

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1978

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am pleased to welcome to the House of Assembly this afternoon seventeen students in the BJRT programme which is being conducted by the Department of Education in conjunction with Manpower at 77 Bond Street. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Cyril Greeley and Mr. Bill Smith.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a very important matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to draw a matter to the attention of the hon. members of the House - and I am sure that the hon. the Government House Leader will approve - and that is, Sir, that Radio Station VPCM has won another award for its excellent news reporting. The VPCM news department, Sir, is the winner of the 1977 Atlantic Provinces Community Leadership award. The award is given to a news service for outstanding community involvement and excellence in news reporting. This time it was one of the subsidiary stations, I think CHCM in Marystown, that was chosen because of its influence in setting up an inquiry into the sinking of the trawler, the Cape Royal.

VPCM has won eleven awards, Sir, from the Radio/Television News Directors' Association of Canada, three of which were for community leadership.

I want to offer congratulations on behalf of members of this side of the House, Sir, to the VPCM network, especially the Marystown station that was so persistent in bringing about this Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Cape Royal sinking.

1775

MR. NEARY: But for the persistence of the news staff, Sir, of that station, we would not have had that Royal Commission of Inquiry. And I am sure that the hon. members on the opposite side would like to join with me in congratulating the news staff and the management of VOXM on winning their eleventh award, three of which were in community leadership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Your Honour.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I, on behalf of hon. members on this side of the House, join with the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in extending congratulations to Radio Station CHCM in Marystown, and I would hope that a letter of congratulations will go to the Manager, Mr. Russ Murphy, in Marystown for their community leadership. Their efforts with respect to convincing the Minister of Transport in Ottawa to establish a Royal Commission - a belated Royal Commission of Inquiry into the loss of the Cape Royal is very commendable indeed.

For the information of hon. members, Radio Station CHCM's influence carries far beyond the South Coast. The ratings show that they have a very substantial listening audience, particularly amongst former Newfoundlanders, in the Province of Nova Scotia, and I quite frequently visit their station in Marystown at their request. And the letters that come in, particularly from Cape Breton, indicate what an influential station for good CHCM is. They have an outstanding staff. They are always interested in the welfare of the Province, particularly so of the South Coast of our Province, and even more so the industrial heartland of Eastern Canada, the Burin Peninsula.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling the first routine order, I wish to draw the attention of hon. members pursuant to Section 29(1) of the Parliamentary Commissioner (Ombudsman's) Act -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

April 6, 1978

Tape 632

EC - 3

MR. SPEAKER:

- that a letter of transmittal

and copies of the third annual report of the Parliamentary Commissioner
have been delivered to my office today and will be distributed within
the next few minutes.

PRESENTING PETITIONSMR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. MODDER:

I beg leave to present a petition

on behalf of the 142 residents of the community of Port au Port West-Aguathuna-Felix Cove. The prayer of the petition is that "Whereas several places on the road through Felix Cove is in a dangerous condition in that it runs by a high cliff and that cliff and the side of the road is crumbling into the sea, and whereas many of the dangerous parts of the road are on a hill which is slippery in winter and school buses and the general public use the road continuously, and whereas conditions are such that should a school bus or vehicle slide or hook into this area it would no doubt go over the cliff, we the undersigned ask the Department of Transportation and Communications to permanently repair through Felix Cove in those places where the road is bad condition and we feel that temporary repairs are not sufficient in this case."

Mr. Speaker, I think the prayer of the petition just about says it all. The road is a very important road, and about two-thirds of the people of the district pass over this road. There is a school very near the section which is in bad condition, the Bishop O'Reilly High School, and that is a feeder school for many communities in that particular area and all of those children are bused through that area each day. This problem arose last year when residents of the area became concerned and at that time I wired the Minister of Transportation and Communications and temporary repairs were done to that section of the road. I believe some car wrecks were put down and some gravel and one thing and another to bolster up the road, but this is not sufficient because the road needs to be taken in somewhat from the cliff. Members might remember that last year an RCMP car went over the cliff in this particular area. I believe they were answering a call and this was the area. Neither one of them was seriously injured but it goes to show, and there have been other cars go over the cliff in this area as well. There are guard rails there but the road has crumbled underneath the

MR. HODDER: guard rails and there is a whole section of the road, perhaps for about two miles there, there are areas where the road needs to be moved, but there is one particular section of road, perhaps 1,000 to 1,500 feet, where definitely the road has to be moved back. I would ask the minister to take heed to this petition and do whatever necessary to repair that section of the road and I ask that the petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay,

MR. RIDGOUT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words in support of the petition so ably presented by my colleague for Port au Port. Mr. Speaker, this must be certainly one of the most reasonable petitions that have ever come before this House certainly this session. All petitions may be reasonable but this one is dealing with safety aspects as far as the condition of the highway is concerned.

The people point out, rightly so, that the section of road referred to is travelled daily by school buses and so on and that the road has tended to deteriorate and wash out. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very reasonable request made to, I would hope, a very reasonable minister that this problem be corrected immediately. You know, it is only a couple of miles of road involved. The people are not screaming and bawling about a major reconstruction job asking for paving and anything of that nature. They are asking that the safety aspects of that particular piece of highway be corrected. And I think it is a very reasonable request. I think it deserves the support of, and I am sure it has the support of every member of this House and I would hope that the minister would act on it and insure that the people of that particular area are provided with a safe piece of highway over which their children can get back and forth to school.

AN HON. MEMBER: Announce it, 'Bill', announce it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

April 6, 1976

Tape 633

DW - 3

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, it is my duty under Standing Order 84(a) as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts to table the Committee's report to the House for the fiscal period ended March 31, 1976. Members will recall that I tabled the Committee's first report to the house, the one I have of last year.

MR. SIMONS: Here, on May 25th. of last year, that document contained not only the Committee's report for the fiscal period ended March 31, 1975 but in addition transcripts of the Committee hearings.

The report which I am today tabling does not include the transcript of hearings. These have been omitted from the actual report because of the sheer volume involved and the consequent awkwardness and considerable expense of including them in a single document. In any event, Mr. Speaker, the transcripts of the individual committee hearings have already been circulated to members of the House and already are part of the House records.

The present report contains a summary of the Committee's hearings, together with its findings and recommendations to the House. Members of the House will be interested to know that there are approximately thirty to forty separate findings, and a total of twenty-three recommendations. All twenty-three of the recommendations represent the unanimous view of the Committee, and all but one of the findings represent the unanimous view of the Committee. The twenty-three recommendations may be broken down as follows: eleven are directed towards a department of government- five to Finance, three to Public Works, one each to Education, Fisheries and Justice; nine are directed towards government involving principally proposals for legislative change, one is directed to the Auditor General and two, both relating to the Committee's operation, are directed toward the House's Internal Economy Commission. None of the twenty-three recommendations would require action by the House in the first instance, although those recommendations to government proposing legislation would ultimately of course have to be considered by the House.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to record the Committee's appreciation to you, Mr. Speaker, to the Auditor General, Mr. Howley, to the Mansard staff, and to witnesses who appeared before the Committee for their help and co-operation. In particular I want

MR. SIMONS: to note the tremendous contribution made by the Committee Clerk, Mr. Ron Penney, who is now retiring from that position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMONS: As I said, Mr. Penney is retiring from that position and we certainly wish him well in his other endeavours and we look forward to working with the new Committee Clerk, the Clerk of the House, Miss Duff.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the Committee members for their diligence and their determination to fully examine the matters under investigation. Special recognition is due my Vice-Chairman, the member for Mount Scio (Dr. Windsor), who deserves much of the credit for the success of the Committee to date.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Finance, I table the Public Service Pension Regulations, the Members of the House of Assembly (Retiring Allowances) Regulations, the Public Service Pensions (Home Care) Regulations. I have two here, I do not know how they came on my desk but I will table them anyway. One is I guess on behalf of the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment, The Waste Material Disposal Area of New World Island East Regulations, and The Forest Fire Liability and Compensation Regulations, 1977.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, question number seven, in the name of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), to ask the hon. Minister of Health to lay upon the table of the House the following information: Since January 1st., 1977, and as of the current date, what is the total value of amounts which have been paid by the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission, as fees or as retainers, in respect of services rendered or to be rendered by legal counsel for or in behalf of

MR. H. COLLINS: the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission, showing for each firm of barristers and/or solicitors, the total amount that has been in during the same period.

And the answer, Mr. Speaker, is the payments to solicitors by the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission, January 1st., 1977 to date, amounts to \$585. The total payment was made to the firm of Sterling, Ryan, Reid, Wells, Harrington and Andrews.

Mr. H. Collins: Question No. 8, in the name of the same hon. member: During the fiscal year which began April 1, 1977, and as of the current date, what are the names of those persons who were granted bursary assistance during their years of study of medicine or of dentistry or of fields of specialization within each of those disciplines who, upon graduation, indicated to government in any manner that they did not intend to honour any undertaking made with government at the time when such bursary assistance was rendered by which they undertook to repay government for each such person and the names of the schools of medicine or of dentistry that he attended and the total amount of bursary assistance that government had paid to him?

And the answer is, Since April 1, 1977 the number of students under bursary contract for medicine or dentistry training who upon graduation indicated that they did not intend to honour their undertakings is none.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Premier, Sir. Since the announcement was made in the Budget Speech, and announcements made outside of the House by hon. ministers, especially the President of Treasury Board, that 300 permanent civil servants would lose their jobs in this fiscal year, and in view of the fact that the axe has been hanging over the heads of all the employees in the public service, and they are tormented and troubled and in deadly fear that their particular jobs may be in jeopardy, and the whole public service is completely demoralized as a result of these announcements, would the hon. the Premier indicate to the House if and when notices of those to be laid off, when these notices will be going out?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, as I think has been explained many times, and the same holds true of the teachers situation, a great many of the people when there are X number of people, whether it is

Premier Moores: 200 or 400 or whatever the figure is, are to be laid off, that means in fact that those positions are going to be closed out, but most of that, Sir, is done by attrition; in other words, people retiring the position will not be filled. And what this means is that it is not a matter of laying a great number of people off, it is a matter of hiring less people on.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. President of the Treasury Board in a news release today is quoted as having said that notices would go out to members of the public service, but that did not necessarily mean they were going to be laid off. Would the hon. Premier care to indicate what the President of Treasury Board meant by that double talk?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The President of Treasury Board can well answer for himself, Mr. Speaker. But as I understand it, and I can be corrected on this, if that is the case where a job is necessarily cancelled, where you have some one notified in that job because of the union agreement and because of the association, NAPE and CUPE in some areas, but particularly NAPE, I think, in this area, is where someone is notified they are laid off; in fact, union seniority, and civil service seniority come into play, and these people even though they are out of that job, in fact, come and fill another job, and it is the new people who come on with junior status that in fact are the ones who are not employed rather than the person who may get notice and get reassigned to different positions.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. Premier indicate to the House if the Treasury Board will go over the list of public servants and eliminate the made jobs, in other words, the political appointees that have been made in the last five or six years, if they will be terminated before

Mr. Neary: the permanent civil servants are laid off?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the number of political appointments that were made in this government over the past thirty years, I suggest if we did that very few who could be called P.C s would be the last to go, Sir.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. Premier indicate to the House if Mr. Syrett, the gentleman who was on the carpet yesterday, is still an employee of the government? If so, would the hon. Premier indicate in what capacity this gentleman is employed at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I have no idea. I would assume he is not, The Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, I am sure, can answer that. But to the best of my knowledge he is certainly not employed in the position which he previously held.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Tourism or the Minister of Rehabilitation care to answer the question? Is Mr. Syrett indeed on a payroll of either one of these departments?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was suspended after the court case was over. He was notified that his services were to be terminated, given the required number of days under the wage and working agreement, and obviously given the opportunity during those days to present any arguments he might have against our action.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Fogo followed by the hon. gentlemen for Lewisporte and Terra Nova.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism. Can the minister indicate to the House if and when there will be hunter's tests for certification taking place on Fogo Island? And I might interject, Change Island as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, there will be these tests carried out on Fogo Island, Change Islands, St. Brendan's and Greenspond. Tests on all these island communities will be carried out around the end of the month or the first week in May.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

CAPT. WINSOR: Can the minister also indicate to the house if there will be a big game licence season again on Fogo Island this year the same as last year?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the information from the management people in the Wildlife Division indicates that we will be able to have a big game licencing again this year on Fogo Island, I would like to say at this time that the information from the management division commends the people of Fogo Island for carrying out the wishes of the management division of the Wildlife over the past couple of years to enable the licence system again this year to be open for Fogo Island.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: I wonder if the minister could tell me whether or not the department has any immediate plans to conduct the hunter safety test on the Baie Verte Peninsula and where those tests might take place?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question under advisement and give information on it tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture and it stems from the present uproar throughout Central Newfoundland with respect to Crown Lands and in particular the temporary permit situation and the cabin situation. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not he would consider extending the March 31st deadline for the obtaining of temporary permits in view of the large number of people who were not aware of that deadline? And if he does not intend to extend the deadline, what procedure is going to be followed after this?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I think the number of complaints that are coming in are related to hunting and fishing cabins which are used temporarily mostly throughout the year, or at least most of the complaints coming into my office are on that particular subject. The permit to occupy and the requirement for a lease were not meant to apply in the first place to temporary hunting cabins and temporary fishing cabins along the shore and this sort of thing. I suspect that some of our staff were a little bit overzealous in trying to apply the rules. We have the whole thing under consideration now and I should be making a statement on it within the next three or four days.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary by the original questioner.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell the House if the regulations do not apply to the temporary hunting and fishing cabins, then who gave his officials instructions to tell the people out in Central Newfoundland that cabins they had been using for years in the woods and for fishing, many of those

MR. WHITE: cabins actually saved lives because of dangers in hunting and so on, would the minister tell the House who have his officials the authority to threaten various people throughout the area, and I can get affidavits to prove it, and also, Mr. Speaker, who gave his officials authority to warn that the cabins would be burned within a period of time and when this burning will start?

