

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
Wednesday, May 11, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief and a very pleasant duty to perform. I have with me a Canada Summer Games pin which is designed for the St. John's Lion's Club to commemorate the occasion of the Summer Games coming here to St. John's this August. The club, of which I am a member, as is the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), the club decided last week to have a pin presented to each member of the House, and I have sufficient pins here. With the permission of the House I would like to ask the pages to distribute them in a moment.

Just let me say, one, it is an attractive pin and it will provide quite a nice souvenir for members of the House, a souvenir of the Summer Games, secondly, it is most appropriate that we have this presentation today because today marks the beginning of the Annual Spring Fair of the Lion's Club at the Stadium, its big fund raising for its various humanitarian endeavours, and a Fair which I would urge all members to patronize at their convenience. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a very pleasant duty today to bring a matter before the House, and, I believe, Sir, this is the appropriate time to do it. Mr. Speaker, the matter to which I refer, which I consider is good news for a change in amongst all the bad news that we have been getting, is that CJON and two newsmen, Carl Lake and Jim Furlong, won - CJON was given the award, but these two gentlemen were the newsmen who did the documentary that brought the award to Newfoundland for the first time, called the Dan MacArthur Award, and it is for an outstanding documentary, for excellence actually in the news documentary. It is an award that is made in the Atlantic Provinces; competition is very fierce and very keen, I understand, between the four Atlantic Provinces. And, as I say, it is the first

Mr. Neary:

time that this award has come to Newfoundland. The host of the programme, the show, was Bob Lewis, and the producer was Dave Lawrence, and the two newsmen were Carl Lake and Jim Furlong, and the documentary involved the closing of the oil refinery at

MR. NEARY: Come by Chance. I do not know if hon. members will remember the documentary but it had to be put together, as hon gentlemen will realize, in a short time, the research had to be done very carefully, and they produced the programme, Sir, that brought an award to Newfoundland. And I want to congratulate both CJON, the two newsmen, Carl Lake and Jim Furlong, and all the others who were involved in hosting and producing and filming the documentary. And I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. the Premier, that a letter of congratulations be sent out to CJON and especially to the two newsmen and those who produced the documentary from this House. So it gives me great pleasure, Sir, to make that motion seconded by the hon. the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I second the motion speaking from the government side. It is always good when you see excellence achieved by any members of our society, and in the field of the media generally there is always a great deal of competition, there is always a great deal of creativity and all the rest that goes into making up documentaries and putting together interesting shows.

I think for these two people particularly, and plus the support staff which is always necessary to make it work, the government has great pleasure and the government side has great pleasure in congratulating them on a job well done.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we would like to be associated with the motion, I think it is one in which all members of the House would agree and we certainly would like to add our voice.- I think the programme was an excellent one. I recall it vividly. It is too bad in a way there has not been a similar programme done by one

MR. ROBERTS: of the television networks on the Linerboard situation; perhaps there will be shortly. But the programme was I thought a first class example of journalism using the television medium in a creative and responsible way. It was done very rapidly, it was done very comprehensively, and altogether I think it richly deserved the award.

I think it should be noted too - not to take away in the least from the achievement of CJON television and the award which they have won - that another news organization in Newfoundland has won a number of these Dan B. MacArthur awards. I do not know who Mr. MacArthur was but there are a number of awards named after him, and I believe the competition to CJON, at least the radio competition, the VOXM stations have won a number of these awards for various types of programmes and for news reporting. And I think, Sir, that they should be congratulated - not in the motion, the motion should recognize the achievement of CJON and the award that is given to them this year. But I think the House should recognize at the same time that Newfoundland news media, in the plural, have achieved this success against very stiff competition. I think that is something of which the House ought to be proud and of which every citizen of this Province ought to be proud.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: I would like to present a petition, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of forty-three families of the town of Victoria. The prayer of the petition is presented in letter form and subsequently only two-thirds of the letter is applicable to the petition and it says, "Dear Mr. Moores: No doubt you are aware of our water and sewer problems. On behalf of myself and the following names I am presenting a petition requesting immediate action for the installation of a water and sewer main for this area. The area in question is Pennys Hill, Victoria area. It is the most densely populated area of the community. It would take approximately 3000 feet of water and sewer

MR. MOORES:

main to service this area from the present water and sewer system on the main highway. At the present time our water is not fit for human consumption and we would like immediate action from the Department of Municipal Affairs."

Mr. Speaker, it is true that the water in this particular area is not fit for human consumption. In the last seven weeks it has been condemned four weeks in a row by the local Department of Health. I understand now that the Department of Municipal Affairs does know what its budget allocation for water and sewer activities in the Province will be this year and I am hoping, in fact I am urging the minister to take appropriate action because this specific area and this specific community is in very urgent need of consumable water. Not just water, but consumable water.



MR. R. MOORES: I pass the petition along to the appropriate department and I support it fully. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Unless somebody wants to speak on that petition, Mr. Speaker, I have another petition to present.

MR. SPEAKER: No hon. member has risen.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great - I might say for the benefit of the hon. gentleman I concur and support the prayer of the petition. But I have a petition of my own, Sir, to present on behalf of 440 voters, 440 citizens in the district of Green Bay. And the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is as follows:

MR. MORGAN: From Green Bay?

MR. NEARY: That is right.

"We, the undersigned residents in the district of Green Bay and voters over the age of eighteen years, hereby petition the provincial House of Assembly to take whatever measures within its power to stop any move to increase electricity rates in this Province."

Mr. Speaker, it is rather an unusual petition. It comes in two forms, the formal petition itself and then there is a coupon that was published in a newspaper called The Green Bay News. It says, 'Please sign your name in return to the address below not later than April 30, 1977.'

AN HON. MEMBER: Just what is it?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?  
It is a petition published in The Green Bay News.

MR. DOODY: By the paper?

MR. NEARY: No, the people I think. There must be a group of concerned citizens there. I think it was a man who called me and asked me to present it in the House. But there is the petition that appeared in The Green Bay News, Sir, the same wording as is on the formal petition - 440 total people over the age of eighteen years, 440 voters in the district of Green Bay who are very concerned about their survival, very concerned about the future because of the increases, the heavy increases, the huge

MR. NEARY: increases in electricity rates in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the people are very concerned about the fact that this House is likely to shrug off its responsibility on some regulatory body and that the House, the elected representatives of the people, will not face up to the fact that the real power behind blocking these increases rests in this House and not in the hands of a regulatory body. And the people hope that the regulatory bodies will not just be used to get the government or the members of the House, the elected representatives of the people, off the hook, to get the heat off the elected representatives of the people of this Province. It is a matter, Sir, which is concerning every citizen of this Province at the present time. And now today, Sir, we hear news that the people in this Province are going to be hit with an eight cent to ten cent increase in gasoline and a six or seven cent increase in heating fuel.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, they are not.

MR. NEARY: Further justification, Sir, for people being discouraged and disgruntled and wondering where it is all going to end. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, but that increase in gasoline and heating fuel, so we are told by the media, is supported by the Minister of Energy from this Province. And if the price of fuel goes up, the price of gasoline goes up again, Sir.- diesel fuel. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear what members on either side of this House have to say about this petition. This is typical. The feeling of these people, Sir, is typical -

MR. NOLAN: Read it again.

MR. NEARY: - of the feelings of people all over this Province at the present time. And it is our duty, Sir. We should not be so quick to pawn off the responsibility for coping with this problem, to pawn it off on a regulatory body like the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities who merely act as a rubber stamp for the government.

The prayer of the petition, Sir, goes on the coupon that appeared in The Green Bay News and the formal petition, just to refresh members memories: "We, the undersigned residents in the district of Green Bay and voters over the age of eighteen years, hereby petition the



MR. NEARY: provincial House of Assembly to take whatever measures within its power to stop any more increases in electricity rates in this Province."

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to present the petition on behalf of these voters in Green Bay and lay it upon the table of the House and refer it to the department to which it relates.

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

Mr. Nolan:

Mr. Speaker, first of all with your permission, the permission of the House, I would like very much to welcome back our hon. friend, the honourable and learned doctor (Dr. T. Farrell) who is back with us once again -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And he is keeping an eye on us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: - and I am pleased to see that he is keeping an eye on us, but we wish him well. Obviously he has had a difficult time, and we are all delighted, on all sides, obviously, to have him back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: So in rising then, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I rise obviously to support the petition. There is something coming to the fore in this Province, not only in this Province, but in other areas as well, and even in Canada, and that is that those who are elected to office are no longer governing the country or the jurisdiction. For example, -

MR. ROBERTS: Just what the printed estimates say.

MR. NOLAN: - the petition as supplied by, tabled by our friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) indicated quite clearly the concern of the people of Green Bay district, And you see, Mr. Speaker, it is not just the increases in electricity rates and the increases in heat and so on; the fact is that every single day residents of this Province when they turn on their radios or read the news find that this is gone up, and I am talking about necessities now, housing, clothing, schooling, transportation, and so on, the bare and essential items that are needed and required to live, not luxuries. And so when the Light and Power or the Labrador Power Commission bring in additional further massive increases, as they have proposed, it puts an inexorable burden on the people of this Province that they are no longer capable of bearing. Now I do not think there is anyone perhaps in the House perhaps that should know better

Mr. Nolan:

perhaps than the Minister of Social Services, because you cannot help but wonder, Mr. Speaker, how people who are forced by circumstances to accept social services, how they can manage today to pay the electricity rates and all the other things that they need to keep body and soul together.

But the fact is what has happened in this House in the past, and I fear will continue to happen in the future, is when we bring an item in - and there have been hundreds and thousands of petitions about this very necessary item - we have responses such as, Well it is the Power Commission or it is this one, it is that one. Everything that seems to come up, it is someone other than us. We are no longer prepared to take our responsibilities, the reason being that we have brought in legislation of one form or another over the years that has authorized groups, agencies, boards and so on, we have given them all of the power and all of the authority; we put too much into the hands of the bureaucrats, and we have left people in a very, very difficult position, and it is for this reason, I submit, with respect, Mr. Speaker, that it is for this reason that people no longer look to the House of Assembly for the type of representation that they have come to expect. And therefore we have failed.

So I certainly support the prayer of the petition from the people of Green Bay, and it is interesting too because, I believe, it originates in the district of the - or does it? - of the Minister of Energy. So therefore I hope that it will not be just another petition. It is all right to table it and lay it on the table of the House and have it referred to the department to which it relates, but it is not supposed to die here. Something is supposed to be done. There has to be a response. Now it is up to someone to answer for it, and the time is now, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Well said.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the occasion pass without rising on this particular petition for two reasons: One,

Mr. Simmons:

because of its subject; and two, because it comes from the district of Green Bay. I only wish that the Minister of Mines and Energy, the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) were here today, I understand he has other commitments, but -

MR. ROBERTS: In Ottawa supporting prices increases.

MR. NEARY: Supporting gasoline prices and fuel oil prices.

MR. SIMMONS: Whatever he is doing, Mr. Speaker, it is probably fair to say some things I have in mind in his presence rather than in his absence. But it is significant that the petition should come from Green Bay.

The petition, I believe, is only part of what you will receive from Green Bay on this subject. There is a fairly massive effort, as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is probably aware, ongoing right now to give the people of Green Bay a voice in this matter. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is very significant that they, notwithstanding they have as their member the Minister of Energy, have to use this particular route to get their message across to the House of Assembly. It is certainly an indictment of a number of people, including an indictment of the government itself.

A lot has been said about the cost of electricity. I suppose we have had tens, upon tens, upon tens, upon tens of thousands of names tabled in this House

MR. SIMMONS: affixed to petitions on this particular subject, and at worse they have welcomed, these petitions, with stoney silence from the government benches, and at best, if best is the term to use, they have been welcomed with derision, half serious comment. On no occasion yet, Mr. Speaker, have we heard a member of the government indicate in any clear terms what is being done to - not only to come to grips with the rates but to come to grips with the mechanism which is allowing the rates to increase, and that itself is a subject for a full scale debate, and the rules do not permit me at this particular time to get into debate, but I do want without reservation to support the petition presented by my friend from LaPoile on behalf of the 440 people of Green Bay, who like thousands of others across this Province have had just about all they can take when it comes to the cost of electricity.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, a few words in support of the petition from Green Bay, from 440 residents of that area of the Province, and to clarify some again misunderstandings put forward by the members of the Opposition. The member of the House of Assembly for Green Bay, who happens to be the Minister of Mines and Energy for the Province, quite clearly pointed out to the House of Assembly a short while ago in speaking in support of petitions, plural, from around the Province, complaining of the increased cost of their power supply, their light bills, Mr. Speaker, it was then clearly put forward by my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, who happens to be the MHA for Green Bay, that legislation will be brought to this House of Assembly in this session giving the regulatory authority in this Province, in this case the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities -

MR. NEARY: Pawn off your responsibility on them!



MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if I could speak without interruption, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman wishes to speak without being interrupted.

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker, we are supporting these petitions and we have said as an administration that we are going to bring in legislation to ensure and to enable the provincial regulatory authority, in this case the Board of Public Utilities in the Province

MR. NEARY: You are pawning it off on somebody else!

MR. MORGAN: that the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro will have to bring forward to them an application for any increase in power rates in the Province, whether they be charging as in this case the Light and Power, or charging directly the consumers of the Province. And I do take strong exception, Mr. Speaker, to the Opposition members saying that the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) has not been a spokesman on this matter. As Minister of Mines and Energy he has clearly pointed out that we are concerned over the increase in the power rates and the spiralling increase in power rates in the Province, and that action will be taken this year. So, Mr. Speaker, there has not been stoney silence in this House of Assembly from this side of the House as pointed out by the member for the Burgeo area. The fact is that we are taking action this year and all of us on this side of the House of Assembly, on behalf of the consumers throughout the Province -

MR. NEARY: You are going to set up -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the lip from Burgeo - or for LaPoile would keep quiet -

AN HON. MEMBER: LaPoile.

MR. MORGAN: Or the mouth from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The best dressed politician in government.



MR. MORGAN: If the ignoramus, Mr. Speaker, from LaPoile would keep quiet for a change! Ignoramus.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I believe I anticipated the hon. gentleman. I would draw to his attention that the term ignoramus is one which many hon. members would regard as offensive and I would ask him to withdraw it.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I refer to the term of ignorant in this case of being ignorant of the procedures used in controlling power rates in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! We are still on a point of order so I cannot entertain another one. The hon. gentleman has sort of defined what he meant by it and it well may be that if in originally applying the term he had used the definition rather than the term defined there may have been no interjection. But I think to keep the record straight that we should regard the word ignoramus as one which should not be applied by one member of another.

MR. NEARY: Withdraw.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your ruling and I withdraw, but I again repeat that the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is ignorant of the procedures to be used in controlling power rates in this Province. It is as simple as that.

MR. ROBERTS: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker—

AN HON MEMBER: Another foolish argument!

MR. ROBERTS: No, it is a valid point of order. I would love nothing better to debate with the minister of whatever he is -  
Transportation and Communications -

MR. ROBERTS: about this subject but unfortunately we are on a procedure that is a petition procedure. The hon. gentleman is accusing the gentleman from LaPoile of being ignorant of procedures and in turn displaying what I submit is either ignorance of the rules or disregard of the rules which quite clearly state that one is not allowed to debate on a petition, and surely everything the hon member has been saying for the last few minutes, as well as being incorrect, is debate, Sir. I mean, if it is in order well and good, but if it is in order then a number of us are prepared into the debate on the same terms. My submission is that it is not in order and accordingly I would ask Your Honour, if my view is correct, my view represents the rules, to direct the hon. gentleman to try to act within the rules and not display what I submit is ignorance on his part, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in my speaking on the petition I was replying to argumental points put forward by the opposition spokesmen, number one from the LaPoile member saying that there was no method of controlling power rates, and number two that there was stoney silence from this side of the House of Assembly with regard to the matter of the increase in power rates in the Province.

So in my argument in speaking in support of the petition I was clarifying points which were also argumental from the opposition members.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order -

MR. NEARY: On the point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: On that point of order, yes.

MR. NEARY: I would just like to set the record straight, Sir. One remark that the hon. gentleman just made, that I said that there was no method for controlling power rates in this Province: I said

MR. NEARY: the only real authority for controlling power rates in this Province is this House and not a regulatory body. Do not look for a scapegoat or pawn it off on some other group.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order. The rules are quite clear with respect to petitions that there may be no debate, Standing Order 92 requires "hon. members to confine themselves to statement of the parties from which it comes, the number of signatures, the material allegations it contains." I think where some of the difficulties arise is that the House has not always given the strictest interpretation to 'material allegation,' and one has allowed material to be presented which is related to it, related to the material allegation but which in the most restrictive sense is not in itself the material allegation. I am inclined to think that comment on petitions would be extremely limited if one were to give the most restrictive interpretation possible to the term 'material allegation.' What I would point out, however, is that even using the criterion which has usually been applied in the House there should not be confrontation or argument of views because that has to be debate. So I think the point made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition was a valid one and it may well be that some prior remarks were of the same nature. But I think what we should bear in mind in order that the House will not have to apply the most restrictive interpretation possible to the term 'material allegation' is the avoidance by hon. members on both sides of confrontation of views. They may state different views without commenting specifically upon the views of another hon. member.

Does the hon member have leave to continue?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in continuation - Mr. Speaker I understand the rulings of the House allows five minutes to speak on a petition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The usual understanding is that points of order and points of privilege do take up -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am now going back to the petition, not the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The rules as they are - there could be arguments that they should be different—but the rules as they are is that points of order and points of privilege take up the five minutes or take up the thirty minutes in Question Period or the forty-five minutes of a speech period. There are the rules as they are. That is why I said, "Does the hon gentleman have leave?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I will have to ask, "Does the hon gentleman have leave?"

SOME HON MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: When I hear a negative view it is not something on which I take a vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon member for Fogo.

MR. E. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker. Settle down there!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. E. WINDSOR: I certainly support the petition presented by the member of LaPoile on behalf of the 440 voters in Green Bay and, Sir, what applies or what is applicable to the residents or voters of Green Bay is certainly

CAPT. WINSOR: applicable to a great area of this Province.

Now, Sir, we all recall, just a few years, maybe three or four, five years ago, the Newfoundland Light and Power carried out an extensive campaign advertising the sale of electricity and advising people, especially people who were building new homes, to electrify their homes - that was the cheapest way of heating and the cleanest way of heating a home. So, Sir, a great many people took advantage of that.

AN HON. MEMBER: They were conned.

CAPT. WINSOR: They were persuaded and influenced by that advertising to do exactly that. Consequently, Sir, a great many of them now find themselves in dire financial situations, because, Sir, it is utterly impossible for them to heat their homes -

MR. NOLAN: Any sales tax on electric power?

CAPT. WINSOR: Oh, yes. Of course.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, there is a sales tax. The government put a sales tax on it.

CAPT. WINSOR: And, Sir, they certainly find themselves in a financial bind now because their houses were built for the same purpose, to heat their homes by electricity; therefore, it is not easy to install other means of heating. So, Sir, if there is any control or any mechanism to control the rates of electricity, it certainly has not surfaced to this date. And I think we in this House should impress upon the powers that be whether it be the electrical companies or whether it be the hydro companies, certainly something has to be done to get that rate of electricity down within the means of the ordinary man. And a great many people, Mr. Speaker, today are now trying to convert their homes back to the old wood stove. And, Sir, I travelled through the district of Fogo -

MR. NOLAN: And there are charges, I bet. to that.

CAPT. WINSOR: - a week ago - Well, I am not so sure.

MR. NOLAN: Well, I am sure.

CAPT. WINSOR: But, Sir, you could see piles of wood where people were out sawing wood and splitting wood and trying to heat their



CAPT. WINSOR: homes in the old-fashioned way. This is what they have to come back to after being, I would say, persuaded by the powers that be. And we, as members of this House, and government in particular, have let the electrical companies just jack up their rates day after day almost - month after month - and no action taken.

MR. NOLAN: Tory times are hard times.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the petition, Sir, and request that serious consideration be given.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Terra Nova followed by the hon. gentleman from Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I want to present another petition -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Terra Nova followed by the hon. gentleman from Lewisporte.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the opportunity go without supporting this application - this petition with 400 names from the area of Green Bay. And I am sure that these people from Green Bay express the same concerns as thousands of people throughout this Province, and thousands of people who indeed have expressed their opinion through the presentation of petitions in this hon. House. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province are indeed frustrated over the escalating cost of electricity. And one group in particular, of course, that is getting hit extremely hard are those people who have installed electrical heat, and that has been mentioned here before. Mr. Speaker, I have met so many of these people in my own district, people who had wanted to have central heating and were advised by people to put in electrical heat, that this would be the cheapest form of heat, and now, of course; they find themselves in a position where they cannot pay the bill.

And another point about these electrical costs is the fact that the Newfoundland Hydro at this particular time is trying to get from a deficit point to a point of profit. Mr. Speaker, that certainly must be a point that cannot be forgotten in the next few



MR. LUSH: months. To allow the Newfoundland Hydro to come from a deficit position to a point of profit all in the one swoop cannot be allowed, and we must continually harp on this point. The people of this Province cannot afford such a rise in the cost of electricity and they certainly cannot afford to put up with the cost of having Newfoundland Hydro move from a deficit position to a profit position in one swoop, in one quick raise. This cannot be allowed to happen.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present on behalf of 265 people in the community of Horwood, in the District of Lewisporte. Horwood as hon. members know of course derived its name from the former Horwood Lumber Company who operated a major concern in the Horwood area in the early 1900's. Today Horwood, the people there, Mr. Speaker, derive a living from working in the woods and any other jobs they can get their hands on. The community is located about thirty or forty miles from Gander and it is on a gravel road and the prayer of the petition is that the government pave this particular road this year. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that only a few years ago was the road constructed to Horwood. I suppose it is one of the few communities in that particular area of the province which has received very little government service other than the usual kinds of things such as telephones and electricity and so on. There is not even an artesian well, for example, in the community of Horwood.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the government will see fit this year to pave the road to Horwood and at the same time connect up the Gander Bay road and the Stoneville-Port Albert roads which are in the same area and encompassed within this petition. So, I present the petition to the House asking that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister, Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, just a few words to comment on the petition. The area of Stoneville, Horwood and the Port Albert area I am not too familiar with, but last summer in my travels to make myself as minister more familiar with the roads and road problems throughout the province, I recall holding a public meeting in fact at Stoneville with the member for the area. We discussed at some length then the road problems in the area and of course at that time I had the unfortunate duty, I guess, to tell them that they could not get their paving last year.

MR. MORGAN: This year, Mr. Speaker, at this time I cannot give a definite indication what we can do in that area this year. But I will say we will give consideration to that area, in fact the same as we give consideration to all the areas around the province which put forward petitions to this hon. House. The unfortunate thing is, of course, we have approximately 2400 miles of gravel road throughout the province that remain to be constructed and paved. We have limited funds to be spent each year from provincial sources on this projects.

However, I will say one thing, Mr. Speaker, that if we cannot arrange to have that section of road paved this year I will give also every consideration to the possibility of applying a dust control measure particularly in that road leading through the communities of Port Albert, Stoneville and Horwood. At least that will help to alleviate one of the major problems, the dust on that road in the communities where people are living. So, whether or not they get pavement or not, the second thing is a possibility of getting a liquid calcium application to at least be a dust control measure this summer.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Finance, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in relation to the granting of Supplementary Supply to Her Majesty for the financial year ending March 31, 1977, and to Amend the Statute Law to permit designation of beneficiaries in certain income tax savings plan, and a Bill, An Act To Amend The Legitimacy Act.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have three answers here. The first is to

MR. COLLINS: Question No. 75, on the Order Paper dated Feb. 9, in the name of the hon. member for Lewisporte; Question No. 197 in the name of the hon. member for LaPoile; Question No. 29, on Order Paper dated Feb. 8, in the name of the hon. member of Eagle River.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I table the answer to Question No. 218 on the Order Paper of Thursday March 24, 1977 asked by the hon. member for LaPoile.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. ROBERTS: A question for the Minister of Justice - One, two, three, four, five, six, seven; we have at least half the Cabinet here today. I hope the Press notices. A question for the Minister of Justice, Sir; can he tell the House when the new Law Society Act will be introduced to the legislature, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Is there an agreed upon draft of a new Law Society Act and if it is agreed upon, with whom has it been agreed upon?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, there is not.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the hon. gentleman aware that the treasurer of the Law Society of Newfoundland has scheduled a public meeting for our brethren at the Bar to discuss the new Law Society Act and its implications on practitioners and the Law Society as a whole?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received an invitation as well.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then, the final and obvious supplementary is -

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: How can the treasurer of the Law Society, who is also the gentleman from Kilbride, be talking about the new Law Society Act if there is no agreed upon draft for it?

