

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

House of Assembly

For the period:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

February 28, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. members will recall that on Friday two points of order very closely related were brought up, and I said that I would give the decision Monday. The points of order related to oral oral notice given by the hon. member from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and by the hon. member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) with respect to replies from different ministers, in the first case, the Minister of Mines and Energy, in the second case, the hon. Minister of Justice, the oral notice that they were dissatisfied with the answer and wish to debate the matter on Thursday.

In making a decision on this I refer hon. members to the quite specific wording of Standing Order 31 (g) which I will read: "A member who is not satisfied with the response to an oral question, or who has been told by Mr. Speaker that his question is not urgent or not of public importance, may give notice that he intends to raise the subject-matter of his question on the adjournment of the House. The notice referred to herein, whether or not it is given orally during the Oral Question Period, must be given in writing to the Speaker not later than 4:30 p.m. of the same day."

Now obviously an hon. member's doing what is totally voluntary, which is not required, they cannot, in my opinion, prejudice their right if in fact they do what is required, and what is required is that by 4:30 of that day they give written notice. The giving of oral notice does not put the matter within the purview of a decision for Thursday, and giving oral notice and refusing to give or not giving written notice does not bring it within the purview either. Because what the Standing Order says "That the notice referred to herein, whether or not it is given orally must be given in writing to the Speaker not later than 4:30 of that day." So certainly the giving of oral notice, which is totally gratuitous and has no immediate effect could not, in my opinion, prejudice whatever right an hon. member would have in doing what is required of him if he wishes the

Mr. Speaker:

matter to be under consideration for Thursday.

With respect and judging from the argument given, although that was technically the point of order, I think what hon. members were really trying to get at was

---

Mr. Speaker.

whether the matter would be permissible for debate at 4:30 P.M. Thursday, assuming that what is required to be done, had in fact been done, assuming that. In one of the replies it was not a substantive answer. It was a general response to the effect that the hon. minister did not, in fact, wish to answer it because he thought it might prejudice negotiations, etc. In the other answer there was a specific substantive answer, and the subject, at least, suggests itself, when there is no specific answer, whether that can be debated. But I think the Standing Order is quite clear on that, because it says, "May give notice that he intends to raise the subject matter of his question." In other words it is not the answer which is debated. If words mean what logic suggests they mean, what he intends to debate is the subject matter of his question on the adjournment of the House. So I think from the Standing Orders it is quite clear, number one, that the giving of oral notice, which is not necessarily a gratuitous act, could not prejudice an hon. member's right to give written notice if in fact he wished to do so, and number two, whether the question was answered substantively or not has nothing to do with a person's ability to debate the subject matter of the question, because that is somewhat different than the answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

o o o

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on two matters

of privilege. And first of all though, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to say how pleased we are to see the Minister of Industrial Development in his seat notwithstanding the events of the weekend. We are very pleased to see him back on his feet.

AN HON. MEMBER: A hard weekend, boy!

MR. SIMMONS: We heard some news, Mr. Speaker, and we are just welcoming him back in the House. That is all. I meant well. But if the welcome is out of order, withdraw it.



MR. NEARY: Do not be so sensitive.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on two matters of privilege, one a matter of personal privilege and the other a matter affecting the privileges of the House. I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to the rough draft of the verbatim report of Friday, February 25, this past Friday. The page I refer to is labelled, tape 578, page 1, and I would like to quote from a statement made by the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) in which he said that: I, as the member for Bay d'Espoir, had called the hon. Premier a liar. His actual words were: "Called the Premier a liar." That statement by the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) is completely untrue. At no time did I state that. It is a completely untrue statement unfounded on fact. And it is one of the two reasons why I rise at this time and raise this point of privilege. I will come to the other matter shortly. A check of the verbatim report, Mr. Speaker, for Wednesday, February 2, opening day, will readily confirm that I did not at any time call the Premier a liar, as the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) alleges. I refer you to page sixty of the verbatim report for Wednesday, February 2. The Premier had said a couple of times during his remarks, first earlier in his statement on page fifty-three he had said, and I quote: "One time if a development association spoke up against the government that would be the end of the funding." He

MR. SIMMONS:

subsequently said the essence of that again in these words. "One time if they were criticized, as I said, they would be cut off." Then there was a brief exchange. The Premier then went on to say in response to me and the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), he said, "The fact is this is not the time for interrupting the House." When he said 'the time for interrupting' I said, "Or for telling a direct lie." I repeated that. The Premier said, "Pardon?", and I said, "Or for telling direct lies".

Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that I said as the record will show that I felt the Premier had told the House and the people of Newfoundland a direct lie. During the period to which the Premier referred in his statement I had been actively involved in development association activities both as president of the Green Bay Development Association and as a member of the Newfoundland and Labrador Rural Development Council. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, knew first hand that the Premier's statement, that public funding had been cut off if a Development Association spoke up against the government was blatantly untrue. He had no foundation, in fact, whatsoever, completely false.

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman for Burgeo -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it -

MR. ROWE: A point of privilege has precedence over a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WHITE: The minister should know it. Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The question now is whether when a point of privilege is being made to what extent a point of order can interrupt it. A point of order cannot in fact interrupt a previous point of order and a point of privilege can interrupt a previous point of order. We would have to do some considerable research to see to what extent a point of order can make an interruption during a point of privilege. A point of

MR. SPEAKER:

privilege does take precedence over everything else before the House. So unless hon. members wish to adjourn for a specific ruling on that, then I would suggest the hon. member continue with his point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like a specific ruling on that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I believe the hon. member wishes to have a specific ruling. We shall therefore adjourn for a few minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Does Mr. Speaker wish to hear argument before he gives his ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: Well the first ruling I have to give is whether in fact I can hear argument on the point of order. Now the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir was speaking on a point of privilege when the hon. Minister of Justice got up on a point of order. I adjourned to consider whether in fact a point of order may interrupt consideration of a point of privilege. It is clear in Beauchesne that a point of order may not interrupt another point of order. It is also certainly the general practice that when a point of privilege is being made it is heard out and any decision that is necessary is then made upon it.

However the hon. Minister of Justice, as I understand it, wishes to know whether in the strict sense as of right he may get up on a point of order. It is not the usual practice which I am required to inform the House but it is that strict question, whether the hon. gentleman as of right may now make a point of order during the course of the point of privilege. I refer to May, page 441. I will read the relevant section and give my interpretation of it, how I see it has to apply here.

"Although it is the duty of a Speaker to interfere in the first instance for the preservation of order, when in his judgement the occasion demands his interference, it is also the right of any member who conceives that a breach of order has been committed, if a Speaker refrains from interfering either because he does not consider it necessary to do so or because he does not perceive that a breach of order has been committed, to rise in his place interrupting any member who may be speaking and direct the attention of the Chair to the matter provided he does so the moment the alleged breach of order occurs. When a member speaks to order he must simply direct attention to the point complained of and submit it to the decision of the Speaker."

There being no authority that I am aware of to the contrary, there being no specific rule such as there is on a point of order interrupting a point of order and since the hon. gentleman wishes a decision on his



MR. SPEAKER:

specific right to raise the point of order, then I will hear the point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point of order that I was rising on was this - and I want to make it very clear it was not to argue or infringe upon the hon. gentleman from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir's (Mr. Simmons) right to rise on a point of personal privilege, but rather to draw to the attention of Your Honour the obligation of any hon. member rising on a point of personal privilege to stick precisely to the issue giving cause to that point of privilege. I was directing Your Honour's attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman had started to embark upon his experience with developmental associations or councils which had nothing to do with the point of privilege upon which the hon. gentleman had risen and was bringing to the attention of the Chair, namely, that one hon. member had alleged that he had called another hon. member a liar and the hon. gentleman had read therefrom. That I submit, Mr. Speaker, is the only issue upon which the point of privilege can be based and is before the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: On that point of order. Certainly the rule as stated by the hon. Minister of Justice is precisely and correctly stated, that in speaking to a point of privilege an hon. member is required to keep his remarks strictly to the alleged breach of privilege that he has under consideration.

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps in fairness to the Minister of Justice the confusion arises over the fact that I am raising two matters of privilege simultaneously and I said that at the beginning of my statement. One relating to a statement that the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) had made on Friday and a second

MR. SIMMONS: arising out of some information that has come to my knowledge as of Friday, because in checking out some background in relation to his statement, I found some other information which I am coming to and so that in both instances I am raising the matters of privilege at the first possible opportunity. Now withstanding the fact that one of the matters of privilege is based on an exchange that took place here just about a month ago, on February 2.

To refresh memories, Mr. Speaker, in view of the long interruption just let me say that I have risen on two matters of privilege, on Friday the member for Bay of Islands, as I have indicated from the rough draft of the verbatim report, alleged that I had quote "called the Premier a liar, I have already said that that statement is blatantly untrue and is not founded on fact. I have referred you, Mr. Speaker, and the House to the verbatim report of Wednesday, February 2nd which will very readily confirm that I did not say at that time that the Premier- did not call the Premier a liar, as the member for Bay of Islands alleges, I had said at that time and I acknowledge that I had said that he had told a direct lie. I acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, now that I was a bit indiscrete in using that term because as I understand it, it is probably not parliamentary. I should have chosen other words to observe parliamentary niceties but the essence of my remarks on opening day would have been the same, namely that the Premier had made a false statement to the House on opening day.

On that particular day, Mr. Speaker, I was particularly disturbed about the Premier's deception because the electronic media -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I believe that I would have to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the word deception.

MR. SIMMONS: I am quite happy to do that, I used it in the understanding that I had not alleged a deliberate deception and I have been of the understanding that deception was parliamentary. But it has been ruled before in this House, Mr. Speaker, that deliberate



MR. SIMMONS:

deception may not be used, however if deception is also unparliamentary then I shall be very happy to withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: I would regard the term as unparliamentary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on that particular day the Premier's false statement was all the more disturbing to me because he was making it, not only to the House and those in the gallery, but at a time when the electronic media were recording the proceedings for broadcast purposes. Now, Mr. Speaker, since the Premier made that statement, I have had an opportunity to check with a number of people who were and/or are in positions in the Department of Rural Development and/or the former Department of Community and Social Development. Two former ministers of the Community and Social Development Department, one Liberal and one P.C., have told me that there is not a shred of truth in the Premier's statement. In addition two officials of the former department-

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order;

The hon. gentleman is doing precisely what Your Honour ruled that he is not entitled to do under these rules. The only issue before this House is whether or not, No. one, there has been a breach of personal privilege when the hon. member from Bay of Islands on Friday alleged that the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir on opening day, called the hon., the Premier a liar. The member opposite rose today on a point of personal privilege and said, "that is not true and my privilege has been offended as a member of this House." I said, quote, "the hon. Premier had told a direct lie" that, Mr. Speaker, is the only issue that the hon. gentleman could conceivably rise on on the question of personal privilege and I submit that when the hon. gentleman starts to get into a debate as to the accuracy or otherwise of the hon. the Premier's statement is not at all relevant, in any way relevant and not admissible and is certainly most assuredly not a second point of privilege. If it was it would have had to be raised on opening day



MR. HICKMAN:

or the first sitting thereafter.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as I said and obviously the minister has not heard.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking on the Point of Order now?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, I am , Mr. Speaker, as I have said twice and now for the third time, particularly for the benefit of the Minister of Justice, I have raised two points of privilege

if that is not in order I am prepared to deal with one at a time. I raise one , a matter of personal privilege, I stated this in my opening statement which I quote to you word for word" I rise on two matters of privilege, one a matter of personal privilege the other a matter affecting the privileges of the House. My references to the Premier's statement, or my statement in response to the Premier's on opening day, is

MR. SIMMONS: the matter affecting the privilege of the House.

I have said a few moments ago that as a result of discussions I have had as late as Friday afternoon, Friday evening in checking out the allegation of the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) it came to my attention that the matter I had entered into debate with on opening day was one that could be substantiated by other people and they did it for me as late as Friday night and it is that point that I am raising in reference to the second matter of privilege. Now if it is Mr. Speaker's wish that I deal with one at a time, if that would be more understandable to the Minister of Justice, if he could follow us a little better, I could do it that way.

MR. HICKMAN: I can hear you. I can follow you. I know a breach of the rule when I hear it.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order. There is no doubt that the remarks have to be strictly relevant to the point. I do think that all hon. members would be in a better position to judge the hon. member's performance of that obligation if, in fact, he did take one at a time.)

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall take first the matter of personal privilege. I have said most of the information so I shall go over it very briefly. One, that the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) had alleged on Friday that I had called the Premier a liar on opening day. This is blatantly untrue. It has no foundation, in fact, as can be substantiated by a look at page sixty of the verbatim report for February 2nd. What I did do was say that the Premier had told a direct lie.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, in view -

MR. MURPHY: You did not care if he only -

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: You are wasting the time of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) began wasting the time of the House by making a statement that had no foundation in fact. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, for that reason and because the rules of the House require that a point of privilege be accompanied by an appropriate motion, I would move that the member for Bay of Islands be instructed to withdraw without qualification his false statement in reference to me, made on Friday, February 25, that I had called the Premier a liar on February 2. I so move.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: In response I take what Your Honour has to decide first is whether or not the hon. gentleman has made a prima facie case -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: I can appreciate the minister is wanting to be a speaker or something, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: Make the point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Make the point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the rules provide that Mr. Speaker shall determine whether a case has been established

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WHITE: Do not let him throw you off.

MR. HICKMAN: Go ahead now.

MR. MURPHY: Say it. Come on.

MR. HICKMAN: Come on. Come on now. Come on.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in the interest of expediting I would wait for Mr. Speaker's ruling on whether I have established a case and then I would like to debate the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: As hon. members are aware the procedure with respect



MR. SPEAKER: to a point of privilege, a substantive point of privilege is outlined in May, page 346, and I shall read from it, "As a motion taken at the time for matters of privilege is thereby given precedence over the prearranged programme of public business, the Speaker requires to be satisfied both that privilege appears to be sufficiently involved to justify him in giving such a precedence or as it is sometimes put, that there is a prima facie case that a breach of privilege has been committed and also that the matter is being raised at the earliest opportunity."

It goes on on page 347 to state, "It has often been laid down that the Speaker's function in ruling on a claim of breach of privilege is limited to deciding the formal questions of prima facie case and whether it has been raised at the earliest opportunity."

So that is what the Chair has to decide and depending on that decision there is or is not the substantive question of privilege before the House. Since the matter is somewhat complex and since it will require me to refer to the actual words said and to consult the verbatim transcripts of those days I would reserve opinion on it. Certainly the hon. member has not slept on his rights because of that and I will give the decision later because, as I say, I <sup>will</sup> have to refer to the verbatim transcript of certain remarks. And indeed I would like to get the verbatim transcript of the hon. member's remarks, the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir today, in putting forward his arguments so that I have them all before me.

MR. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understand from what Mr. Speaker has just said that it is his intention to hold the decision in abeyance and proceed with the regular business of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I certainly am not in a position to give a decision right now.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Standing Order (15) provides that whenever any matter of privilege arises, it shall be taken into consideration immediately. Now, Mr. Speaker, my point of order. I would submit that the rule does not provide for any intervening period unless the House recesses for Mr. Speaker to do his research. But that rule is very specific that the matter I have raised must be considered immediately, not at some future time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: In response thereto. The hon. gentleman does not really mean that I am sure. The rule is so clear that it shall be taken into consideration immediately, not dealt with immediately. This is certainly a totally different situation. Consideration means giving the Chair the right to do what Your Honour has precisely ruled he intends to do; namely, take it into consideration immediately and deal with it at the earliest possible moment, and at the same time indicate to this House, as Your Honour has done, that the hon. gentleman has not slept on his alleged rights.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, on that point of order, Standing Order (15), "Whenever any matter of privilege arises, it shall be taken into consideration immediately." I think that can only have two specific applications, number one, when the hon. member gets up on a point of privilege to establish or to endeavour to establish that there is a prima facie case, and if he has raised it at the earliest opportunity, that he should be heard immediately. And I think also when a decision is made, whether there is in fact a breach of privilege, and if it is affirmative, there is a motion before the House, then that takes precedence.



Mr. Speaker.

