rings, earrings, different types of jewellery, the actual mining of the mineral will make money for people, will employ people, the actual polishing or finishing of the stone, the cutting of the stone could employ people, the setting of that mineral in various forms of

MR. ROWE: Jewellery could employ people and obviously the sale of this kind of jewellery outside of the Province will bring money into this Province.

Sir, I was absolutely astounded when I was in Toronto there a few months ago, when I walked into Eaton's Store, Eaton's Store on College Street, and what should I see staring me in the face but a whale bone, the vertebra out of a whale, about that high and shaped something like a face and carved out on the face of that whale bone, the vertebra of the whale bone were a couple of eyes, a nose and a mouth. And that old whale bone was sitting up there on a glass plate in Eaton's College Street Store for \$55.

Now, Sir, three, or four or five years ago I can remember going down to Dildo and seeing thousands upon thousands of vertebra of the pothead whale, just rotting on the beach, being grown over by algae and finally washing out to sea. And of course some collectors, including myself, I collected a few parts of the whale bone. But the fact of the matter is that when it comes to whale bones or bones of any type of fish or snail shells or scallop shells, all of these things which we are now dumping into the sea can be used for various handicrafts.

Hon. members are obviously aware of going into stores on the Eastern Seaboard and seeing little ships, and what are the sails made out of? Scallop shells! And you see necklaces made out of snail shells. You just drop snail shells in a bit of vinegar, vinegar would do the trick, but hydrogen peroxide and you can bleach them perfectly white and it makes very attractive jewellery. And this is the sort of thing, Sir, that if a select committee was set up to travel this Province the ideas that could come from our people or even, you know, if people indicated the source of material-

MR. ROWE: and they have not had an opportunity to travel the world - if we can get people together who travel the world, their ideas combined with the resource ideas of our people can make for little industries that would probably employ only two, or three or four or five people, but do that for -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is a need of the Department of Rural Development, the handicrafts.

MR. ROWE: Well the Department of Rural Development, if it goes in that direction they are to be commended for it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: They have marvellous ideas.

MR. ROWE: Well, the Department of Rural Development may well have some marvellous ideas, but I still submit that if a select committee travelled throughout this Province that they would get very many more good ideas from the people of this Province in the way of boat building and this kind of a thing.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We have hundreds of ideas coming in every day. It is a matter of getting them off the ground, some of the problem.

MR. ROWE: What is it like, without getting into a long debate? You know, obviously one of the problems is getting them off the ground, presumably getting them off the ground is a financial problem?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We got a lot off the ground, like about 1,000 in the last three years.

MR. ROWE: 1,000 off the ground.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will give you some run down on industrial development when I get -

MR. ROWE: Industrial Development? Now are we talking about rural development or industrial development?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Both.

MR. ROWE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. Minister of Rural and Industrial Development to probably table a list of

MR. ROWE: some of the projects that his department has gotten off the ground in the last few years, along with a list of those who have been employed. How many people have been employed?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I gave you that not more than two weeks ago. You have not had time to digest it.

MR. ROWE: Well, I would like still for the minister to table that type of information because I am unaware of it. And apparently the minister was unaware of it up to a few weeks ago. And the people of Newfoundland, a lot of them are unaware of it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The hon. member is correct that we do not brag enough about it.

MR. ROWE: I did not say that. The hon. member is -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He is absolutely correct that we are not political as we should be. I am not being partisan now Your Honour.

MR. ROWE: Are we finished, Sir?

MR. MARSHALL: It is desperate. I cannot hear a word you are saying.

MR. ROWE: I cannot hear a word I am saying, neither can I recognize what I am saying.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I just want to enlighten the hon. gentleman.

MR. ROWE: Sir, I brought out that as an example of the types of things that a select committee could find if they travelled throughout this Province, that we do not recognize nor do we put enough emphasis on what our fellow Newfoundlanders can suggest to us in this Province. And it is better to have a select committee travel through the Province than to expect every Newfoundlander with a good idea to travel into the Confederation Building or to try to get hold of a minister in order to present his idea. So that is the point of that one.

Now, Sir, I would like to commend the Leader of the Opposition for bringing in this particular resolution because, you know, it really asks where are we going in this particular Province? Where are we going? And, Sir, when we ask that question and when we look at the various sources of revenue in this Province and we think about

MR. ROWE: where we are going, it is extremely depressing, extremely depressing.