MR. HICKMAN: I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Kilbride in his capacity as treasurer of the Law Society intends to discuss with his brethren at the Bar what they would like to see in a proposed Law Society Act.

MR. ROBERTS: Ah, but there is no agreed upon draft. Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Premier disappointed the delegation for Buchans by not attending the very important meeting that was held in Central Newfoundland, would the Premier care to now make a statement to the House as to the future of the community of Buchans and the mining operations in Buchans?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: First of all, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect I do not think it was appropriate at that time for us to go out there just to sit and not be able to make any contribution. The representatives of all the applicable departments were there, senior people. I have not received a report from them as yet. I look forward to doing so and see what progress was made at the actual meeting.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Does the Premier have any indication at all of the life span now of the Buchans mine and have they found any new deposits that may prolong the life of the mine? What is the situation now concerning the future of mining in Buchans?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I will take notice of the question and try to get an exact answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary; the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the Premier advise the House as to when he can expect a report from the top level civil servants he referred to that attended that meeting Monday in Grand Falls?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Hopefully, because of the fog, hopefully as soon as they get back and get that correlated within the next day.



MR. ROBERTS: Sure, he was at the meeting and -

PREMIER MOOPES: Well that is fine. He can tell me what went on. What is he asking the questions for?

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. One additional supplementary.

MR. NEARY: When the Premier gets the report from his officials and the Premier has it in his hands, will the Premier be making a statement in the House or tabling the report in the House?

PREMIER MOORES: Can do, yes.

MR. NEARY: Well would the Premier put it in the record, put it in Hansard? Will the Premier be making a public statement or a statement in the House and tabling the report?

PREMIER MOORES: I will table the report, Mr. Speaker, sure.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Premier. The press has reported in the last day or so that advertisements have been placed in the American papers for the sale of the assets of the Come by Chance Refinery, Would the -

MR. ROBERTS: And in The Mainland and Newfoundland papers.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, and in the local papers subsequently as well.

My question to the Premier is was he aware that this move was about to be made?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker, The fact is that we were advised that it was to be made, but we did not know when. There was some controversy with the Canadian Government and ourselves as to the wisdom of the particular move at the time because there are people interested in making bids. But the British explanation of it is that the reason they called it now is because even if they did have bids that were acceptable, as the refinery is in bankruptcy they would still have to go to auction in order to assure the court in bankruptcy that they had gone through all avenues. And as the first mortgagee and as

PREMIER MOORES: the merchant banker, Kleinwort-Benson, and the British Export Credit Division, as the first mortgagee they felt it was their right with or without consent of other groups to do what they have done.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary for the Premier. I am not wanting to sound as though I am looking for legal opinions, but otherwise could

MR. SIMMONS: the Premier indicate what the implications of this move are for the government in terms of the government's equity position and even more importantly in terms of a possible reopening of the refinery? There are really two questions here obviously.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I do not think there will be any way to know until expiry date of the tender call which I understand is September 1st.,  
Mr Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The 15th of September, the middle is it not?

PREMIER MOORES: The 15th is right.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. the Premier indicate to the House if there are any proposals to reopen that oil refinery actively being considered by the government, either from Mr. Shaheen or from the Roman group? I would like for the Premier to bear in mind  
in answering the question that a statement was made recently that the Premier was aware of negotiations and proposals whereas his Minister of Finance was not, and the Minister of Finance was denying there were any statements. So would the Premier set the record straight?

PREMIER MOORES: I do not think there is any conflict there, Mr. Speaker, We have no written proposals, no specific written proposals before government at this time, but all of us in government know, as I have told this House, there are a few groups interested in making proposals and they have been in continuous touch throughout as to what progress they were making and that they would be back at a future date. And that included the Roman Corporation and Mr. Shaheen's people.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, hon member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: I would just like to rephrase the second part of my supplementary a moment ago because I am not sure the Premier responded to it. My question really was whether the government feels that

MR. SIMMONS: the move to call public, to invite public bids in any way might adversely affect a possible reopening of the refinery at some future time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, that is very difficult to answer. The Federal government and ourselves both thought there should be a further delay to see if we could not get some firm proposals on the table before the -

MR. SIMMONS: Delay in going public, you mean?

PREMIER MOORES: Yes. So we could get some firm proposals on the table. But as I say we have absolutely no jurisdiction over what the British have done, and now that it has been done the proposals will have to come in under that condition.

MR. SIMMONS: A further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, was the government, our government here, consulted by the British before the final decision was made to go public?

PREMIER MOORES: The British had notified us some two or three months ago that this was their intention, Mr. Speaker. At that time they were talking a couple of weeks, but I had no contact regarding the issuance of the proposals and if we had any contact at all it was within hours before the thing was actually in the papers and was gone.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now that the oil refinery has been put on the auction block, would the Premier indicate to the House if his administration would tolerate in any way, shape or form scrapping the oil refinery or somebody bidding on it for scrap or dismantling the oil refinery and taking parts of it out of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Under no circumstance, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: What a silly question!

MR. NEARY: It is not. It is a good question, it is not a silly question.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier tell us in connection with this announcement by, in effect, ECGD - no, in effect -

PREMIER MOORES: Kleinwort - Benson

MR. SMALLWOOD: Kleinwort - Benson, the merchant bankers who represent the ten banks in Britain who under guarantee of ECGD put up the money, the main money, the first money for the oil refinery, is this decision of theirs to call for tenders to September 15th in fact the result of strong representations made by the Premier and by the Government of Canada to Britain, to the relevant authorities in Britain, that might otherwise have been acted upon long before but for their representations? In other words what I am asking the Premier is this: Is it not a fact that the Premier is to be thanked by everybody really involved, primarily Newfoundland, be thanked for delaying the calling of tenders to September 15th which will give those who are trying to put together a revival of the refinery - and I am thinking primarily of Mr. Shaheen - has not the Premier really made a strong contribution to that cause, that if he had not and if the Canadian Government had not



MR. SMALLWOOD:

made the representations they did in London - and the Premier will excuse me if I say that I have heard some rumor of the representations he made in London and the representations made by the government of Canada in London. I have heard these rumors. I know little about this Come By Chance oil refinery. And I know little about this powerful effort that Mr. Shaheen is making to get it reactivated, which is the prayer of every Newfoundlander he will succeed in doing - that the Premier and the Canadian government are to be thanked as of this moment for their success in causing the tenders to fall due not before the middle of September which gives Mr. Shaheen and anyone else who might try to put a deal together, not to buy scrap, not to tear Come By Chance apart, but to get it reactivated, bigger and better than ever, that we owe the Premier a lot, a vote of gratitude, for having delayed this call for tenders until the middle of September, long before which date we hope and pray to God that Shaheen or someone - my own personal preference is fairly well known - but someone will come with a deal to reactivate this great refinery, not only reactivate it but make it bigger and better than ever. Now that is a long question. And the Premier will understand the sympathetic spirit in which I pose the question. And I know that Newfoundland will hear with enormous interest his answer to this long and rather involved question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if it is a question or a eulogy.

MR. SIMMONS: That bad, ah!

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, probably, for somebody. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we have been involved in the timing for the tender call and delaying it to try to get those people who were interested, all groups, as much time as humanly possible to try to put together a very complicated set of numbers and dollars that have to be done to reactivate the refinery.



PREMIER MOORES:

As I said to the member for LaPoile, Mr. Neary), under no circumstances whatsoever could this government, or any other government, I suggest, sit by in this Province to allow that refinery to be scrapped, to be taken off for that and that should be made very clear and very much on the record.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

PREMIER MOORES: Like the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), and I am sure once again every member in this House, we are very anxious that the refinery be activated and hopefully the September 15 deadline which is a few months away will give those people who are actively interested in opportunity to get the proposals in.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NOLAN: I cannot remember offhand, I do not have a copy of the ad from Peat Marwick Mitchell, I believe, who submitted the ad in yesterday's -

MR. SMALLWOOD: In behalf of Kleinwort-Benson.

MR. NOLAN: Well, whoever they had it on behalf of. The fact is that it was in yesterday's Telegram and also, I believe, in the Wall Street Journal. I am not aware that there was anything in the particular ad that stipulated that the refinery bought in whole or in part had to stay where it is. And this is the question that surely we are interested in right now. I mean, there is nothing in the ad. And I would think if you were buying it, or anyone else, there is nothing in there that I know of that says it must stay there. I wonder if the Premier could enlighten us on this?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, this House has certain legislative powers, and it would be this government's intention to bring in legislation at any time if there was any threat of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Bellevue, a supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Premier regarding the refinery. Will the Premier comment on the suggestion that the British have now called tenders on the refinery naturally to get their money back, but in addition with the hope that Ataka, who has sunk approximately \$300 million in the refinery concerned, in the hope that Ataka will bid on it, will buy it, reactivate it and then hopefully get their money back?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I do not think anyone knows that answer, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that they want to get a realistic proposal that can make that refinery a going concern again. There is no questioning the fact that the Japanese, the unsecured creditors - I think it is far in excess of \$300 million. It is much closer to \$400 million. - certainly have a very vested interest as to what happens even in their unsecured position. But this is one of the things the auctions will do, we will just see what kind of remuneration they will get or whether they will be interested themselves. But I have no idea as to the answer.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: I am wondering if the Premier - the Premier mentioned earlier in answer to a question that there were offers from the Roman group and also from Mr. Shaheen - I am wondering if the Premier could tell us -

PREMIER MOORES: Verbally, you mean.

MR. NOLAN: Verbally, yes, I am sorry.

I am wondering if the Premier could tell us if in fact there have been also approaches by the Japanese? We understand that the man in New York - at least the one responsible for advancing up to something in the vicinity of \$300 million - has been withdrawn from New York. He has probably gone home to commit hari-kari or something. But the fact is, is there an offer from the Japanese to buy the refinery?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, no.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether he has received any word or any correspondence yet from the Mount Sinai School of Medicine and Dr. Selikoff regarding the road dust samples that were taken on the Baie Verte Peninsula last June, I do believe?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the only indication from Dr. Selikoff has been an indirect indication through the media in the Province, the electronic media, who were in contact with Dr. Selikoff and the Mount Sinai research foundation, or facility in the States whereby Dr. Selikoff did indicate publicly that his report would be forwarded to the Newfoundland Government in a matter of days, and that interview was with Dr. Selikoff approximately two weeks ago. The report, I understand, would not be coming to me. It would be coming to my colleague, the Minister of Health. It is regarding a matter pertaining to a health hazard in the Baie Verte area. So to date neither my colleague nor myself has received any official correspondence, in fact any correspondence whatsoever from Dr. Selikoff, none whatsoever.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister will acknowledge that a health hazard related to road dust would be the direct responsibility of the minister. Since the minister is aware of Dr. Selikoff's comments to the media only a couple of weeks ago, has the minister's department at any time ever made any effort to get in touch with Dr. Selikoff to ask him if he could have the road dust analysis that was carried out in that area, a copy of whatever the results were?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we did. In fact, last Fall the Deputy Minister of Transportation and Communications contacted Dr. Selikoff by phone and spoke to him briefly, and it was briefly.

MR. RIDEOUT: When?

MR. MORGAN: In the Fall of 1976.

- and it was briefly because Dr. Selikoff in no uncertain terms clearly indicated to the Deputy Minister of Transportation and Communications that it was none of his business, the report was coming in to the Department of Health, it had nothing

Mr. Morgan.

to do with Transportation. So the deputy minister was merely inquiring about Dr. Selikoff's statements which were made by him, or at least attributed to him in the media in the Province. The only contact we have made since is a call to his office which, I understand, was made about two months ago, again requesting some confirmation of the statements made, and to verify the research carried out by the Department of Transportation and Communications in co-ordination with the geology department of the University here in St. John's which did not give any conclusive evidence that there was any asbestos dust in the road dust on the Baie Verte Peninsula. So other than that, Mr. Speaker, we have had no correspondence or contact with Dr. Selikoff.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, this is the most urgent matter facing the people of the Baie Verte Peninsula today. In view of that, could the minister tell the House - and there is a report on the way to the minister - could the minister tell the House whether or not he will make another effort to get in touch with Dr. Selikoff because the Summer is going to be gone in another couple of months and the construction season is going to be over. Could the minister tell the House, tell me, tell the people of the Baie Verte Peninsula, will they get in touch with Dr. Selikoff, ask him to send down the statistical analysis - because I have a letter which I have sent to the minister today - but to send down the statistical analysis so we can look at it and get on with the job? It is the minister's responsibility to take this ball right to New York if necessary. I am not the minister.



MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I again indicate - taking the ball! We took the ball last Fall. The report was not going to be filed with the Department of T. and C., although there is an indirect connection and now maybe a direct connection, but the report was coming in to my colleague, the Minister of Health. It was going to deal with all possible health hazards on the Baie Verte Peninsula area in connection with asbestos dust. It was not just merely one report for the Department of T. and C. It was an official report to the administration of the Province. Now sure I will arrange for the officials of the department again to make contact. But I sincerely hope, and I repeat, I sincerely hope that the response from Doctor Selikoff will not be of the insulting nature as it was last Fall.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I am dissatisfied with the answer and I will debate it at the late show tomorrow.

MR. MORGAN: The answer about what?

MR. RIDEOUT: The answer about everything.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in connection with this rather urgent matter, this health hazard in the Baie Verte area, and in view of the fact that Doctor Selikoff is working independently of government, is not commissioned by government in any way, shape or form, is under no obligation to this government, does the Minister of Health not think that it is incumbent upon him and his officials and his department to investigate an explosively potential health hazard on that road on the Baie Verte Highway and in Baie Verte in connection with asbestosis? Does the minister not feel there is some obligation for the minister to take the initiative? Doctor Selikoff, who is down in New York, took the initiative. Should not the minister be taking the initiative and doing something about this?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, Doctor Selikoff and the Mount Sinai University are not doing, they have done the report at the request of the Steelworkers Union, I think, in Baie Verte,

MR. COLLINS: not entirely outside the auspices of the government. As I indicated to the House earlier, when Doctor Selikoff agreed to go in and do the study naturally he made contact with us and there were a number of telephone calls back and forth and some correspondence. And we indicated to the doctor at the time that all of the resources of the Department of Health, the university would be made available to him.

MR. NEARY: I know. I understand all of that but there is no direct -

MR. COLLINS: And everything that he asked for we supplied him with in terms of cars, in terms of equipment which we could find, in terms of human resources. We also supported the study financially. I forget what the figure was, but not a great deal of money. But there was a certain amount of money. And he did not want very much from us really in terms of financial backup. Doctor Selikoff is a gentleman who we all realize now maintains a pretty high profile. I suppose the type of work which he does, a lot of research work at a big university, he wants to let all the people in the United States and Canada and elsewhere know that he is there because they have to go out and raise funds, of course, for research work. But Doctor Selikoff has promised us a report just as soon as he can get all of the information put together. And I would prefer that Doctor Selikoff and his team would take the time to do the report properly. I assume they did their testing and so on in Baie Verte. And knowing that the man has credibility, I am sure that the report will be coming to us just as soon as it is ready. In fact, I believe, although I am not sure of this either because he has not made any formal commitment to us as to the date of a report being submitted. And we will be getting a copy, it will go to the Steelworkers' Union in Baie Verte. But I believe that on the basis of the X-rays, etc. which were performed on the individuals in Baie Verte, I think a lot of the miners probably have received word back. I understand some of them have anyway from Doctor Selikoff. The hon. member might -

MR. MORGAN: Not one, no, no.

MR. COLLINS: But it is my understanding that they have. I have not got anything in writing to show that.

MR. RIDEOUT: Within three weeks.

MR. COLLINS: Within three weeks. But we could - I can call Doctor Selikoff tomorrow afternoon, or this afternoon for that matter. But I am not sure what purpose it might serve.

MR. NEARY: What is that going to do about it.

MR. COLLINS: Well we are waiting for the report.

MR. NEARY: You are not going to get the backup material from Doctor Selikoff.

MR. COLLINS: I am pretty sure we will. Doctor Selikoff promised to co-operate with us to the extent that we co-operate with him, and that was the maximum co-operation.

MR. NEARY: He is not going to give you his X-rays and all this sort of thing. You are not going to have access to all the documentation.

MR. COLLINS: The hon. member, Mr. Speaker, is talking about a subject

MR. H. COLLINS: of which he knows very little.

MR. NEARY: I know all about it.

MR. H. COLLINS: And -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. H. COLLINS: - We have an expert -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

When the hon. gentleman is answering there should not be that kind of interruption.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, original questioner.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Health could tell the House when was the last time his department was in touch with Dr. Selikoff, asking him how he was getting on with the report - whether he had it ready, and when we could expect to get it?

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would not want to give a date because I might give the wrong date, but I will certainly undertake to get that information for the hon. member. I do not want to get into a public discussion with Dr. Selikoff. I could say two weeks or three weeks ago and that might not be the facts, but I will certainly get that information.

MR. RIDEOUT: But you will get the information?

MR. NEARY: A further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: One further supplementary, the hon. gentleman for LaPoile and then the hon. gentleman for Twillingate.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell the House whether the officials of the provincial Department of Health will have access to the X-rays all the documentation and all the working papers and all of Dr. Selikoff's files, and will they be thrown open for perusal, to be scrutinized by the minister's official? Does the minister know that? And is Dr. Selikoff under any obligation at all to give the Province a report?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. And whether Dr. Selikoff gave us a copy of the report or not I do not think is too important,



MR. H. COLLINS: but I am sure he will. But if he provides the report, which I am sure he will do, to the Steelworkers Union of America, the local at Baie Verte, I have no doubt at all that we will be getting a copy of it just as quickly as they do.

MR. NEARY: What about the working papers, the X-rays and so forth will you have access to that?

MR. H. COLLINS: I will certainly look into that, but I presume - I am sure we will get whatever information is necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Health give me his opinion on an assertion made to me two or three weeks ago in the airport terminal in Montreal. I was on my way to London and a man there came up and made himself known to me. He turned out to be a man named Hutchinson, the Chairman of the Board of the company - What is the name of the company?

MR. RIDEOUT: Advocate Mines.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, no, the company that owns Advocate Mines.

SOME NON. MEMBERS: Johns-Manville.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Johns-Manville - Mr. Hutchinson. That the long delay in the report from New York from Dr. Selikoff was to him clear indication - clear, and to him, unmistakable indication; and he was immensely interested as head of the company in Baie Verte he would be enormously concerned - that the long delay is clear indication to him that the report from Dr. Selikoff will be, as we all hope and pray to God it will be, that we do not have to worry too much. And then, would the minister comment on the further statement made to me by Mr. Hutchinson that their operation in Quebec - I suppose it is about the same kind of operation - in a long, long period of time with hundreds and hundreds of workers, twenty-five, thirty years and more working at the same kind of work end up in perfectly good health.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is not true.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, I do not know whether it is true or not.

MR. RIDEOUT: I can put it on paper.



MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, well, I have no knowledge. I am asking the minister -

MR. RIDEOUT: I will go down to the office and bring up all the stuff from Quebec and start reading it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, I would certainly love to read it.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not know that I would love to read it - I would be most interested in reading it. But what I am asking the minister is his reaction to the statement -

MR. RIDEOUT: I am not worried about the reaction!

MR. SMALLWOOD: - to me in casual conversation by that Chairman of the Board of the company that owns and operates Baie Verte.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we generally believe in the Department of Health and the people who are involved in the Occupational Health and Safety Division, that by virtue of the fact that Dr. Selikoff has not seen fit to rush the report, certainly would indicate that things look pretty well down there. Now I cannot say for sure if that is a fact or not, but I would presume that had the X-rays which were done, and other tests which were done by him and by our own people, had they shown any cause for alarm I suspect that Dr. Selikoff would have had his report out pretty quickly. I think that is what the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) is alluding to. However, I would not want to say that that is so, but there is every appearance that Dr. Selikoff is not attaching too much importance -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not conclusive, but it is suggestive.

MR. H. COLLINS: That is right.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling the motion, I would welcome to the House of Assembly on behalf of all hon. members some gentlemen from Badger - Mayor Guy Coleman,

MR. SPEAKER: Councillor Davis and Councillor Hayden.

I know all hon. members join me in welcoming these gentlemen to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day, Motion 7 is called and the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) was delivering his discourse.

A point of order has come up.

MR. NEARY: I do not know if it is a point of order, a point of information, or what, Sir, but, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to forego Private Members' Day to carry on with the Linerboard debate, because if we do not carry on with it, Sir, we are going to destroy the momentum that has been created in the last two or three days. I believe the Government House Leader should call the Linerboard debate and let us get on with it. It is a rather urgent matter, Sir.

Give up Private Members' Day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It being Private Members' Day I automatically call the Private Members' motion. If what the hon. gentleman is asking is whether there is leave, whether there is unanimous consent to revert to Motion 6, which is the Linerboard debate, I cannot call it, indeed the Government cannot call it, but if there is unanimous consent, then the House can call it. So, is there unanimous consent to go to the Linerboard debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Yes!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I asked yesterday of my friend opposite for unanimous consent and the official Opposition have indicated they are not prepared to grant it.

MR. MORGAN: Shame!

AN HON. MEMBER: What shame?

MR. MORGAN: Such an important debate!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NOLAN: If the private discussion is over, Mr. Speaker!

The hon. House Leader knows that he discussed this with me last evening. He also knows the answer that I gave on behalf of my colleagues. We happen to feel that the Linerboard mill is one of the most vital things to come before this House in a long time. We also know that certain things are going to happen in the next couple of days and we also know that the Joint Venture is important; and we have decided, and this has already been conveyed to my friend, the hon. House Leader opposite, that before this House opened today and last evening that we would go with Private Members' Day today. It is as simple as that. I mean, all -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's question has been answered. Unanimous consent is not given. Motion 7 is called and the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) was in the midst of his discourse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: I would like to continue my remarks on the motion as presented by the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in connection with Joint Ventures. Before continuing to do so I would like to say that we have had a lot of doom and gloom in the House over the past couple of days. In fact, most of it came from the West Coast of the Province. I am happy to say that there is a very bright spot on the West Coast and I refer to the herring fishery; in fact, I only heard today, although the spring herring fishery has been going on for some time, that the six herring fishing plants are working to full capacity. There was a newly renovated plant in Cox's Cove last year. They have now added two new filleters to this plant and they are employing twenty-nine people.

Mr. L. Woodrow:

There is a company formed, Two of the most respected citizens of the West Coast in the persons of Joe Taylor from Bonné Bay and Captain John R. Hackett from Halfway Point, Bay of Islands, have formed a company and it is called T. and H. Fisheries. And this new plant is turning out to be very beneficial to this part of my district, that is to say to the community of Cox's Cove. The Silver Dolphin, a large boat owned by Captain John Hackett, landed 100 tons of herring in Cox's Cove last Saturday. And these herring were trucked to places like Curling, to Benoit's Cove and Lark Harbour. And up to this date, in fact, herring had to be trucked from as far back as Arnold's Cove and other places on the East Coast, so it is really nice to know that the herring supply now for the plants, for the six plants in the area, are coming from Cox's Cove and this is going to mean a lot more employment because it is going to give employment not only to the people who are directly connected with the processing of the herring, but it will also give work to truck drivers as well.

MR. MURPHY: How has the price been? Are they getting a dollar?

MR. WOODROW: Oh they certainly are, yes. They are certainly making a very good dollar on it. And it also, Mr. Speaker, to my mind brings out the importance of having private enterprise look after any, I suppose, and all project if possible in our Province. I have always felt that private enterprise should be encouraged everywhere in the Province, and I hope that it will continue and may I say also that if we ever get the Linerboard Mill going again, I hope with God's help we will, that it will go under private enterprise.

Now these large quantities of herring are giving employment not only to the people in Cox's Cove, at least to a portion of them, but they are giving employment to the people all over the district, giving employment to the people in Curling and all along the South shore of the Bay of Islands and in other communities on the North shore as well. And this is really very, very encouraging, and I hope that this will continue because it is giving



MR. WOODROW :

a lot of employment to both the males and the females in the area, and when there is no herring fishery they are able to get their unemployment, which means a lot to the district of the Bay of Islands, and it certainly makes me very happy.