However, that is all that it means. The first aspect of it has been complied with in hearing the hon. gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. (Mr. Simmons). The second aspect cannot be complied with until there has been a decision on whether the prima facie case, and the raising at the earliest possible opportunity, until those two matters have been decided. So there is no way of taking it into consideration until a decision has been made on that.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a matter affecting the privileges of the House. On Wednesday, February 2 the Premier, during his remarks, following the Speech from the Throne said - and I quote from page fifty-three of the verbatim report for that date - "One time if a development association spoke up against the government that would be the end of the funding." He subsequently, on page sixty of the verbatim report, is recorded as having said a statement of the same essence. "One time if they were criticized, as I said, they would be cut off." Mr. Speaker, at that time my gut reaction to it based on some knowledge I had with the Green Bay Development Association and the Newfoundland and Labrador Rural Development Council was that the Premier was not telling the truth. I have since had an opportunity, as late as Friday night past -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is rising on a question of privilege of the whole House or breach of privilege of the whole House that allegedly occurred on February 2, nearly one month ago. And if there is one very fundamental rule, and that is on any matter involving privilege, be it privilege of an hon. member or privilege of the House, the hon. gentleman must bring it to the attention of the House and raise the question at the earliest opportunity. I waited to hear the first few opening sentences of the hon. gentleman's remarks, and when he indicated to us, "That his gut feeling on that day was that it was not accurate," surely it ill-behooves him to come along

Mr. Hickman.

thirty days later and say now - as he must - this is the earliest opportunity upon which I can raise it, because I am doing some research. That, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, does not conform to the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. I do not know what the minister's intentions are, whether he wants to chew up the afternoon. I want to raise this very quickly and get on with the business of the afternoon. And, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!



MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down, boy!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I had, as I indicated a gut feeling on this. A gut feeling is not enough at times, and I wanted to do some extra research on the matter. I did so, and as late as Friday night, Mr. Speaker, the information came to me, that there are two people presently employed in the Department of Rural Development, very senior people, who will and have substantiated the essence of what I said on opening day.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Unless any other hon. gentleman wishes to speak to the point of order raised by the Minister of Justice then I will make a decision on the point of order. The point of order was that the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir was not bringing up the matter at his earliest opportunity. Any hon. member wish to submit argument with respect to that point of order?

There being none, and understanding that the hon. member's comments, allegation of breach of privilege related to what was said or transpired on February 2, bearing in mind the lapse of time in the interim, I will rule that the point of order is well-founded and that the hon. gentleman is not bringing the matter up at the earliest opportunity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ooo

AN HON. MEMBER: He is writing the rules for himself.

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of order.

MR. MURPHY: What do you mean, writing the rules?

MR. HICKMAN: The ruling of Your Honour has been challenged by the hon. member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I did not hear what the hon. gentleman said, so I will ask him to repeat it.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Simmons:

I said nothing for the hearing of -

AN HON. MEMBER: You did.

MR. SIMMONS: - Mr. Speaker I said something for the hearing of the Minister of Justice.

AN HON. MEMBER: You did not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: And I said you are writing the rules for yourselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No you did not.

MR. MORGAN: "He is breaking the rules," you said.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I said, and the transcript I am sure will show, you are writing the rules for yourselves, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: It is another one, Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to my point of privilege, it is another one of the gut reactions I have when I see that for a number of years, last year and the year before when another member was trying to raise points of privilege the member from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) we were not allowed to interrupt on points of order. Now the rules have been changed, and I object.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! On that matter I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to infer directly or indirectly that the Chair is acting partially, and as I said before that what my obligation is, is to maintain the authority of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: There is a prescribed manner or there are a couple if the hon. gentleman wishes to take exception with the Chair's ruling. I cannot however allow the last remark to go without withdrawal. The hon. member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir is asked to withdraw the last remark which I consider a reflection on the Chair and on the House.

The hon. member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is not intended to be a reflection on Mr. Speaker at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Withdraw it! Withdraw it!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Withdraw it! Withdraw it!

MR. SIMMONS: I believe, Mr. Speaker, I am allowed a word of explanation, if Mr. Speaker misinterpreted what I said. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that what I have said has been misinterpreted by Mr. Speaker, and I would like to say that I had no intention of casting any reflection at all on Mr. Speaker. If I may be allowed a sentence to put in context what I was saying, last year we were attempting to interrupt points of privilege with points of order the Minister of Justice sat silent, now all of a sudden he is the champion of the point of order. I withdraw any implication that Mr. Speaker had made a wrong ruling or anything of that nature, I did not mean it. I do not intend it. I withdraw it if that implication was left.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that certainly covers the situation in which I intervened. That came up during the course of a point of order being made by the Minister of Justice. If the hon. gentleman would state it again, please.

MR. HICKMAN: The point of order, Mr. Speaker, that I made was that the comment by the hon. gentleman from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) who says "That it was intended for the House and not for the Chair, or for the hon. Minister of Justice, and not for the Chair." I suggest to Your Honour that no hon. gentleman within the confines of this House has the right to make comments or statements for anyone other than for the House and/or the Chair. And most assuredly the statement made by the hon. gentleman from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir following Your Honour's ruling against him did, in my opinion, cast very serious reflection on the Chair, and it is my opinion, that as members of this House we have an obligation to protect the Chair, and it is in that light that I rise on that point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!



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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, if it is that, I have already stated without any qualification that I withdrew any implication that the Chair had made an unfair ruling. I have said that very clearly. The record will show that. My aspersions, Mr. Speaker, were not either indirect or against the Chair, they were direct and they were aimed at the Minister of Justice.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman has clarified his remarks with respect to any application they may have been assumed to have had towards the Chair or towards the House. That matter should now be regarded as disposed of.

On behalf of hon. members I would like to welcome to the gallery today Mr. Gordon Bradley and Mr. Fred Gosling. Mr. Bradley is the mayor, the second gentleman, the deputy mayor of Bonavista and I know that all hon. gentlemen to my right and to my left will join me in welcoming these gentlemen to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 431 residents over the age of eighteen years of age in the community of Isle aux Morts and the electoral district of LaPoile. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the House I will just read the prayer of the petition. I might say, Sir, at the outset that the petition was circulated by a newly formed group in the community of Isle aux Morts called the Committee for Community Betterment. It is a Committee that was set up recently to try to bring about some badly needed improvements in the community. And they have become a legal entity, they have become an incorporated body, and their first project is to try and have something done about the fish processing facilities in Isle aux Morts. The Committee is representative of various aspects of life in the community, union, the Local Improvements District educationalists and so on.

MR. NEARY:

Now here is the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, "Whereas Nelpack Fisheries Limited, Isle aux Morts, a subsidiary of B.C. Packers, a Weston owned company recently transferred ownership to another Weston owned company, Connors Brothers Limited;and whereas immediately following the takeover by Connors Brothers twelve permanent employees were laid off; and whereas there has been no statement of policy by either government or company as to what this transfer of ownership within the multi-national Weston Corporation will mean in terms of employment or extending the work period at Isle aux Morts beyond the ten or twelve week herring season; in which the plant presently operates; and whereas the previous company, the Nelpack Fisheries Limited had been given DREE grants to install equipment, ice making machines and refrigeration on the assumption that many permanent jobs would be created on a year-round basis; and whereas the history of this plant in Isle aux Morts has been one of exploitation of one of our basic natural resources, the herring fishery, to the extent of practically depleting the herring stocks off our coastline; therefore be it resolved that we the undersigned residents over the age of eighteen years in the community of Isle aux Morts, in the electoral district of LaPoile, request the appropriate department of government to bring to bear whatever pressure possible to compell Connors Brothers to process all produce of the sea at their fish plant in our community thus making it a year-round operation employing workers for longer periods throughout the year."

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the petition indicates at the present time this modern, up-to-date fish plant in Isle aux Morts only operates during the herring season, about twelve or fourteen weeks out of the year. As a result of this, Mr. Speaker, the whole community is completely demoralized. It is the second largest community in the district of LaPoile. It is not a community, Sir, where I got the most support in the last provincial election. As a matter of fact, Sir, it was the community of Isle aux Morts that through the CBC computers out and had opponent re-elected. I think they voted about ninety per cent against me

MR. NEARY:

in the community of Isle aux Morts. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will ask the hon. gentleman now to get to the material allegation of the petition.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am coming to that. I am just merely pointing this out, Sir, to show the House that there is no discrimination as far as I am concerned. I think the people of Isle aux Morts have a very valid case. On either side of the community of

---

---



Mr. Neary.

Isle aux Morts-in Port aux Basques you have a fish plant that is operating on a year-round basis. In Fox Roost - Margaree you have Gabe Billard's fish plant that operates on a year-round basis. And down in Burnt Islands you have a fish plant operating on a year-round basis. And down in Rose Blanche, T. J. Hardy's fish plant operating on a seasonal basis, and I hope that that will be rectified in the near future. They do have a very strong argument, Sir, because at the present time I would say most of the unemployed in that community are forced to leave, to go up to the Great Lakes, to look for employment. There are a lot of young people, there is a very young population in the community of Isle aux Morts, and there is no employment there other than in the fish plant. There are a few people who commute back and forth to work to CN in Port aux Basques.

And, Sir, in this day and age now when we have the 200 mile limit, when we are talking about increasing our capability of catching the fish, and having it processed in our own fish plants here on the Island of Newfoundland, I would submit to the House, Sir, that there should not be a fish plant on this Island at the present time or in the foreseeable future that is only operating on a seasonal basis. If we are going to catch the fish, Sir, and process it here in Newfoundland then every fish plant should not only be operating one shift, they should be operating in three shifts at maximum capacity. The fish is going to be there. Apparently this year, Sir, in my district - and I was down on the weekend, and I just got back. As a matter of fact I went down and met with the committee in Isle aux Morts when they presented me with the petition, and I was in Burnt Islands and in Margaree. And I can tell the House, Sir, that they are having the best fishing season that they have had, I would say, on the Southwest corner of this Province, in twenty-five years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!



Mr. NEARY:

They have not seen the likes of the fish, Sir, I would  
say in twenty-five years. And the three mid-water trawlers that my friend has experimenting on the Southwest corner of the Province - one went out yesterday evening, left Port aux Basques yesterday evening when I was there, went out and came in today with 100,000 pounds of fish. It is unbelievable, Sir. It is absolutely fantastic the amount of fish that they are getting on the Southwest corner of this Province. And here you have a fish plant right in the middle of this, owned by a multi-national company over on the mainland, closed down. And they have in that plant, as the ministers knows, because the minister and I went through the plant, they have stored in that plant the cutting tables and so forth, Sir, for processing ground fish, and that could be very easily put in place. And I know the minister is most sympathetic over this matter, because we have talked about it a number of times, and the minister came to Isle aux Morts with me.

So, Sir, I would like to support the petition and have it laid upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates. I hope, Sir, that the petition will get the support of members on either side of the House.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, we can certainly support this petition from 431 residents of Isle aux Morts as presented by the Community Betterment Group there. We are certainly alarmed by the fact that twelve employees have been laid off particularly in view of the fact that we are talking about a change of companies, for whatever reason, and public money is involved, vis-a-vis, the DREE grants and so on. I have in the past few weeks brought to the attention of the Minister of Manpower certain employee exchange and layoff in another firm. He was very quick I might say to take some action in this regard, and I certainly compliment him on that. And I would hope that he will take a look at this situation as to why the twelve employees of some standing in the community, and in the plant concerned, were laid off.

MR. NOLAN: Is this some corporate move that bears looking into? And if so, I would certainly suggest to the Minister of Manpower that he take a look at this petition and possibly at the management and so on to see what happened to the twelve employees and if anything can be done in this regard? So we certainly support the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition as so ably presented by my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and I support it primarily because whatever happens in Port aux Basques has almost a direct bearing on the Bay of Islands district. In fact many of our men go out to Port aux Basques to take part in the fishery, going on

MR. WOODROW: draggers or whatever the case may be. And seeing that the member was in LaPoile and was given the petition certainly it makes me feel that the people must be very, very serious about it. And the fact that in the plant he speaks about people who are employed anywhere from ten to twelve weeks, this indeed is pathetic and I hope with the 200 mile limit that this plant, which he is speaking about, will be opened twelve months of the year if possible. And knowing how interested our present Minister of Fisheries is in the fisheries all over the Province, how hard he has been working at it, especially over the past year, that is another reason why I give my full support to this petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I feel a special obligation to support this petition. I accompanied the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) this week on a flight back to my district, I think he was getting down to his own district and during the trip I had a chance to learn first hand of his concern for the plight of the fish plant workers in Isle aux Morts and for that matter his concern all the fish plant workers in the Province. And so I want to heartily support the petition presented on behalf of 431 people from Isle aux Morts.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member in presenting the petition pointed out that this fish plant is owned by a multi-lateral company, a very large -

AN HON. MEMBER: Multi-national.

MR. FLIGHT: Multi-national. It would be very interesting to find out how many other fish plants that that company owns that are operating on a ten to twelve week basis, besides the Isle aux Morts plant.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that the fish that has been taken over the years, over the centuries, inside of what is now our 200 mile limit would have kept what fish plants - if that fish was processed in this Province it would have kept what fish plants are in Newfoundland, and any fish plants that are possible to build in any community in Newfoundland going. And I would suspect, Sir, that if all the fish that will be taken within the 200 mile limit were processed in Newfoundland in the future, that every fish plant, including the Isle aux Morts one, would not only, as the member says, work year-round but will probably work two shifts year-round. And Mr. Speaker, let me say, I am sure that all hon. members in the House are probably, if not questioning my right are certainly questioning my knowledge of the fishery, representing the most central of central districts. But the fact is, Sir, that I would like to tell the House that I have my roots in the fisheries. I grew up in Notre Dame Bay. My father was a fisherman and I feel very close and I feel I understand some of the problems of the fisheries. And I think the challenge facing the Minister of Fisheries is to see that the fish - we have the 200 mile limit and the word is that there will be plenty of fish - the challenge is to see that those fish are processed in Newfoundland. That is the challenge. The fish may be there. There is where the employment for Newfoundlanders will be, not taking the fish and shipping it into Boston, but processed in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily support the petition which was so ably presented by the member from LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I want to add my support to that petition as well, because we have, and I think the hon. member is aware of this, we have had meetings with the Connor group suggesting

Mr. W. Carter:

that every possible step will be taken by them to ensure that the plant does operate at a much greater capacity than what it is presently operating.

The plant, Mr. Speaker, is a privately owned operation, the Weston Company is a privately owned company, the subsidiary Connor Brothers, I should add, the largest canning factory in Eastern Canada, is a privately owned company as well. But be that as it may, the company has to apply to the Newfoundland Government for a licence to operate. And I hold the view, and I have for quite sometime, that the issuance of such a licence carries with it some responsibility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: Any company in Newfoundland that applies for and receives a licence from the Province to operate a fish processing operation, and to harvest that resource, carries with it a great deal of responsibility. And I can tell the House now, Mr. Speaker, that every effort will be made by the Department of Fisheries and by this government to ensure that the companies who get these licences are not permitted to use them just for their own personal gain, and at the whims



MR. W. CARTER:

of their own balance sheets and chartered accountants, but that they will be operating these plants that are licensed for the benefit of the community and the Province. That is something we are doing. I repeat, we did initiate a meeting with Connor Brothers. We have asked them to tell us what their plans are to ensure that every possible step is taken by that company to ensure that they do increase their productivity there and maybe diversify where they will be employing many more people on a longer period of time.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). His district and mine are not only adjacent to each other but they are also very dependent on the inshore fishery. We have heard a lot in recent weeks and months about the trawler fishery and as important as it is we should not allow it to overshadow the stability which the inshore fishery can bring to the Southwest Coast and is bringing to the Southwest Coast.

As the member has indicated, the inshore fishermen are having their best year in a long, long time. The fish are there and the willingness is there to catch it and they are catching lots of it. Indeed in a number of cases the inshore catch is enough to keep the fish plant going a couple of days a week. A case in point is the Gaultois plant which is not in my district anymore but in that of my colleague for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor). But the inshore fishery, despite the smallness of the boat when compared to the large stern and side trawlers, nevertheless the inshore fishery has a substantial input into the raw material of the fish plants along the Southwest Coast.

How much better would it be for the petitioners at Isle aux Morts, not only the 431 who have signed but the others, if that plant there could operate not only as a herring processing facility but on a year-round basis. As we have said the fish are there, Mr. Speaker, the equipment is there thanks to a DREE grant. The equipment is there, it just needs to be installed as the member has indicated. All that is

MR. SIMMONS:

needed, Mr. Speaker, is a couple of trawlers. A lot could be said on that subject if we were in a full debate but all that needs to be said now, Mr. Speaker, is that the people of Isle aux Morts, like the people of Burgeo and Ramea in my own district and the people of other communities where there are fish plants on the Southwest Coast, are being deprived of a full income, a full, a good weekly take-home pay because of the shortage of catch capability, because there are not the trawlers available, there is not the trawler programme available, Mr. Speaker, to give to Isle aux Morts and those other communities the catch capability which would make working in those plants a worth-while and a full-time employment opportunity. I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to give my full support to the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a batch of questions here that I can table, questions that have been asked. I guess I do not want to waste the time of the House in elaborating on the contents of the questions. Some are relating to the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), everything from the price of char to the fish caught in such-and-such a place, to the losses sustained in the plants in this community and that community, a lot of good, useful information.