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame, shame!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the authority to enforce the Crown Lands Act came from this House of Assembly through various acts that have been passed over the years so I assume that the authority given this House of Assembly can be carried out by anyone in the staff. The minister does not change an act, the House of Assembly does and all members are quite well aware of that. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, my people do not tell anyone that their cabins are going to be burned or that their cabins are going to be removed. That is done by the courts after prosecution is effected under the act.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, on the topic of Crown lands and so on, I wonder is the minister aware of the fact that applications for Crown land have not even been opened, the envelopes have not even been opened three months after they have been received by the officials in the Division of Crown Lands? Is the minister aware of that?

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

MR. MAYNARD: I am not aware of it no, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. gentleman has some specific examples I wish he would bring them to my attention.

MR. SPEAKER: One additional supplementary. The hon. gentleman for Bellevue and then the hon. member for Conception Bay South, I believe, had a supplementary as well.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, obviously if a receipt for the one dollar or whatever fee enclosed with an application is not sent out within three months it has not even been opened. But to pursue it a little bit further, in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there is obviously a shortage of staff in the Division of Crown Lands - that apparently is quite obvious. Applications take as high as two and three years - in view of the fact there is a shortage of staff, how does the minister explain the fact that the liaison officer, a Mr. Winsor, was taken out of that department and put over with the Action Group? And will that position be filled by some other person?

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

MR. MAYNARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the position is being filled through the normal channels while Mr. Windsor is with the Action Group. I do not know how long

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Winsor is with the Action Group, however long that might be. I do not know when we will get a person on staff but it should not take too much longer to fill it.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated that I would recognize the hon. member for Conception Bay South, for a supplementary, and then - I presume all the other gentlemen are asking supplementaries as well? - then the other three hon. members.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, on the supplementary. I am sure the hon. minister is aware that one gentleman than many members of the House dealt with in Crown Lands was Mr. Robert Winsor whom the minister and his colleagues have now changed apparently to the Action Group. I am sorry to say that this position does not seem to have been filled, at least I am wondering what the position is. Is he going back there? I was told by one civil servant it would be two years. Does that mean you are phasing the Action Group out in two years or what is it?

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I just answered that question. Obviously the hon. member was not listening very well. I said that Mr. Winsor's position is being filled and we hope to have a person in that place within the next few weeks, or as soon as possible, to fill the important position that he held in that department. I have no idea how long Mr. Winsor is going to be with the Action Group, presumably as long as he wants to be there or as long as the Action Group continues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: For years, and years, and years.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Conception Bay South followed by the

MR. SPEAKER: hon. members for LaPoile and Lewisporte.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Again to the Minister on Crown lands, and it is in connection with an application that has been in, and could be approved, from a gentleman in my own district, in fact, where he has applied for Crown land. It is going to cost him, I think, \$1,500 to have it surveyed, maybe \$1,000 to have it fenced if he does it himself, and he wants to spend some money, obviously, in farming, it is an agricultural grant, but he is not permitted to build a building on it in order to hold his equipment. I am wondering if the minister is not aware of this specific complaint because I have written him and no doubt he will be examining it, but I am wondering what is the policy in this regard, not only for the man I am referring to but anyone else. If they have a Crown land agricultural grant and they are intending to go at it in earnest, how can they have equipment and so on without putting a building on it to house it?

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that particular case, but I will have a look at it. However, there are various types of leases issued and approvals given for Crown land leases. Some leases specify specifically that it is for farming with no buildings, other leases permit buildings for farming purposes, there are other leases that permit residential buildings and farm buildings, it depends entirely on what the person applied for initially. Or, there may be some problem with timing which is inside my department whereby the Planning Division, possibly Municipal Affairs or the local council will not allow buildings in the area. I

April 6, 1978

Tape 638

EC - I

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay and then the other hon. gentleman on supplementaries.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the minister explain how it is that people who have applied for a residential lease on which to build on a piece of Crown land and have gone through the process and have received permission from councils to do so during the past couple of years, but have not yet received their lease and so on back from his department, how it is that those people have already been taken to court and have been fined \$200.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right. Come on, 'Ed'.

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

MR. MAYNARD: Well, if the person applied for a lease and has not received it or the lease has not been approved, obviously they are violating the Crown Lands Act by building on it. The local council has no authority over Crown lands and has no authority to give a permit to build on any piece of land that belongs to the Crown unless the Crown first authorizes it, and the only authorization can come through a lease. So regardless of how many permits they may have had from a town or community council or a local improvement district or whatever, that does not give them the right to occupy land until the Crown says so.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that councils throughout this Province - and some have told me that they were not advised of the changes in the Crown land regulations regarding leases - in view of the fact that councils are asked their opinion on whether it is proper by the Crown Lands Division, whether they have any objections

MR. RIDEOUT: to settling on those lands, in view of the fact that councils have always been in the past given permits once they have been told by Forestry and Agriculture, "Look, we have processed the application to the point that you people have no objections so you can go ahead and give them," and in view of the fact that councils were never told that they could no longer do that, does the minister have any plans to undo the damage that has been done to people in rural areas who have already been taken before court, prosecuted and fined?

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, there has not been any change in the law in the last fifty years regarding councils being able to give a permit to build on Crown land. They have never been able to give a permit.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) object to it?

MR. MAYNARD: Oh, they are able to object now, they are able to give a permit now. Once an application comes in to the Crown Lands Division, it is immediately sent to a number of different agencies, one of which is the local municipal council. Now if that application is for agriculture or for residence or for commercial purposes or whatever, and the local municipal council feels that that should not occur within their boundaries, then they have every right to object to it, and the Crown will not normally issue a lease or a grant within the municipal boundaries if the local council objects to it. It is the same thing, of course, with the Planning Division of Municipal Affairs or the Department of Health, the Department of Transportation and a number of other agencies. Quite often an application is turned down by the Crown Lands Division but not normally because of Crown lands regulations; it is normally because of regulations of other agencies, other departments or the local council itself.

Now we have over the last few years, I believe starting in 1974, been making development lands available to

MR. MAYNARD: council. In other words, if a council in any area of the Province comes in to us and says, 'We have a plan to develop fifty homes in this certain part of town and a few commercial lots and this sort of thing; we want a grant to that land,' we will give the grant to the council specifically for that purpose. It is very easy then for the council to sell the land in lots to the local people and it is much easier that way. We have been trying to encourage municipal councils around the Province to prepare plans and come in and get a block of land,- and once they are getting it surveyed it is a matter of slicing it up and then dispensing it themselves. So that means that that application only has to go out to the agencies once, whereas if each individual comes in from the town, each one has to go to all the agencies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary by the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay and then the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. BIDEOUT: I just want to give notice for the minister's information that I would like to have this held over for the Late Show.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile has got a supplementary, and then I recognize the hon. member for Lewisporte for supplementaries, and then the hon. member for Terra Nova on new subjects.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter outside the City of St. John's, in the rural areas, this matter of Crown land applications and the whole Province seems to be in a uproar over the policy now that is being followed by the minister issuing ultimatums to people and dragging people into court, hauling innocent victims into court while they are waiting for their applications to be processed by the Crown Lands Division of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture. And in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that in one case that I know of, in Rose Blanche, where a person was waiting for his approval of his application for a piece of Crown land and later was told that what was hanging it up was the Department of Health for water and sewerage, and during the time he was waiting for the application to be processed, which is about a year and a half, water and sewerage has now been put in the community of Rose Blanche. And that particular gentleman was hauled into court recently and fined \$200 and all the other people along that Coast who had built homes and houses on Crown land have been taken to court and fined \$200 and made look like common criminals in this Province. Would the minister tell the House who issued these ultimatums to take these people into court, who have built houses pending the approval of their application by the Crown Lands Division of the minister's department? And why does it take so long? Why does it take two and three years, and four years in some cases, to process one of these applications when the minister assured the House a few years ago that the minister was going to streamline his department and these applications would be processed

MR. NEARY: in a matter of months?

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, the last part of the hon. gentleman's question he answered himself. He said that the application took a year and a half because the Department of Health would not approve an application. Now that said nothing whatsoever about streamlining the Department of Crown Lands. If the Department of Health feels that in a certain area that the sewerage system cannot be put in acceptable to their standards or there is no sewerage system in the town or the water could be polluted, the drinking water for other parts of the town whatever, they can hang up an application and we are not going to issue a lease to that piece of land until the Department of Health says so.

There are a number of cases where this happens. As far as taking to people to court is concerned, our staff, whether they are Forestry and Agriculture or in the Lands Division, have the authority under the act to enforce the Crown Lands Act. And when they know that there is a violation of the act, the same as when any officer of the Crown knows that there is a violation of any act of this Legislature, they might take action. They take the court and assesses the situation and applies whatever penalty they feel is necessary at the time. That is no different in Crown Lands than it is in hunting for moose or fishing for lobsters without a licence or anything else.

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated I will hear the hon. member for Lewisporte with a final supplementary. I should stick with that.

MR. WHITE: He recognized me, 'Steve'.

MR. SPEAKER: There have been such a large number of supplementaries on this, and I am aware that there are other members wishing to get in, it will not preclude hon. members from getting back to the subject. But I did

MR. SPEAKER: indicate that I would hear one from the hon. member for LaPoile, a final one—the one I already heard, not an additional one—then a final one from the hon. member for Lewisporte, and then the hon. member for Terra Nova on a new subject.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, when I asked the first question to the minister with respect to this particular topic, he indicated that the temporary hunting and fishing cabins were not intended to be included under this new restriction, this new law. Can the minister tell the House whether or not he plans to inform his officials of this because as late as this morning I know of people who were told that they had to tear down their cabins or would be brought before court, AS late as this morning, Mr. Speaker, that happened. And at the same time would the minister tell the House when he plans to hire additional staff at the Gender Forestry and Agriculture office to handle the 800 applications that are on the desk not even opened? 800 on the desk not opened!

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame! Shame!

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

MR. WHITE: Well the staff should be aware by this time that they are not to take any action in regards to temporary hunting and fishing cabins, wherever they may be, until such time as a more precise definition can be applied to them. And it is pretty hard to define what is a temporary and what is a permanent structure I guess.

As far as the number of staff in the Crown Lands Division are concerned, we feel that we do at this time have adequate staff. There may be backlogs in certain regional offices at certain points in time, but I should point out to hon. members that within the last two years we have decentralized the Crown Lands Division of the Department. We now have offices in Goose Bay, Corner Brook.

Mr. Maynard: Gander, and a regional office here in St. John's which I believe is serving the public fairly well. It is not as good as we would like to have it, obviously, and I suppose to take on the number of staff that would be the ideal situation would increase the public service that much more, and I do not think it is necessary at this point in time, in this time of restraint to increase our staff too much.