Sir, there is a big gap and this very much relates to the minister who was just adding to this debate, We are simply not generating the dollars in this Province through Industrial and Rural Development that we need to generate. If one looks at exhibit two, for example, in this year's budget, exhibit two in this year's budget, page 22.

AN HON. MEMBER: Exhibit "A".

MR. ROWE: Exhibit two on page 22 of this year's budget, a comparative summary of provincial and federal revenue.

Mr. Rowe:

We see, Sir, that the total current account revenue is \$651 million, \$242 million of that comes from the Federal Government, \$40 million comes from the gasoline tax, \$145 - I am rounding it off - comes from the retail sales tax; personal income tax \$100 million; tobacco tax \$11 million; corporate income tax \$20 million. When we get down to money coming from Industrial and Rural Development, and money that is generated through mining, and forestry, and this sort of a thing we find that the money is low in comparison to the other sources of revenue. In other words, the major part of our money, the revenue of this Province is coming from the Federal Government or from some form of taxation on our people. And the big gap that we have is the fact that we are not generating the dollars in this Province that we need to generate in order to keep the Province afloat.

Now, Mr. -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is wondering and foresight, then it grows, the tax base grows, It is axiomatic.

MR. ROWE: Of course, it does. But still we have not had the major industrial and rural development in this Province to generate dollars and bring money directly into the coffers of the government. This has been the failure, not only of the present administration, the previous administration was not completely successful in having the industrial and rural development to the point that it would put significant gains into the treasury of this Province. There has been some progress.

MR. PECKFORD: If you had kept some of our electrical power instead of giving it away!

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, look I am constantly in -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: - I do not know whether I am provoking it, or inviting it or what. But for some reason or other I have been constantly in a dialogue since I have been on my feet. And I would ask that the members remain silent while I am trying to make some point.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I thought you were enjoying these exchanges.

MR. ROWE: Well, I do enjoy the exchanges, Sir, until I get lost.

Mr. Rowe:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been a failure, and this administration has failed utterly to generate the dollars through Industrial and Rural Development, to put the money, as the minister says, into people's pockets so that they can pay these taxes. Obviously if people are making money, and they are going to spend money, they are going to be hit on making money through the personal income tax, they are going to be hit on spending money through the retail tax. So the money is not getting to the people's pockets that way. If more money can be generated through Industrial and Rural Development there would be more money going directly into the treasury.

Sir, one other point before I sit down that I would like to make is this, and that is the apparent reversal of hon. members in this House with respect to their philosophy. And I would like to mention, unfortunately the two members are not here, but the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood)

MR. POWE:

when he spoke practically in every speech that he has made in this session of the House of Assembly and during the Committee stage, if I could use one phrase it has been 'balance the budget, we are nearing bankruptcy, which is obviously a complete reversal of what the hon. member has been saying for twenty-three years. Now he probably has good reason for saying it. The hon. member probably has good reason for saying it. On the other hand, Sir, the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), the government House Leader in his speech sounded very much like the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) did over the past twenty-three years, 'develop or perish'. I can remember that speech very clearly that he made in following the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). I cannot remember, I think it was in the Throne Speech or it might have been on this particular motion. But one followed the other and they said exactly the opposite thing. The member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), "Balance the budget at all costs". The member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) to just phrase it, "Develop or perish". The complete reversal of the policies of both hon. gentlemen previous to this year at least.

Sir, if people are listening to what hon. members are saying in this House they have to be totally and completely confused, if they are listening to what hon. members are saying. What they said yesterday is reversed tomorrow. This in itself is enough reason to give the people of this Province an opportunity to have some input into government policy, and this can only be done through the select committee as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition in his motion No. 5. If we do not go to the people, Sir, and get their ideas we are going to be misrepresenting in the way of administering this Province, we are going to be directing this Province in a way that may be far different from what the people wish to see.

I can use one example, my pet example. The government have consistently gone stone deaf when it comes to school tax authorities. If the people who are in the administration of this Province listened to the majority of the people of this Province, they would reverse their stand on school tax authorities because I can -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: To a point of order.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have been reading away but listening to the hon. member and he is talking about a very important topic at the present moment and one of course which is timely and always can be debated. He just started off his remarks by saying that there was no philosophical base to the members' attitudes, that there was a here today and somewhere else tomorrow and so on. At the present moment he has gone from development into school tax authorities, and he is saying the government are stone deaf on school tax authorities. I do not see that is relevant at all, Your Honour, and I hope that in his wranglings that he does not sort of become guilty of what he is accusing the House of being guilty of.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, surely that is not a point of order. It is very relevant. What we are talking about is a select committee to go around and hear out the people of this Province. What I am saying is that if a select committee -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On what? On everything in the world?