Mr. Speaker, the motion deals primarily with the 200 mile management zone, and also with joint ventures. And the resolution of the motion is: Be It Therefore Resolved that in order to give effect to these purposes a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the proposals with respect to joint ventures, to examine their implications and effects with respect to the fishery of Newfoundland and

MR. WOODROW:

Labrador and to report thereon. Mr. Speaker, when I started to address the House on this motion last Wednesday I emphasized that I would vote against the motion because we have a very capable Minister of Fisheries. In fact, his capabilities, his qualifications have been made well known in this House of Assembly. They have been made known by the former Premier, by just about every member in fact who spoke on fisheries. I know and realize that they have the greatest respect for him and they feel that he is capable, with his competent staff, of doing a good job for the Province of Newfoundland; capable, in fact, of at last getting this great industry off to a good start, off to a different start. I suppose we could say to a 1977 start - after our history of 500 years of fishing.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday I had the pleasure of speaking on television and I took for my topic joint ventures. I pointed out how important this is for the Province of Newfoundland and also, I should say, that it is something, to me, at least, and I think to all of us, it is something like new life being pumped into the fisheries. In other words, we have to learn all about it. I suppose in fact you could say it may be I do not know whether the comparison is good or not - but it is almost like the birth of a new baby in a family: You have to start off, in fact, right from the beginning and nurse the baby up until he or she is strong enough to walk on his own feet. So I do not think really that we should expect miracles right away. It is going to take time to get the new fishery programme, as it were, off the ground.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad also to say that my district is a very important district for the herring fishery. And we have there, in fact, we have at least six herring plants. And they are also, to a certain degree I suppose, they are run by private enterprise, granted that the money has been put in them from government sources, but the people who are running them know what they are doing. They are very intelligent, very productive and maybe I should say very good Newfoundlanders.

May 11, 1977.

Tape 2553

RH - 2

MR. WOODROW:

And as a result in fact of those plants it certainly is alleviating a lot of unemployment in the district. There are, for example, in the Curling area there are plants that are owned by Barry Fisheries, Dunphy's Fisheries, and Humber

MR. WOODROW: Cold Storage. I suppose altogether these plants may be giving as much as, probably employing up to five or six hundred people, and giving a lot of work also to maybe people like truckdrivers and the like. A little farther on down the shore we have the very enterprising firm of Allen's Limited. They are not only engaged in the herring fishery, but they are engaged in the lobster fisheries and in the salt cod and other species as well. This in fact is a privately owned company and very little government funds have been put in it, but it is doing a lot for the community of Benoit's Cove and the nearby places.

Of course, then National Sea Products are established in Lark Harbour. They are employing, I just cannot say offhand, but maybe in the vicinity of seventy or eighty people during the herring season. I understand that there will be a new plant built out there in the very near future. Also, to encourage the fisheries in the Lark Harbour area the hon. member from Humber-St. George's - St. Barbe got for the people this year, they will be getting a new wharf built out there, at a cost of some \$200,000. There is also a wharf being built under the LIP Programme over in Little Port. All of this in fact is doing wonders for the fishery in this part of the province, namely, in the Bay of Islands District.

As I said earlier, the enterprising firm of T. & H. Fisheries took over the plant in Cox's Cove last year and they have added this year two filleter machines and they really mean business and I feel they are going to do a lot for the fisheries in this part of my district. So, it is really encouraging, Mr. Speaker, to be able to report such a good thing for the fisheries in the Bay of Islands District.

MR. NEARY: Tell us a few things about joint ventures.

MR. WOODROW: About what?

MR. NEARY: About what the resolution calls for.

MR. WOODROW: Now we are coming to that Mr. Speaker. I mentioned some things about it already. If you want to hear some more about it maybe I could read a part of this for you first of all.

MR. NEARY: You are not allowed to read speeches.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Statistics only

MR. WOODROW: Yes, statistics only. I believe that joint ventures is presently the most logical and effective solution.

Through cooperation with other countries like the West Germans, who have the catching capabilities, the expertise and advanced technology our present feasible industry can be turned into a prosperous, viable, year-round operation.

MR. NEARY: We are to take it the hon member is in favour of joint ventures.

MR. WOODROW: Well, I see that that was coming, Mr. Speaker. What I am saying is that we are starting off on a new venture and we have to learn what it is all about. I think that really joint ventures are going to help us because they are going to teach us something. But I do not expect,



MR. WOODROW: and I would want them in fact to continue in the future, but I hope they will continue as long as we feel they should continue. Our traditional eight to twelve week fishing season is just not enough to provide a measure of economic security for communities with a relatively very weak base. If joint ventures prove to be successful, as I believe they will, it would mean that fish plants could offer full-time employment while the plants could expect a specialized permanent work force processing a variety of species of fish for our broadened world markets.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore feel that when we get properly established, are properly on our feet, then maybe in fact, and I hope so, we will be able as it were to venture out in the deep on our own. Mr. Speaker, with the introduction of the 200 mile limit this year our fishing industry is facing the biggest challenge in its history. With sharp reductions in foreign fishing quotas and increased management within the zone it is hoped that fish stocks hitherto dwindling will restore themselves to a healthier level. With increased fish stocks the challenge for us all will be to build up our Newfoundland fishing effort in order for us to harvest the total allowable catch in our own ships to be processed year-round in our own plants utilizing a permanent, specialized work force. We are presently looking at the development of our fishing effort so that we will have the ships and expertise to increase fish landings to the point where the Province's one-and-one-half billion pound plant processing capability will be fully utilized.

No fishery can develop overnight the sophistication needed to exploit our marine resources now available to our Newfoundland fleet. Special ships are needed to utilize the Hamilton Banks stock, vessels that are strengthened to operate in ice which covers much of the area at this time of the year. Until we have the ships and expertise to do the catching ourselves, joint ventures appear to be a logical alternative, most importantly as a learning experience for our

MR. WOODROW: Newfoundland fishermen and indeed for our fishery officials in general. We will continue to develop the Newfoundland fishery for the benefit of our fishermen and continue to find new possibilities and directions within the industry to make it the primary resource it has always been for Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I think my time has just about expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: I want to say that I back the Minister of Fisheries, the Premier and the administration one hundred per cent and I admire the efforts, the visits they have made, the European trips and the like. I am sure in fact all these trips have been very productive and as time goes on and I hope in the near future, Mr. Speaker, we will reap the benefits of the fisheries of Newfoundland. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the resolution we are on is really the coming together, the happy marriage of two resolutions. I would suggest it is a portent of things to come where we shall witness more happy marriages involving the individuals concerned.

MR. NEARY: We are getting closer together.

MR. SIMMONS: All the time. The member for LaPoile put down a motion on the

MR. SIMMONS: Order Paper on opening day on the subject of joint ventures, as we recall. The Leader of the Opposition put down a resolution whose concern was the same, and, as I say, there was a happy marriage of both. And we have the one resolution standing, as is appropriate, in the name of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. NOLAN: If we can recognize Red China.

MR. MURPHY: New leader! New leader!

MR. SIMMONS: Ah, Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend from St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) we do not have any leadership problem over here.

MR. MURPHY: No bands or anything?

MR. SIMMONS: No leadership problem over here. I have got my band all ready to go, all primed up.

AN HON. MEMBER: The band ready, literature printed!

AN HON. MEMBER: Of course, you are not running!

MR. SIMMONS: Well, it may be for renting. As a matter of fact I have tried to nail it on the guy from LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I cannot quite determine whether he has booked it or he has just got an option on it. But one way or the other he will figure in the band, either as a member or as a sponsor.

MR. NEARY: No, I will be playing the tambourine.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, that is another joint venture we will love to talk about, but the one I want to talk about today is the one to which the motion addresses itself. I represent one of the great fishing districts of this Province, Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. For many, many years, for decades now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MURPHY: We have seen more fish marketed in Steers Cove than you ever heard of.

MR. SIMMONS: I would love to have a battle of wits with the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) except it would be a one-sided battle, and I would not dare to say in which direction. I would not dare to say in which direction.

MR. MURPHY: Anyway, I am sorry, 'Roger'. Go ahead.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir has a tradition which goes back into the last century, well back into the middle of the last century. Burgeo itself - the dates of settlement escape me - but the people

MR. SIMMONS:

there have always from the very earliest days relied on a thriving year-round fishery. Indeed that Coast is the only part of this Province which can truly claim to have a year-round fishery. The people in Burgeo and Ramea and Francois and Macallum, those communities in particular in my district and other communities on that Coast fish fully ten and a half months to eleven months a year. Now they have some lean periods. They have some slack periods, slack, not in terms of their involvement but slack in terms of the return that they get for their efforts. But barring Christmas Day and bad weather they are out there in their boats, whatever the size, from early morning on. And the result is that they prosecute the fishery in a way that is unknown, for various reasons, in other parts of the Province, unknown by virtue of weather conditions, climatic conditions on the Northeast Coast and on the Labrador Coast. It is the South Coast of this Island which has the most potential for the development, the future development of the fishery. And it is for that reason in particular, as a member for one of the South Coast ridings, that I can get particularly excited about the advent of the 200 mile limit and its implications for the future of the fishery. All forms of the fishery are prosecuted on the Southern part of this Island. They have a very thriving inshore fishery, codfishery in particular. They pursue the herring fishery. They pursue the lobster and the salmon fishery. We, of course, on the South Coast have the big trawler fleets which pursue the midwater and the deep sea fishery. So in a variety of ways, as plant workers, as inshoremen, as trawlermen, in a variety of ways we have men and women who prosecute the fishery or who participate in the processing of the catch in one form or another.

So it is appropriate that I, as a member representing a district with such a continuing and long tradition in the fishery, should want to address myself to it for a few minutes. I believe most of the things that need to be said on this subject have been said, because the decision we are asked

MR. SIMMONS:

to make in this resolution is fairly clear and pretty much to the point. The resolution having set forth a number of whereases, a number of arguments for the step which is being proposed, the resolution then proceeds to say, "Now be it therefore resolved that in order to give effect to these purposes," the purposes outlined above in terms of the feasibility of joint ventures and how they might serve the future of fisheries enterprise of the Province, "now therefore to give order, to give effect to these purposes a select committee to be appointed to inquire into the proposals with respect to joint ventures, to examine their implications in effect with respect to the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador and to report thereon." And the resolution goes on to give power to the committee to sit in and out of session, to send for papers and documents and that kind of thing, the usual provision for a select committee of this House. But the burden of the motion, the essential decision, is whether we ought to set up a committee of this House to look into the whole question of joint ventures.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I referred a moment ago to the extent of the fishery insofar as my own district in my own part of the Province is concerned. But let us, for the sake of a prospective, let us look at the impact of the fishery on this Province as a whole.



MR. SIMMONS: The fishery today has a direct implication for over 300 communities in Newfoundland and Labrador. I understand there is well in excess of 15,000 people actually involved in the catching of fish of one kind or another. Fifteen thousand get their direct livelihood from catching fish. I am told that there is another 10,000, an additional 10,000 people involved in fish handling and fish processing so that with the 15,000 plus who are catching and the 10,000 who are handling and processing you have 25,000 plus - 25,000 people, as a minimum, involved in the fishery at this particular moment in time. That represents about 15 per cent of the entire labour force of this Province - 15 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, we in this country talk a lot about resources, untapped resources, and the difficulties of tapping our resources. But here, Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced, is one area where not only do we have tremendous resource potential but we are beginning to find the way to properly, efficiently tap that resource. It is an exciting resource. It is one that offers a lot of promise for us economically and socially. I say socially because a good part of our problem in this country has been that we have become involved in ventures which, while economically sound, are socially - ethnically, if you like - socially, culturally very much out of step with our way of life. That is not to criticize them but it is to comment on the Come-by-Chance operation, the Churchill Falls operation to some degree. You know, the thought that 1,000 Newfoundlanders could be hemmed in an artificial community such as Churchill Falls is, that thought, if you related it to a period of ten or twenty years ago, would be absolutely unthinkable; that fellows so used to living in the communities around the bay - Trinity Bay and Bonavista Bay and Placentia Bay - would find themselves today completely landlocked in a very artificial type community, the only exit from which is by plane about three times a week, a very artificial set of circumstances in comparison or in relation to our tradition as a people - our lifestyle - our physical lifestyle as a people.

MR. SIMMONS: The fishery, unlike the hydro development I referred to or unlike the Come-by-Chance development or unlike others that we have locked into, even the Buchans mining operation, for example, or the St. Lawrence mining operation, or the iron ore mines in the Labrador City/Wabush area, or the asbestos mine in Baie Verte, or the copper mine in Baie Verte, or the five copper mines that used to operate in Green Bay - in Tilt Cove and Whalesback and Little Bay and Gull Bridge - and the other mining operations around this Province are in many respects not foreign to our way of life but certainly not as easily dovetailed into our way of life as is a resource industry, the fishery, which is physically a part of the community and physically a part of our way of life as a whole.

So, I think it is particularly appropriate that the fishery should be showing the promise it is at this time,

MR. SIMMONS: because in the fishery we are not dealing with a lot of unknowns. Now it is true there are unknowns. I do not beg the question of what the total potential is, what the total yield of the fishery is; I do not beg the questions which are unanswered about the impact of new technology in the fishery; I do not beg the question about whether or not the ICNAF quotas are going to conserve the fish stocks to the degree that they purport. There are still a lot of unknowns in the fishery, there is no question about that.