Another question, Mr. Speaker, which -

MR. HICKMAN: What number are you on?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Oh, I am sorry. The question, Mr. Speaker, is number 32 by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) dated February 8.

I have another series of questions - Mr. Speaker, there is quite a series of questions here. I believe the questions might go beyond number 32 I believe. Am I right on this? There are six or seven questions. But they are the one question, I guess the one. Is that how it goes?

AN HON. MEMBER: What question number is that?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Number 32.



Mr. Lundrigan:

No 28, Mr. Speaker, by the member from Eagle River as well, with a considerable amount of information regarding the travelling activities of Mr. Michael Martin who was retained by the department this year to do some investigative work regarding the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, indicating, basically, the information regarding the transportation costs. And this will be laid upon the table. That is Question No. 28, the member from Eagle River.

Question No. 127 by the member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) regarding resettlement. How many families were resettled in the calendar year 1976? The member will be pleased to know, of course, that the resettlement programme terminated in terms of any applications being approved during that calendar year. At the end of the calendar year the information here indicates the number of families moved, and the cost of the relocating of these families for that particular year.

Questions, Mr. Speaker, regarding trips made by the minister outside of St. John's, by the member from Lewisporte (Mr. White), charged up to Industrial Development. He might want to raise Rural Development too at a later date?

MR. WHITE: I will ask another one tomorrow.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: All right, because there is a whole slew of little trips here and there in Rural Development. I only gave him the big expensive one here for the making of a little bit more news. That is Question No. 46.

Answer to Question No. 85, the member from LaPoile, regarding contracts oral or written entered into by Viking Helicopters for the Minister of Industrial Development. And the answer is given there, Mr. Speaker, which is not going to communicate a great deal of information because I am not aware of any contract.

Another question, Mr. Speaker, about the tugboats at Marystown, Question No. 94 raised by the member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) February 10, asking for tabling of documentation regarding Marystown contracts, and number two, asking for federal and provincial subsidies? The

Mr. Lundrigan:

answer to number one will not be provided, I do not have any plans to table the contract. Documentation by Marystown Shipyards on the Norwegian Company, on the Export Development Corporation, on the Bank of Montreal. But I do indicate here, Mr. Speaker, that the federal subsidy of roughly \$3 million that was provided under the SIAP, the Department of Industry Subsidy Programme of 13 per cent, for ships in excess of 100 tons, there is no provincial subsidy involved.

Mr. Speaker, again for the member from LaPoile, Question No. 87 regarding Viking Helicopters to the Minister of Rural Development. And the answer is similar or the same as it was before there are no such contracts to my knowledge.

The member from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe), Question No. 19, Mr. Speaker. Information regarding a resource loan bank - 1972 Throne Speech. I guess I could go into some detail on that and maybe make some elaborate statements, but there was no responsibility that I assume as minister for such a bank and consequently no initiatives have been taken by me as the Minister of Rural Development.

Question No. 6, Mr. Speaker, asked by the member from Bellevue (Mr. Callan), regarding information as it pertains to loans, grants, and community projects in the Department of Rural Development. These are similar questions that were raised last year regarding rural development. The question was basically the grants and/or loans which were made to individuals or groups in the calendar year 1976. Now what I have done here, Mr. Speaker, is give the loans up-to-date for the calendar year, I cannot give them for the fiscal year because it is not over yet. The incentive grants for small industries, I would like to quote these figures, were seventy-two incentive grants for \$714,000; the rural development loans, up until the calendar year 1976, were 114 loans for \$1,489,000; community projects, Mr. Speaker, these are projects that are funded under a particular programme in the department similar to the fish farm

Mr. Lundrigan:

as a community project, I believe that was a pilot project, it is just a different stage of the same thing. What is the community project? Greenspond smoke house, I guess. There were thirty-seven such projects for \$473,000. The projects are broken down as into the regions; Western, Central, Eastern, and so are the loans and so are the incentive grants. So I would like to make that information available.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CARTER: I want to table, Sir, answers to questions placed on the Order Paper. One question No. 61 from the hon. member for Trinity-Bay De Verde having to do with the programme of assistance to help inshore fishermen. Another question, No. 51 asked by the hon. member for Fogo, having to do with the fisheries loan board. Question No. 83 placed on the Order Paper by the hon. member for LaPoile concerning the Viking Helicopters. What contracts have been entered into, awarded to Viking Helicopters? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is, of course, none. And another one, question No. 59, placed on the Order Paper by the member from Trinity-Bay De Verde, asking what the government has done with respect to its commitment in the Throne Speech made in 1972 to embark immediately upon the programme to encourage the establishment, additional advance, re processing fish facilities in the province? Mr. Speaker, the question is rather long and I do not think I shall want to waste the time of the House to read it, but it is contained in the ~~answer~~.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I have a reply to a question asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition on Friday, I believe. There are two parts to the question. First of all he asked if I would undertake to report to the House on the progress of a project being carried out in Hampden; and secondly if it were true that the people who are incapacitated for medical reasons, are being forced to work.

First of all, I think I should tell the House a little bit about the project. It entails building 1.6 miles of access road which will be constructed along the shore and a further three miles of road blazed through timber stands. This will make approximately six million board feet of lumber and over two hundred thousand cords of pulpwood accessible to the loggers of Hampden and surrounding area.



MR. BRETT:

The people in that area have been looking for this project for some time, so we feel it is a very, very viable project. It appears now that some single men from the community, who are not, and I repeat, not recipients of Social Assistance, are attempting to stop the project because they are not being employed. I also understand that they are being encouraged by an individual or some individuals, apparently for partisan reasons from what I can find out.

Now Hampden needed this project probably more than any community on the West Coast because when we started this programme there were 99 families in receipt of short-term assistance in that area, so obviously the area was picked, not for political reasons as you can see, but because they were so many people there in receipt of assistance. Now all I can tell the House is that if these particular gentlemen continue to interfere we may not have any alternative but to consider taking the project out of it all together and then I would assume that the people who are kicking up a fuss over there will have to be responsible for the consequences.

There are twenty-four married men with families hired on the job right now, there are another six families with children who are available, who I hope will be hired. As for the second part of the question, people being forced to work, this is ludicrous, stupid, silly, to ask such a question. To think that professional, educated men would go out there and force people who are medically incapacitated to go to work, well it is just stupid, it is stupid to ask the question and of course the answer is no.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, please! I must draw to the hon. gentlemen's attention that rules with respect to answering questions are similar to those <sup>asking</sup> ~~answering~~ questioning in that they preclude debate, or are supposed to. Are there any further answers to questions? The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions the hon. gentleman

MR. MORGAN:

from Port au Port, who I understand is the official spokesman on transportation matters from the opposition, has asked questions with regard to, that is oral questions, with regards to the Auditor General's Report in connection with the collection of abandoned and derelict vehicles around the province and the payment made to the company concerned.

When this idea was conceived by government, the funds were allocated in the Department of Transportation and Communications. However shortly after that, the supervision and contract was signed between the company concerned and the Department of Environment and Provincial Affairs.

---

MR. MORGAN: This matter is being discussed with my colleague, the hon Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment, and I can assure the hon. gentleman for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), indeed this House of Assembly, that all information pertaining to this matter will be made available to the House of Assembly. We have nothing to hide.

MR. NEARY: If you are hauling the cars what role does the Minister's Department play?

MR. MORGAN: You did not ask the question, he did.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the answer to Question No. 159 on the Order Paper of today's date, asked by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I table herewith.

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

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 118, Order Paper, February 15 asked by the MHA for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) with reference to: - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to lay upon the Table of the House the following information: What are the monthly totals paid to E.P.A. or reimbursed to workers to and from Labrador? since? I have not the faintest idea. I do not know what department. It used to be Labrador Affairs that looked after that. I do not know who it is now. The Minister of Transportation - would the hon. member kindly redirect that question?

Question No. 103: - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to lay upon the Table of the House the following information: What steps have been taken to have the World War II gun emplacement on Bell Island turned into a provincial historic site? I have referred this to the Department of Defence. The hon. Minister of Tourism is in charge, and the question may be redirected to him.

With reference to Question No. 41 asked by the hon. member for Lewisporte: - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to lay upon the Table of the House the following information: The number of out of St. John's trips taken in the past fiscal year, which were paid for by the provincial Government,



Mr. Murphy.

the destination of each, mode of transportation used, and cost of each trip taken? I am tabling that because I was Minister of Social Services so I table this. This fiscal year is not over yet so that is up to end of March, 1976. So I will table that answer. These are for the information of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), too. It is a very substantial answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further answers to questions?

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Finance. Perhaps he would be good enough to bring us up to date, the House, on the current situation insofar as the strike is concerned in the Waterford Hospital. When we adjourned on Friday it was with the expectation that we may be called together during the weekend, and it was for this reason that we left it wide open to meet on the weekend. Perhaps the minister would now bring us up to date on what is the situation as of this moment, assuming that he has some recent word from his officials and so on?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: No, Mr. Speaker, I have no further information. As the House is aware the officials of Treasury Board and the Hospital Board and the Department of Health are sitting down this afternoon. They were scheduled to start at 2:00 P.M. with the NAPE unit at Waterford in an attempt to iron out the differences that are in there. I have had no information from them or communication from them as to what progress, if any, has been made up to now. Hopefully, some has. I cannot honestly say.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Sir, if he would clarify the situation, the controversy that seems to be existing between the minister's department, the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) and the Mount Pearl Town Council in connection with a grant to the stadium



Mr. Neary.

in Mount Pearl? Would the minister clarify that situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Well, thanks very much. Mr. Speaker, I have  
+ been wanting to clarify this for days, and obviously I cannot  
listen to every radio station in the mornings as a councillor  
for Mount Pearl has come on and made several statements. But the  
fact of the matter is that we have a complete financial statement  
from the recreation committee and, therefore, do not need one from  
Mount Pearl. The other part of it :

Mr. J. Dinn:

is that, there are five items outstanding that we want some information from the council of Mount Pearl, and cannot seem to get that information. So to the council I would say if they want their budget approved I would appreciate it if they would supply the information as asked for by me in previous correspondence, and it will be all settled then.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate if it is usual, routine procedure to by-pass the council, I understand the council is responsible for the Recreation Committee and the stadium, to by-pass the council and give grants directly to the Recreation Committee for which the council is responsible, and have to answer to the minister for? Is this usually done or is it unusual? What happened in this case?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there have been no grants made to the Recreation Committee in Mount Pearl? All grants made are made through the council of Mount Pearl. That has been the practice and always will be the practice from the point of view of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. NEARY: Well a supplementary question then.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Why is it then as the minister just indicated a few moments ago that the Recreation Committee is answering to the minister and not the Municipal Council in Mount Pearl? Why did the minister adopt that procedure?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the Recreation Committee obviously does not answer to me, it answers to the Municipal Council.

MR. NEARY: But you said, the Financial Report, the minister said was coming to him.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I said that I received the Financial Report and I am perfectly happy with that Financial Report.

MR. NEARY: Has the Council received it?

MR. DINN: I do not know. I have no idea what council did or did not receive from the Recreation Committee, I would hope they would.

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

MR. SPEAKER: One additional supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Is the minister then aware of any gr<sup>e</sup>ivance or any dispute between the Council and the Recreation Committee? Does the Council have the financial report? Are they satisfied with it? Are they satisfied with the fact that public tenders were called in all cases?

MR. DINN: The City Council did not tell me.

MR. NEARY: Well the minister is representing the Council here.

MR. DOODY: How many questions to that?

MR. NEARY: Well would the minister just tell us what, you know, is the situation regarding the council's relationship -

MR. MORGAN: Ask the council.

MR. NEARY: Go and look after the air space in Newfoundland will you, or for Gander so they will not all lose their jobs out there.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) four questions like you are doing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Is the hon. gentleman finished his question?

MR. NEARY: Well if it got through, if the minister can understand what I am saying with all the interruptions from the Minister of Transportation.

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

MR. DINN: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the Council certainly has a copy of the Financial Report and statements, they were passed on to the Clerk of the Council.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment. As a result of an incident in Central Newfoundland last Spring, the flooding of the Trans-Canada

Mr. Flight:

Highway, out of the enquiry, Mr. Speaker, came a fear by very knowledgeable people. There were statements made that because of the high water level in Red Indian Lake there was some fear, and well grounded fear for the ability of Exploits Dam to hold - that the people who controlled the dam had no choice but to run that water off because of their fear that the Dam itself might not hold. now my question is, does the minister have any basis for concern in that area? Is the Department of the Environment concerned about the ability of the Exploits to hold, in the event of a high water level in Red Indian Lake? Because in asking that question I am sure I do not need to point out that if there is any fear, if there is a possibility, given a fast rise, a high water level, and that Dam were to go, then Badger is going under water and that is the basis of the question, Sir?

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

MR. A. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to answer that off the top, it is a rather complex question. We have had surveys made of the reason for the floods, and there were many factors entered into it, the ice was melting, and this type of thing, earlier than usual, and there were high floods in the river. But to my knowledge I do not there think is any fear of the Dam breaking or anything like that, and we had our man fly over, our water expert fly over in a helicopter when the floods were in full height, recently, not the earlier one. And I would like really to take notice of the question, possibly, you know, a question like that quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, is so important, I would like to see it put on paper so that I, you know, it is very difficult for me now to go back after listening for a minute or so and try to repeat the fears of the member. I would like to see it on paper, but if not I would invite the member to come over and sit down and talk with our people and let us know the fears, and he can express his fears, and we can have a look at the whole thing, and if he has got any information that we are not in possession of, we will be only too happy to go out with him and look at what is happening out there.



MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: For the record, Mr. Speaker. I want this read into the record of the House that there is no question about my sincerity -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman is recognized to ask a supplementary question, and in doing so he may give what information is necessary for the question, but I would not be allowed to permit him to make a statement.

MR. FLIGHT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Then a supplementary, Sir. Would the minister undertake to assure the House— as soon as he is in a position to have talked with his department's officials - assure the House as to exactly what the situation is with the Exploits Dam, as to whether or not there is a basis of concern, and to assure the House that in as far as his department is concerned, there is no fear to the towns down river from the Exploits Dam, that that dam could break?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MURPHY: I will undertake that, Sir, if the hon. member would undertake to make known to me in writing, and also to my officials, what his great concerns are, and any information he has pertaining to the hazard that exists.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications, and it deals with the freight subsidy on flights to islands of the Northeast Coast. I wonder if the minister could tell us when he is going to be in a position to announce the freight subsidy, as I understand it is being planned at the moment?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is a coincidence that the question is asked today, because it was just today that the subsidization of the movement of produce, of food items, to the islands of St. Brendan's, Change Islands and Fogo, and in all possibility Long Island as well,

Mr. Morgan.

has been approved through the operations of Gander Aviation at Gander, which we are subsidizing and have been subsidizing since the first of January with regards to passenger movement to these same islands. So now as of today we have approved the subsidization of the movement of food items, produce, and that has been made retroactive to February 12 based on the fact that the environmental conditions and ice conditions, in particular, have prevented the ferry services from operating on a regular basis. So these three islands I mentioned, St. Brendan's Change Islands and Fogo will now be subsidized to the amount of seven cents per pound. The tariff used by the carrier is fourteen cents per pound so we are subsidizing to the tune of seven cents per pound, which will mean that the cost to the customer will be seven cents as well. So we are subsidizing to the tune of fifty per cent of the cost. And in all possibility we will also apply the same subsidy to the community of Long Island as well, which will be a total of four islands included.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell us what goods will be included in that subsidy? Will it be restricted to food and clothing or will clothing be included or just food? And what is going to be the total cost to the Province for the year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, rather than make an estimate of the cost this year, what I will do is supply the hon. gentleman with the cost over the last couple of years with the same subsidy, and I am of the firm impression from the officials in the department that only produce items, like food items and meats, etc., will be subsidized. I surely hope that they would not be subsidizing cases of beer, etc.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance.



Mr. Simmons.

I wonder would the minister indicate to the House whether this Province is now officially a partner in the Atlantic Lottery?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: The Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is officially a partner. We are operating under licence from the government, which is, I think, our legislative authority to do so. We had a bill before the House last year which did not go through the House. It slipped off the Order Paper toward the end. If the House so desires we can bring that bill forward again, and re-introduce it and debate it. But I understand we do have the authority to be a partner of the Atlantic Lottery Corporation through a licence from the Order-in-Council.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: I wonder would the minister be good enough to indicate what the authority is, under what legislation the authority is vested?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: Yes, I will have to get that information. I do not have the proper references off the top of my head, but I am sure it will be no difficulty. I will certainly get the information.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the minister indicate who Newfoundland's representatives are? I understand that each province is supposed to have two representatives on the board.  
I wonder

MR. SIMMONS: is that correct as far as this province is concerned and if so who these representatives are.