MR. ROWE: - if a select committee travelled this Province they would get loud and clear the people's feelings with respect to the school tax authority -

MR. DOODY: : People are against all taxes.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We know that.

MR. ROWE: What is the point of order then?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The resolution is that you are irrelevant.

MR. ROWE: I am not irrelevant. Mr. Speaker anything is relevant in this debate as long as it concerns a select committee and what can be brought before a select committee. If -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: In other words you just want a select committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, can I make my point of order, or speak to the point of order. If the people of this Province feel that it is important to talk about the sex life of a caplin, they should be afforded

MR. ROWE:

the opportunity to do so. And if I feel it is important I should be able to speak about the sex life of a caplin. It is as simple as that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUNDPIGAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. Certainly

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

I would not want to debate with the hon. member about the sex life of the caplin, but he has indicated that anything is relevant which deals with a select committee. Now I have heard of select committees that have very, very specific application, very, very specific terms of reference. This specific select committee that the members have proposed across the way talks about development. It addresses itself to the development in the Province. Most of the debate has been in the area of economic development, rural development, any types of development. Now he is involved in the sex life of the caplin and school tax. Certainly he is not serious and I think Your Honour must recognize that.

MR. SPEAKER: That is a very fishy point of order. However with respect to the relevance, the operative part of the resolution is that a select committee be appointed to inquire into and to report upon the prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. ROWE: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER: It goes on to say, "including" but it really does not exclude anything.

MR. ROWE: That ~~is~~ right.

MR. SPEAKER: So I presume as long as it deals with the prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador then one may continue.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: In other words it is a Throne Speech or a Budget Speech, a Throne Speech debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It is a very broadly based resolution - a select committee be appointed to inquire into the prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador. And as long as they are the prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador and not the prospects for some other place, Manitoba, the Ukraine, et cetera then -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is a good ruling. That means we do not need any Throne Speech.

MR. DOODY: Let us get on with -

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I was hoping Your Honour would say that.

MR. DOODY: Come on now. Tell us about the caplin.

MR. ROWE: Now are they finished their remarks, Mr. Speaker, or what?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest, Sir, that if a select committee travelled throughout this Province that the government would hear loudly and clearly many of the things that are disturbing the people of this Province. They would get some very positive suggestions as to what should be done to solve some of the problems that face this Province. Now I do not want to get into the details of the school tax authorities or the school taxes. But I can tell you - I am not saying this because it is politically popular to do so, and it is politically popular to do so, to speak out against school taxes. Like the hon. Minister of Finance said, it is popular to talk about being against any tax.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out to the hon. gentleman that his forty-five minutes have expired and he cannot continue without leave.

MR. ROWE: Do I have leave, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, by leave.

MR. ROWE: Well, do I have leave or not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave, yes.

MR. ROWE: Okay. It sounds like I have leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It would appear.

MR. ROWE: I would suggest, Sir, that the people of this Province would demonstrate to the government quite dramatically that whichever way you look at it, whether you are paying through sales tax or through a personal income tax or through a school tax, it is coming from the people's pockets anyway. But the difference is basically this, is that through the school tax you will lose part of the tax that you are collecting in the administration of the school tax authority. So if you collect \$9 million you might end up spending \$1 million on the administration of it, ten per cent or twelve

MR. ROWE:

per cent or fifteen per cent. It does not take a mathematical genius, nor the Minister of Finance, anybody in this Province can indicate to hon. members in this House that even an increase in the personal income tax or the sales tax or a fuel tax or the gasoline tax or the tobacco tax or - there is another one I am looking for here - but any of the various taxes already imposed would be fairer in the sense that they are more closely related to a person's ability to pay. It would not add any additional administrative costs to the government whereas a school tax does.

MR. DOODY: That is not true of the S.S.A. That is for sure.

MR. ROWE: Well the S.S.A. causes a few problems in a few stores. But I would submit, Sir, that changing the personal income tax or the S.S.A. tax or any of the taxes that are already in existence will not cost as much to implement as does the school tax authorities and neither is it as inequitable nor as unfair.