However, we do have at the present time a management and organization review of the Crown Lands Division being carried out. And if that review suggests that more staff was needed to push the applications through, and to get them filled, along with all the other duties of the Crown Lands Division has, then we will certainly do that.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated that I would recognize the hon. member for Terra Nova followed by the hon. members for Eagle River and Carbonear.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, in view of the tremendous labour unrest in the Province in recent weeks in particular, I want to direct a couple of questions to the Minister of Labour and Manpower. I wonder if the minister can inform the House as to what is happening with respect to the Labrador situation, the strike between IOC and its workers, the situation which seems to have brought a complete standstill in Labrador West with the QNS and L Railway workers out on strike, also effecting Wabush Mines, I understand they have laid off fifty-nine people, and if the railway workers are out much longer it is possible that they are going to have to lay off more men and possibly close down the whole operation. So can the minister tell us what is happening with the negotiations? Is there a settlement in sight? Has the minister taken any action in this respect?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Sir, all I can tell the hon. member is that the minister has certainly been on top of this from day one, obviously, as he is with the Baie Verte situation, and tried to be. And the

Mr. Rousseau: situation in Western Labrador is the Iron Ore Company of Canada operations in Sept Iles is on strike. According to the collective bargaining process they went through all of the procedures and are legally in a position to strike, and have taken a strike vote, and have struck the company at Labrador City. At Sept Iles, the Iron Ore Company of Canada is also on strike. One must realize that the problem here does not exist only with Labrador City and Wabush, but exists with Schefferville, Sept Iles, The Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway, and Point Noire, Point Cartier of the Wabush Mines operation in Quebec.

Talks have been ongoing from the first day that a request was made for a conciliation officer. I have directed two people from the department--because of the distance and because of the number of labour contracts we have this year on the Island part of the Province, for the most part 125 - I directed my deputy minister, Mr. Blanchard, and my Director of Labour Relations, Mr. Noseworthy, who normally does not get involved in conciliation proceedings to handle the situation up there because they are going back between Quebec and Newfoundland, and there is also a federal mediator involved, or a conciliator, so you have three jurisdictions. The Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway is not on strike. The problem is that the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway is operating, but they are carrying non-company merchandise; in other words, they will not carry any of the things that will continue operations at either the Iron Ore Company of Canada and Wabush, because the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway employees will not cross the picket lines by the steelworkers at the Sept Iles operation, so the trains are running, and talks are being held, and we are very hopeful this week that some progress will be made. I think this is a very important week. The talks started on Tuesday, I believe, again in Sept Iles involving both Wabush Mines and the union there, Local 6285 and Sept Iles with the Iron Company of Canada 5795, and their unions. So the talks are progressing and I hope this week that we will have something concrete from it.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: Can the minister verify that the reasons for the strike, the two major reasons, have to do with health and safety measures and with contracting out?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I think that the hon. member realizes full well that during a situation in which negotiations are going, a strike situations, that the minister normally does not say what is going. I get a report every day or every two days, a report from my conciliation officers, but I can report that when I last reported there were some forty items outstanding on language, the majority of those have been cleared up and they are not a problem. The monetary package is not on the table at all in any instance throughout the whole Quebec North Shore iron ore operations, and also that

MR. ROUSSEAU:

the question of contracting out appears to be the big question in Seven Islands and the question of occupational health and safety appears to be the big question in Labrador City. The monetary package is still not on the table but the two big issues within the proper context would appear to be contracting and occupational health and safety.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on estimates Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Transportation and Communications, Heading

KV11, page 109.

Hon. Minister.

MR. DOODY:

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if this is significant or not but my desk mate has just left. They are all leaving. There they go.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. DOODY:

Good, good! As long as we keep enough people around here to make this an interesting session, Your Honour would be quite pleased.

I will not take too much time on a preamble, Mr. Chairman, because I am sure that the committee want to get into the estimates themselves and into the vote. I simply want to say in opening that I am quite pleased to have this opportunity to become involved in the Department of Transportation and Communications. It is a new era for me really. I have not had this opportunity to become exposed to people, to groups, to the Province for a number of years having been somewhat isolated in that gray, dismal ground of Finance, Treasury Board, with apologies and respect to my successors.

MR. DOODY: I compliment my predecessors of this particular department for the work that they have done. I had no idea that it was such an involved and such a complicated area of responsibility until I move in there a few weeks ago. The exposure, as I say, to so many problems of so many people in this Province simply demonstrates the vast strides that we have yet to make in terms of transportation and in communications here in this Province. We have made obviously fantastic strides since Confederation and we have made great inroads into the problems that the Province had faced at that time. In many areas unfortunately the Province is still far behind the rest of Canada. We have attempted to do perhaps in the twenty-seven or twenty-eight years or so of Confederation what the other provinces have had a hundred year head-start on us and to that degree I suppose we are that much behind both in terms of repayment of debt and in terms of infrastructure placement.

What was taken for granted just a few years ago, Mr. Chairman, as a normal set of circumstances in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is no longer the case. People in every community feel, and rightly so, that they have a right to what many of us take for granted, reasonable communications, opportunities to hear what is going on and to see what is going on in the rest of the world and the rest of Canada, the right to be able to move from place to place at reasonable cost and in reasonable comfort under reasonable degrees of conditions, driving conditions in terms of roads, in terms of rail, in terms of air. And this is indeed a responsibility that we share with the Government of Canada and indeed if it had not been for the assistance of the Government of Canada and indeed for the ongoing assistance of the Government of Canada we would not have had the opportunity to put in place the amenities that we have here now. And we look forward to that continuing relationship with the federal government to carry us on

MR. DOODY: even further. We realize that there are certain areas of responsibility that are strictly those of the Government of Canada under the terms of union. We know that there are areas of rail and coastal service and of the gulf service that are, strictly speaking and legally speaking, the responsibility of the Government of Canada. I think it may be time for us perhaps to start thinking of reshaping our thoughts in that direction and to ask for some input into that decision making process by the Government of Canada. Obviously if we do that we are going to have to be prepared to pick up part of the tab, part of the price of performing these services. And so the Provinces during the next few years, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, is going to have to make some pretty tough decisions as to which direction we want to go and where we want to put those dollars that are available for transportation and communications.

We cannot think only in terms of roads. Roads are certainly the most obvious and the most apparent and the most necessary part. But strangely enough those areas of the Province that have the best road service relative to other parts, or those from whom we get the most complaints, the most petitions, the most demands, the most expectations, or the highest degree of exposure to expectations come from the Island part of the Province which is indeed so far advanced in terms of communications, in terms of road networks, in terms of air transport, as to be in an entirely different world, just as we here on parts of the Island are so far behind parts of Ontario, when you look at parts of our Province, the major land mass of the Province, the Labrador section of the Province, that is almost in a different century and I think that we in the Province have during the coming years and in very few years, have got to come to grips with the transportation and communication problems in terms of the whole Province and we have got to look at that major

MR. DOODY: part of the land mass of the Province which is in Labrador and I do not mean this as a pious certainty. I think it is something that has been neglected for too long. Perhaps there have not been enough people. Maybe there has not been enough — I do not know what the answer is. I do not know why the problem is as acute as it is. But I do know that it is only during relatively recent years that any great recognition of the transportation and communication problems in Labrador have come to the surface. And that is one of the things that has really been brought to my attention, as I am sure it has been to my predecessors, but it was something that I can say in all honesty that I had not fully realized until the past few weeks when I have been exposed to the hugeness of the problem since I have taken over the responsibility for that department. I know it is a horrendous one. I know it is not one that we can do on our own in terms of a Trans-Canada Highway. I know that that is the sort of thing we have to do with the co-operation of the Government of Canada.

It has been suggested by one of our colleagues here in this House that that should have been included in the Terms of Union. Nobody can argue with that truism. There are many things that should have been included in the Terms of Union. The unfortunate fact is that it was not. I think that it is a good lever and a good argument to start working along these lines.

We have presented to the Government of Canada, in collaboration with the Government of Quebec, a very detailed and very involved plan which demonstrates — and there may be people who would smile at this — but demonstrates the economic feasibility of a Trans-Labrador Highway. The consultants, and I was as cynical as most people when they started, demonstrated the fact that it was a feasible and reasonable

April 6, 1973

Tape No. 642

NI - 3

MR. DOODY: plan in terms of the development of Canada as
a nation to put in effect a Trans-Labrador Highway. And unfortunately
it has taken us, I think, and I acknowledge a fair share of the guilt,
it has taken us far too long to put into effect some of these things.

MR. DOODY:

I think that we here on the Island part of the Province have taken too much of the cake on a short term effort. I think that we have looked at things in too narrow perspective. I think that the future of this Province as a whole has got to be expanded in terms of the Province of a whole and we have got to look at our future not only in terms of the fishery resource, which has been mostly related to the Island and partially to Labrador, but in terms of providing the opportunities to the people in Labrador to attract more people and to develop those things that the people there now have and can use. The Government of Canada is starting, fortunately, to recognize that. I think that this thirteen airstrip program which they are putting in place during the next few years is a major step forward. I think it is only a partial step, it is only a little toddley step; these airstrips are not really sufficient to do anything really in a big way to alleviate the physical isolation of the coast of Labrador, I think they will be a tremendous asset in terms of the morale and the knowledge of the people in that area that they are not forgotten and not cut off. It may very well be as some of the arguments that I have heard that they may be only used for a couple of months of the year during a break-up season or during a freeze-up season. I think that may not be true. I think that under proper conditions and with the proper kind of maintenance and the proper kind of attention they could very well be an all year-round operation and I think that that is a major and important thing.

Obviously air transport in that area is going to be of far more importance in the short-term than road transport. And I think that the money that is invested in air transport in the coastal part of Labrador, and indeed in Labrador generally, is going to be far, far more rewarding in terms of human values and actual terms of economics than money that is paid into a half-hearted and inefficient coastal boat service which is spasmodic at best. And I suppose it is only the mercy of the good Lord that we have a harsh winter on the coast of Labrador or it would cost the Government of Canada two or three times

MR. DOODY: as much to keep that service going for the rest of the year which would make it. Right now we have the excuse I suppose of having a freeze-up which relieves us of some that responsibility. But for too long I think we have we in the Province, the Government of Newfoundland, have been only too happy to slough the responsibility off on to the Government of Canada under the terms of union. The Government of Canada are physically very far removed and they can look at the fine print in the contract and say that that is really their responsibility and so they will make a stab at it and do what they can.

I think that in small way we are going to have to try to get ourselves involved in there supposing it is only on a small percentage basis, supposing we only make a token contribution toward the operation, and it will give us here in the Province some input into what should be or what we feel should be instead of saying that the CN or the MOT or the Marine Services or whatever new body we find to bounce the potato in, but that, I think, is the sort of area that we have to follow in that particular situation. I think that we have to grapple with it and that we certainly are not attempting to do so to date and we are certainly not attempting to really do so seriously during the present set of estimates.

I think that the communications area of the department is one that is of major importance. It is one that has just been recently established, one that has far more importance perhaps in this Province than in many of the Provinces of Canada. The radio - television, the satellite possibilities, the possibilities of provincial input into the ownership of satellites, the opportunities of taking advantage of these ownership entities to beam our message to our people and cut off that sense of isolation. We recognize the fact that we want to keep our lifestyle here in this Province, all parts of this Province. In order to do that we have got to recognize the fact that we are in the twentieth century, that people in the twentieth century want to have the amenities or at least part of the amenities of life. I think that with the proper

MR. DOODY:

communications and the proper transportation system. We here in this Province are in the weird and wonderful position of being able to take advantage of the best of both worlds. I think that the money that is spent in the Transportation and Communications section of our budget will give us here in Newfoundland the opportunity to become, really, a part of Canada, to become part of the Western World, to be able to communicate with ourselves and with all parts of the Province, and still have our own unique lifestyle down here on the East coast.

The challenges are huge.

The money is missing. We do not have enough money to handle all the problems. We may not have the money for years to come, but we have to recognize the problems and we have to grope with them. We have the situation in the Baie Verte area, the health hazard situation. That is not one that can be ignored, it is one that has to be grappled with. The money has to be found. It cannot be done in a year or two years; it may take three years or more to put in the pavement that is necessary to cover up the dust problem in that area. What we have to do is do it in a series of reasonable, sensible, well-calculated and well-thought-out steps and use what ever other agencies are possible. It has been suggested that liquid calcium will keep the dust in place while we try to catch up with what should have been done, perhaps years ago.

The neglect in St. Mary's district, where there was not a mile of pavement done until a few years ago; the isolation of Buchans which is now a socio-economic problem, which perhaps one can say should have been looked at some years ago but which

MR. DOODY: is now one that this administration has to face and deal with; the Burgeo situation, with the help of DREE we are cutting off that particular isolated area; the ferry services in the Province which many of our people, particularly in the Northeast area are concerned about and I am certainly concerned about, and the Bell Island situation. All these things, Sir, are real problems, problems that have to be faced and ones that have to be dealt with.

The air services situation is one, I think, that has got to be expanded and pressed on further because for us here in this Province with its huge land mass and its relatively small population, that has to be the most sensible and reasonable form of transportation that we are going to find, certainly in the short-term, and one, I think, that the Department of Health and other departments would be very much in favour of.