But in terms of whether or not it is suited to our lifestyle as a people, obviously we have 450 years of history behind us to verify that it is very suited to our lifestyle. In that context, in the socio-cultural context, the fishery is an industry that we have lived fairly comfortably with - also fairly poorly with too, I might say - but fairly comfortably with. It is an industry that does not have the hazards associated with it, for example, that mining does, where today a fair amount of our Question Period was taken up in the matter of occupational hazards imposed by the asbestos industry. And I say these comments not to downplay those industries, all of which are playing a very important part economically in our way of life here, but just to draw a contrast with the relative safety, if I might call it such, the relative safety in a social-cultural sense of the fishery, there are not as many unknowns. And now that we are coming into a time where resource stocks appear to be assured in the long-term, though fairly precarious in the short-term, let there be no doubt in the short-term, Mr. Speaker, we are facing very difficult times, we are facing substantial down-time in the plants on the South Coast, in Burgeo and Ramea in my district and in other plants along the South Coast, facing it because of the artificially imposed quotas, the arbitrary quotas - I will not take exception to them here because I am not a biologist or otherwise an expert who can advise on what ought to be

MR. SIMMONS: the appropriate quotas. I can only talk in terms of the impact of those quotas-and the impact of the quotas last year, this year and the next year or so are severe, **severe** economically. They are having a drastic frightful affect on the pocketbooks of the plant workers in Burgeo and Ramea, and the other plants I have not mentioned but which are situated along the coast, and on the pocketbooks of the trawler-men and the in-shore men who prosecute the fishery along that coast.

But in the long-term, Mr. Speaker, in the long-term the evidence is there that the stocks are going to be more than adequate to support not only the fishery on its present scale but a much expanded fishery - a much expanded fishery, and hence the need, Mr. Speaker, to give attention to how we go about expanding that fishery; hence the need for bringing together all the minds and hearts that are concerned about this vital issue.

I have mentioned that about 25,000 - at least 25,000 people - prosecute the fishery either in the catching phase or in the handling and processing phase. I could point out that there is 130 fish plants in this Province - 130 fish plants, large and small around this Island and in Labrador, 130 plants providing direct employment in the communities concerned, processing our product, adding value to the product before it is shipped out of the Province. That is an important consideration in any plan for the future of the fishery: To see that not only is the fish caught - not only are we the hevers of wood and the drawers of water-but that in addition to catching the fish that we have a hand, a direct hand in improving the value of the fish.

And right now a fair amount of the value of the fish is being added at the American stage in the New England states. To a degree that will always be the case because we are always at the beck and call of the market, and if the market says that it wants the fish at a particular stage of its processing then we have to make the hard

MR. SIMMONS:

decision always as to whether we will supply it at that stage of processing or whether we will look elsewhere for the market.

I am encouraged by comments I have heard in recent months that we are looking to Europe for markets because I understand again that the potential for marketing a more finished product,



MR. SIMMONS: a product which is further along the stage of being finished, the potential for doing that in Europe is better than it has been in the United States where they insist on getting the fish at an essentially raw stage and then getting involved themselves in the labour intensive part of the operation.

Mr. Speaker, I was in the process a moment ago, before I got off on a tangent there, talking about the physical facilities and the extent of the fishery in terms of equipment and facilities. I mentioned we have 130 fish plants. We have eighty trawlers prosecuting the fishery. We have about 600 longliners, 600 of them around this Province pursuing the fishery, and in addition to the eighty trawlers and the 600 longliners I understand there is more than 8,000 small, open boats, the eighteen, twenty, twenty-two, twenty-four foot boat, 8,000 boats under thirty-five feet in length also prosecuting the fishery; which brings me to one of the observations I want to make about the fishery and it is an observation of a layman when it comes to fishing. I am not by background a fisherman though my family on both sides has a long tradition in the fishery directly but there are many men in this House who have a much more direct association with the fishery than I do. And so I stand to be corrected on the observation I am about to make. Many men here in this House, my friend from Fogo is among them, a gentleman who knows the fishery inside out and he is just one of many that I could name in this House.

Mr. Speaker, one of the big problems in getting into the fishery these days is the tremendous capital cost. And bearing in mind that by and large the person who is getting into the fishery is not often a person who is necessarily formerly well educated - he does not need to be a college graduate, for example - bearing that in mind the fisherman, while very skilled at the fishery, tends to have a fair amount of difficulty getting through the red tape and that is no comment on any lack of intelligence. That is more an inditement of the amount of red tape involved. The CBC programme Country Canada last Sunday

MR. SIMMONS: aired what I believe was a rather good programme on a community in my district, the community of Gray River. It was called Incident at Gray River. It was a half hour show which I believe basically demonstrated the attempts of the people of Gray River to get productively involved in job opportunities. And the film at one point pursued the possibilities for these people in the fishery and our own Minister of Fisheries was interviewed on the programme. And I say this not to criticize but to demonstrate how we can overlook the essential problem that these men face. I believe that the minister by and large was quite helpful in his comments on the programme. But at one point he found himself saying, "Any young man who wants to get into the fishery

Mr. Simmons:

can do so, Of course, he will need a couple of years experience!" "Any young man who wants to get into the fishery can do so. Of course he will need a couple of years experience." And he went on to say "to qualify for programmes." And that is the bind. That is the bind. And I say to him and to his department that as much as I can appreciate the need for copper-fastening loan agreements to ensure that they are being given to the right people and so on, as much as that need is there, there is an equal need or a greater need to make sure there is an avenue for the young men who have not a couple of years experience, who have no experience in the fishery, to get into it; there must be an avenue for those people to get in, and that is the people who are on the film from Grey River, and in the dozens of other Grey Rivers around this Province. Men who have no experience.

Take the Grey River people, because I think they are symptomatic of people in many other communities in this province. Grey River people a number of years ago were disoriented from the fishery for two reasons; one, was a physical reason - now just keep in mind the geography, Grey River is smack in the middle of a number of fishing communities. Grey River there to the East, Francois, and McCallum, to the West, Ramea and Burgeo, and LaPoile and Grand Bruit and then on up to Rose Blanche and the other communities and into Port aux Basques.

MR. NEARY: Petites, Rose Blanche, -

MR. SIMMONS: Petites and Rose Blanche and Isle au Morts and Burnt Island -

MR. NEARY: Fox Roost, Margaree.

MR. SIMMONS: Fox Roost, Margaree.

MR. SMALLWOOD: These two Southwest Coasters are now monopolizing all the attention of this House.

MR. SIMMONS: Which demonstrates once again where the future of this

MR. SIMMONS:

Province lies.

MR. NEARY: On the Southwest Coast.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Grey River is smack in the middle of a group of communities which have a long tradition of fishing. And the question is often asked, why is Grey River with forty-five families, sixty-six men in that community, why does it have only four men who are prosecuting in the fishery? There are two answers. Before the Bay d'Espoir generating station went onstream, and therefore before the head waters behind Bay d'Espoir were dammed off to serve as a reservoir for Bay d'Espoir generating station, the run-off through Grey River into the ocean where the community of Grey River is located, the run-off there was so great in terms of daily volume of water that it had the effect of creating quite a turbulent water in the harbour of Grey River and in the mouth of the harbour between the community out to the ocean access itself. That run-off was great enough that it affected, particularly in times of high winds or tides or in stormy weather, affected the safety of the entry and exit to and from that particular harbour so that it was not practical on a day to day basis, particularly in the Winter months, for those men to become involved in the fishery although the fishery was all around them. So as a result you had some involvement on a seasonal basis. And they turned instead to the forests. So they became quite well known for their logging activities and for their sawmilling. Indeed at one point I think there was a sawmill in Grey River which used to employ twelve men year round and which would ship the logs all over the Coast. So their industry was logging. And then came the period of the tungsten mine in Grey River. And so for a period a number of the men there, who otherwise would have been fishing or logging, got disoriented again towards a mining economy. Of course that mine closed fairly soon. And now we have in Grey River sixty-six men altogether, some of whom fish,

MR. SIMMONS:

only six of whom, Mr. Speaker, only six of whom are on welfare in Grey River despite opinions to the contrary. I have heard people make comments about Grey River and the implication of the comments is that Grey River is a welfare community. That is not the case. Only six people in Grey River at this moment, or as of a week ago are on welfare, or six families I should say, six families.



MR. SIMMONS:

Of the other sixty men, six of them are in the - four of them are in the fishery, that is the inshore fishery, eight of them work on trawlers, a couple of them work with Hydro looking after the diesel plant there. But for the most part the men are not employed on any continuing basis. I believe the time is ripe for that community, and I use Grey River as just the example of many such communities, the time is ripe for that community to be given a particular introduction to the fishery. I only wish the Minister of Fisheries were here. I think he and I share a view on this particular subject. I have stated this view to him and I shall have the opportunity to do so again.

But I would like to see some particular emphasis given to trying to involve the Grey River type community in the fishery. I do not mean pushing them into it. But I mean some encouragement. I mean some financial encouragement. I did not say give-aways or hand-outs or grants but I mean the adaptation of programmes which will make them eligible for Grey River people.

Now, again let me go back to the statement that the minister made. The minister made this statement: Any young man who wants to get into the fishery can do so provided he has a couple of years experience. Now if that is the criteria for applying for the programmes in the minister's department of course these people in Grey River will never get into the fishery because they do not have the two years experience he is talking about, which are apparently a requirement of getting in. Their plight is repeated many many times around this province.

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the things I want to say. It is not directly on joint ventures. I have a comment on joint ventures which I would like to come to in a moment. But I believe if we are going to take full advantage of the inshore possibilities of the fishery in the years ahead, we have to, on a one by one basis in a systematic way - Grey River today, some

MR. SIMMONS: other community tomorrow - we have to go to them all and say how can we help some of the men in that community get into the fishery. Not, Mr. Speaker, why does he not qualify? Or if he does not qualify - it is fair to ask that question, why does he not qualify, as long as somebody then asks the question, how can we find the programme for which he does qualify? Again, I repeat, not a handout, not a give away, not even a grant, but a programme which is adapted to his particular concern, the particular nature of his problem.. Because as the programme stands now, as great as they sound in election propaganda, as great as they sound announce that great fisheries conferences, they have no meaning for the fellow in Grey River who is sick and tired of doing nothing and would like to get into the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Grey River, like so many around this province, are seeing the fishery as much more attractive an option than was the case in years before. It was the Minister of Fisheries, again in the television programme on Sunday, who said that there was a time when you were threatened with the fishery - if you do not do well in school: If you do not pass Grade VII, you will be a fisherman like your father. Of course, that is no longer a threat. For many people it is a promise. It is a promise. It is a promise of an economically sound job. A job, a career, a profession, which has a future to it.

Mr. Speaker, just a few words on the joint venture. The Evening Telegram a while ago, I think it was a month ago, April 14, published an editorial which said in part, "If the Moores Government has any kind of clear policy for the Newfoundland fishery -

MR. W. CARTER: Excuse me. Would the hon. member allow me to clarify a point?

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, sure, by all means, yes, Sir.

MR. W. CARTER: It is always nice to shape the back to bear the burden. We have the means of assisting the people in one area with their problem and naturally we will help the people with the other one. But he talked about assistance to fishermen and the fact that they had to have two years experience. I should inform the House that we have made some changes in that policy, and while initially we thought that a person applying for a loan should have maybe two years experience, we have now changed the policy where if in the opinion of the Loan Board - and we must have some criteria - that person has what it takes to be a success in the fishery, then we will assist that person.

MR. SIMMONS: That is good!

MR. W. CARTER: That announcement should be made shortly. The decision has already been made to change the policy, and the fishermen will be advised accordingly. Grey River, I think, is an excellent example of where that kind of an approach would be necessary. But certainly we are prepared, Mr. Speaker, to make assistance available to people who want to get into the fishery and that the two-year period will not be required - now up to a certain extent. We are not going to give a young fellow, nineteen, \$200,000 to buy a longliner. It would not be fair to him or to the -

MR. NEARY: He should go to the College of Fisheries and learn how to fish.

MR. W. CARTER: That is right. But, certainly, we will advance assistance up to a certain amount, all things being equal, to people who want to get into the industry without the previously stated two-years experience.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, that is what I call action. That is what I call real action.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is the result of the speech of the last ten minutes?