MR. ROWE:

It is as simple as that. Now that is one, and the government has just closed its ears to it. I think, Sir, the real reason may be that the Opposition came out against school taxes and they had the intestinal fortitude to do so because it was this party that brought in the school tax. At least we had the gumption, the gall, the intestinal fortitude and the guts to change our policy to meet changing times.

AN HON. MEMBER: We were not going to raise taxes.

MR. ROWE: That is so foolish, Mr. Speaker, so absolutely foolish.

The school tax is a tax. It comes out of this pocket here and -

MR. MURPHY: The general revenue.

MR. ROWE: - out of this mysterious general that the member for St. John's Center (Mr. Murphy) talks about, general revenue, whoever he is.

MR. MORGAN: With no increase in taxes.

MR. ROWE: You can do it without an increase in taxes by simply diverting funds in different directions. The hon. government, Sir, they have approximately \$1 billion to spend. They can spend it whichever way they want to. They can spend it all on education or they can spend it all on highways. Now I have just made a point that the school tax is unfair, inequitable and you are not getting - a lot of the money that you are collecting, some of it is going back into the actual administration of that programme. If a select committee was set up and the people were heard, that this government, I would submit, overnight would change their minds with respect to their attitude towards the school taxes. I would submit that the only reason they are not changing their minds is because it is a Liberal policy.

Now, Sir, with respect to the curriculum of the university and of the schools in this Province. I think everybody recognizes, Sir, that in the university and in our secondary and primary and elementary schools that to say the least the curriculum is traditional or conservative. Educational institutions are probably some of the

MR. ROWE:

most conservative and traditional institutions on the face of the earth. They are probably the slowest to change, particularly with respect to curriculum. I think, Sir - and the youth conferences, by the way, and I commend the government for this - I think those youth conferences, or whatever they are called, will help in the young people of this Province having some input into, for example, the need for a dramatic change in the curriculum of our schools and of the university to make it more relevant to their life when they leave these particular institutions, because I would suggest that eighty per cent of the curriculum of the schools are not particularly relevant but are based on old, traditional courses of study. Again this is where a select committee would probably receive some information from parents and students and the youth of our Province and the government might influence school boards, and influence the division of curriculum in the Department of Education to make the curriculum in our schools more relevant. I am sure the minister knows exactly what I am talking about.

MR. HOUSE: I would ask the hon. member to give us some details about eighty per cent irrelevancy in the curriculum.

MR. ROWE: Okay. Mr. Speaker, I obviously cannot get into it because it is six o'clock. So, Sir, I adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: This House now stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at two o'clock.

#365

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

Table a copy of the Ross Report on miners' disease at Baie Verte.

A report was prepared by Dr. J. M. Ross approximately 8 years ago on the health of miners at Baie Verte. A copy was forwarded to my Department but unfortunately it cannot be located.

Dr. Ross did not retain a copy.

April 14, 1976

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

Table a report of the latest information he has with regard to the possibility of occupational disease at Long Harbour.

Answer:

A well developed occupational health program exists at the E.R.C.O. plant, Long Harbour. A physician visits the plant each week. A full-time nurse is employed by the company. Regular annual medical examinations are carried out including chest x-ray, lung function tests, and blood and urine tests. All employees receive regular dental check-ups and necessary dental work from a visiting dentist as a measure to prevent "phossy jaw" - decay of the jaw bones due to exposure to phosphorus. Gases and dust in the plant are monitored on a regular basis and reports are forwarded to my department.

No cases of occupational disease have to date been uncovered by the medical examination programme. A major hazard in the industry is related to phosphorus burns. Workers through a safety programme are alerted to the dangers of white phosphorus which ignites on exposure to the atmosphere. Showers and plunge tanks are located throughout the plant to combat the problem of burns from accidental phosphorus leaks.

April 9, 1976

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

A statement showing, for each financial year 1970-75, the numbers of persons known to be suffering from mental and nervous diseases.

There are no tabulated statistics available to support a statement on the number of persons suffering from mental and nervous diseases.

The best known information that can be provided is statistics obtained from hospital based psychiatric services which would not include incidence of treatment by either family physicians and specialists, or, for patients admitted to special care institutions and programs.