But, Sir, as I have said, these various areas and these various items I will try to elaborate on to the best of my ability as we get into the subheads of the estimates. I will crave the indulgence of the House as I may have to pop out from time to time to crave the advice of the officials of the department who are expert in various areas. With these few opening comments, Sir, I throw myself at your mercy and we will get on with the details.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise, and report no progress. We have no confidence in the government, we will not pass the estimates,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Close the doors.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
The Chair can only recognize one hon. member at a time.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman yielded, Your Honour, so I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
The Chair is not aware that the hon. member has yielded.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I will move that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order! Order!
When the question is being put hon. members are aware that the Chair has precedence and that hon. members should not interrupt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Dr. Collins) Those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay' -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, who can vote when Your Honour is putting the question when five members of this House came through the doors? The member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young), the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey), the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey), the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford), the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), and the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) came through the door, Your Honour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

A point of order is not in order whilst the question is being put, and I have not completed putting the question as yet. In my opinion the 'nays' have it.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the minister, we should try to get down into the headings of his department as soon as we can. Certainly before we do that there are a few general comments that I would like to make in response to the few opening remarks that the minister had made and raise some new subjects.

The minister certainly in his opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, raised a number of good ideas, maybe a lot of idealism with regard to the development of transportation in this Province. And on most of the counts I can certainly agree with some of the ideas and idealisms suggested in the remarks by the minister.

I only wish though, Mr. Chairman, we could see some of the long range plans that the minister referred to sort of exemplified into government goals and laid down so that we know without any doubt where we are going in this Province with regard to the development of a transportation policy.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would submit to the Committee that this Province needs a well thought-out, a well defined transportation policy and that up to this point in time we certainly have not had that type of approach by this government. We cannot continue on an ad hoc basis with regard to the development of our transportation links in all forms by sea, road, air and so on around this Province, and I do not believe that it is too harsh, Mr. Chairman, to say that the government's policy on transportation has in many respects been based on political expediency. I do not believe it is too harsh to say that. I have not been around the political arena very long, but I have fought some of the wars and I have seen the examples in Exploits, for example, I have seen them in Bonavista North, I have seen them only last Fall in Twillingate district, and you cannot develop a transportation policy that is going to have the necessary effect that it must have if we are to develop the economy of this Province based on political expediency alone. So therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that we have to have a well thought-out, well defined transportation policy for this Province. We need a transportation policy that has projected goals and objectives. What happened, Mr. Chairman, for argument sake, to the five or six year master plan that this government was professed to have had when it came to office five or six years ago? What happened to the five or six year master plan with regard to upgrading and paving of highways in this Province? I know we talk about cutbacks, we talk about restraints and so on, but transportation, Mr. Chairman, is certainly a vital part of the infrastructure that is needed for the development of the resources of this Province. I do not think anybody, for example, looks at the Department of Transportation and Communications in the social sense that you would look at Social Services or the Department of Health. Transportation is almost, I suppose you could say, a resource department. Certainly the development of the necessary

MR. RIDEOUT: transportation links in this Province, the development of the necessary infrastructure is going to have a long-term effect upon the development of the resources of this Province, so therefore the Department of Transportation is vital in those respects and must be looked at in that very light.

For example, the transportation of fish and fish products. We hear a lot about the Department of Fisheries and the growing fishery and how the future of Newfoundland is dependent on the fishery - rightly so, I agree with that - but the transportation of fish and fish products, Mr. Chairman, can be done more efficiently, more effectively, more cheaply if we have in this Province a well developed transportation system, a well developed system of paved roads, good roads to provide cheap transportation and so on. Now that will have, I would submit to the Committee, an economic effect on the development of this Province. And, Sir, is not that the goal that we are talking about? And if that is the case then the significance of the Department of Transportation has to mean more than just snow clearing in the Wintertime or Summer maintenance of gravel roads and so on. We have to have a well thought-out, well defined policy saying where we are going, how we are going to get there and when we can expect to get there.

We have not had that in this Province up to this time, as I have suggested to the Committee already. It has been development of transportation policy strictly on an ad hoc

MR. RIDEOUT:

basis, mostly on a political basis, and the effect has not been the type of effect that has been beneficial to the Province as a whole.

And, Mr. Chairman, I mentioned the fisheries just as an example. Certainly the same is true of the development of our potential in the forest industry, transportation of forest products around the Province, through the processing centres and so on, the tourist industry. Transportation has connotations for the whole development, the development of the whole economy of this Province and that is why it is important that we have a well thought out and well defined transportation policy.

Now no doubt progress has been made in some areas. It would be foolish of me to get up here and suggest that it has not. We have made extremely good progress in DREE agreements, for example, building the highway down the Northern Peninsula, which will be of great economic benefit for that particular area of the Province, the LaScie Highway, for example, the Bonavista North Loop Road and so on. We have been able to utilize those ninety - ten dollars to develop and to build very important pieces of road in this Province.

And, Mr. Chairman, that brings another question. In doing that we should have been able to free some of the provincial dollars that ordinarily would have had to be spent on doing those roads, because if we did not get a DREE agreement, the Northern Peninsula Highway still had to be done, granted it would not have been done as fast, or probably not up to such a standard. The Bonavista North Loop Road would still have had to be done, the LaScie Highway and all of them would still have had to be done. But because of the fact that we were able to get the DREE agreements, because of the fact that we were able to get the ninety - ten dollars, then that should have meant that a lot of the millions of dollars that this Province would have had to provide out of its own resources to spend on those roads, which certainly are the priority

MR. RIDEOUT: roads or would have been the priority roads in anybody's imagination, a lot of the dollars that this Province would have had to find from its own resources to spend on those roads should have been able to find itself into the rebuilding and reconstruction of the other less important trunk roads and those major ones I have mentioned, in this Province.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is where our transportation policy is falling down. It has not happened with any degree of planning. That has happened on an ad hoc basis, that has happened on a political basis and so on. And that is what we have got to get away from and that is why it is so vital, as I have been trying to point out, that we have a well defined transportation policy that is going to benefit this Province, not only what we can get out of DREE but what we can do on our own from our own resources as well.

No doubt about it, Sir, we need a policy that reflects a long-term plan to upgrade and pave every major road in the Province. It is not going to happen overnight. Nobody over here is naive enough to expect that it will, nor naive enough to demand that it should, but we have to have that plan. And that is why I am interested in knowing what happened to that great master plan that was supposed to have been developed some five or six years ago, where every major road in the Province was supposed to know where it was on the priority list. What happened to it? Did it disappear after an election or what? Every major road in the Province was supposed to know where it was. No, in 1978 this is what we will be doing. In 1979 this is what we will be doing, based of course on our ability to do so. But that great master plan seems to have disappeared and I would submit that it is what is needed in an overall transportation policy for this Province, a policy that would see the reconstruction and paving carried out on a priority

MR. RIDEOUT: basis, Mr. Chairman, that would enhance the economic development of the Province, based on priority and based on the development of the resources, whether it be the fishery resource or the forestry resource or the tourism resource or whatever in the various parts of the Province. It is not based on four or five miles of pavement for no particular reason. It is important to the people who live there and when we can get around to doing it certainly we ought to do it. But there ought to be some priority basis and that has not happened in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, as I have suggested, every part of this Province should know where it is on the priorities scale. We ought to know what the goals are. We ought to know what the aims and objectives of a transportation policy to develop Newfoundland, based on - in cahoots of course with the whole economic development priorities of the Province. And then we should set about adhering to them in an orderly and planned manner.

Mr. Rideout:

not departing from them for political purposes or other purposes or whatever but have the master plan and follow it and then we all know where we are, and how we are going to get there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having said that I want to spend a few minutes on this Trans-Canada Highway deal, a few general comments before we get into that particular heading. Nobody will argue, Mr. Chairman, that upgrading and paving of this Trans-Canada Highway is not vital. It is absolutely vital to this Province. It is the major road across the Island, the only one we have. We do not have the railway for passenger services, but this Trans-Canada Highway without any argument is vital and necessary to the development of this Province. And there is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that it has been downgraded over the past number of years, and I would say that government has let it happen. A blind man, Mr. Chairman, could have seen what was happening to our Trans-Canada Highway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: A blind man could have seen five or six years ago what was happening to the Trans-Canada Highway in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Statistics were telling us about the vast increase, the enormous increase in rubber tire traffic across the Island. We knew that there was a decrease in the amount of freight on the rails and so on. We knew it was coming across the Island in rubber tire vehicles, but we turned a blind eye to it. And for five or six years the Trans-Canada Highway just went downhill and downhill and deteriorated worse and worse each year, until last year, after cries from the people of this Province and the people who were using it, the government began to wake up and think that, yes, the Trans-Canada Highway certainly is in bad shape, and we have got to try and do something about it. But they let six years go by, Mr. Chairman, before they started at all, or we can only judge by what is being said publicly and what has

Mr. Rideout: happened publicly over the past year. They have let six years go by without spending any substantial sums of money on the Trans-Canada Highway at all.

MR. F. WHITE: Too many by-elections.

MR. RIDEOUT: And maybe too many by-elections. But the result is now, of course, that it is going to cost us more to reconstruct and upgrade that Trans-Canada Highway than if we had been spending the necessary dollars on it all along.

MR. LUSH: They were suppose to be doing it.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, you will not find me defending the position of the federal government when it comes to the upgrading and reconstruction of our Trans-Canada Highway, you will not find me defending them at all, in fact you would find me saying they are not putting enough into it. I do not mind saying it on the public record, and I do not mind saying it publicly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: But the whole issue, Mr. Chairman, the whole issue has been clouded by the efforts, as far as I am concerned, of people to make political Brownie points at the expense of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: No way!

MR. RIDEOUT: First of all they were cries that it was built below standard. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is not true. The Trans-Canada Highway was not built below standard. That really is a slap in the face to the present Deputy Minister of Transportation and his predecessor. It is not true that the Trans-Canada Highway in this Province was built below standard. It was built to a minimum standard, because the first Trans-Canada Highway agreement was a fifty-fifty deal and it was all we could afford. It was all we could afford to build it to a minimum standard. It was built -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: The first deal was.

AN HON. MEMBER: He does not know.

MR. RIDEOUT: The first Trans-Canada Highway, well that was all we

Mr. Rideout: could afford was the minimum standard. We could not build it to the top of the standard. We could not afford it, because of the deal. But when we got the 90-10 deal, Mr. Chairman, when we negotiated and got the 90-10 deal, then the sections of the Trans-Canada Highway that were built under that agreement were certainly built to top standard.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: I may be wrong. The minister will get a chance to get into the debate later on. I am not saying I am infallible, but that is what I have been told; the Trans-Canada Highway was not built under standard. It was built to the minimum standard in the first part of the building because that was all we could afford, and in the latter deal it was certainly built much better than the first part was built.

Take, for example, Mr. Chairman, the piece of Trans-Canada Highway from Badger to Deer Lake. It is one of the best pieces of Trans-Canada or TCH in this Province.

MR. WHITE: One of the few.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, probably one of the few good pieces of TCH in this Province. That is still good today. You will find a scattered bump, yes. You will find a scattered bump in any piece of highway. But it has not deteriorated like you will find on the West Coast from Georges Brook going on to Port aux Basques. It has not deteriorated like you would find sections - Gander, Glovertown, that area - pieces

April 6, 1973

Tape No. 648

AM-1

MR. RIDEOUT: that were built a long time ago under the old fifty-fifty agreement. Mr. Chairman, I am still convinced that this foolish escapade that we saw last year with the efforts to get funds from the federal government cost this Province tremendously. The foolishness for example of our Minister of Transportation, throwing in his hat with the Atlantic Provinces to negotiate a deal on Trans-Canada Highway upgrading. What nonsense to throw our hat in with the Atlantic Provinces. Was the minister foolish enough to think that we were going to get you know this old adage of strength in numbers, and you go, the four of us together and we may get a better deal. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that there was enough evidence, our economic conditions, the importance of the Trans-Canada Highway to this Province, the downgrading of the railway in this Province, Newfoundland had a case unlike any other province of the Atlantic Provinces. But what did we do? We threw our hat in with those people and we went and of course Ottawa stuck to the fifty-fifty thing and there it stood.

Those people obviously thought there was strength in going together also, but when they saw they were not going to get anything better one by one they began to fall off and sign their agreements with Ottawa and we were left where we are now, where we should have been a year ago when those negotiations started, going on our own with our own case, our own strong case that we had to make. And if that was not bad enough, Mr. Chairman, the publicity hound that went to Ottawa attempting to negotiate a package on our behalf did more damage to our case than probably words can ever say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Here, here!

MR. RIDEOUT: Negotiating in the press with Ottawa. The arrogance and conceit and the egoistical approach by a minister

MR. RIDEOUT: on behalf of this Province.

MR. NEARY: The deposed and rejected minister.

MR. RIDEOUT: I am talking about the deposed minister now, not the present minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. RIDEOUT: Blabber-mouth. A blabber-mouth approach.

MR. MORGAN: I do not even hear you.