MR. SIMMONS: Actually, I hope it is the result of that particular program, because the program, for those who did not see it, I thought was quite a good adult education process and it was not particularly critical of anybody in the Government, or anybody else. What it did do was it offered an option for some people. I thank the Minister for his intervention because, as I said, and I am sure he heard me downstairs or wherever he was, the Minister's participation in the program was so positive that I was not even wanting to introduce the sentence, and I was not doing it at all in criticism. It pointed up the anomaly, the problem, the dichotomy of these people are often caught with, and not only in fishing but in others where you walk in to look for a job, you have all the paper credentials, and the next question is, How much experience do you have? And it is hitting so many people. Like buddy said, 'How can you get experience if you have not got any?' How can you have experience if you cannot get it?

In the case of Grey River, the Minister's new policy is a good one because it will cater to that particular need. How completely it answers the need is more up to the community than up to the Minister. The Minister can only anticipate what the need may be and then attempt to cater to it.

MR. W. CARTER: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: I quite agree. Mr. Speaker, at the moment the Minister interjected I was about to get on to something else that is of deep concern to me because it has a relation to the Joint Venture question. I was reading from an editorial in The Evening Telegram of April 14th, and the first sentence says, 'If the Moores' Government has any kind of clear policy for the Newfoundland Fishery it is a closely guarded secret'. 'It is a closely guarded secret.'

AN HON. MEMBER: What is that?

MR. SIMMONS: That is The Evening Telegram editorial of April 14th.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who wrote it?

MR. SIMMONS: I do not know who the author was but we can guess who the author was.

'If they have any policy it is a closely -

MR. W. CARTER: Was slender, tender and bone involved?

MR. SIMMONS: 'If they have any policy it is a closely guarded secret'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at best, at best that statement says that if the government has a policy it is not being made very well known. That is the kindest interpretation. As a member who sits in this particular House I have to say that if there is a policy I have not heard about it either. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us clarify it because we are a very sensitive people, we here in Newfoundland, very sensitive. I am not suggesting the minister is any more a less sensitive than the rest of us, but as a group we are a very sensitive people. And we often do not hear what is being said because we are too interested in who says it. And I am sitting in Opposition to the minister and



MR. SIMMONS: the fact that I point out this statement may mean that somehow I have some malicious motive in mind today.

Mr. Speaker, nobody will fault this minister for being the most active minister that I can recall having occupied the position of fisheries in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: And I say again, active is not a loaded term in that context, active in a positive sense. I mean that. This minister, in my view, from my observations, and I see him from a distance, if you like, I am not in his department obviously, but he has obviously decided that he is going to attempt to do what has to be done and nobody can fault him for that. Indeed you must commend him for that. And wherever I have gotten the opportunity to say not only nice things about the minister but I hope helpful things I have said so. But the minister is facing the same problem, Mr. Speaker, and it is not particularly his problem except in a de facto way, he is facing the same problem that a predecessor of his faced, Mr. Roy Cheeseman, the gentleman whom I succeeded as the member for Hermitage. And you remember that Roy Cheeseman was appointed to Cabinet as the Minister of Fisheries in March 1972 and he resigned from Cabinet and from the House in March 1973 and he kept quite silent on why he had resigned from March 1973 right through that summer and into the fall, and then the Hermitage by-election was called. During the Hermitage by-election, for whatever reason you can speculate yourself, but during that by-election the open line show in the radio station in Grand Bank invited Mr. Cheeseman to go on the air actually during the by-election. Indeed I think it was the Thursday before the by-election was run on the Monday.

MR. NEARY: He wanted to get revenge against the -

MR. SIMMONS: That may be. As I say I am not going to assign motives. I do not know why. My friend with his usually good sources obviously knows why. The fact is that Mr. Cheeseman was asked a question, why did you leave, why did you resign? It was a question he has been asked

MR. SIMMONS: many times and he had answered only in a very dodgy way. The Premier had been asked and the Premier said that Mr. Cheeseman had resigned because he wanted to give time to private business and that kind of thing.

But that fall, Mr. Speaker, about four days before that by-election when the government was running a candidate and the Liberal party was running a candidate, Mr. Cheeseman was asked right in the district concerned or on air waves broadcast into that district, Why did you leave, why did you resign?

MR. NEARY: Who did we cast to ask that question? I did, did I not? Did I not ask him that question?

MR. SIMMONS: No, no. I do not know who planted the question. I know who suggested to Howie Hickman that he call Mr. Cheeseman. I suggested it and it was a chance I had to take because Mr. Cheeseman might well have said some very complimentary things to the government, but so be it.

MR. NEARY: I had been on the phone talking to him from Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: You phoned in, did you not?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: But anyway, I did suggest to Howie Hickman that he call Mr. Cheeseman and he subsequently called him. Mr. Cheeseman came down and went on the open line and Howie said, Why did you resign? And here was his answer and I believe these are almost the exact words he said, "I went in there with the feeling that I could do something for rural Newfoundland and for the fishery," and he mentioned about sitting around the Cabinet table and after that reference he said, "I found that they," presumably in the context of the Cabinet, "I found that they were so busy talking about overpasses and St. John's they had no time"-

MR. MURPHY: Overpasses and St. John's.

MR. SIMMONS: Well these were the words. I am just quoting it.

MR. MURPHY: Overpasses in St. John's.

MR. SIMMONS: Overpasses and St. John's.

AN HON. MEMBER: Cowardly!

MR. SIMMONS: Well that may be. Take that up with Mr. Cheeseman. I am only quoting what is already public knowledge. "I found that they were so busy with overpasses and St. John's that they had no time to talk about rural Newfoundland." And I say to the Minister of Fisheries that if there is truth in that editorial, and I believe there is truth -

MR. W. CARTER: Not one word! Not one word!

MR. SIMMONS: - that the government lacks a policy, a fisheries policy, it is not particularly the minister's fault as such. It is the fault of an administration which either does not have its priorities straight or does not know what they are yet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us relate that comment, if I may, because I know my time must be running out. Could the Clerk indicate?

MR. SPEAKER: Five minutes.

MR. SIMMONS: I want to relate that directly to the joint venture thing. If the Minister of Fisheries is right today when he says that there is not one shred of truth in this editorial, I am going to ask him if in addition to fisheries conferences, which I was privileged to attend in part and

MR. SIMMONS: where I heard people interviewed on CBC radio after say that they never had a chance to say what they wanted to say - and the minister should respond to that sometime - and a programme where I look and I see that the people on every single panel, with about three or four exceptions, are non - fishermen and were never within 500 miles of a boat, And where I see that the panels by and large have as their anchor<sup>man</sup> somebody right from the Department of Fisheries - but there are asides - I say to the minister in addition to fisheries conferences, do the House the courtesy, the House, the members, the elected people of this country, do them the courtesy and tell them what the policy is.

I would suggest, and I say this kindly, I would suggest to the minister that he give thought to putting together a package particularly for members of the House. What he did last week in inviting the members down to have a sample of the fisheries products in this province, that was a good idea, a very good idea.

When, two or three years ago, the minister's predecessor, Mr. Crosbie, arranged or somebody in his department arranged for a handbook, a fisheries handbook, I, a member of the House, first of all I learn of it on the phone from a fisherman down in my district, then I have to get on the phone and ask someone in fisheries would they send one over to me. Now that is just the small example of how the members of the House are forgotten, forgotten, forgotten! The minister's announcement about the longliner programme was not made in this House.

Indeed to my knowledge was never made in this House as such. It was made over in the Holiday Inn, while we sat here. If the minister is being criticized fairly or unfairly for policies or lack of policies and he is anxious to defend himself or more important to put the record straight and get the policy exposed to some



MR. SIMMONS: scrutiny, his first obligation obviously is to tell us what the policy is. Mr. Speaker, there are so many other things could be said about this subject, but my time has run out. I believe clearly that there is a need for a Select Committee (1) because there is so much that is unknown about joint ventures, and (2) because it is time to bring the subject of the fishery back to this House where it belongs. Today decisions about the fishery are taking place everywhere except in this House, just as decisions about electricity and decisions about hydro generally, and decisions about government generally are taking place everywhere except in this House. I believe what is happening in respect to joint ventures reflects the larger problem that we have talked about in this House, that we are becoming a debating forum and a debating forum only, instead of a debating forum which has as its purpose to reflect the kind of concerns that we should have in this Province. We are never going to have them as long as we have a government which insists, for whatever reason I do not know, on circumventing the House role, on circumscribing that role in such a delimited fashion that it can have no input. I say to the minister and to the administration that one clear way to get input on this most important subject of joint ventures is to support this resolution, appoint a select committee and get the feelings of the members of the House - not only the members of the House obviously, but through them the public at large and the industry people, the trade people, the fishermen, the plant workers, the whole group who have any investment in this matter at all, get their input through the select committee of the House. I cannot think of a better way to do it. I congratulate my friend from LaPoile for originating the motion and my colleague the Leader of the Opposition for being part of that motion, and I would hope that there would be



MR. SIMMONS: unanimous support for this particular motion which has a lot of implications for the future of our most promising resource industry, the fishery.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. President of the Council.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, please excuse my voice today, I am a little hoarse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. FARRELL: But I feel that this is such an important area concerning joint ventures that I should say a few words. I am no expert on the fishery. But I did work for several years in parts of the Province where there was a fishery, and I have had close contacts over recent years with the district of my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), particularly in South West Newfoundland and the South West Coast, and indeed in many other parts of the South West Coast, and I know from historical research in this Province over the years and my interest in the history of this Province that the South Coast no doubt was the mainstay of this Province for several hundred years. And I do not disagree for a moment with much of what

Dr. Farrell:

the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) has said; actually I agree entirely with most of what he has said. Now my opinion is, and I have had strong opinions on this for many years, that the future of this Province was the fishery and tourism, but I still hold those views. And just that I digress for one second about tourism I would like to say this, I have not had much chance to speak in the last year or two, is that the tourist potential in this Province is second to none, including the area I was born in which is supposed to have one of the greatest potential from a tourist point of view in the world. But there is nothing even over there that can compare with most of the areas where I have been on the coast of Newfoundland such as Gros Morne, the Bay d'Espoir area, the Burin area, Bonavista area, the Humber area, the Bay of Islands, I do not know any place in the world, including the Rockies, that can compare with the Long Range Mountains at this time of the year. I would like to say at this time that the more emphasis we put on tourism, I think the more money we are going to make in the future.

To come back to the fisheries, there are a few points that I would like to make, As I said, I am no expert, but I will say one thing, that this government, particularly the Premier of this Province, for years has laid emphasis on the fisheries including during the period - because I have been around for every Minister of Fisheries - including the period I mentioned when Mr. Cheeseman, now his name was mentioned, was Minister of Fisheries in this Province. And during our initial days in government, which were very difficult days, when thousands of man-hours were spent on such things - which I should not mention now, and I am not going to mention - industrial development, which has already started or we inherited and which required a great deal of time, but even during that period of time a great deal of time was spent on the fisheries as well. And a great deal of emphasis was laid on the Fishery Department, which was at a very low ebb at that time. But Mr. Cheeseman received full and complete support from his colleagues in the Cabinet at that time. And there is no doubt in my mind that

Dr. Farrell:

the present Minister of Fisheries is by far and away the best Minister of Fisheries that this Province has had in my time in government.

And I do not think there is anything about that. He is a man who has worked like a dog, whose every weekend has been given up since he was appointed to this office. I do not know if he has even had a holiday, Mr. Speaker, since he was appointed Minister of Fisheries. I think perhaps I may be a little wrong there; he may have had a week off comparatively recently during the Easter recess, I am not quite sure of that, because I had a week or two off, because every few months I lay down and bleed awhile, but I always come back eventually.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. FARRELL: And I am delighted, thank God, that I am able to come back. And I could not take notes of much of the speeches that have been made and unfortunately I was not here for much of this debate, and I hope I do not repeat myself. But I would like to re-emphasize that for years the Premier of this Province and all the members of this Cabinet realized the importance of the fishery, and the necessity of the 200 mile limit, almost 70 per cent of which we brought into Confederation, and which in my opinion, had not been handled very well federally, from a federal basis, as far as we are concerned, that we are in the position we are in today, where we are going cap in hand. Talking about our fisheries, the greatest potential that this Province has at the present time - forget, as far as I am concerned, your oil and gas and your power - at this time in history in the short term, where I will disagree with the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), and in the long distant future the fishery of this Province is going to bring us to being a have Province, not oil and gas -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. FARRELL: and not power.

And on the power bit, if Quebec does separate then we can renegotiate the whole power situation that will only add to our benefits. I hope that day never comes, as I expressed in a vote

Dr. Farrell:

in the House here, but if it does we are not going to be a have-not Province because of our fisheries.