MR. DOODY: That is no problem, Sir. We have two members on the board. The Chairman of the board is Mr. Dave Roberts of the Treasury Board, the other member of the board is Mr. Peter Kennedy, also of the Treasury Board. Both very capable and competent public servants. As a matter of fact, I think it may be appropriate at this time, if I am allowed, to pay tribute to these two gentlemen in operating this part of The Atlantic Lottery in Newfoundland in such a capable and efficient manner as they have, I think it might be fair to them to say that this was and is an opportunity for great political and other abuses and I do not think it has happened. I think they have managed to do it very, very nicely and I think it has worked out very, very well. It has been done by the public service and there has been no political involvement.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: I have two and I can put them together if I may, Mr. Speaker, they are related. I wonder would the Minister indicate whether the provincial treasury has received any returns, any revenue from the lottery to date and also would he indicate whether the treasury has to date underwritten any of the costs of the administration, the operation of the lottery.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: No, the answer on both counts is no. We have not received any returns to my knowledge as yet although we are anticipating some, and with some glee. Our share of the costs will be deducted from that payment when it comes through. The present cost of the administration, the ongoing cost and the formation of the whole thing was underwritten and financed by the Council of Maritime Premiers Organization of which this province is not a part, but we participated in the lottery group and they will bill us for our portion of it when they make their first distribution of the profits.

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



MR. NOLAN: To the Minister of Finance on the same subject.

I wonder if he could provide the House with some information regarding the percentage breakdown? Of the dollar taken in, on the Atlantic Lotto, how much returns to the province is concerned and how much of it would go into operating costs and so on? What percentage of the dollar really comes back to the people.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. DOODY: That is difficult once again, but if the House, as I have heard my honourable and learned friend over here say without prejudice, my understanding is that something like 40 per cent is retained by the operators and something like 60 per cent goes out in prizes but I would like to get that straightened out and give it to you in more detail. The operating expenses and so on, as I say, and all the other detail, if it is so desired, I can get it for you perhaps in the form of a statement or, it maybe more convenient than having all these -

And incidentally, tickets are available at all drugstores and other outlets in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: Is any hon. member now rising on a supplementary.? One additional supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Could the minister indicate to the House who is responsible for the designation of the agents for the distribution of tickets in the province. Would you please?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. DOODY: The hiring and designation and the actual, even physical breakdown, was handled by the officials, the board of directors who consist of two public officials from each of the four provinces and the general manager of the corporation, Mr. John Mark Le Faye who was the number two man in the Quebec lottery effort until the Atlantic Lottery managed to snare him. These people associated with a consultant firm called - and I stand to be corrected on this

MR. DOODY:

again because I was not expecting this today -it is Ross Associates I think, were the public consulting firms. These people advertised for distributors and agents and so on and the applications all went to Moncton and all the hirings were done and the screenings and the interview were done by these people. And that is how it was done. We had nothing to do with it.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay followed by Fogo, Carbonear and Terra Nova.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communication. The minister is aware that today is the last day I believe for the registration of snowmobiles and all-terrain vehicles in the province and I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not any consideration has been given to an extension for isolated communities. I am thinking in particular of communities like Harbour Deep in my district which I found out today, 90 per cent of the people do not have their licenses back, and they have been told from the Corner Brook office that it may be four or five weeks before they will get them back because of backlogs. So

Mr. Rideout.

in isolated instances I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not there will be an extension for those communities.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, today is the last day for the licencing or registration of these types of vehicles, snowmobiles and all-terrain vehicles in the Province. There has been no consideration given to extending that deadline as of today or beyond today based on the fact that in the Fall of last year, 1976, it was announced then that the deadline would be the end of February. I understand from the motor vehicle registrar that approximately 12,000 vehicles have been registered as of last week, last Friday. We have no definite indication of how many of these vehicles are in the Province based on the fact that it is the first time of licencing these vehicles.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Four times that number.

MR. MORGAN: That is an educated guess. It is a one time registration of these vehicles. There has been no consideration given to the deadline for registering, but, however, in cases like the hon. gentleman mentioned in his question, in cases, for example, where they have made application, and they have forwarded their money orders, etc., and they have not received in return their licencing, well that is no fault of the applicant applying for the licence. In cases like that consideration might be given. It is something that I will look at tomorrow morning with regards to maybe using some other identification like, for example, a money order has been used to purchase the plates, etc. or a decal. And so consideration could be given to that aspect but not to extending the deadline beyond today's date.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, I thank the minister for the consideration that



Mr. Rideout.

he is going to give to this matter. I wonder, in the form of a supplementary, if the minister would undertake also, once he has considered it, to inform the law enforcement agencies in those particular areas? I would only be concerned about the isolated areas. I mean if the people in Baie Verte have not got it, that is their problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will take that latter part of the question, the supplementary under advisement and may be tomorrow indicate to the Assembly exactly what steps will be taken by the department with regards to the licencing of those vehicles.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on the same subject. I wonder would the minister indicate what is being done in those cases where the applicant for a snowmobile licence is unable to obtain a bill of sale? I understand there is quite a large number of people in that particular category, people, for example - in my own instance, for example. I have had a machine for eight years, and I would not know where to go look for the bill of sale. The person who sold me the machine has left the Province, and I am in a position - and I just quote this only as an example, because there are many hundreds in this position - I am in a position where it is virtually impossible, if not completely impossible, to obtain a bill of sale from the person from whom I purchased the machine. I wonder is there any arrangement made to accommodate persons such as that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have not got a copy of the act here with me, but I understand the legislation clearly indicates that a declaration or an affidavit indicating the purchase price of that vehicle is sufficient with regards to licencing the vehicle.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy. Can the minister inform the House if a decision has been reached



Capt. Winsor.

by Eastcan following their meetings at Ottawa last year, whether they will carry on drilling again off the Labrador Coast this season?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: I think the hon. member is talking about last week's meeting.

CAPT. WINSOR: Yes, yes.

MR. PECKFORD: I thought you said last year.

CAPT. WINSOR: No, no, last week.

MR. PECKFORD: Last week's meeting.

No, we do not have any indication of Eastcan's decision. We understand that they are soon to make a decision, and we also understand that meetings are underway in gay Paris today and tomorrow, hopefully, relative to that matter. And, therefore, we anticipate hearing very soon as to their plans for this coming year and for the next couple of years. And I can also indicate that other meetings will be held between Eastcan and the government in the next few weeks.

CAPT. WINSOR: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

CAPT. WINSOR: Has the minister anything to add to statements alleged to have been made by two executives of different oil companies at Halifax during the weekend where they are taking a dim look now at the drilling for oil and gas off the Labrador Coast? It may not be as flourishing as we once thought.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: There has always been a very cautionary note by most companies in the

Mr. Peckford:

exploration activity off Labrador, and especially in the very deep water off the East Coast. It is very difficult to interpret some of the comments that are being made by the oil companies in the last few weeks, primarily because you have to first consider what area they are really talking about. If they throw the whole East Coast into their statement, and say the East Coast of Canada, one can talk about the unsuccessful attempts on drilling on the Grand Banks, one can talk about the ongoing unsuccessful attempts of drilling off the Scotia Shelf, and one can talk about the very deep water off the Northeast Shelf or off the Labrador Shelf. But if one talks specifically about the Labrador Coast and the activities of Eastcan primarily, in the last couple of years, one would have to be very optimistic because the batting average is way above anything else that has occurred in any exploration activity that I am aware of in the world. So, you know, when you have three discoveries, out of six or seven wells that is an awfully good batting average.

But if you take the whole thing, the whole East Coast play, if you want, then most companies are very cautious and spend their money very wisely on any exploration activity. Add to that the present prognostications by experts who say that there is going to be a surplus of gas, or there already is a surplus of gas, and that we might not need Mackenzie Valley Delta gas until 1980 or 1982 which is a different story than they were telling us six or eight months ago. So it is very difficult to interpret the comments, but if you relate it primarily to the geological structures off the East Coast - Labrador were you talk about the Bjarni field of the Gudrid field or the Snorri field or some of the other structures that have been identified then one must be optimistic.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. WHITE: — Mr. Speaker, my question has to do with the statement by the Federal Minister of Energy, Mr. Gillespie, in the House of Commons last week, who suggested that \$55 million would be spent in Newfoundland if the Newfoundland Government withdrew its regulations, and I wonder if this has been communicated to the minister? Fifty-five million dollars would be spent in Newfoundland on offshore drilling, if the Newfoundland Government withdrew its regulations, and I am wondering if this has been communicated to the minister by the oil companies?

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

MR. PECKFORD: No that has not been provided to me. I do not know what \$55 million Mr. Gillespie is speaking of. If he is talking about Eastcan shutting off all its exploration activity this year, and one assumed that they were going to spend \$55 million or \$60 million, of that \$55 million or \$60 million we could expect to get, in dollar value, 5 per cent of that in the Province. So the way the hon. member worded his question from the information he had, I will have to say the information is erroneous. What would come to Newfoundland without the regulations, presently proposed, would be about 5 per cent of whatever the total amount the exploration or whatever it was.

MR. WHITE: Fifty-five million would be spent.

MR. PECKFORD: Eastcan has indicated to me on a number of occasions, especially last Fall, that they were talking about a \$40 million to \$60 million programme, so you can take whichever end of that you wish.

But I think the salient point is that up to this point in time the amount of activity, financial returns to the Province, was about 5 per cent of their total amount of money that they spent.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated that I would recognize the hon. member from Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) after the hon. gentleman from Fogo (Capt. Winsor).

MR. R. MOORES: A question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Mr. Speaker, in November of last year, a construction activity in Carbonear namely, the installation of a water main for the



MR. R. Moores:

community valuing some \$1.1 million was halted due to a bankruptcy suit or a quasi bankruptcy situation. What now is the minister's or the government's intention with regard to the completion of that water main?

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

MR. J. DINN: Well with regards to the funds that are available for the project now, the funds that we have available, we will, you know, make that available when the discussions between the company that was out there and the department are finished. They are not in receivership as I understand it. So there is very little we can do, and it is up to the town and the consultant. But the money is available and that is being protected by the town.

MR. R. MOORES: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. R. MOORES: Related, Mr. Speaker, but not directly related subsequent to that halting of the construction activity the minister, presumably representing the government, agreed to, out of the public treasury of the Province, pay

Mr. R. Moores.

the entire back wages owing from the quasi bankruptcy situation to the employees. For a clarification of the question, Mr. Speaker, I personally contacted all of the major creditors involved in the quasi situation and they agreed to release the wages from the holdback money. Why then did the minister, a Minister of the Crown gamble a further \$20,000 plus -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must ask the hon. gentleman to put his question in a factual way, but not in such a way as to imply debate.

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, for a clarification for the House there is no need - or I am not provoking debate. The question is simply: Why did the minister, why did the government gamble \$20,000 further of public funds when they could have gotten the wages from the private people, the private enterprises involved, from the holdback fee?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there was absolutely no gamble at all. The \$18,000 was paid out, and we have the monies in lieu of bond in the bank, and it is available to us. When the project goes on, we will just collect the money. It is not a gamble.

MR. SPEAKER: The time is up.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Motion, the hon. Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Stephenville Linerboard Mill (Agreement) Act, 1972," carried. (Bill No. 21)

On motion, Bill No. 21 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Forestry to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Land Development Act," carried. (Bill No. 22).

On motion, Bill No. 22 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Enable The Bennett Brewing Company Limited To Become A Federal Corporation," carried. (Bill No. 23).

On motion, Bill No. 23 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Canadian Javelin Limited (Acquisition Of Crown Lands) Act, 1970," carried. (Bill No. 24).

On motion, Bill No. 24 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Government (Elections) Act," carried. (Bill No. 26).

On motion, Bill No. 26 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.



MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, the adjourned debate on the amendment to the address in reply. The hon. member for St. John's South.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I can perhaps do no better in starting than to emulate my good friend, the hon. member for Bay of Islands. In offering some congratulations, before I get into the body of my remarks, I would firstly like to offer congratulations to my medical confrere the hon. member for Exploits. It is a little unusual to refer to him in those terms, but the hon. member, as many of you know, has been in medical practice in this province for many years. As a matter of fact, I think, this summer he will have been in practice here for thirty years, something like twenty-seven or twenty-eight of them, in the town of Botwood and in that area, and indeed throughout the province.

The hon. member has been a bit of a legend in his own time, and certainly has given outstanding service to the population of the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: The hon. member was not native born, not native born to Newfoundland, that is, but of course he is a Canadian to the same extent that we all Canadians in that he was here when the province became a province of Canada. I would hope that whatever changes go on in medical practice in the future, and there are changes going on in the practice of medicine, that there will be the same close contact and the same humanity, the same personal concern shown by those practicing the profession, that the hon. member from Exploits has shown to the people of Botwood and the people who came under his care during all these years.

I would also like to offer some congratulations to my former seat mate, the hon. member for Bonavista North who moved the Address in Reply. Of course we are all aware of the notable feat that he was engaged in, in carrying of his election, I am sure

DR. COLLINS:

everyone on both sides of the House offer him the most sincere congratulations in this regard and he was a very worthy mover of the Address in Reply.

I also offer congratulations to, and this is the first opportunity I have had to do so in any sort of a public way, to the Minister for Municipal Affairs and Housing. The new minister occupies a portfolio which is of tremendous concern to the people in my district, indeed to people in districts throughout the St. John's area, and also, of course, throughout all districts in the province. In particular his ministry is of great concern to us and I will speak on this a little bit later on because of the new moves that are made to reorganize municipal government in the St. John's area.

The minister is a very worthy successor to other powerful people who have been in that portfolio and in that regard I mention the hon. John Crosbie and of course the present minister of Mines and Energy. A word of congratulations also, though he is not here, to the hon. member for Ferryland. He presents us with a fresh face, which never goes amiss, I will not say particularly on the benches opposite, a fresh face probably would not go amiss on either side, but certainly it does not go amiss on the benches opposite. I wish he were here because I would like to compliment him on his maiden speech the other day, which I thought was an extremely fine effort.

Finally, if I may be permitted I would like to offer a word of congratulations to someone, in whose district I partly reside, that is the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Here, here!

February 25, 1977

Tape 616

AH-3

DR. COLLINS:

He has reached, as you know, the dizzy heights of opposition House Leader and I would congratulate him on that. I would just like to point out to him that that post is one associated with a high rate of attrition, I think the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde occupied that post, the hon. minister for Fogo occupied that post and I believe, Mr. William Rowe occupied that post, neither of which are in the post now -

MR. ROBERTS:           The caliber is rated very high.



Dr. Collins.

The calibre is high, but the stay is rather short.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments in regard to my own district. I hope most hon. members will remember that I do represent St. John's South. St. John's South is an area of Newfoundland which has been occupied for very, very many years. It is probably the area of the Island of Newfoundland, the Island part of the Province, that has been occupied longer than any other area with the possible exception of the Placentia area, and perhaps in the immediate Conception Bay area. The hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) I see is shaking his head there, and he probably means by that that the Eastern section of the city of St. John's was occupied for a longer period of time, and that is quite true. But the Western part of the city, which comprises the St. John's South district, was occupied and used by visitors to our Province for very many years. Despite that it is really a new district. During the redistribution the district was altered quite a bit, and it now lies wholly within the urban area of St. John's, and I have the privilege of being the first member to represent the new district of St. John's South. However, I would not like to leave the impression that the people in St. John's South have only, shall we say, urban concerns. The people of St. John's South have many concerns. As an example I might mention that they are very concerned, or at least some portion of my constituents are very concerned, regarding the fisheries, and regarding marine works generally. Many people in St. John's South are closely associated with the harbour, and there is an inshore fishery that is based in St. John's South. I would hope that that fishery will increase in the coming years because certainly there is a market in the immediate St. John's area where the inshore fishery can flourish.

There have been many remarks, of course, about the need for water and sewerage in various parts of the Province. It may surprise some members in this House to know that in my district that concern is shared. Not all areas in the district of St. John's South have piped water and sewerage. I am referring, of course, to perhaps one of the more historic parts of the city, and that is the community, if you want to call it that, of Fort Amherst. Fort Amherst reaches far back into

the history of the Province, and certainly of the city of St. John's, and there are approximately thirty to thirty-five families living there. They are a very tightly knit group. They are a very industrious group of people. Yet they have not had the privilege of having water and sewerage. As a matter of fact it was only in relatively recent times that they have had electricity into the area. Now the council, of course, the municipal council of St. John's is the body that is responsible for this and the council certainly do have a problem on their hands because of the topography of the area. But despite that I would like to bring to the attention of my fellow members of the House that the people in the urban areas often do share the concerns and the difficulties of people in the rural areas. The impression may also be about - or at least it has been expressed on occasion that the urban dweller is a very opulent person in comparison to the rural dweller. Well I would like to put that to rest certainly in regard to my own district. And I would like to quote if I may a few statistics in that regard. I can only quote for the year 1974-1975 because these are the only statistics available from the Department of Social Services' report. But in the district of St. John's South the number on able-bodied, short-term assistance was the highest for the whole forty-one districts.