MR. RIDEOUT: Publicity hound. I am not suggesting for one minute that the minister is not a hard worker. I have a lot of respect for the minister, but in this particular case the minister blew it. He blew it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not a negotiator.

MR. RIDEOUT: He is not a negotiator, that is right. Imagine the minister being responsible as a conciliator with union and management. Just imagine it - and talking about the minister's colleague. We lost so much, Mr. Chairman, by the approach.

MR. SIMMONS: The company would go on strike.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes. The company would go on strike. We lost so much at the approach by this minister, the blabber-mouth approach, the publicity hound approach, negotiating in the press, so much so, Mr. Chairman, that the Province was told to get rid of him, told that we do not want to see him up here again. We cannot negotiate with a man like that.

Mr. Chairman, we can look around us, other ministers of this government have not been like that. Other ministers have made substantial progress and brought home tangible results in diplomatic negotiations with Ottawa. We have seen DREE agreements signed and subsidiary agreements signed. We did not hear the bang, bang, bang confrontation in the press on them every day.

MR. MORGAN: who designed (inaudible)

MR. RIDEOUT: Some of them. Some of them were signed.

The minister may not have negotiated -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: How many agreements did the present Minister of Tourism sign on DREE roads?

MR. W. ROWE: None.

MR. RIDEOUT: How many? Mr. Chairman, the truth hurts.

He is listening now because the truth hurts. Other ministers went up there and in a very diplomatic and proper fashion negotiated good deals for this Province. But they did not do it by the bang, bang confrontation or situation.

MR. WHITE: Through the Evening Telegram.

MR. RIDEOUT: They did not do it through the Evening Telegram or the evening news. It makes good political Brownie points, Mr. Chairman, but it brings no dollars into this Province. It does not help the Trans-Canada Highway.

And then, Mr. Chairman, lo and behold what did we see? We saw this Province signing a fifty-fifty deal anyway. After all the negotiations, after all the strained relations, after a full year lost of political waffle, waffle between the Province and Ottawa.

MR. MORGAN: Power politics. He does not know anything about power politics.

MR. RIDEOUT: After all that - Mr. Chairman, I am not going to bother to answer the minister. I made my decision clear on that in the beginning. After all that this government had the guts to sign a fifty-fifty deal anyway. And on what basis, Mr. Chairman? What basis did they sign a fifty-fifty agreement? On the basis of hope. They were hoping that the Sullivan Commission will make recommendations that will force Ottawa to increase their share, and I hope they do.

MR. RIDEOUT: Ottawa should be forced in some way into increasing their share for that, but they are signing that agreement on the basis of hope.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if that report was not due until next year and another construction season was going to be lost, then there would possibly be some reasonable - people could agree to that. When is the Sullivan Commission Report due? My understanding is any day, a few days.

MR. NEARY: This month.

MR. RIDEOUT: This month? So why rush into it? We wasted a year anyway. We want work to begin this year, but could not it have waited for another few days until the report was in the hands of the people in Ottawa? Then if the recommendations were there it would not be necessary to sign this reopener clause. What does the reopener clause say, Mr. Chairman? Both governments have to agree to reopen. That is a nice one to sit on. Maybe Ottawa will never agree to reopen it and we are stuck anyway. So after all year, after a wasted year of negotiations we end up signing a fifty/fifty deal anyway, postponing the inevitable. The doomsday approach, do so much of it now anyway and we will see what we can get down the road. And, of course, to add insult to injury the last year of the agreement we are going to end up paying seventy-five per cent ourselves when the minister said we could not afford to pay twenty-five per cent. We are going to end up paying seventy-five per cent ourselves anyway in the final year of the agreement. That is the type of situation we ended up in, Mr. Chairman.

I understand my time has elapsed so I will have to come back to this and other matters a little later.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Chairman, just to deal with a couple of points made by the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout). Dealing first of all, Sir, with the Trans-Canada Highway situation, nobody, Sir, will deny the deplorable condition of that highway at the moment. It is the only road across the Island, of course, and many areas of our Province are heavily dependent upon it.

The hon. member talked about standards of highway construction though we all know very well the slogan, Finish the Drive in '65 and the great push that was put on at that particular time.

But I do not want to talk about that as much as I do about the standards of design, Sir. In any standard design you have a minimum and a maximum tolerance level. You would design for either minimum standards or maximum standards, normally, possibly in between those standards. I am of the opinion that when the Trans-Canada Highway was built the minimum standard was the one that was used.

But that, Sir, is not even the main problem with our Trans-Canada Highway at the moment. The main problem is that that highway when it was designed was designed for the projected traffic volume that was foreseen at that particular time. So that traffic volume particularly, in fact - let me go back a little bit. In designing a highway when your main consideration is the number of tractor-trailer vehicles that travel over that highway in any given period, it is one of the main factors that you consider in designing the strength of your subgrade and your pavement and so forth.

Nobody, Sir, could foresee at that time that CN were going to take the policy that they

MR. N. WINDSOR: have over the past number of years, clear policy, attempting to take freight traffic from the rails in this Province and put it on the highway in tractor-trailers. They have done it with our passenger service, Sir, and I am convinced that they are making every attempt to do it with freight traffic.

Sir, the tremendous increase in tractor-trailer traffic in this Province over the past number of years is unquestionably one of the main factors involved in the rapid deterioration of the Trans-Canada Highway. For that reason, since CN is a federal agency, Sir, I think that the federal government have a tremendous responsibility in this regard and should certainly give every consideration to this Province's proposal for a ninety/ten deal.

MR. NEARY: Who allowed the Trans-Canada Highway to get torn the way it is? The government is responsible for the Trans-Canada.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Certainly we have a certain responsibility for maintenance, but any federal government also has some responsibility when they take action that is directly responsible for the rapid deterioration of that road.

MR. NEARY: Who has the responsibility for regulating the traffic?

MR. N. WINDSOR: On the highway?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. N. WINDSOR: I would say the Province -

MR. NEARY: Of course.

MR. N. WINDSOR: - in the first instance does.

MR. NEARY: Well, then it is the Province is the one that allows it to be torn up.

MR. N. WINDSOR: The Province does not control what traffic is coming in here.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. N. WINDSOR: When a federal agency takes a policy that dictates that that traffic volume on that highway increases drastically, then certainly they have a responsibility not only for upgrading, but of maintenance.

MR. NEARY: Cannot the Province force the freight back on rails by just cutting down on the Trans-Canada?

MR. N. WINDSOR: No.

MR. NEARY: Of course it can.

MR. N. WINDSOR: No.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Oh, listen to lippy, lippy.
Listen to lippy.

April 6, 1978

Tape 650

RC - 1

MR. N. WINDSOR: The hon. member, Sir, talked about the proposed 50/50 deal with Ottawa. The hon. gentleman knows full well that for the first year it is a 75/25 deal and scales down from there. I agree with his point that it may well balance out at a 50/50 deal; however, he also is well aware of the fact that there is a clause in there - the hon. minister made it very clear the other day that there is a clause in there that opens that contract for renegotiation following the tabling of the Sullivan Commission report.

AN HON. MEMBER: Provided both governments agree.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Provided both governments agree.

But it is not by any means a closed deal. It does mean that some work will get underway in this Province this year. It means that 75 per cent of the cost of any work this year will be paid by the federal government and it means a heck of a lot of creation of employment - work for construction companies in this Province this year.

Somewhat in line with the discussion on the Trans-Canada Highway, Mr. Chairman, would be consideration of the Trans-Labrador Highway, and I do not want to take away anything from what my hon. colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) will undoubtedly be saying about the Trans-Labrador Highway, Sir -

AN HON. MEMBER: And Menihek.

MR. N. WINDSOR: - and the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Pousseau) and perhaps the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). Give them full marks - I am sure they will have more to say about it and they are much more qualified to talk about Labrador than I am, but I would like to say, Sir, that having looked briefly at the report on that proposed highway that it would appear to be an extremely desirable thing and it would benefit not only Labrador - it would benefit Labrador, certainly, because it would open up the interior of Labrador, it would tremendously increase the level of communications in the area - but it would certainly facilitate a tremendous flow of traffic, tourists and

MR. N. WINDSOR: so forth through Labrador heading to and from the Island part of the Province via the Northern Peninsula Highway which is well underway to being completed.

Sir, I just want to talk for a moment - and I would ask the hon. minister to address himself to some of these points when he speaks - talk about highways and transportation, Sir, in the Northeast Avalon region which is more directly related to my district of Mount Pearl. I do not want to talk directly about Mount Pearl at the moment, I will get into that in a future debate - in the Throne Speech debate or something. But I want to talk about the region, Sir.

Sir, in the Northeast Avalon region we have a population something in the order of 250,000 people within a fifty mile radius of the city of St. John's. Nearly half the population of this Province lives within a fifty mile radius of St. John's.

Sir, I want to give you some figures for what percentage of the budget of the Department of Transportation and Communications spent on highway construction and improvement over the last three years was spent in that region. In the year 1974 - 1975, 7.2 per cent; in the year 1975 - 1976, 10.7 per cent; in the year 1976 - 1977, 19.8 per cent. And, Sir, that is in a region that serves primarily one-half, or nearly one-half of our population. And, Sir, I would ask the hon. minister to consider that perhaps greater priority be put in this area.

Now, I am not denying the importance of some of the roads that the hon. member mentioned who spoke earlier. The Bonavista Loop Road, the Northern Peninsula Road and so forth. Unquestionably these people have a right to paved highways. I am talking about increasing or improving existing paved roads; hon. members in rural areas are talking about paving gravel roads and putting in a decent standard of road for people to drive on day in and day out. There is no question that those areas need, and justifiably so, a higher

MR. N. WINDSOR: priority than we can claim in this particular area. But, Sir, I think we have to have a good look at this particular area now. There are a number of very serious problems that are developing, and if they are not taken in hand in very short order, we are going to have a very serious traffic problem in this area. When you have nearly half your population in this confined area, the amount of traffic, obviously, is going to be more serious than you will find in rural areas. A case in point, the Kenmount Road, for instance, which is used now by thousands and thousands of people daily travelling to and from the city. In the peak hours it is just unbelievable what you have to experience out there. I am talking about people travelling from Conception Bay South or from Mount Pearl to the heart of the city. As an example, on Monday morning of this week, I think it was, I left my home at twenty minutes after eight and arrived in this building at twenty-five minutes to ten, and I did not stop anywhere, I did not take any side roads - I drove directly out Topsail Road, out the Kenmount Road and down the Prince Philip Parkway - better than

MR. N. WINDSOR: an hour and a half to get to the office. And it took me an hour and ten minutes to get home.

MR. DOODY: Commonwealth Avenue was not ploughed.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Commonwealth Avenue was not ploughed. I will do the minister a favour by not getting into that one this afternoon, but I will at a later date. And we have already discussed that that is a problem, the level of service and the snow clearing operations on Commonwealth Avenue. It is one of the most critical hills in the area and I have discussed it with the minister and we will be discussing it even further.

I have mentioned some figures of dollars and cents that were spent in this area in the last three or four years. A high portion of those, by the way, were spent on the Harbour Arterial Road, which I support. It is going to take an awful lot of tractor trailer traffic off Topsail Road and Kennmount Road, traffic going from the port of St. John's to rural areas by the Trans-Canada Highway and to Donovans Industrial and so forth. But the Harbour Arterial Road in itself, Sir, does not fulfil its complete role. Unless the crosstown arterial road is built then that Harbour Arterial Road will be only half as effective as it really should be. Other than tractor trailer traffic, the main flow of traffic in the region is from North to South, not from East to West. So you have a tremendous problem of people from the Southern Shore area, from the area the hon. member for Ferryland (Mr. C. Power) represents, from Kilbride area, and from Mount Pearl as well, travelling to Confederation Building and the Memorial University and the Trades College and very shortly the Health Sciences Complex is going to even increase that further. Unless that outer ring road is built, you will never upgrade the roads in the City of St. John's to a standard that would accommodate the amount of traffic that we now have and that we certainly will have even greater increases in that regard in the future.

Sir, we have heard a lot of talk about an

MR. N. WINDSOR: outer ring road; obviously that is the ultimate solution. It is going to take some time undoubtedly to build a highway that is going to cost that much. The City of St. John's is basically designed, if you ever look at an aerial plan or a map of the City of St. John's, you will see it is basically a ring radial type configuration town planners talk about with the central core being the harbour and Water Street area and you have radial type roads leading from that to the suburban areas of the city.

Prince Philip Parkway, in front of this building, when it was built was basically an outer ring road, that is what it was designed for. And now it is right in the middle of the city and we are now talking about building another outer ring road which will take high speed traffic around the city and greatly reduce the amount of traffic within the city streets itself, travelling just from one side of the city to the other.