The reporting is by calendar year:

	<u>Number of admissions to in-patient services</u>	<u>No. of new patients seen in out-patient and Day Care Centres</u>
1970	2,198	1,838
1971	2,719	1,955
1972	2,538	2,102
1973	2,978	2,323
1974	3,006	2,419
1975	3,203	2,841

March 29, 1976

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

A statement describing the system followed in supplying the Cottage Hospitals, Gander Hospital, Grand Falls Hospital, etc. - with food, fuel, drugs and dressings, and the other necessities; are tenders called for the sale of such supplies; if not, why not?

Hospitals in the Province avail of tendering for purchase of their supplies, etc. wherever possible.

A number of the hospitals previously operated by government, but now administered by Boards of Management, continue to obtain drugs and dressings through our Central Supply Division. That Division is the sole supplier of drugs and dressings to Government operated facilities and programs. All purchases are through tendering. The Newfoundland Hospital Association provides a co-ordinated group purchasing program for hospitals not operated by Government. Purchases are made through tendering.

Bunker C. Furnace fuel is purchased by tender where possible. In some areas of the Province, it is available only from one supplier; thus quotations only are requested.

For hospitals with contract food services, the contractors avail of tendering for main food items. For perishables, daily quotations are obtained. Other hospitals obtain tenders for food supplies.

Emergency maintenance work is not tendered. Major routine maintenance is obtained by public tender.

April 8, 1976

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Mr. Murphy informed the House that the Department of the Environment would launch an anti-litter campaign during May month. 6754

Commented on by Mr. Roberts. 6754

Mr. Hickey informed the House that officials of his department had held meetings with officials of Parks Canada to discuss further potential national park sites in Labrador. 6756

NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. Canning gave notice that the House allow an extension to the time limit set for discussion of the estimates to provide for unlimited debate of the estimates of the Department of Fisheries. 6758

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Mr. Collins tabled answers to Questions Nos. 365, 368, 393 and 398. 6760

Mr. Hickey responded to Questions asked earlier concerning complimentary hunting licences. 6760

ORAL QUESTIONS

Query as to steps taken by officials of the Department of Transportation and Communications in connection with the events that led to the deaths of two ladies whose car left a flooded section of the Trans-Canada Highway West of Grand Falls. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Morgan. 6762

Query as to whether any of the minister's officials were present throughout the afternoon and evening at what was considered to be the site of potential danger. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Morgan. 6766

Query as to whether a judicial enquiry will be held into the accident. Mr. Neary, Mr. Morgan. 6769

Query as to why the conditions had been permitted to exist since many complaints had been made about the dangers in that section of the Trans-Canada Highway. Mr. Flight, Mr. Morgan. 6770

Query as to what steps were taken by the officials given the fact that the foreman had concluded there was a clear and present danger on the highway. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Morgan. 6772

Query as to what action the foreman took after he returned to the area at 9:00 p.m. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Morgan. 6774

Query as to whether the minister feels on present evidence that the action taken by his officials was reasonable and prudent under the circumstances. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Morgan. 6776

The capacity Mr. Robert Morgan acted in when assembling the MacPherson property for sale to the Summer Games Committee. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells. 6777

Query as to ministerial awareness of Mr. Morgan's association with or employment by Andrew Crosbie chairman of the Summer Games Committee. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells. 6777

C O N T E N T S - 2

ORAL QUESTIONS (continued)	Page
Query as to whether Mr. Morgan's proven association with members of the Summer Games Committee would change the minister's opinion concerning the request for an equity into the land transaction. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	6777
Query as to ministerial awareness that Mr. Morgan is a shareholder in a company owned by Mr. Crosbie and Newfoundland Engineering and Construction Company. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	6777
Need for a further investigation. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	6778
Query as to the availability of Mr. Morgan's options on the MacPherson property. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	6778
Query as to whether the circumstances do not indicate conspiracy, fraud and collusion. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	6778
Stadiums to be built in Newfoundland this year. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Wells.	6779
New high school for Robinson's. Mrs. MacIsaac, Mr. House.	6780
 <u>ORDERS OF THE DAY</u>	
Private Member's Day	
That a Select Committee be established to enquire into and report upon prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador, including the prospects for economic growth, etc. (continued).	6780
Mr. Flight (continued)	6780
Mr. N. Windsor	6803
Mr. J. Winsor	6814
Mr. Neary moved the previous question.	6818
Mr. Speaker ruled that since Mr. Neary had already spoken in the debate, he was not in order to so move.	6820
Mr. Rowe	6820
Mr. Rowe adjourned the debate.	6843
 <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>	 6843