Dr. Collins:

When this report was compiled, of course, there were forty-one electoral districts in the Province, and St. John's South had the dubious record of being at the top of the list in terms of the number of able-bodied on short-term assistance. If we look at the cost, the expenditure for able-bodied short-term social assistance St. John's South district was the second on the list only exceeded by the district of Port au Port. And the number on long-term social assistance St. John's South was sixth in line of the forty-one.

So I do not think anyone can say that in that part of the urban area anyway that the people are over opulent, over-favoured in comparison to the rest of the Province. As well as unemployment and the need for social assistance or other problems in the district of St. John's South, possibly the greatest one is in regard to housing. The district of St. John's South is a very densely populated area. The housing stock is by and large not new, there are new housing areas in the district, but by and large it is not new housing stock. The housing stock has tended to change hands over the years, and has tended to become occupied or even owned by those less favoured in terms of wealth than previously, and it means that the housing stock has tended to deteriorate in maintenance and in general care and attention. Not that my constituents are neglectful in that regard, but that their means have not allowed them to keep up their housing stock to the extent that most of them would desire.

Another difficulty in the area is the lack of recreational and open space. There is a park in the district of St. John's South, Victoria Park, but except for that it, and is rather a small park. It is rather an underdeveloped park, in terms of facilities, there is very, very little in the way of recreational facility and open space. And this is in an area, as I mentioned before, which is densely populated and with a high proportion of children in the population.



Dr. Collins:

In my district also we have a hospital. I will not say it is a district hospital, because none of the hospitals in St. John's really are district hospitals, they are hospitals for the City and to some extent they are base hospitals for the Province. But despite that, it is to some extent a district facility, and I am referring to the Grace General Hospital. The Grace General Hospital is a very old hospital with a very noteworthy record. It has been administered by the Salvation Army throughout, it has given yomen service throughout the district, and indeed throughout the Province. It was opened in 1923, it was extended in 1967, and it is in full operation as a general hospital at the present time.

Now I mention this to get to the point that the hospital has tended to fall on hard times in recent years. In terms of capital expenditure, it has been a little bit at the wrong end of the stick. In terms of capital equipment expenditure, again it has tended to get rather less, in my view, than is warranted by the amount of work that goes on there, and the amount of responsibility that has to be discharged by the hospital and by its staff.

I am glad to say that this point has been forcibly and vigorously brought to the attention of the authorities by the administration, and by the staff of the hospital. And without endeavouring in any way to get more than is their due I think there is some expectation that some of deficiencies will be made up in the not too distant future.

The problems, of course, require a solution, and I am glad to say that there is some prospect for a solution to the housing one that I mentioned, which is possibly the major one. The NIP programme, the federal NIP programme, the Neighbourhood Improvement Programme will be

DR. COLLINS:

implemented within a goodly part of the district of St. John's South and because it will be designated as a NIP area there will also be the associated programme, the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Programme brought in. The latter will allow householders to acquire loans and in some cases grants to refurbish their housing. The NIP funds themselves will allow the whole area to be upgraded in terms of streeting, lighting, sewer arrangements, traffic redirection and so on and so forth. The total federal grants will amount to \$1,152,000. There will also be a federal loan which of course will be the responsibility of the municipal authority ultimately to repay. It will amount to \$1,700,000. The municipal council itself will make a contribution of \$300,000 and provincial government will also make a contribution of some \$200,000.

This is a very exciting programme for the area and the studies are going on now which will allow a plan to be drawn up. There is already a board of citizens in operation who will advise the planners as to citizen input. The district is also looking forward in the not too distant future, I hope, to seeing the removal of much of the CN facility down there. The CN facility is a very necessary facility but fortunately it is being moved out of my district because it really is an eyesore. I think the CN cannot be too severely criticized for the way that the whole area along the Southside Road, the whole area along the West end of Water Street has been allowed to acquire a rather non-descript, dowdy appearance because of CN yards and buildings and facilities.

I would hope as the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs mentioned that the rather attractive station itself, the building itself will be preserved, but that the unsightly yards and the uncultivated banks and the various other rather untidy looking aspects of CN property will be used for other purposes and upgraded in the process.

Another area that we look forward to seeing development in - but I am afraid that I do not see really much prospect at the present time - is in development of the harbour. There were developments in the St. John's Harbour a number of years ago when I believe something in the order

DR. COLLINS:

of \$26 million was spent. It seemed a lot of money at the time and indeed it was. But in comparison to federal monies spent in areas like Halifax and St. John, our neighbor Atlantic ports, it was really peanuts. And I think the time is long past when the St. John's Harbour, even though it is not a harbour used for intransit traffic in the ordinary sense of the term, it nevertheless is a harbour that has a great future for Northern development. It has a great future for the servicing of the new fishing fleets we will see off our coast and it has a great future in the general servicing of shipping on the transatlantic run. So I would think that the harbour has certainly the rights to deserve extensive federal redevelopment. I will certainly work towards that. But I am afraid that I cannot at this time see it in early prospects.

Turning now, Mr. Speaker, to the St. John's urban study. My hon. friend for Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor) had spoken on this to a large extent the other day, but I would like to mention a few points that concern me particularly. As you will all remember this study was initiated in the 1970-1971 area under the former administration but was completed under the present administration. In 1976 last year the regional plan was adopted. The Henley Commission has now come in with final recommendations in terms of the governance of the area. I would hope that we will have



DR. COLLINS: a greater opportunity to debate this matter later in the session. I would just confine myself to a few remarks. The first one that does concern me is in terms of the ward system that is suggested in the Henley Report. I could not be in greater favour of a ward system for the Municipal Council of St. John's.

MR. DOODY: Hear! Hear!

DR. COLLINS: This is something that has been in great need for many, many years. I think there is no validity to the argument that this would in any way undermine the interest of councillors on a broad city basis. I think it would do the opposite. I think it would give them greater context with the city as a whole.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

DR. COLLINS: The only point that I would differ with in this regards with the commissioners is that they do recommend two types of councillor, two types of ward councillor and I cannot quite see this working. They look to several councillors, elected on a city-wide basis and others elected on a district basis. This would mean that you would have two levels of councillor and I cannot see how a municipal council would operate efficiently under such an arrangement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

DR. COLLINS: Having said that I am in favour of one aspect of the Henley Report I would not like to leave the impression that I am in favour of it all and I certainly see the fears of some areas around St. John's, such as Mount Pearl, I am sure my hon. friend from Mount Pearl has put forth his case well and I certainly see the fears that such places and such communities might have if they looked to some of the neglected areas of the city at the present time, such as my own district. And these other areas that might be incorporated into a large city, they would certainly have to have a greater guarantee than history would give them as to their continued development if they are to look at an enlarged city of which they would be a part.

DR. COLLINS: Another area in this regard, that I have concern over, and that is the arrangement for district governments. It would seem to me that this is going to impose another level of government on the poor citizen. So the citizen might end up with a district ward councillor, then a city-wide municipal councillor presumably, if the Henley Commission is followed, he would then have district governments as the next layer, he would then have somewhere along the way I presume his MHA, and then finally he would have the provincial government. So he would have five layers of government to deal with. And this seems to me an unnecessary way to government and I am sure that there can be other arrangements made. I would like to see the MHA and the district council in some way integrated and this would certainly reduce the weight of government and would give the MHA more opportunity to serve the district for which he is elected.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear! Excellent.

DR. COLLINS: I would like to turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the House of Assembly, some consideration of our own activities here and I was disappointed that the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) seemed to get such short shift to what I thought was a - it is a very excellent suggestion or a number of suggestions he made. I have them before me here and in brief summary he wishes to experiment with shorter speeches. He wishes to experiment with having some of our motions brought forward and debated with expedition and brought to a vote, and he wishes to have the remarks of members more to the point and less diffuse.

All these points seem to me very well taken indeed. They would certainly perhaps reduce our freedom a little bit from what it is at the present time but I think that freedom can very easily degenerate into licence and I am sure that the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) had no intention to limit freedom to the extent that it would muzzle anyone but that he wanted

DR. COLLINS:

to make our deliberations more fruitful. I would certainly support him on that. The way we operate here at the present time I think is open to criticism. When petitions are presented sometimes one loses sight of what the petition is all about in hearing the political points made over them. I think that this is a disservice to the petitioners when the very legitimate concerns that they bring forward are distorted or misrepresented so as to gain some political advantage.

I would like to compliment my friend, the hon. member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) on the way he presented his petition and indeed the hon. member for Fogo (Capt. Winsor) a few days ago also presented a petition which I thought was done in an exemplary fashion. The prayer was given, it was supported and supported in such a way that one felt like supporting it. It was not presented in such a way as to lambaste this side of the House or indeed anyone.

In our debates here we do many times have specious arguments put forward. And I would have to say that my fellow hockey player, the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White), did engage in such specious arguments the other day when he pointed a finger of scorn at the government over Bonavista North, at the time of the election, and if there were any public works carried out there. This was supposed to be a matter that was not correct. On the other hand he immediately then said that he had many federal projects going forward in his own area and this then was apparently all right. But if it is all right for one, how can it be all right for the other? What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. This type of specious argument I do not think adds really very much to the House.

In terms of length of speaking, I think that not only is it dreary to have long speeches - and I hope I do not offend in that regard - but I think even more important is that in this House we have people with a great deal of expertise on both sides, the people from various walks of life, people who can add a lot to the House, and if these people are prevented from speaking by other people unduly occupying the time of the House, I think it is most unfortunate.

The press have been taken to task sometimes for not reporting what



DR. COLLINS:

goes on in the House. This of course does get back to the quality of debate here. I think if we did have better quality of debate, I think we would find the press paying more attention. I do not think the press is above complaint. I think the press many times tend to sensationalize, they tend to editorialize when they should be giving the facts. They tend to let personal bias get in the way, and this diminishes the quality of their reporting. But the House certainly could help if it would undertake some reform such as the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) brought forward. If not that precise reform at least some reform of the rules with the same objective in mind.

Mr. Speaker, if I may make a few comments on health. I feel I should do this and that I have some reason to speak about health as I have been in the health field throughout my adult life, some twenty-five years in practice in the Province. The concerns of health of course are, by and large, two: One, the supply of health services where they are needed. And the second concern is that there should be efficiency in the system. That is proper use and proper economic use of the system.

Now it is not my intention in any way at this time to present a plan for ensuring that supply of services is

DR. COLLINS: there or that services are efficiently given, that would require a great deal of study, a great deal of debate and there are people who have more to say, more right to say things on this than I. But I would like to make a few comments particularly in terms of costs. Now when one hears of costs in terms of health one tends to think nowadays of MCP and MCP is a very costly mechanism. I think it is an unnecessarily costly mechanism personally, but it has to be put in its proper perspective.

MCP in the last year available to us cost this Province \$28 million. A lot of it came from the federal source, but nevertheless the total cost was \$28 million. Whether that was all well spent or not I would not be prepared to argue at this point in time. I am sure it was not. You cannot spend \$28 million and have every cent of it well spent. But the point I would like to make is that this compares to a total outlay in health in this Province of \$180 million, approximately \$160 million on current account and \$20 million on capital account, in the same year, so that MCP makes up about fourteen or fifteen per cent of the total health outlay.

MCP of course, because it makes up a relatively small portion of the total outlay cannot be neglected. We certainly have to make sure that monies expended on the medical care programme are spent well. But I think we would be deluded if we concentrated all our attention on MCP because the bulk of the cost of health care is in the other area, that is the area of health and diagnostic services, administration and various programmes.

Now these other areas, there is no doubt about it, they are carefully budgeted. There is no quarrel in that regard. The people responsible for expending monies in hospitals, monies in laboratories, expending monies on a TB programme and so on and so forth, these people do consider budgeting very carefully.

DR. COLLINS: The problem arises not so much in the budgeting but in the utilization.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. member permit a question?

DR. COLLINS: Surely.

MR. NEARY: Does the member know if there is any large amounts of money now being spent on upgrading the General Hospital? Spending money for painting and renovating and new equipment and so forth at the General Hospital when in a short time the Health Science Complex over here will be opened. Does the member think that is wise budgeting?

DR. COLLINS: I am afraid I do not have any precise knowledge in that area. I would be surprised if there is not some money spent in maintenance and perhaps even upgrading of the General Hospital because it is a facility that certainly should not be allowed to go to waste. But I would not be in a position to say how much or whether it was justified or what.

The utilization of the hospital and diagnostic services is a matter of great concern and I think it is not well controlled. Now this is not something that only applies to Newfoundland. It applies throughout Canada and it might even apply throughout the world. But because it is a widespread problem does not mean that something should not be done about it where possible.

If I may just use some very small examples to show what I mean: There is now a tendency to expand hospital out-patient services. Now on the face of it this seems to be a very good idea, but what I am concerned about in terms of cost is, which is more effective and which is more economical, to have a patient seen in an out-patient facility or a patient seen in a doctor's office?

I do not believe that there has been enough consideration given to the costs and to the results obtained when we direct medical services in one direction or the other and that is one in particular.

The same way we do evolve programmes to deal with certain



DR. COLLINS: health concerns, be they mental health, be they maternity services, be they infectious diseases, various programmes, and I am not convinced that these programmes are well monitored, that they are well reported, that we are ensured we get the value for our money. The cost benefit is something that tends to be neglected. They are begun with the best intentions in mind, but the effects of the programme, the results, the beneficial effects of the programme are often not studied in the detail they should. And I think that when they are not studied like that very often you do get into the area of unnecessary cost.

Now health services can be broken down another way as opposed to MCP and hospital diagnostic. They can be broken down into the service type of health care, educational type of health care and research health care. Now these are really three separate entities, and in my view I think they should be kept separate from one another in terms of cost accounting also because it is very easy for one to unduly take over the monies that should be spent for another. In education, that is in the area of educational health personnel, be they doctors, nurses ancillary personnel, this is a very costly business. Academic medicine compared to what we ordinarily look upon as service medicine is several times more costly. Our medical school is a very, very costly institution. I do not think we know the cost of our medical school as yet. In the estimates it is given as \$5 million and that is a vote given to the medical school. But the medical school also gives rise to many other costs that are not easily seen, that are - I will not say hidden, it is not the right word to use - but they are not apparent in the other costs of health services. The medical school has a very legitimate role to play, but I do not think the Province is well served if medical school costs distort the whole venue of health care in this Province.

Similarly research; research can be a bottomless pit. I do not know if the Newfoundland Government intends to be into research, but it is very easy to slip over into research or have monies allotted for health services to be expended for research. I bring to your attention

DR. COLLINS:

the remark of the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Janeway Hospital recently when he was speaking to the Rotary Club. He made the point that he would like to see the hospital expanded because there is a great deal of research that should be engaged upon. Now there is no doubt about it, I think that research where it can be funded should be engaged upon, But I think that is would be a misuse of health funds if funds that were apparently voted for service care were expended on research matters. Research funds should by and large come from other sources rather than from provincial sources.

The final way I put forward that health care should be looked upon, is from a central as opposed to a regional point of view. I think that this is a matter that will find interest with many of the members of this House. There is a tendency for all things to centralize and health care is not the least of these. There is no doubt about it that there are justifiable cases that can be put forward for centralizing certain services. But it is very easy to overstep this limit and I think that in some regard we have overstepped this limit now. I think that there are many areas of this Province which should have their health services expanded and not have any expansion that are needed by the people in this area take place in the St. John's area. I think the St. John's area

Dr. Collins.

because of the bulk of the population here will always have to supply a certain amount of base services to the Province. But the regions need development so that they can get into more and more sophisticated areas of health care. And I would not like to see the trend go on where the regional areas of the Province are kept at a relatively low or even primitive level of health care while the St. John's area is expanded and made to emulate large centres elsewhere. I do not think the health care of the whole Province is well served by citing everything in St. John's and only the minimum in the regional areas of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other areas that I would like to comment on outside the health area, although this is one that I have a particular interest in. I was struck a little while ago when I read in one of our newspapers a comment by the President of the Newfoundland Fishermen Food and Allied Workers, when he was attending a meeting in Ottawa. And it might be presumptuous for me to talk about anything with regard to fisheries, but I feel that all members of this hon. House do have a responsibility of speaking up where they see some area that needs to be commented on. And the particular point here was that the gentleman in question seemed to indicate he was turning away from co-operation with the provincial government in the matter of fishery development and specifically in the matter of joint ventures, turning away from co-operation, and turning towards one of confrontation. In the same report there was, and I would like to quote it, there was a colleague from New Brunswick who said, "The solution is not to consult with government, but to confront it." Now I think that every right thinking person in this Province, if we are to get the benefits that come from the 200 mile limit, will seek co-operation between the trade, between government, between plant workers, between fishermen. We do not want to see battle lines drawn. There will not be the maximum benefits brought to this Province if battle lines are drawn in this matter. We will only get the full benefits, and it is



Dr. Collins.

not even certain that we will get the full benefits even if there is co-operation on all sides, but certainly it would be most unfortunate if confrontation was the order of the day and not co-operation. And I would hope that the fishermen of this Province will not support any form of leadership which will bring them as a routine matter, into confrontation with the government, but will seek to have the unions co-operate as fully as they can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, first of all do I understand that we are to interrupt our regular proceedings about 5:50 P.M.? Is that still the understanding?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

MR. RIDEOUT: Not that I know of.