So just those few remarks, Mr. Chairman. I would ask the hon. minister if he would make a few comments on those when he speaks.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of more points that I want to get into before the minister starts to respond to some items that we have raised and we will get those off. I dealt with the Trans-Canada Highway situation and a general policy for transportation within the province. Also, Mr. Chairman, there has been a number of points come to my attention this past few days as spokesman for transportation in this party. With regards to this Labrador barge, I understand that the Department of Transportation and Communications has a barge that they use going up and down the Labrador Coast to transport equipment into small communities to carry out road work in those communities along the Labrador Coast and some of the stories that have recently been coming to me about this Labrador barge I would hope that the minister could reply in some detail after we bring up a few points on it.

MR. RIDEOUT: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I understand that this barge is under the absolute control of the highways division at Deer Lake. Now I do not know what logistical sense that makes but my information tells me that this barge is under the control of Mr. Wes. Roberts who is the, I do not know what his title is, district supervisor, or something I suppose like that, in Deer Lake. Now I do not know what logistical sense that makes but anyway, be that as it may I understand that that is the situation. I understand also that the department contracts out the towing

MR. RIDEOUT: services for this particular barge every year and that they let a contract out to some person who has a vessel that can do the job and he goes down there and he spends a number of days towing this barge wherever it is necessary up and down the Labrador coast. This year I am told that the barge has to be brought into Marystown for repairs. But instead of having that done when the work was completed down there this year, which seems to me would be the most efficient and logical way to do it to tow it into Marystown this fall so that the work could be carried on during the winter and it could be carried back again in the spring, the barge was left in Goose Bay and now somebody has to go down there in the spring, special trip down, still has to be towed back to Marystown and then towed back down the Labrador coast again after the repairs are carried out. Of course the obvious question is this, Mr. Chairman; when are the communities along the Labrador coast going to be able to avail of the services of that barge so that the necessary road construction can be carried out in those communities? It is a very - you know, we have all kinds of problems in transportation along the Labrador coast especially as far as air services and that go. My colleague from Eagle River, I am sure, will deal with these in more detail later on. But this barge is very important to the communities along that coast. The only way that they can get the machinery in there is by bringing it in on this particular barge. So, you know, the inefficiency of the system to allow that piece of vital equipment to stay over the winter period frozen in the ice in Goose Bay area, when they knew full well it had to come to Marystown - that was decided last fall. It had to come for repairs. It could not operate another season without them - had to come to Marystown for repairs - NOW we have to go down there in the spring of the year when the navigation season opens, tow it back up, have the repairs done and, I understand, tow it back down again so that it can go to work. Now what kind of sense does that make? To me it does not make very much sense as regards to planning and especially as far as providing those people on the coast with the barge so that they can work done on their roads along the coast this

MR. RIDEOUT:

year.

And also, Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to make note of the North West River bridge. I understand that there is - even though this was supposed to be done in a DREE agreement, I understand that there is a lot of it, there is a great deal of cost overruns when the tenders came in, and nothing has been settled so far as to whether or not this vital transportation link is going to get off the ground or not this year. So I would like the minister to fill us in on what is happening with regards to negotiations to get the North West River Bridge off and running this construction season. Now, Mr. Chairman, for the next few minutes I want to return a little closer to home. I think I have probably covered the most general areas that I wanted to cover in my opening remarks and my other colleagues will be bringing out their own points as we go along. But I want to return a little closer to home.

The minister in his opening remarks made reference to the absolute necessity of upgrading and paving roads on the Baie Verte Peninsula because of the recognized health hazard to people living on that peninsula due to asbestos contamination of the road dust. And I agree, Mr. Chairman, with the minister, or with some of the points made by the minister in his remarks that, you know, even though it is a recognized and admitted health hazard by the greatest of authorities, that still does not mean that the problem can be solved overnight. None of us expect that, but we are very sensitive, Mr. Chairman, to commitments, and despite the long hard battle that we had to get any commitments we are very sensitive to commitments. And there is no doubt about it, commitments have been made to spend substantial sums of money in that part of the Province this year. Now there is no good getting into old hassles of the last session or the session before and say like it should have been spent anyway and that kind of stuff. The fact is it was not. But the government has finally accepted the recommendations of the Selikoff report. It was presented in this building in December the final draft of the report came to government as well as it did to the rest of us, the union, company and myself and so on in January with the written recommendations attached to them. And from a transportation aspect one of the most important

Mr. Rideout:

principle involved that those roads have to be done. And as I said in the beginning, we know it cannot be done in one year, we know it cannot even be done in two years, but we want to know beyond any doubt what the plans are for doing those roads and we want them done as quickly as possible. I think it is fair to say that, and I would be derelict in my duties as the representative of that area if I did not say it. We want them done as quickly as possible, but recognizing the fact that it cannot be done overnight.

Back in December, Mr. Chairman, the Selikoff report - I may be close to twenty minutes - back in December the Selikoff report finally went to Cabinet. Now before the report went to Cabinet it was still the contention of the minister of the day that he still did not know what Dr. Selikoff was talking about. You know, that is another debate and I will not get into it. But the report finally did go to Cabinet in December. As a matter of fact, I believe it went to Cabinet on December 17. Up to December 16 the minister was still saying that I see no reason having not heard from Dr. Selikoff or have not had recommendations from him and so on, that we should do anything above the ordinary with those roads. But, but, but -

MR. MORGAN: I was waiting all year (inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: I am not criticizing you for that. But, if the recommendations come in then we are certainly going to have to look at it and do something about it.

The minister talked about a \$20 million upgrading and paving programme for the Baie Verte Peninsula. Well certainly that would include every inch of road on the Peninsula, and in time it will have to be done. But the minister talked about a \$5.5 million to \$6 million for this year, in the coming year, to pave Seal Cove to Wild Cove and Baie Verte to Fleur de Lys and Coachman's Cove, and every resident there knows that, Mr. Chairman, every resident of Fleur de Lys and Coachman's Cove, Seal Cove and Wild Cove, and we were as proud as peacocks because the Minister of Transportation told us. Now that was the day before the Cabinet meeting, even though he had not accepted the

Mr. Rideout: fact, even though there was still some doubt about whether it would be accepted and so on. But the day after the Cabinet meeting, December 17, the minister was interviewed and the headlines were "Morgan decides to pave roads". I will read a few passages from this that will probably drive the point home.

MR. MORGAN: Quote properly now.

MR. RIDEOUT: I will quote properly. I will table it and the minister can read it himself. "In a surprise change of heart Transportation Minister" - the hon. member for Bonavista South - "says paving of roads on the Baie Verte Peninsula where asbestos dust is posing a health hazard" - this is difficult to read because it is not a good copy - "will get underway in 1978. Engineers will begin testing what needs to be done early in the New Year" - I understand they have been at that - "with a view to getting much of the paving work included in the 1978-1979 estimates, Morgan said last night". Now that is what we are doing now, right? The 1978-1979 estimates.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: With much - hold on now, it is explained a little bit better than that way down in some quotes. "Top priority will be given to two particularly asbestos dust laden roads, the one from Fleur de Lys to Coachman's Cove and the road from Baie Verte to Seal Cove to Wild Cove. In the past, stating government has no proof paving of the roads in the area is required from the area's population's health, Morgan indicated last night that this move to commence paving was prompted by the recent visit by New York occupational health expert Dr. Irving Selikoff". And then they go on to talk about the dust counts and so on.

The second last paragraph, "He has mentioned the \$20 million figure for the work that needs to be done but last night said there could be a \$5 million expenditure in the next year". Now, Mr. Chairman, we want to know - \$5 million is a substantial amount of money; I would say it could possibly do though I have no way of knowing - but \$5 million would go a long way to doing the work what needs to be done on those two roads.

MR. RIDEOUT: I want to know while we are doing those estimates how much money is earmarked in the estimates for the upgarding and the paving of those roads on the Baie Verte Peninsula. Two different days, the day before the Cabinet meeting, the day after the Cabinet meeting the minister then beyond doubt, and I hope that the minister is not going to get up and say it is a misquote, because I am coming to the conclusion that it must be a government of misquotes; every time you quote something, Ah, it is taken out of context.

MR. MORGAN: I did not say 'misquote'.

MR. RIDEOUT: not so far, not so far.
I hope the minister does not do that. I know that there had to be liquid calcium put on some parts of those roads this year and other roads on the Baie Verte Peninsula. I know that, because you will not be able to do it all even if you wanted to, I would submit. But are we going to get the \$5 million or \$6 million spent on those roads this year instead of dragging it out over four or five years? With \$5 million or \$6 million this year and \$5 million or \$6 million next year, the job can be completed. I do not think it will take that much over two years, my sources tell me. Are we going to get that? Or are we going to get the bandaïd approach? A million this year for two roads, a million next year for two roads, a million the year after for two roads and five or six years down the road you may get the job done. Now is that the commitment? I think we have a right to know, Mr. Chairman.

The people down there are anxiously waiting. I asked the present minister in this House shortly after the session opened when he intended to call tenders and he told me, hopefully, very early in the season so that work could get underway without any undue delay, and I know the minister will do that. But unless you have some money to spend, then the calling of tenders very early is not the important point.

We want to know how much money is going to be spent on those roads, and if it is anything short of \$5 million then the special consideration, and the special grant, the special Cabinet allocation that the former minister was walking about, if it is anything less than that then I will challenge the minister - and I am sure that I will be backed by people on the Baie Verte Peninsula - I will challenge the minister, Mr. Chairman, to honour his public commitment to those people

Mr. Rideout: and resign. I will challenge the minister if there is anything less than \$5 million allocated in the Budget for those roads -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: - then the minister's public commitment, not once or twice, but a dozen times during the whole debate on the health hazards on the Baie Verte Peninsula, not once but a dozen times the minister made that commitment. He made it in the House. I checked Hansard, it is in the record. He made it to delegations, he made it on the air, he made it in the print media. So if there is anything less than \$5 million in the estimates for that work this year.

MR. MORGAN: Do not be so foolish.

MR. RIDEOUT: Do not be so foolish! Mr. Chairman, that minister made the commitment.

MR. NEARY: He did not know what he was doing.

MR. RIDEOUT: That minister told a delegation from Seal Cove and Fleur de Lys that if Dr. Selikoff recommended beyond any doubt that it must be done he would go for a special Cabinet allocation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I have to clarify it, because the hon. gentleman is now putting in the record incorrect information about statements made by myself.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is not incorrect.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the fact is I am on a point of order for clarification - the point is that I did say publicly and I did say in the House of Assembly that if any concrete evidence was put forward by Dr. Selikoff's report indicating that there was any health hazard or danger to health as a result of a possibility of asbestosis in road dust on the Baie Verte Peninsula roads that I would take the matter to my colleagues in Cabinet. I also said that the government would deal with the matter as -

MR. NEARY: A quorum call, Your Honour has to rise the Committee when there is no quorum.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! Continue on your point of order.

MR. NEARY: Is there a quorum?

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Yes, we have a quorum.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Fourteen is a quorum. We have fourteen.

MR. MORGAN: We have a quorum. Okay, Mr. Chairman. Stop playing games on the other side in the House of Assembly.

MR. RIDEOUT: Fourteen is a quorum.

MR. MORGAN: They can make their abusive attacks , but they cannot listen to the information from the other side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! Order, please! You cannot interrupt when another person is speaking unless you are recognized. I will ask the hon. minister to continue on his point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The point I was making is when they want to get information of the House, correct information they leave the House. The fact is that the information given by me was stated publicly and also in this House on record in Hansard. I said that the government would give the matter special consideration based on the fact that it could be a potential health hazard. I also said that government would attempt to find funds to commence the paving of roads this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I would ask the hon. minister to make his point of order a little shorter, please.

MR. MORGAN: Well the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify the statement that has been made which is not true, and I am giving for the record of this House the correct information.

MR. RIDEOUT: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will hear the point of privilege.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I am all for hearing the minister clarifying, but he will have twenty minutes to make a speech the same as I have. And I would submit that the minister is using the guise of a point of order to make an explanation of the charges that I have made. Now the minister will have twenty minutes to do that after I sit down. It is not a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, there is no point of privilege. And my point of order is still on the floor.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well let us have a ruling.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the point I am making - Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman wants to make accusations about statements made by me I want these statements tabled in the House of Assembly.

MR. RIDEOUT: You have got twenty minutes to reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I feel I can rule on the point of order which will also explain your point of privilege. I feel it is not a point of order it is more or less a point of explanation, and I would ask the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay to continue.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, -

MR. MORGAN: Table the evidence.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, what -

MR. MORGAN: If I was quoted in the Evening Telegram, table the evidence.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, look at the Bonavista Yahoo going off his head again. The minister - well I cannot say that, it is unparliamentary - the minister who had the gall to tell a delegation of five people from Seal Cove and Wild Cove that if it is recommended beyond doubt by Dr. Selikoff that there is a health hazard in your area we will find the money or I will resign from the Cabinet.