Now I was a little involved a year ago in the initiation of this pilot project because we realized, if we got any fair deal at all on the quota system, that we would be unable to catch the quota that would be allotted to this Province, and there were no ways that we could see after rehashing and discussing this for many hours, then the approach we did take - and that was try and find the type of vessel that the member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) mentioned recently, or during his speech this afternoon, that much bigger trawlers to take that 60,000 tons is allotted, or part of it, in Northern waters which we are unable to catch today.

Now how do we catch it? We have our 80 to 100 trawlers on the South Coast who go out the Grand Banks, an ice free area

DR. FARRELL: on the Grand Banks and ice free areas, the mid-water areas, to catch their fish, we need a different vessel. If we started off today to build those vessels it would be five to seven years down the road before we could even have them. Where do we get them? Eighty per cent of the British fleet right now is tied up because of the Icelandic situation. The German fleets are tied up. A lot of European fleets are tied up at the present time. So what do we do? Do we sit around wondering how we are going to catch this fish, or do we pass it back to the Europeans? Because that is the way the bilateral agreements have been worked out by the federal government with the different European nations, without any input from Newfoundland, by the way, Your Honour, no input as far as I know from this Province. They were all done bilaterally by the federal government and the European fishing countries.

Now when we went over a year ago - as I said, I had a little input in it when we discussed this initially - and we felt it was feasible that we get a pilot project, a one-shot deal - 6,000 tons which provided 300 or 400 jobs for this Province in a very difficult time, and which in my opinion, has been very successful. And this is something we had a fight right down along the line with the federal government to initiate, and it proved that it could be successful by providing jobs for the smaller plants although there were only two plants utilized at this time. Now I am speaking a little off the cuff because I cannot refer to any notes, and I made a few notes. But this is a one-shot deal, and this whole subject of this pilot project is under very careful assessment at this time, under very careful study, under very careful scrutiny. Before any further pilot projects will be undertaken in this Province, a full report will be available on all the facts and features that have been gained and the knowledge gained during that pilot project.

Now there is no doubt whatsoever that we do not want Europeans to come over here in perpetuity to catch our fish. And I do not quite understand some of the press and some of the members of the Opposition when they mention that they do not quite



DR. FARRELL: understand what this pilot project - joint venturing, I should say - is all about. But joint venturing looks like it is going to have to be an essential part of our process of catchability in the next several years. There seems to be no way out of it. Wherever those boats come from we can supply them for the present time for those northern waters and I know that it is going to be a benefit to all Newfoundlanders.

Now the hon. member from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) mentioned a number of plants - 130 plants - a great many of them which were only part-time, eight to twelve week plants, the number of fishermen who are fishing directly or indirectly, gaining their livelihood from the fisheries, which are roughly 15,000, and various other matters.

It always seems to be the way that everybody in this Province seems to go to the government. Every time anybody wants anything from Construction to the Board of Trade, it is the government has to produce everything. I do not see very much coming from the fishing merchants themselves in this line - or investments.

I was in British Columbia talking to a very good Newfoundlander not too long ago who was running a big fish company on the West Coast, which has 600 longliners or boats of 60 feet to 65 feet, a little larger than our average longliners, and every one of those boats is subsidized by the company catching the fish, there is very little government input, if any, into that particular company. But it is the company which is providing the finances for the gear and the ships and the expertise and the training, and that is the type of thing I would like to see in this Province,

Dr. Farrell.

besides having to go to foreign countries. But the main fact that I think is not getting across here is that this joint venture is not in perpetuity. It is for a few years. If it works out and our studies of this pilot project prove that it is feasible and economically correct, and even sociologically correct, that we go into this for several years. And I think the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries, the present Minister of Fisheries, are to be congratulated highly on the work they have done over the past year and one-half in getting this project off the ground. I know there is a great deal of work that has gone into this, many, many hours of work that has been going on continuously day and night for over a year and one-half. And the basic groundwork is there, the groundwork to protect the Newfoundland fishery and the Newfoundland fishermen is there, and that is the first and foremost thing in the hearts of the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries, and all their colleagues around the Cabinet table, and I am sure everyone of our members of the House on this side.

You know, when I hear that a year and one-half after our first Minister of Fisheries resigned, Mr. Cheeseman got during a by-election - and that was the first utterances he had made since he resigned from the Cabinet of this government at that time when he was Minister of Fisheries - and the comments were not very complimentary to this administration, but I do not want to set out the whole situation straight, because I do not think it is necessary at this time. But the statements that were made at that time were incorrect. I think it is about time someone said it, that they were incorrect at that time. We had difficult problems in the Marystown Shipyards, and indeed the fisheries as a whole. And, Mr. Cheeseman received every support that this government could give at all times, and it was unfair to hear remarks that he did not receive that support while he was Minister of Fisheries. And I felt he left his job too soon. He

Dr. Farrell.

should have stayed a little longer because we were going through an initial first year period when things were very difficult indeed. However, that was done, and we have not heard from Mr. Cheeseman since that by-election, I do not believe, and I do not suppose we will hear from him again. Maybe we will after today.

But I repeat - and I did write a few things down, but I have an unfortunate habit of writing things down today and then I cannot read them. But when we say -

MR. NEARY: Will the hon. gentleman speak tomorrow?

DR. FARRELL: Yes, if I have a chance.

- when we talk about a Select Committee - and, you know, I am not really at odds about a Select Committee, but I do feel that this present Minister of Fisheries has been travelling this Province since the day he was appointed. I know he has held at least fifteen meetings around the Province -

MR. W. CARTER: Seventeen.

DR. FARRELL: - or seventeen - thank you, Sir - seventeen meetings around this Province, which were extremely well attended, and I think a great many members of the House, including a great many members of the Opposition, he was very careful - I should not say the word careful - but he was very generous to make sure that they attended all these meetings, and got full credit, which they should have, which members of the Opposition should have for more Ministers of the Crown on this side, no matter what area they are in, in highways, Transportation and Communications, the Fisheries, Tourism, that they should be willing to travel to any district in this Island. We are all Newfoundlanders. We should not, because we are in Opposition, avoid that. I tried to do that, I feel - and I stand to be corrected. - in my early years here as first a Minister of Highways, and then Transportation and Communications, if possible.

Dr. Farrell.

where I could aid any member of the Opposition I certainly tried to do so.

Now this Minister of Fisheries at the present time, I think, has done that 110 per cent. And I might add that I believe - I just heard a remark from the Minister of Transportation and Communications, and he also has demonstrated his good will and good heartedness -

MR. NEARY: The only district the hon. minister has not toured is mine.

DR. FARRELL: Well, he is going to do that very shortly. I will make sure of that.

MR. MORGAN: I will tour it with you.

MR. NEARY: The only district he has not toured is mine.

DR. FARRELL: I am going to make sure of that. I am going to ask him especially to visit Burgeo - LaPoile, because it is one of the most beautiful districts -

MR. NEARY: LaPoile.

DR. FARRELL: I am sorry, LaPoile.  
- it is one of the most beautiful districts in Newfoundland, and one of the most prosperous.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. FARRELL: I do not know any people on social services -

MR. MORGAN: Good fishermen.

DR. FARRELL: - in any place from Rose Blanche to Diamond Head to Burnt Islands, Isle aux Morts, Maragree, Fox Roost or



DR. FARRELL: Port aux Basques. Do you know many people on social welfare over the year? Only the ones who are completely helpless medically or from old age are on social services on that part of the coast, and who have ever been on social services. I repeat, historically the South coast of this Newfoundland, all of it, has kept this Province together right up to this day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. FARRELL: That is why I laid so much emphasis on the fishery over the years. I felt, and I think we proved - but very slowly, and I know we have made mistakes - in improving the budget of the Fisheries Department which had a large input this year. I feel it was long deserved and should have been done long ago. More emphasis should have been put on it.

I would like to see people in very wealthy positions in this Province who also come - not the fisherman from Grey River who is looking for some help to get off the ground where he does not have a hope unless he has some government assistance - I would like to see some assistance coming from the people with money in this Province because I am getting a little tired of listening to people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. FARRELL: I am getting a little tired of people coming to the government for handouts continuously, in all fields from construction - what can the government do in construction? We cannot keep building forever. We are at the end of our building in the next year or two. A few more hospitals, a few public buildings, a library or two or whatever, and what happens after that unless there is a massive boom?

MR. NOLAN: They are professional leeches.

DR. FARRELL: I want to come to that.



DR. FARRELL: Exactly! I agree with the hon. the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan). I am getting a little sick and tired listening to them complaining to me personally about what the government is not doing for them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. FARRELL: I am including now the fish companies who do not help their own men, they do not help anybody subsidize any longliners, the government has to do that. Oh sure, to buy a trawler which is well subsidized by the present government, and I want to go into details on that. I am getting a little sick and tired of handouts to people who do not need handouts, at a time like this when we need the support of everybody in this Province to get this Province off the ground.

The only fishery I really know well is the herring fishery on the Bay of Islands and the little bit of lobster and the bit of cod they catch there. But the herring fishery is taking a little beating, and it was mentioned. I said I agreed almost whole-heartedly with everything the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) said, almost whole-heartedly with everything he said. I thought he made a very sensible and very good speech until he got close to the end where naturally he had to go off a little bit.

MR. MURPHY: He had to get a little bit political.

DR. FARRELL: No, I would not say political even. No, he did not get political, he just defended the resolution put there by my good friend - if I remember correctly, I have not seen the Order Paper today - for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and which I thought was an excellent resolution except for the end of it. But I will say, and I repeat, that I think we are being strangled, as he mentioned, by the quota system on the South coast which

DR. FARRELL: is told by some academic biologist from Ottawa who, to quote a favourite remark of the Premier, knows about as much about the Grand Banks as the catch on the Upper Ottawa River and who comes down here and is an instant expert.

That was proved very, very well last year in the herring fishery around the North coast where they felt that the quota system that they put in there for 300 tons and 600 tons in the different bays, from White Bay, Green Bay, and down along there, was sufficient to prove that there was herring there. The largest bodies of herring seen in Newfoundland in years and years were seen up in White Bay, Green Bay and Notre Dame Bay in the last couple of years and has been proven by the number of small herring plants which have gone up along the Northeast coast in the last year. I think that has happened pretty well all over the North coast.

I think we are at fault here, and we have great difficulties in discussing these matters with the federal government on this quota system. Again we are, to put it mildly, we are pushed around. If I could digress again for one second, and I meant to get up at the time but suddenly it was over. We were talking about -

DR. FARRELL: I know I am off base; if I am stop me, Your Honour - And I meant to get up to put one remark across when they were discussing the power rates in this Province, and I agree with the speakers wholeheartedly except for one point, because from British Columbia to Newfoundland the power rates are going up hand over fist in every Province. It is only a matter of checking it through. I have done it recently.

MR. MURPHY: United States too.

DR. FARRELL: Everywhere, but I am just talking about our own country; from BC, which has gone up twenty-seven per cent last week, over here which are not quite as bad as you may think in comparison to some areas, as I could say about Nova Scotia and New Brunswick - of Nova Scotia, I should say, and PEI, who receive large Enersave grants from the federal government of \$72 million and \$18 million, but we could not receive a grant because our application went in too late - which is completely untrue. I stand to be corrected - our application went in at the same time, am I correct, Sir? - but I just throw that out to show the difficulties we are having of negotiating in any way at the present moment apparently with the federal government. But we are having great difficulties and I hope the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs does not mind this criticism, because they are not criticism of him and they are not criticism really of the federal government. I know they have got their problems up there today but it is difficult even though when I hear all the criticisms coming back across the floor that we did not do this federally, we should have applied for that, you know it does make you a little upset when you come down to the fisheries and see the problems that are thrown in your way in trying to make this a successful and everlasting benefit for the Newfoundland people.

Now, Your Honour, my voice is a little rough but I will say this that in view of the fact of the number of meetings that the minister has held, and with members of the Opposition and with members of the government side in the

DR. FARRELL: different areas he has visited. I think that everything that needed to be expressed about the fisheries have been expressed at those meetings and for that reason and that reason alone-if they had not been expressed as well as I thought he had done so, I would be one of the ones who would vote for that select committee-but on the basis of what he has done I just cannot do so. But I would like to congratulate him and the Premier on the work they have done in the last year for the fisheries of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member spoke he would close the debate.

MR. MURPHY: It is rather late, Sir, May I have permission to adjourn the debate, perhaps call it six o'clock?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister has moved the adjournment of the debate. Is it agreed that it be called six o'clock? It being six o'clock the House is adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 10:00 A.M. This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at 10:00 A.M.