MR. SIMMONS: If someone could indicate that to me I would know whether to get into the substance of my remarks?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, that is still so.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, that is still so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): Order!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that other events are to take place about 5:50 P.M. so I shall restrain myself from getting into the substance of my remarks today. I do want though, Mr. Speaker, at the very outset to offer some words of congratulations

Mr. Simmons:

as 'is not only in order, but as in this case I would very much like to do, I would first want to congratulate the member from Exploits (Dr. Twomey). I believe his, Mr. Speaker, was a classic maiden speech, the kind which perhaps could well become the model for those who follow him in moving and seconding the Address in Reply in future sessions of the Thirty-Seventh General Assembly, and indeed future General Assemblies.

I particularly welcome him to the House as a man who has had a tremendous impact for good on the community life of Central Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: I spent fifteen years as a resident of Bishop's Falls and I came to know the very high esteem in which the member from Exploits has held as a medical doctor. Indeed six of my brothers and sisters were brought into the world under his direct supervision and his expert care. Perhaps some would suggest that I should have been as well.

Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for men such as the member for Exploits, and my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and others who came from other parts of the world to cast their lot in with ours, and more than that, to make their very positive contribution to our common endeavour.

I congratulate also the member from Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) who is not in his seat at the moment, but I nevertheless would offer him my congratulations on his election and on his having made his maiden speech. I think it would be an understatement to say that his maiden speech was not the most non-partisan speech we have heard in these Chambers. He meant well. He was obviously ill-advised by those of his colleagues who have either forgotten or have never understood, never realized that time honoured tradition dictates a much less rancorous address on opening day than we heard from the lips of the member for Bonavista North. Notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, we do heartedly welcome him to the fray. And we

Mr. Simmons:

express the fond hope that we shall see displayed in this House the same gentler side of his nature that is so evident to us in private conversation with him, the same gentle side of his nature that was evident Saturday night when we were all privileged to be at Lewisporte playing in that great hockey game.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, the MHA Humbugs have played three times. They lost decisively at the stadium. That game is still under dispute - now three times in this particular year - lost decisively at the stadium, the coach was the member from St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy), lost decisively at Harbour Grace, the coach was the member from St. John's Centre, won decisively at Lewisporte with no coach.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Young): Order, please! I would like for the hon. member not to cast any reflections on the Chair because I -

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for protecting my reputation.

MR. SPEAKER (Young): I was upholding Harbour Grace.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I believe on behalf of the team I should be thanking the present occupant of the Chair for his very fine hospitality at Harbour Grace.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I also want to offer my congratulations to the member from Ferryland (Mr. O'Brien). He is not in his seat at the moment, but I listened with great interest to his speech a few days ago, and he displayed the kind of knowledge that we have come to accept from him in Caucus, a very inimitate knowledge of the fishery, and a very real knowledge of the problems of rural Newfoundland. And it is a real delight to have that kind of a person, not only in Caucus, but as a contributor to the debate in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I listened also with great interest to the member from St. John's South (Dr. Collins) this afternoon,



Mr. Simmons:

and while he was in a very congratulatory mood, and he did all the right things, he did commit, Mr. Speaker, a very serious sin of omission.

---

MR. SIMMONS: He pointed out at great length that the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) was the member for a district in which he resided in part. I did not quite grasp where the other part was residing, But apart from that he overlooked congratulating me for being one of his constituents and I count that, Mr. Speaker, a distinct -

MR. MURPHY: Why put in the sordid details?

MR. SIMMONS: - I count that a distinct honour, Mr. Speaker, to be in the district of the member for St. John's South. Needless to say he offended one of the voters but he will have time to make amends, Mr. Speaker, Indeed his hockey skills as displayed in Lewisporte more than make up for any omission he might have committed here this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, it being nearly ten to six I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. HICKMAN: I move the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): It is adjourned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: / Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, by gracious leave of the House and the co-operation of the members of the Opposition, I have at this time the privilege of making an announcement I think of some significance.

I <sup>will</sup> state that the Premier of Alberta and our own Premier, Premier Moores are making simultaneous announcements. Theirs will be in somewhat more detail. The fact of the matter is, Sir, that the Province of Newfoundland has successfully negotiated a \$50 million private placement for twenty-one years with the Province of Alberta. The debentures are to carry an annual sinking fund rate of two per cent with an interest rate of ten per cent, priced at a discount. The reason why, Sir, I ask permission of the House to make this announcement at this particular time is because it coincides with Premier Laugheed's comments in his own House of Assembly and the time difference is such that he asked us not to announce it until he had an opportunity to speak first.

MR. DOODY: I might say, Sir, that this issue marks the first long-term financing undertaken by the Alberta Heritage Savings trust funds outside the Province of Alberta. As is well known to hon. members the earnings or the revenues accruing to the Province of Alberta have been deposited in a Heritage Savings Trust Fund for the use of the people of Alberta during the past few years and that fund has grown to such an extent now that the Government of Alberta has decided to get involved in some outside financing.

The spirit and intent of this financing, Sir, I think is a major step forward in inter-provincial fiscal co-operation and is of a major benefit to Confederation during this difficult period of Canada's development.

The private placement proceeds will be for general government revenues and will form a portion of the Province's capital market requirements for the fiscal year beginning April 1 in 1977-78. The Province, as I have said had earlier completed its 1976-77 borrowing programme.

I think, Sir, that all Canada, certainly all the people of this Province welcome this gesture by the Government of Alberta. It is indeed encouraging to see the people of Alberta investing the wealth that has been developed in their Province for the benefit of the people of the rest of Canada, just as we here in Newfoundland during the next few years, as our resources become developed, we will be in a position to pass these benefits back along to the people of Canada.

MR. NEARY: We are paying it anyway.

MR. DOODY: I should say that this is not an unusual placement in terms of the interest rate or of the term. It is a good rate, ten per cent over twenty-one years with a two per cent sinking fund. It is though indicative of the fact that there are people in Canada and governments in Canada who have the benefit

MR. DOODY: of the whole of Canada at heart and are willing to invest in the future of the whole of Canada and I think that this was the spirit into which this Province entered Confederation and I think that that is the spirit that we would like to see Confederation carry on. And so I am quite pleased to make the announcement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps before the hon. minister makes his motion I would give a decision on the



MR. SPEAKER:

matters of privilege brought up earlier today by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). And after doing that I would like to draw hon. members' attention to a ruling in the House of Commons which I think is relevant to this afternoon's procedures which we can bear in mind if and when similar occurrences develop.

The hon. gentleman rose on two points of privilege. One after hearing I decided and now repeat the decision, in that it referred to something which transpired on February 2 and the criterion of earliest possible opportunity was not met. In the first matter of privilege brought up by the hon. gentleman it is, in my opinion, essentially a difference of opinion between the hon. member for Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) and the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) as to what the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) said on opening day.

Now it is in Hansard what he said and what he said is what he alleges he said, what he this afternoon said he said. But the effect of it is a difference of opinion as to what he said. I do not see that there is a prima facie case for breach of privilege.

Now I would draw hon. members' attention if they would bear with me for a few moments, to a decision in the Canadian House of Commons January 27, 1971 and the procedure and complexity and interruptions and perhaps unnecessary complexities were somewhat similar there. I would like to read what happened and then inform the House what our procedures should be, and that the rather confusing situation that developed this afternoon should not be regarded as a precedent.

Mr. Lang rose on a question of privilege relating to something said by the then hon. member for Gander-Twillingate who is presently a member of this legislature. There were interruptions from various sides. The Speaker, "Order, please!" Perhaps the hon. member would agree that the Chair should listen to what the question of privilege is about. It is difficult for the Chair to determine whether there is a real question of privilege until there has been at least a brief statement to indicate what it is about." There are a few more interruptions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, "The Chair has recognized the minister on a question of privilege. I will see the hon. member on his point of order in a moment." That was somebody endeavouring to interject on a point of order. So in effect he said there, the Speaker said that he would not hear a point of order. However just a short while after a point of order was made and he appeared to rule on it, then goes on to say when another hon. member gets up on an intervening matter of privilege, "If the hon. member seeks the floor on a question of privilege I must then point out to them that there cannot be two questions of privilege at the same time."

In my opinion it is clear although the procedure here has certain complexities and confusing attributes because of interruptions from both sides. But certainly the line of procedure that the Speaker in this instance was endeavouring to put forward was that when a matter of privilege comes up that it should be stated briefly and that there should not be interruptions, that any points of order should in fact wait until after the brief statement as to privilege. That is the line of thought he developed. It is not what actually happened. What happened resembles more what happened here this afternoon. As I say this afternoon's procedure should not be regarded as a precedent. number one. Until I asked the hon. gentleman to deal with one at a time there were two matters sort of, at one time which made it more difficult for all hon. members. There were interruptions. Perhaps the statement was not as brief as it should have been although when there are interruptions I realize it is difficult to keep one's statement brief.

Also certainly the theory is that there should not be interruptions on a point of order while a point of privilege is being made although I have to add that in practice that has not always been observed. But certainly it appears to be what should be observed. So henceforth I think it would be preferable for all hon. members if we keep our procedure straight on this, one point of privilege at a time stated simply or as briefly as possible and that there should not be

MR. SPEAKER:

interruptions during that statement and any points of order or other points of privilege should wait until the hon. member making his submission has been heard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, obviously the House of Commons are not nearly as well behaved as this legislature. I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at three of the clock and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at three of the clock. Those in favour "Aye". Contrary "Nay". Carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

February 21 and 28, 1977



---

In answer to an oral question asked the Minister of Social Services by the M.H.A. for Carbonear.

FEB 1 1977

The Department of Social Services appointed five Regional Special Projects Officers in 1974. The sole function of these officers is to find or create employment opportunities for recipients of Social Assistance. During their first year they worked through private employers and public job creation programs. During the past year funds were allocated to the Department for direct job creation itself. This required the Special Projects Officers to consult with the people in communities with high Social Assistance caseloads because of unemployment, with a view to determining which needs could be met by community projects. This has been going on for two years and the Department has no shortage of ideas for projects. Many of the projects recently announced were actually designed months ago. There are many others on the drawing board if sufficient funds were available to implement them.

In summary, the criterion used for developing projects is the need of the community as identified by the Special Projects Officers through consultation with the people of the community.

---

---

FEB 21 1977

Answer to Question #92, February 10/77.

Mr. Neary (LaPoile)- To ask the Honourable the Minister of Social Services to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

1. Give the locations, places and the type of employment of the 5,000 chronic welfare recipients who were removed from Social Welfare to productive employment during the years 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975 and 1976.
2. Indicate how many of these jobs were on Local Initiative Projects or other Federal sponsored projects.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Division of Employment Opportunities

Table A

Regions					Total	
July 1972 to March 1973	St. John's				147	
	Western				70	
	Other regions				80	
	Total				297	
April 1973 to March 1974	St. John's				458	
	Western				192	
	Other regions				465	
	Total				1,115	
Breakdown by type of employment or training and complete regional basis not compiled until April 1974						
Regions		Permanent Employment	Temporary Employment	Upgrading or Vocational Training		
April 1974 to March 1975	St. John's	312	132	36		
	Eastern	129	315	6		
	Central	86	234	20		
	Western	109	233	47		
	Labrador	0	21	4		
Total		636	935	113	1,684	
April 1975 to March 1976	St. John's	174	97	32		
	Eastern	127	172	40		
	Central	41	346	26		
	Western	31	191	37		
	Labrador	5	18	3		
Total		378	824	138	1,340	
April 1976 to Dec. 1976	St. John's	100	32	23		
	Eastern	73	121	23		
	Central	7	37	7		
	Western	22	170	35		
	Labrador	11	30	3		
Total		213	390	91	694	
Grand Total					5,130	

Table B

Regions	1974-75	1975-76
St. John's	213	153
Eastern	267	160
Central	108	67
Western	110	296
Labrador	108	118
Total	806	794

Table A shows the cases moved from the Social Assistance caseload into employment or training primarily through the Department's involvement in finding or creating the opportunities or motivating the clients to accept them or both.

Table B shows the number of Social Assistance recipients who obtained temporary employment on Local Initiatives Projects. Most of them are not included in Table A. The figures for the current year are not yet available.

FEB 28 1977

Question #6 on Order Paper 2-77 Dated February 8, 1977

Mr. Callan (Bellevue) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Rural Development to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

QUESTION (1) The grants and/or loans which were made available to individuals or groups.

ANSWER Grants and loans made during the Calendar year 1976, since last reporting to the House are: -

Incentive Grants to Small Industry	72	\$ 714,893.00
Rural Development Authority Loans	114	1,489,850.00
Community Projects	37	473,259.00

QUESTION (2) The areas of the Province in which these grants or loans were made and for what purposes.

ANSWER

Incentive Grants

<u>AREA</u>		<u>PURPOSE</u>	
Western Region	18	Agriculture	2
Central	16	Construction	2
Eastern "	38	Forestry	2
		Manufact.	<u>59</u>
	<u>72</u>		<u>72</u>

Rural Development Authority Loans

<u>AREA</u>		<u>PURPOSE</u>	
Western Region	24	Agriculture	9
Central "	24	Community, Business & Personal	
Eastern	<u>66</u>	Servicing	24
	<u>114</u>	Forestry	6
		Manufacturing	74
		Transportation	<u>1</u>
			<u>114</u>

Community Projects

<u>AREA</u>		<u>PURPOSE</u>	
Western Region	15	Community projects viz, trout farming,	
Central	16	wool carding mill,	
Eastern	<u>4</u>	handcrafts, etc.	
	<u>35</u>		



FEB 28 1977

Question # 19 on Order Paper #2 Dated February 8, 1977

Mr. Rowe (Trinity-Bay de Verde) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Rural Development to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

**Question:** The status of a resource loan bank to be established as promised in the Throne Speech of 1972.

**ANSWER:** The 1972 Throne Speech did not indicate responsibility for introducing Legislation establishing a resource loan bank would be that of the Minister of Rural Development.

Question # 28 on Offer Paper #2 Dated February 8, 1977

Mr. Strachan (Eagle River) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Question (1) The name or names of the companies from who aircraft were chartered by the Special Advisor to the Minister during 1976 while travelling the Labrador Coast.

Answer: Universal Helicopters  
Gander Aviation  
Labrador Airways

Question (2) The cost of chartering the aircraft from each of the companies.

Answer	Universal Helicopters	\$ 615.40
	Gander Aviation	5,294.48
	Labrador Airways	15.00

Question (3) The name or names of the companies or private individual from who aircraft were leased by the Department for the purpose of transporting the Special Advisor to the Minister

Answer: Northern Builders & Contractors.

Question (4) Whether or not public tenders were called asking for the leasing of the aircraft.

Answer No.

Question (5) The total cost of leasing the aircraft.

Answer: \$3,000.00

Question (6) The total cost of the pilots salary and expenses including the Division or Department of Government which paid the pilots salary and expenses.

Answer: \$3,085.30. Department of Transportation & Communications

Question (7) Was the aircraft leased by MOT inspected and approved under the regulations for the leasing of aircraft.

Answer: Question is not understood.

QUESTION NO. 1

The prices paid to his Department for the different sizes of frozen Arctic Char processed at the Department's plants in Northern Labrador 1976.

ANSWER NO. 1

#1	2- 5 lbs.	@	.55
#2	2- 5 lbs.	@	.45
#1	5-10 lbs.	@	.75
#2	5-10 lbs.	@	.65
#1	Over 10 lbs.	@	1.00
#2	Over 10 lbs.	@	.90

FEB 28 1977

QUESTION NO. 2

The prices paid to his Department for different grades and sizes of frozen salmon processed at the Department's plants in Northern Labrador in 1976.

ANSWER NO. 2

#1	under 6 lbs.	@	1.20
#2	under 6 lbs.	@	.90
#1	6- 8 lbs.	@	1.60
#2	6- 8 lbs.	@	1.20
#1	8-10 lbs.	@	1.90
#2	8-10 lbs.	@	1.50
#1	10-12 lbs.	@	2.40
#2	10-12 lbs.	@	1.80
#1	12-14 lbs.	@	2.60
#2	12-14 lbs.	@	1.90
#1	over 14 lbs.	@	2.60
#2	over 14 lbs.	@	1.90

QUESTION NO. 3

The profit it made or the loss incurred by the fish plants at Nain and Makkovik for each of the operating seasons 1975 and 1976.