MR. MORGAN: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: Five people can back that up.

MR. MORGAN: That is right! I did say that.

MR. RIDEOUT: The minister who had the gall to tell a delegation

MR. RIDEOUT:

including the parish priest from Fleur de Lys and Coachman's Cove, the same thing. And then he asks me to table my evidence.

MR. MORGAN: I did not say \$5 million though.

MR. RIDEOUT: The minister said \$5 million or \$6 million in here.

MR. MORGAN: Give evidence.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is the evidence and the minister has said it to people, to those delegations that I am talking about. Now weasel out of it, Mr. Chairman. He weaseled out of one resignation the other day when the Premier came back and cracked the whip and you have not heard him since. Well weasel out of this one. There are enough people down there to take the minister to task for this. Mr. Chairman, this is a very, very important situation. I thought the minister appreciated it and I thought that we could count on his substantial support in Cabinet as he told us he would.

Now if it is \$1 million or \$1.5 million for those roads, then I would say that that is not good enough in view of the situation that exists down there. We do not want all the money. We do not expect it to be done in one year but we want a substantial start made, and I think we deserve it. And this minister or the former minister has led us to believe beyond any doubt that we are going to get it. I would hope that the minister who has inherited his portfolio and who is a member of that Cabinet will not let us down, and will make sure that we get our fair share. We are not talking about upgrading a road for a fish plant's sake or anything else, as important as that is, we are talking about upgrading and paving a road to save peoples' lives. Now, how can you argue against that? That is how important it is and for anybody to try to weasel out of a commitment on that, Mr. Chairman, is despicable beyond words.

Now I understand my time is pretty well expired. I would like to call a quorum, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: No quorum, Mr. Chairman. You have to rise the Committee when there is no quorum.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is a quorum call, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKMAN: No, no quorum call.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have not heard a quorum call.

A quorum call.

MR. NEARY: When a quorum call is made in Committee of the Whole, Sir, Your Honour has no choice but to rise the Committee when there is no quorum.

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of order. There was no quorum call as Your Honour so properly pointed out. There was an hon. gentleman who tried to make a quorum call from outside the confines of this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order, Sir. There was a quorum call. My hon. friend got up and counted the House after I called a quorum and according to Beauchesne, Sir, Your Honour has no choice when there is no quorum in the House but to rise the Committee. And Your Honour can send for the record, can send for the transcript.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I will wait for three minutes and

then I will call a quorum.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, under the rules of Committee of the Whole on Supply, Sir, Your Honour has no choice but to rise the Committee.

AN HON. MEMBER: Call order boy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I have not recognized the hon.

member.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman -

MR. NEARY: I am up on a point of order. Sit down 'Yahoo'.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry I cannot hear a point of order. When the three minutes is up I will make my ruling.

MR. MORGAN: 'Steve' why do you not learn some manners in the House boy, come on. Learn some respect for the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I would ask the Clerk to count the House.

We have a quorum.

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: When a point of order is raised in Committee of the Whole, Your Honour, the Chairman has no choice when he does not see a quorum but to rise the Committee. We do not follow the same procedure as we do on bills, when we go into Committee of the Whole on bills. In Committee of the Whole on Supply when it is brought to Your Honour's attention that there is no quorum in the House Your Honour has no choice but to rise the Committee.

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Order 5 says and I quote, "If notice is taken by a member that there is not a quorum present in the Committee of the Whole, presumably Committee of Supply is the same, the Chairman follows the course pursued by the Speaker of the House. If he ascertains that fourteen members are not present, he leaves the Chair. The House is resumed and on his report the Speaker counts the House and may cause the House to be counted by one of the Clerks of the House. If

MR. MARSHALL: if there be not then a quorum he must adjourn the House." So, Mr. Chairman, the procedure is quite obvious. When a quorum is called in Committee your Honour determines whether or not a quorum is present; you make the count. If you determine that there is not a quorum then, and only then, do you rise and the Speaker is called in and then the count is taken, and if there is not a quorum then the house adjourns. That is the procedure Your Honour followed. I would suggest that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) should do an advanced study in the normal rules of the House, not just Beauchesne but the rules that are set down by the House itself.

MR. NEARY: What rules are made by the -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I feel it is not a point of order as pointed out by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and I will recognize the next hon. member.

The hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe).

MR. DAWE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise now and use this occasion to point out to the Minister a traffic condition on a road that I consider is the most travelled on the Avalon Peninsula after say the traffic flow on Topsail Highway and the Kenmount Road. I refer to the Roaches Line access road. I know Your Honour, the Chairman, is very familiar with this condition and I am sure the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) is familiar with it as well.

MR. R. MOORES: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: The road itself is very treacherous. It is narrow. It's curves are very difficult to manoeuvre in the Wintertime, and I would say that there are at least 10,000, I repeat, 10,000 heavy tractor loads travelling this road each and every year, and this is increasing. We have a population as well that uses this road from four districts, that is from part of the Bay de Verde District, Carbonear, Harbour Grace and Port de Grave, a population of about 40,000. All the oil that is now consumed in Conception Bay is now trucked over this road; it is trucked from St. John's to Harbour Grace. All the salt fish, about seventy per cent of what is produced in Newfoundland today, is brought to various

MR. DAWE: sections of Conception Bay over this road, it is processed and made ready for market and now it is primarily being exported out of the Province by tractor-trailers. There is some planning arranged and a site is being determined, the route is being determined, to have an access road from Carbonear to the Trans-Canada Highway and probably the Minister when he speaks later on can advise the Committee what the status is on this particular road, if immediate work is going to be done. If not, I strongly suggest to the Minister that at least temporary improvements be made to the Roaches Line access road or that the pavement should be extended on the Roaches Line access road a distance of six miles and this would take quite a bit of the traffic off the Roaches Line access road, in particular the traffic that would be using the Trans-Canada Highway going west.

Mr. Chairman, as you know - you are familiar with the conditions, we have, as well, I think, four or five of the largest wholesale distributors in Conception Bay. We have some of the largest lumber supply businesses in the Province located in Conception Bay and they are using this road, as I say, each and every day. We have two large sand and gravel, ready-mix concrete suppliers, and I think between them they have eleven or twelve mixer trucks. I guess there is

MR. DANE: more than half than is used here in the City of St. John's over in Conception Bay and people are using this road each and every day. There is a large block plant over there, blocks going all over at least from Gander East. Practically all the salt is used in the production of salt fish or other fish products which come out of this part of Conception Bay, over 500,000 bags in a year. There are two or three now large shopping centres being just constructed and a new one under construction in Carbonear. This brings in a lot of traffic flow from all parts of Trinity South, Whitbourne and these sections of the Province. And I would suggest to the minister that if a traffic count was made on the Roaches access road, a weekly account of the traffic, he would be amazed beyond words of the traffic on this road. I doubt if there would be five other large sections of road in this Province travelled more. It is too narrow. It is dangerous and it is treacherous. And as I say, if the minister or the government have no immediate plans to proceed with this access road from Carbonear I appeal not on behalf of my own district, but the four districts of Bay de Verde, Carbonear, Harbour Grace and Port de Grave that some improvement should be made of a temporary nature until the government can find funds to complete this arterial road to the Trans-Canada.

It is a serious condition, Mr. Chairman. There have been several accidents only lately on the Roaches Line from which death has resulted and anyone who travels especially in the Wintertime move in fear and trembling especially when you meet these heavy tractor-trailers. There is no shoulder on the road and it is almost beyond description the condition for people who have to travel. I would like to make this appeal to the minister on behalf of these people to at least try to do something in the immediate future until such time as the access road will be built. I am sure it will be welcome news, as I say, by all these heavy truck operators. I understand that just M.A. Powell alone in Carbonear, one of the largest has a fleet of seventy trucks himself. I do hope that the minister

MR. DAVE: will take this under most serious consideration. I know financial straits that the Province is in but I say to him something must be done with this road and done quickly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I think all in committee will recognize that we tend to go from side to side in the House and especially insofar as in committee the time of speaking is relatively limited, so it is presumed that every member certainly will get his opportunity to speak.

The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I feel I have to stand and say a few words at least in defense of my own performance as Minister of Transportation for the past year or so based on the attacks this afternoon in the House by at least one speaker from the Opposition. I take exception to information being given to the record of the House of Assembly which is not correct. I attempted to correct it through a point of order but I will have a chance to do it now.

First of all may I say in connection with the negotiations over the past two years - in fact they were commenced by my predecessor, the hon. member for Manihak - in trying to obtain funds from Ottawa to carry out the upgrading of the TCH, the initiative was taken by him. It was taken and carried on by myself for two years, or a little more than two years but not by myself alone.

MR. MORGAN: I take exception to statements which leave the impression with the media and in the House of Assembly that it was because of poor negotiations on the part of this minister, or this government, which resulted in us ending up with a fifty-fifty cost sharing for the Trans Canada Highway. The fact is that my counterparts in Nova Scotia, the same stripe as the present party in power in Ottawa, my counterpart in the province of PEI have the same stripe as well and my counterpart for New Brunswick. The four of us were asked by the federal minister to present to him a presentation on the upgrading of the primary highway system in the Atlantic region along the same lines as the primary highway system was upgraded in the Western part of the country, in the four Western provinces. After months of negotiation and sometimes confrontation, not between myself and the federal minister only, but between all of us, all four with the federal minister, the federal government's attitude is that the roads are primarily the provinces' responsibility and jurisdiction and that has a lot of merit. But on the other hand, why is it Ottawa through one department, like through the department of DREE - and I was pleased that during the two terms in office, my term in office that we were successful in getting over \$60 million for secondary roads in this Province in a 90-10 cost sharing arrangement, 90-10. Why? Because we had a man in Ottawa through the person of the hon. Marcel Lessard who recognized the needs of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: It was not because of the confrontation attitude of the previous minister and myself, it was not because of that. There was no confrontation with the hon. Marcel Lessard it was a spirit of co-ordination and co-operation. And we received excellent co-operation to the tune of sixty odd million dollars. The Baie Verte Peninsula, for example, the LaSalle Road was part

MR. MORGAN: of that \$60 million, the Great Northern Peninsula, the Bonavista Loop Road, the Burgeo road and others like the Harbour Arterial Road - it was not as good a cost sharing arrangement but it was still federal funds over and above the sixty odd million dollars. So why was it that the minister in the Newfoundland government could not negotiate with the federal government a successful highway agreement? He was not doing it alone. I was not there alone. I was there with three of my counterparts from the Atlantic region.

Well, if the opposition wants to say that 'Morgan' was the man to blame for getting a fifty-fifty cost sharing because of his confrontation with the federal minister, he was making statements attacking the federal government's attitude, because he was making statements to the press, that he was negotiating through the press, he was criticizing Ottawa - and of course the attitude always has been with the previous government, do not criticize Uncle Ottawa, do not dare criticize Uncle Ottawa because we depend so much on them. Oh gentlemen, gentlemen! Let us learn a lesson from the province of Quebec. Now I do not advocate to be so radical as that but a few weeks ago we heard an announcement in Ottawa looking at the public account spending this year of the federal national government of our country. Out of a spending of \$305 million for the total country \$173 million is going to the province of Quebec this year alone. Fifty-seven per cent of all the expenditures of the Public Works of Canada is going into a province that co-operates with Ottawa? Oh, no! Confrontation with Ottawa? Oh, yes! So maybe confrontation is the answer. Maybe it is the answer. I will tell you one thing sitting down with three of my counterparts in meaningful negotiation, monthly discussions with the federal authorities, including the federal minister on many occasions, was not being successful in getting better than a fifty-fifty. Nova Scotia had to take it, PEI had to take it - the same stripe won, one of them with an election on now -

April 6, 1973

Tape No. 638

AII-3

MR. MORGAN: New Brunswick has been forced to take a fifty-fifty. The situation in this Province looks as if we are going to be forced to take a fifty-fifty with a little more benefit than the other provinces. The fact is that the Sullivan Commission is not our commission appointed here, it was appointed by the federal government upon the complaints and screams and complaints by this minister to Ottawa about the transportation problems we have in this Province.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so foolish.

MR. MORGAN: Every week or end I was in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Complaining to Ottawa about the CN ferry service, the CN road cruiser service, the coastal boat services, the Trans-Canada Highway.

MR. MORGAN:

What happened? Otto Lang probably said:-

'Well, let us keep that fellow Morgan shut up down there and we will appoint a Sullivan Commission of enquiry, or a commission of enquiry into transportation. Let us keep him shut up and keep him quiet down there. He is making too much noise. He is criticizing me in the national press. He is getting on national television. Even CBC National News is carrying him. Why? That little man down in Newfoundland criticizing me, the Federal Minister of Transport? How dare he? Let us keep him quiet. Let us appoint a Royal Commission of enquiry into transportation so that Minister of Transportation in Newfoundland, Morgan, will shut his big yap and keep quiet in complaining about transportation problems in his province.'