ANSWER NO. 3

Operating Deficit 1975	Nain	\$ 78,000
	Makkovik	\$115,000
Operating Deficit 1976	Nain	(Total figures not yet available)
	Makkovik	
Estimates Only	Nain	\$35,000
	Makkovik	\$32,000

QUESTION NO. 4

The capital investment of the Labrador Services Division in vessels used for fish collection during the years 1974, 1975, 1976.

ANSWER NO. 4

- 1974 Purchase of "O'derin" \$25,000 plus refit \$10,000  
Total cost \$35,000 plus refit of other longliners approximately \$5,000 Total \$40,000
- 1975 Refit costs for all longliner collectors \$25,000.00.
- 1976 Refit of 6 longliners and construction costs of MV Turnavik \$140,000.

QUESTION NO. 5

The quantity of fish collected by the collection boats for each of the fish plants of Nain and Makkovik, during each of the years 1974, 1975, and 1976, the total cost of collecting that quantity of fish at each of the plants including depreciation of equipment, crews salaries, all operating costs and cost of repairs for the fishing seasons 1974, 1975, and 1976.

ANSWER NO. 5

Approximate quantities of fish collected includes Salmon and Arctic Char.

Nain	Makkovik
1974 - 165,000 lbs.	1974 - 40,000 lbs.
1975 - 145,000 lbs.	1975 - 55,000 lbs.
1976 - 170,000 lbs.	1976 - 110,000 lbs.

Costs of collecting their fish

Nain	Makkovik
1974 - \$121,868	1974 - \$114,042
1975 - \$140,281	1975 - \$140,916
1976 - \$151,356	1976 - \$156,292



Order Paper ~ 2/77 ~ Question 41

Honourable A. J. Murphy

M.H.A. (LEWISPORTE)

FEB 28 1977

Date	Destination	Mode of Transport	Cost \$
<u>1975</u>			
June 10-12	Gander, Grand Falls, Wesleyville & Fogo	EPA & car	148.50
27-28	Grand Falls	car	97.12
July 7-11	St. Anthony, Englee, Woody Pt., Port Saunders, Stephenville, Stephenville Crossing, Corner Brook & Deer Lake	EPA & car	330.00
Aug. 29 - May 2	Ottawa	AC	472.87
July 4	Gander		80.00
July 18-21	New Brunswick	EPA	213.00
Sept. 24-26	Prince Edward Island	EPA	338.00
Oct. 24-28	Grand Falls & Corner Brook	EPA & car	268.20
Nov. 30- Dec. 2	Ottawa	AC	366.00
<u>1976</u>			
Jan. 15-24	Ottawa, Toronto, Oakville, Hamilton, Niagara.	AC	882.50
Feb. 14-17	Toronto	AC	486.92
Feb. 23-25	Moncton	EPA	316.00

---

The following information is supplied by the Honourable the Minister of Industrial Development in reply to Question #46 asked by Mr. F. White (Lewisporte) as appearing on the Order Paper of February 8, 1977.

Q. The number of out of St. John's Trips taken within the fiscal year 1975-76 which were paid for by the Provincial Government, the destination of each, mode of transportation used, and cost of each trip taken.

A. Number of trips - one (1)

Destination - various European countries

Mode of Transport - commercial airline

Cost - \$3,287.80

FEB 28 1977

---

---

51. Capt. Winsor (Fogo): To ask the Minister of Fisheries to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) As of March 1- 1975 what is the total value of amounts due, payable and outstanding to Government in respect of loans issued by the Fisheries Loan Board?
- (2) What is the total number of loans issued by the Fisheries Loan Board in respect of which payments were due, payable and outstanding to the Government as of March 1, 1975?

ANSWER

(1) \$8,884,656.37

(2) \$1,965

FEB 28 1977

---

59. F. Rowe (Trinity-Bay de Verde) to ask the Honourable The Minister of Fisheries to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What happened to the Government's commitment in the Throne Speech of 1972 to embark immediately upon a program to encourage the establishment of additional advanced reprocessing fish facilities in the Province?

ANSWER

A Market Research and Product Development Branch was established within the Department of Fisheries during 1973. The Branch staff work directly with many of the smaller processors in the Province to encourage expansion or establishment of secondary processing facilities through technical assistance in developing of products and laying out processing lines, demonstration of new equipment, assistance in acquiring new equipment, assistance in marketing, and limited financial assistance to encourage various private initiatives in secondary processing.

FEB 28 1977



61. F. Rowe (Trinity-Bay De Verde) to ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

. What is the status of a new program to provide better assistance to inshore fishermen in obtaining boats, gear and equipment, as stated in the Throne Speech of 1972?

ANSWER

Loans

Down payment on loans reduced as follows:

Used boats from 25% to 15%

Engines 25% to 15%

Electronic gear 25% to 15%

Other equipment 25% to 15%

Loans provided for conversion of fishing vessels

Leasing Program

Small boat Bounty

From \$10.00 per foot	25 ft. to 30 ft.
From 12.50 per foot	30 ft to 35 ft.
To 35% cost of hull	20 ft. to 35 ft.

On 31 foot boat, this means an increase from \$497.50 to \$1,225.00.

On boats 20 -25 ft. increase of approximately \$700.00 on the average.

33. Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House the following information:

- (1) What contracts either oral or written were awarded to Viking Helicopters Limited by various Government Department during the years 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975 and 1976?
- (2) List details of all work or services provided by Department and the cost of each individual project.
- (3) Were public tenders called for any of this work, and if so, did the lowest bidder get the job?

ANSWER

(1), (2), and (3): None

FEB 28 1977

The following information is supplied by the Honourable the Minister of Industrial Development in reply to Question #85 asked by Mr. S. Neary (LaPoile) as appearing on the Order Paper of February 9, 1977.

- Q. (1) What contracts either oral or written were awarded to Viking Helicopters Limited by various Government Departments during the years 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975 and 1976?
- (2) List details of all work or services provided by Department and the cost of each individual project.
- (3) Were public tenders called for any of this work, and if so, did the lowest bidder get the job?
- A. No contracts, either oral or written, have ever been awarded by the Department of Industrial Development to Viking Helicopters Limited or any other Helicopter company.

FEB 28 1977

Question #87 on Order Paper #3/77 dated Wednesday, February 9/77

Mr. Neary (La Poile) - to ask the Honourable Minister of Rural Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

- (1) What contracts either oral or written were awarded to Viking Helicopters Limited by various Government Departments during the years 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975 and 1976?

ANSWER: No contracts either oral or written were entered into by the Department of Rural Development with Viking Helicopters during the periods listed.

- (2) List details of all work or services provided by Department and the cost of each individual project.

ANSWER: Nil.

- (3) Were public tenders called for any of this work, and if so, did the lowest bidder get the job?

ANSWER: Nil.

FEB 28 1977



The following information is supplied by the Honourable the Minister of Industrial Development in reply to Question #94 asked by Mr. S. Neary (LaPoile) as appearing on the Order Paper of February 10, 1977.

Q. 1. All contracts and agreements involving the construction of tug boats at the Marystown Shipyards for Norway.

2. Amount of (a) Federal subsidies (b) Provincial subsidies (show separately amounts of subsidy per tug).

A. 1.

2. (a) Federal subsidy: Under the Shipbuilding Industry Assistance Program (SIAP) of the Department of Industry Trade and Commerce a subsidy of 13 per cent is provided on all vessels (over 100 gross tons) constructed in Canadian yards. This subsidy is applicable to the tugs being constructed at Marystown and will amount to approximately \$3,055,000.

(b) No Provincial Subsidy is involved.

FEB 25 1977

Question #127 on Order Paper 10-77 Dated February 18, 1977

Mr. Neary (La Poile) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Rural Development to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

QUESTION (1) How many families have been assisted in re-settling from one community to another since January 1, 1976?

ANSWER 43

QUESTION (2) What is the total cost of this program since January 1, 1976 (broken down monthly) to date?

ANSWER \$183,449.26

FEB 28 1977

Question #127 on Order Paper 10-77 Dated February '18, 1977

Mr. Neary (La Poile) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Rural Development to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

QUESTION (1) How many families have been assisted in re-settling from one community to another since January 1, 1976?

ANSWER 43

QUESTION (2) What is the total cost of this program since January 1, 1976 (broken down monthly) to date?

ANSWER \$183,449.26

FEB 28 1977

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 159 ON ORDER PAPER DATED MONDAY, 28TH  
DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1977 ASKED BY MR. STEPHEN NEARY (LAPOILE)  
TO THE HONOURABLE T. ALEX HICKMAN, MINISTER OF JUSTICE

- (1) The total cost of the Snowden Royal Commission on  
Labrador for the period April 1st, 1973 (the date the  
Department of Justice was given jurisdiction for Royal  
Commissions) to completion, is \$268,288.58.

The answer to Parts (2) and (3) of the Question are on  
the attached sheets.

FEB 28 1977



SNOWDEN ROYAL COMMISSION - LABRADOR

74/75

VO #	NAME	SALARIES & WAGES	EXPENSES	RENUMERATION
241	MUN - salaries	\$28352.02		
898	Nfld. Telephone Co.		\$ 9.99	
1092	Nfld. Telephone Co.		81.67	
1280	National Office		81.00	
1275	I.B.M.		725.65	
1270	Dicks & Co.		20.92	
1281	Office Mac. Ltd.		10.80	
1266	Bugdons' Taxi		36.00	
1277	Labrador Airways		46.00	
JV 34	John Carter - Travel		239.00	
JV 85	S. Pelley	146.18		
	F. Warren	160.00		
JV 104	Petty Cash(clear)		1173.37	
		<u>\$28352.02</u>	<u>\$2424.20</u>	

Salaries &amp; Wages = \$28352.02

Expenses = \$2424.20  
\$31282.40

SNOWDEN ROYAL COMMISSION - LABRADOR

73/74

VO #	NAME	SALARIES & WAGES	EXPENSES	RENUMERATION
73	Donald Snowden - Travel		\$296.00	
73	John Carter	\$1000.00		
	R. Snell	712.50		
	J. Wall	400.00		
	D. Wood	400.00		
73	115	E. Basha	32.50	
		B. Feltham	20.00	
		J. Jacobs	18.75	
		J. Pelley	40.50	
	118	A. Dorom	57.50	
	119	Happy Valley - P. Cash.	300.00	
73	149	H. M. Budgell - Travelling	691.62	
	150	L. Jackson - Travel	157.97	
	151	D. Snowden - Travel	241.00	
	152	E. Basha	37.50	
		B. Feltham	37.50	
		J. Jacobs	16.25	
		C. Costello	15.00	
		J. Pelley	48.00	
	154	J. Carter - Travel	57.00	
	155	E. Harris - Travel	56.98	
	156	P. Karasek - Travel	17.64	
	157	Happy Valley - P. Cash.	217.50	
	158	W. Sanders - Travel	242.46	
	159	R. Snell - Travel	262.50	
	167	Dr. A.B. Cammast - P. calls-	45.11	
	168	Fees -		\$1250.00
	169	Cyril Goodyear - Travel	643.75	

VO #	NAME	SALARIES & WAGES	EXPENSES	RENUMERATION
170	Faculty of Eng. MUN - Pl. Calls		\$ 14.90	
171	A. J. Rendal - Travel		141.12	
172	St. John's - P. Cash		153.83	
173	Winston White - Cons. Fee.			\$ 350.00
189	R. Donovan	\$ 47.50		
	J. Walsh	70.00		
	L. Sullivan	70.00		
	M. Haley	70.00		
190	B. Buist	375.00		
191	O. Culbourn - Research	544.00		
192	A. Doran - Typing	30.00		
193	Finance Adj. Bank Charges		5.75	
194	F. Hottash - Travel		871.62	
195	Dr. J. A. Hildes - Travel		401.29	
196	L. Hopkins		110.00	
197	J. Huddy	240.00		
198	B. Keough	600.00		
		<u>4825.50</u>	<u>4927.96</u>	<u>1600.00</u>
199	Dr. S. McCurdy - Travel		372.50	
200	Happy Valley - P. Cash		33.00	
201	R. Snell - Travel		600.42	
202	Ed. Watton	240.00		
J.V. 10	Naomi Griffin		509.43	
211	C. Costello	17.50		
	B. Feltham	20.00		
	E. Basha	20.00		
	J. Pelly	20.00		
	M. White	80.00		

VO #	NAME	SALARIES & WAGES	EXPENSES	RENUMERATION
	R. Snell	\$ 712.50		
	D. Wood	400.00		
	J. Wall	400.00		
	J. Carter	1000.00		
221	J. Carter - Travel		\$ 129.34	
133	MUN Research - Dr. Colbourne	544.00		
131	Petty Cash		239.39	
JV 11	O. Colbourne - Travel		481.63	
223	J. Best - Board. - Travel		148.50	
224	E.P.A. - Travel		1624.00	
225	Cyril Goodyear - Travel		129.00	
226	Harvey's Travel		610.00	
227	L. Jackson - Travel		21.65	
228	Labrador Airways		1496.00	
229	LeGrows Travel		2862.00	
230	B. Snell - Travel		214.00	
231	D. Snowden - Travel		118.00	
232	Winston White - Travel		109.02	
254	D. Snowden - Travel		45.89	
256	E. Basha	45.00		
	B. Feltham	47.50		
	C. Costello	37.50		
	J. Pelley	57.00		
257	H.M. Budgell - Travel		345.00	
258	Business Services - Rent		1483.15	
259	A. Doran - Typing	28.75		
260	Gary & Goodland		54.29	
262	MUN. Salaries etc.	1679.36		



VO #	NAME	SALARIES & WAGES	EXPENSES	RENUMERATION
263	Sherdon McCurdy - Travel		\$ 1000.29	
264	Labrador P. Cash		431.79	
265	M. White - Typing	\$ 100.00		
389	Assoc. Video Sys. Recording S.		4334.90	
390	Atlantic Films - Tapes		63.56	
391	Bell Canada - Telephones F.M.A.		1281.96	
392	Budgens Taxi - Travel		9.50	
		<u>5449.11</u>	<u>18748.01</u>	
393	Can. Assoc. Native Peo. (BKS)		\$ 25.52	
394	Carlton Towers - Rooms		245.40	
395	John Carter - Travel (car)		98.28	
396	Churchill Falls - Lab. Corp. - Board. Stiles		72.00	
397	Churchill Falls Inn - Board.White		40.64	
398	City Motors - Car Hire - Travel		145.24	
399	Daily News - Ads.		216.00	
400	Dicks & Co. (Stationery)		113.42	
401	A. Doran - Typing	32.50		
402	E.P.A. Plane Fares		749.00	
403	Evening Telegram Ads.		250.00	
404	Gander Aviation Fares		144.00	
405	Glynmill Inn		36.92	
406	Hickman Leasing		18.68	
407	Hillcrest Rent- A-Car		62.54	
408	Holiday Inn		41.26	
409	Hotel Goose		260.20	

VO #	NAME	SALARIES & WAGES	EXPENSES	RENUMERATION
410	Hotel Nfld.		\$ 12.40	
411	I.B.M. -ribbons		25.26	
412	Labrador Leasing		80.00	
413	Labrador Linerboard		48.00	
414	Sam Metcalf - Interpreter	\$ 50.00		
415	National Office		105.00	
416	Nfld. Air Trans.		70.00	
417	"		154.00	
418	Rec. Gen. Canada (books)		6.50	
419	Judy Roberts	53.51		
420	Robinson Blackmore		11.00	
421	Shearton Mt. Royal Hotel		57.28	
422	Donald Snowden - Travel		144.09	
423	Tulisman Motor Inn		90.93	
424	Tilden Rent a Car.		71.96	
425	Travellor's Inn		66.66	
426	University of Manitoba - books		7.47	
427	Verso Foods		10.12	
428	A.S. West - Travel		342.21	
429	M. White - Travel	100.00		
430	Woodstock Col. Inn		64.57	
73 443	E. Basha - Typing	27.50		
	B. Feltham	37.50		
	C. Costello	30.00		
447	Bell Canada - Happy Valley -Ar.		415.51	
448	H.M. Budgell - Travel		160.00	
449	F. Butler		44.96	
450	O. Colbourne -		48.71	
		<u>331.01</u>	<u>4556.15</u>	

VO #	NAME	SALARIES & WAGES	EXPENSES	RENUMERATION
451	Deerlake Motel		\$ 17.18	
452	Domac Enterprises Limited		25.36	
453	F. Hettasah - Travel		338.00	
454	Hotel Brunswick		15.66	
455	Hotel Goose		152.15	
456	Labrador Airways		1891.50	
457	Legrows Travel		1534.00	
458	Memorial University		16.05	
459	St. John's P. Cash		59.56	
460	Grenfell Hotel		60.36	
474	Dr. J. A. Hildes - Travel		557.67	
475	Mr. B. R. Neville - Light & Electric		634.46	
482	Various Secretaries	\$ 152.50		
484	Janot Grouchy - Typing	17.50		
490	The Aurora - Ads		25.20	
491	H.M. Budgell - Travel		188.50	
492	Business Services - Rent		723.20	
493	Churchill Falls Inn		56.35	
494	City Motors		88.40	
495	Gray & Goodland		48.18	
496	Dr. J. A. Hildes - Travel		181.61	
500	National Office Eqpt.		135.60	
503	Sir Wilfred Grenfell Hotel		32.19	
506	Various Secretaries	610.00		
513	Ann Doran	37.50		
514	Marion White	80.00		
516	Various Secretaries	400.00		
533	Various Secretaries	430.00		
	Salaries -June	4852.55		
547	Donald Snowden - Travel		208.75	
	Various Secretaries		1249.00	

VO #	NAME	SALARIES & WAGES	EXPENSES	RENUMERATION
73	577	H.M. Budgell - Travel	\$ 489.44	
73	715	Janet Grouchy - Typing	\$ 70.00	
	716	Brian Keough - Research	300.00	
73	727	Eugene Rheanme - Fees	2500.00	
		Payroll - July	3807.57	
		Payroll - August	2508.11	
73	733	Eugene Rheanme		\$ 565.47
	734	Sundry - salaries	228.49	
	817	R. Snell - Travel	73.26	
	815	Royal Comm. Labrador - Petty Cash	238.72	
	819	Alberta College	27.00	
	856	H.M. Budgell - Travel	210.50	
	854	C.J. Goodyear - Travel	153.25	
73	857	Ruby Budgell		1250.00
		<u>15994.22</u>	<u>9731.19</u>	<u>1815.47</u>
73	858	Jean Crane		\$1250.00
	859	Renee Snell - Travel	\$ 311.30	
	814	A.J. Rendell - Travel	275.21	
	855	Donald Snowden - Travel	415.15	
JV 42		R. Budgell - Travel	213.50	
JV 44		Salaries	\$3908.39	
1010		W. White		\$ 890.00
933		National Office Eqpt.	600.00	
934		Petty cash - St. John's	76.40	
1012		Aldred & Co.	47.00	
1013		Ass. Video Sys.	4041.62	
1014		Atmospheric Environment	39.55	



VO #	NAME	SALARIES & WAGES	EXPENSES	RENUMERATION
1015	Business Service		\$ 1506.40	
1016	E.F. Cammaert	\$ 30.00		
1017	Churchill Falls Inn		30.70	
1018	Classics Little Bks.		4.50	
1019	E.P.A. -Travel		169.25	
1020	Faculty of Eng. M.U.N.	22.83		
1021	Gray & Goodland		228.51	
1022	E. Harris	38.50		
1023	Harveys Travel		152.00	
1024	I.B.M.		91.30	
1025	P. Karasek - Travel		42.14	
1026	Kenmount Motel		126.15	
1027	Labrador Airways		2683.31	
1028	Labrador Int. School Board		255.00	
1029	Legrows Travel		2189.00	
1030	Mr. Martin Lowe		168.20	
1031	M.U.N.		2.50	
1032	Nat. Office Eqpt.		945.00	
1033	Nfld. Public Libraries Bd.		4.25	
1034	Power Dis. Dist. Nfld. & Labrador		17.01	
1035	Mrs. W. Saunders - Travel		41.25	
1036	Starboard Quarter		14.00	
1037	V.S. Services		45.33	
1038	Wabush Rec. Assoc.		10.00	
1039	Ruby Williams & Son		25.00	
1040	Wing Ding Place		372.10	
1043	D. Wood		4.43	
1041	H. M. Tomlinson - Travel		169.50	
1042	Dr. A.S. West - Travel		654.72	
3 1087	Woodwards Ltd.		1.83	
1086	Western Star		60.48	

VO #	NAME	SALARIES & WAGES	EXPENSES	RENUMERATION
1082	Travellers Inn		\$ 98.44	
1081	Rental Projects		25.68	
		<u>\$3999.72</u>	<u>\$16157.71</u>	<u>\$2140.00</u>
73 1080	Metro Delivery Service		\$ 15.00	
1079	Memorial University	\$1041.41		
1078	S.G. McCardy - Travel		512.15	
1076	Kimberly Info Service		294.00	
1074	Hotel Goose -		388.13	
1073	Hillcrest Rent-a-Car		32.15	
1072	E.P.A.		1186.68	
1070	CNT		13.55	
1069	Bugdens Taxi		81.70	
1068	Bell Canada		359.09	
1067	Avis Rent-a-Car		50.35	
1066	Atlantic Films		69.16	
1065	Aska Sales		510.00	
1091	H.M. Budgell - Travel		509.37	
1092	F. Hettasch - Travel		299.52	
1093	Pat Kidder - Travel		183.00	
1094	R. Snell - Travel		138.10	
1120	G. Rheaume - Travel		295.00	
1090	Salaries	\$2550.00		
1006	Nfld. Telephone		1299.01	
1162	Bank of Montreal		306.12	
1165	H.M. Budgell - Travel		121.50	
1209	Aska Sales		10.70	
1210	Assoc. Video Sys.		122.58	
1211	Atlantic Films		79.70	
1212	Bugdens Taxi		48.30	

VO #	NAME	SALARIES & WAGES	EXPENSES	RENUMERATION
1213	Business Serv. Ltd. - Rental		\$ 1292.50	
1214	C.N.T.		4.55	
1215	Gray & Goodland		125.41	
1216	Hotel Goose		105.93	
1217	Hudson Bay Co.		6.71	
1218	I.B.M.		126.28	
1219	Lawrence Jackson		60.60	
1220	Labrador Airways		2931.33	
1222	M.U.N.		121.68	
1223	Nfld. Public Libraries Bd.		4.50	
1224	Hull, O'Brien (Publishers)		50.00	
1225	Power Distribution		6.42	
1226	The Starboard Qr.		64.48	
1227	St. John's P. cash		443.50	
1228	Dr. A. S. West			\$ 3000.00
1229	Wing Ding Place		762.49	
1221	Manpower Bus. Ser.		70.35	
1234	H.M. Budgell - Travel		140.50	
JV 51	Salaries	\$ 2800.21		
		<u>\$ 6391.62</u>	<u>\$13242.09</u>	<u>\$ 3000.00</u>
3	JV 52	Salaries	\$ 1082.19	
	1407	Dr. J.A. Hildes		\$ 3000.00
	1433	Gray & Goodland	\$ 74.73	
	1432	E. P. A.	168.00	
3	1431	Bell Canada	4.44	
	1434	I.B.M.	290.00	
	1435	Institute of Soc. & Res. Econ.		2208.21
	1436	Labrador Airways	347.80	
	1438	National Off. Eqpt.	783.35	
	1437	Legrows Travel	658.00	
	1439	Park Lane	159.55	
	1440	Rental Projects Limited	8.56	

VO #	NAME	SALARIES & WAGES	EXPENSES	RENUMERATION
1437	Legrows Travel		\$ 444.00	
1542	Nfld. & Labrador Computer Services		1050.00	
1543	Petty Cash - St. John's		57.91	
1539	Highview Guest Home		32.10	
1547	Wing Ding Place		369.02	
1531	Atlantic Films & Electronics		42.85	
1553	Bugden's Taxi		40.90	
1534	Business Services		755.00	
1517	H.M. Budgell		149.25	
3 1608	G.J. Goodyear - Travel		459.95	
1680	F. Hettasch			\$ 1500.00
4 1742	Nfld. Telephone		2158.03	
1881	C.J. Goodyear - Travel		705.30	
1882	F. Hettasch		859.25	
1883	Donald Snowden		85.41	
1884	R. Snell - Travel		652.80	
1963	Winston White		46.07	
1995	Business Services		1430.30	
1993	Atlantic Films Ltd.		229.14	
1994	Bugdons Taxi		150.90	
1996	Gerald S. Doyle		136.78	
1997	E. P. A.		696.60	
1998	Gray & Goodland		105.79	
1999	Govt. Northwest Territories		2568.98	
2000	E. Harris		149.86	
2001	Labrador Airways		194.00	
2002	National Off. Eqpt.		518.20	
2003	Starboard Quarter		21.16	
2004	St. John's - Petty Cash		196.21	
2005	Francis Whitten	\$ 100.00		
2006	Wing Ding Place		566.00	
1547	Cancell Cheque		369.02	



	VO #	NAME	SALARIES & WAGES	EXPENSES	RENUMERATION
74	2106	M. G. Andrews			\$ 1000.00
			<u>\$1182.19</u>	<u>\$16109.17</u>	<u>\$ 7703.21</u>
74	2109	Bugdens' Taxi		\$ 25.10	
	2104	Petty Cash- St. John's		51.81	
	2102	Legrows Travel		22.00	
	2101	Neva Johnson	\$ 24.50		
	2100	I.B.M. Canada		44.16	
	2098	Household Movers		645.50	
	2094	Harveys Travel		60.00	
	2092	Harmon Motors		37.60	
	2085	Bell Canada		497.81	
	2194	F. Hettasch - Travel		320.25	
	2190	C. J. Goodyear - Travel		1096.20	
	JV 84	Salaries	13544.53		
	JV 80	A.B. Calmart - Travel		138.33	
	JV 81	H.M. Budgell - Travel		316.00	
4	2279	Aska Sales		20.00	
	2280	Bugdens' Taxi		20.80	
	2281	E.P.A.		51.00	
	2282	Gray & Goodland		74.11	
	2283	Labrador Airways		15.00	
	2284	Legrows Travel		270.00	
	2285	National Off. Eqpt.		714.75	
	2286	Office Machines		52.80	
	2396	Ryan Searching Serv.			\$10591.20
	2243	Nfld. Telephone		400.30	
	2454	Winston White		44.12	
	2485	C.J. Goodyear - Travel		880.45	
	2571	Bus. Ser. Rental		1530.00	
	2578	Winston White	\$ 800.00		
	2577	Judy Roberts	600.00		
	2573	Nat. Office Eqpt.		268.00	

VO #	NAME	SALARIES & WAGES	EXPENSES	RENUMERATION
2572	Robin Cook		\$ 35.00	
2655	Aska Sales		21.40	
2656	E.P.A.		236.00	
2657	Gray & Goodland		648.24	
2658	Imperial Oil		34.32	
2659	L. Jackson - Travel		60.01	
2660	Legrows Travel		38.00	
2661	Office Machines		85.60	
2662	Office Overload		341.25	
2663	Starboard Quarter		8.27	
JV 109	Freida Hettasch - Travel		2224.85	
JV 111	Salaries	\$ 5274.80		
JV 112	Mr. M. G. Andrews - Travel		437.07	
2670	E. P. A.		53.54	
JV 110	Brian Keough - Travel		631.20	
		<u>\$20243.83</u>	<u>\$12450.84</u>	<u>\$ 10591.20</u>

JV 113	R. Snell - Travel		\$1637.34	
2727	F. Hettasch	\$ 1000.00		
2781	Nfld. Telephone		775.92	
2782	MUN salaries	52397.72		
		<u>\$53397.72</u>	<u>\$2413.26</u>	

- Salaries & Wages - \$111814.92

- Expenses = \$98336.38

- Renumeration (consulting fees, etc.) \$26854.88

\$237006.18

## ANSWER (part 3)

<u>DATE</u>	<u>VO #</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>PLACE VISITED</u>
Mar. 6/73	149	H. M. Budgell	Churchill Falls, Ottawa, Goose Bay, Wabush, Labrador City, Red Bay, Pinware, West St. Modest, Capstan Island, Fox Hr., Lance au Loup, Forteau, L'Ance au Clare, Mary's Hr. & Lodge Bay.
Mar. 19/73	150	L. Jackson	
Apr. 24/73	151	D. Snowden	Port Hope Simpson, Charlottetown, Black Tickle, Cartwright, Mudlake & Paradise.
Jan. 30/73	158	W. Saunders	Goose Bay, Nain, Port Hope Simpson, Charlottetown, & Cartwright.
Apr. 23/73	159	R. Snell	Labrador City, Happy Valley & Goose Bay.
Feb. 19/73	171	A. J. Rendal	Labrador City, Happy Valley & Goose Bay.
Mar. 24/73	194	F. Hattash	Churchill Falls, Wabush, Labrador City.
Mar/73	195	J.A. Hildes	Forteau, Hain, Cartwright, Mary's Hr., Port Hope Simpson, Goose Bay, St. Anthony, Davis Inlet, Hopedale, North West River.
Mar. 8/73	199	S. McCurdy	Edmonton, Ottawa
Mar. 5/73	201	R. Snell	Labrador City, Churchill Falls, Deer Lake
May 21/73	221	J. Carter	Corner Brook
Jan. 12/73	JV 11	O. Colbourne	Goose Bay, Happy Valley.
May 14/73	225	C. Goodyear	Happy Valley, North West River, Goose Bay.
May 14/73	227	L. Jackson	Happy Valley, Northwest River, Goose Bay.
May 13/73	230	R. Snell	Labrador City, Deer Lake, Corner Brook, Goose Bay, Northwest River.
May 14/73	231	D. Snowden	Happy Valley, Northwest River, Goose Bay.
Mar. 28/73	232	W. White	Ottawa, Goose Bay, Happy Valley, Northwest River,
May 22/73	254	D. Snowden	Corner Brook.

<u>DATE</u>	<u>VO #</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>PLACE VISITED.</u>
Apr. 16/73	257	H. Budgell	Cartwright, Charlottetown, Port Hope Simpson.
Mar. 22/73	263	S. McCurdy	Edmonton, Saskatoon.
May 29/73	422	D. Snowden	Flowers Cove, Sandy Cove & St. Anthony.
Apr. 30/73	428	A.S. West	Goose Bay & Hopedale
May 28/73	449	F. Butler	Flowers Cove, St. Anthony.
Jan 1/73	450	O. Colbourne	Wabush, Labrador City.
May 12/73	453	F. Hettasah	Nain, Goose Bay, Happy Valley, North west River, Corner Brook.
May 5/73	474	J.A. Hildes	Montreal, Goose Bay, North West River, Churchill Falls, St. Anthony.
Jun. 17/73	491	H. Budgell	Indian Cove, White Point, Goose Bay, Labrador City, Black Tickle.
May/73	496	J. Hildes	Ottawa
Jun. 11/73	547	D. Snowden	Goose Bay, North West River, Labrador City, Menihek Postville, Black Tickle, Seal Island, Esker, Dreyway, Talzie, Wabush.
Jun. 1/73	577	H. Budgell	Goose Bay, Happy Valley
May 22/73	854	C. Goodyear	Corner Brook, Flowers Cove, St. Barbe, St. Anthony.
Jun 10/73	859	R. Snell	Labrador City, Goose Bay, Black Tickle, Potsville.
May 15/73	814	A.J. Rendell	Labrador City, Happy Valley, Goose Bay, North West River, Hopedale, Cartwright.
Aug. 1/73	855	D. Snowden	Ottawa, Edmonton, Yellowknife.
	1042	A.S. West	Goose Bay, Sept. Isle, Wabush, Labrador City, Churchill Falls.
May 26/73	1078	S. McCurdy	Labrador City, Wabush, Churchill Falls, Goose Bay, Happy Valley, Northwest River.
	1092	F. Hattasah	St. John's



<u>DATE</u>	<u>VO #</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>PLACE VISITED</u>
Jun. 21/73	1093	P. Kidder	Ottawa, Montreal.
Sept. 3/73	1094	R. Snell	St. John's.
Jun./73	1120	G. Rheaume	Happy Valley, Goose Bay, Rigolet, North West River, Makkovik, Hopedale, Nain, Davis Inlet.
Dec. 9/73	1883	D. Snowden	Ottawa
May 21/73	JV 80	A.B. Cammart	Boston, Baltimore, Maryland.
Nov./73	JV 81	H. Budgell	Ottawa, Lucerne, Quebec.
Jun 15/73	JV 109	F. Hattasch	Yellowknife, North West River, Happy Potsville, Black Tickle, Snug Harbour, White Point, Goose Bay.
Apr. 26/74	JV 112	M.G. Andrews	Chruchill Falls, Wabush, Esker, Sept. Isle, Ottawa, Stephenville.
Apr. 26/74	JV 110	B. Keough	Cartwright, Charlottetown, Port Hope Simpson, Red Bay.
Oct./73	JV 113	R. Snell	Ottawa, Goose Bay, St. John's.