Why was I complaining? Because we have many problems in our Province today with transportation, many gigantic problems, and it is hurting the development of this Province, it is hurting the economy of this Province, it is raising the cost of living in this Province. That is why Morgan is up in Ottawa bitterly complaining and fighting and rowing with the Federal Minister and other authorities. Because he recognizes the importance of transportation to this Province.

I take some exception to remarks made that it was because we were in confrontation at some times with the Federal Government that we are ending up with a fifty-fifty. The fact is that our Minister now, today, in a few weeks will be signing a fifty-fifty cost-sharing. I do not think there is any man in this House of Assembly, I am sure there is none on this side of the House, that will say, 'We know it is a good deal', because it is not a good deal but on the other hand it is the best we can get. Because the unfortunate circumstance is that if we do not take the fifty-fifty, hanging over our heads is the possibility of the money being taken and spent elsewhere in the country. Now I am not going to say too much on it but I will say this as an individual Newfoundlander, that, to me, infringes a bit, like blackmail. It does. In other words, here is your money, if you do not take it on our terms we will take that money and put it over here somewhere in the rest of the country. That is the predicament we,

MR. MORGAN: as a Government, find ourselves in today. That is the position the present Minister finds himself in. He finds himself in that position. We have no choice but to accept the fifty-fifty but we are fortunate in getting a better deal than Nova Scotia, better than Prince Edward Island and better than New Brunswick, based on the fact the Sullivan Commission into Transportation, the Enquiry, is sitting there out in the wings with a report coming in in the next number of weeks, hopefully. Looking at the recommendations made to that Commission and the briefs from organized groups throughout the Province, I am sure that the Sullivan Commission will make a very important recommendation in connection with the Trans-Canada Highway which, indeed, is a major artery of our transportation network in this Province. So I am hoping that they will, in their recommendation, be very firm and I am hoping, as well, that the Federal Government will see fit to re-open the agreement we are going to sign in the next few weeks and give us a better deal than fifty-fifty. But the present situation is, we are forced into a position to accept or lose the funds. That is in connection with the Trans-Canada Highway.

You know, it is funny - it seems like from one of the previous speakers in the Opposition that while this minister was in Transportation we could not get any funds from Ottawa. I mention DREE. I will give you one more little example, Mr. Chairman, \$25,000,000 last year up until the Fall of 1977, was allocated for airport development in the Atlantic Region, \$25,000,000 total for the four provinces, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland. Again, maybe because of Morgan's big mouth in Ottawa and criticizing and pressing and criticizing and pressing, we got a little more than \$13,000,000 of that \$25,000,000. \$13,000,000 this Province got.

MR. WHITE: Baker and Rompkey helped.

MR. MORGAN: I agree, Baker and Rompkey helped. I agree on that but this minister was then the Minister of Transport in this Province and the Federal Government saw fit to allocate these funds

MR. MORGAN: and we worked in a cordial way. In Labrador for the airstrip we got \$11,000,000 for the Wabush City Airport Development, and \$2,000,000 for the Coastal Development airstrip. That shows an example that all was not lost by a little confrontation, a little criticism. What I am saying is, if the Opposition wants to blame me for not getting a better deal than fifty-fifty, Morgan will take it on his shoulders because you will always be standing up firm and saying, 'I still do not believe we are getting a good deal', but we are getting the best we can get at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN:

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have many problems in

Transportation and

MR. MORGAN:

I am very enthused over the idea that right now we have one minister responsible for two portfolios. Transportation is a very important portfolio in connection with the needs for this Province and I cannot think of a better move on the part of the Premier to have one minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs and for Transportation at this time because in the next year or so it is going to be very, very important. If the Sullivan Commission, if that Commission is going to have any concrete, any kind of meat to it at all, in its report, if it is, that report is going to be very important in getting the recommendations implemented for this Province. I cannot think of a better move. Because I can tell you right now, Mr. Chairman, in my experience, in transportation, its problems are going to need many answers over the next number of months, the coastal boat services, the CN services they are providing in the Province like, for example, the gulf ferries and the road cruiser service. Then there is the Labrador portion of our Province which needs looking into as well, all these aspects of transportation. And unless we get an efficient, effective transportation system we will always be retarded in development in this Province. I am convinced of that.

I am a bit concerned, and I have expressed my concern to my colleagues and also to the officials in Ottawa, over the recent changes indicated in connection with the CN marine operations in the Gulf. I do not know what it will mean. I am hoping it will mean further improvements. But it could very well mean that we could see, sometime in the future an increase in fares and a reduction in the level of services. I am sure that the present minister and all my colleagues will agree that that is one main aim of this administration, to make sure the level of services improve and the cost to the users is not going to be increased on that Gulf service. Because I look upon it, and I am sure all my colleagues do as well, as part of the Trans-Canada Highway system. If that ferry service is not maintained in a proper standard of service

MR. MORGAN:

it is going to be a very serious factor in the Tourism Industry in this Province and, in fact, the overall economy.

In the Labrador portion of the Province, I know that there are problems down there which we are going to need help from the federal government on. I am hoping that the federal Department of DREE will recognize the need to allocate funds for a Trans-Labrador Highway across from Wabush and Labrador City to Goose Bay. I am convinced there is a need for a ferry service to link that part of our Province to this Island part of the Province. However, I am rather disturbed, as Minister of Tourism, that this year it seems that we are not going to have that very important service this Summer again because of the procrastination on the part of CN officials and mainly decision-makers in the MOT not to implement some kind of a planning procedure to replace the William Carson. They kept on delaying and procrastinating and now we see again further delays in getting the boat, Sir Robert Bond ready for this Summer and this means a substantial loss to the tourism industry in the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area of our Province.

I do not want to get into detail in regards to the air services in Labrador but I know that the hon. gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) will probably agree with me, the only answer is the master plan now developed. And again I would like to emphasize while I was in that department the first year that this was a major proposal we put forward to Ottawa. We wanted to see development of airstrips along the coast. I kept pressing that point even to the point where we allocated provincial dollars to commence the Programme. We spent over \$1 million in Cartwright, strictly provincial dollars, \$1 million. On top of that came \$100,000 from Ottawa, only \$100,000. So this Province showed its concern for the transportation problems on the Coast of Labrador. We are now commencing building an airstrip at Rigolet through our maintenance division of the Transportation Department. But only by pressing Ottawa and pointing out the need for improved transportation

MR. MORGAN:

on the Coast, Ottawa finally came down after weeks of studies, devised a master plan on development of airstrips, a master plan proposing the construction of approximately thirteen airstrips in the Coast of Labrador. Two of them fortunately are underway this year in Nain and

MR. MORGAN: and Makkovik or tenders are being called for these and funds allocated. So transportation is not only a problem in Labrador it is a problem throughout the Province.

I wish the new minister, my colleague, every success in dealing with Ottawa. I sincerely hope he can get a better deal for the highway over the next number of months. I sincerely hope he can get improvements on the gulf ferry operation, on the coastal boat service in Labrador and on C&I's operations in general. I can tell you gentlemen it is no mean task dealing with Ottawa to get these problems overcome. So I wish him well, but I do take exception to being blamed for all the problems we have in transportation in this Province today. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, that was a tremendous display of apotheosis. Apotheosis, in case hon. members might not know what it means, has got its origin from the Latin language and it has got to do with self glorification.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. T. LUSH: And with that display of apotheosis I cannot understand why the minister is still not Minister of Transportation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: And Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. T. LUSH: Despite the minister's behavior in Ottawa. I never ever heard that he was thrown out of the minister's office the way that he threw a delegation of mine out of his office last year when they were talking about the conditions of the roads, the delegation from Bunyan's Cove, but, Mr. Chairman, that is another story.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of Order.

MR. J. MORGAN: Again a second gentleman for this afternoon has attempted to put incorrect information in the reports of this

MR. J. MORGAN: House and I want it to be corrected. The situation was, and the hon. gentleman fully knows what the situation was, there was no delegation thrown out of my office. In fact, the situation was that while I was in my term of office, as I recall, I documented all the delegations from around the Province. There were 268 delegations came to my office, none were thrown out, all of them received cordially. Not all of them went away satisfied, they did not all go away satisfied, naturally they could not do that. But I am saying in connection with delegation from the hon. gentleman's district that that afternoon the hon. gentleman happened to play a very dirty, unethical trick with me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, Oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN:

He arranged to meet a delegation from his district through he would not attend the meeting, he sat in the House of Assembly. There was a quorum call and I had to leave the delegation to come back in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. T. LUSH:

To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Did you call a point of order?

MR. T. LUSH:

Yes number one, if what I say is correct -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

If the hon. member would permit me a point of order has come up I think I can rule on it now. I am not aware that a point of order is before the Chair, it is in the matter of an explanatory statement that the minister made and I might point out that a more correct way, really, of doing that would be to ask the speaker to yield. If the speaker wishes to yield then the explanation statement can be made. If the member who has the attention of the House does not yield, of course, the individual would then have to wait until he was recognized to make a statement but at this time I do not see a point of order as being before the Chair, the hon. minister,

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Chairman, a point of privilege,

April 6, 1978

Tape 661

DW ~ 3

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Point of privilege.

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Tourism

in his vexatious point of order that you have just ruled is not a point of order said very plainly, and I am sure Mansard will show, that my colleague from Terra Nova played dirty political tricks - dirty unethical tricks. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would submit that is casting aspersions and motives on my hon. colleague and I would submit that the minister should be asked to withdraw those remarks.-

MR. PECKFORD:

Sit down buffoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

I hope I did not learn it from you.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The non. member has brought up a matter as a point of privilege. In my understanding to ascribe unethical motives or unethical statements or actions to an hon. member is unparliamentary and it is a violation of order but it would not be prima facie case of privilege. But as it is out of order I would ask the non. minister if he would completely withdraw the remark that I believe he has already partially withdrawn, but I think it would help if he made a complete withdrawal of the remark indicating the possibility of unethical activity.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, I indicated what I felt was an unethical trick, I indicated what it was and let the House decide whether it was a political trick or not.

MR. NEARY: That is not a withdrawal, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do I understand that the hon. minister has made the withdrawal? He has made the withdrawal.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, a point of privilege of the House.

During the heated debate that took place there a few moments ago, Sir, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Peckford) made a very unparliamentary remark in a vicious attack, personal attack, on my hon. friend, the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout). The hon. gentleman said, "Sit down, you buffoon". Now, Mr. Chairman, if that sort of thing is going to be allowed to continue in this hon. House, Sir, then we may as well go down to the Killick or go downtown to a tavern and hold the sessions of this House. That is unparliamentary, Sir. You cannot make that kind of a vicious attack or reference to any hon. member on either side of this House. You can think what you like, Mr. Chairman, but you cannot say it out loud. The hon. gentleman made that statement. I wrote it down and I would ask Your Honour to instruct the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Peckford) to withdraw his remark and apologize to the hon. member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

As hon. members will remember, I am sure, there are a number of expressions which have been termed unparliamentary and I will not, I believe, need to go through the list. But if my memory serves me correctly 'buffoon' is one of those words, or if it is not it is very similar to it, and I think it is clearly unparliamentary. I would ask the hon. minister if he would withdraw fully that remark.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, with grace and dignity I withdraw that remark which was labelled at the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), withdraw completely without qualification, but

MR. PECKFORD:

would point out to the hon. House that the individual or the hon. member who first introduced other phraseology other than that was normally used, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who always refers to everybody, especially the hon. members on this side, as an hon. crowd, and I think it is that kind of phraseology when started that leads to other kinds of words which Beauchesne says are unparliamentary.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) him to withdraw (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I understand the hon. minister has withdrawn.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, under the minister's salary -

MR. PECKFORD: A point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! A point of privilege.

MR. PECKFORD: A very serious breach of privilege of this House was the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) referred to the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) as a 'Yahoo'. Now, I would say, Mr. Chairman, that if on the one hand this House claims that the word 'buffoon' infringes upon the privileges of this House, I would suggest that referring to another hon. member as a 'Yahoo' is also in that category and therefore I would that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) withdraw the phraseology that he uses also.

MR. NEARY: To that point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. Your honour -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - I am sure did not hear any such statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

If you will permit me, my first ruling I think has to be that I cannot recognize that as a point of privilege but I can recognize it as a point of order.

MR. NEARY: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman. Your Honour knows full well that I did not make any such statement. If I made such a statement, Sir, or if any hon. member - and the hon. gentleman for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) who is prompting my hon. friend, who spends very

MR. NEARY:

little time in the House, very little time, just drops in occasionally, and prompting my hon. friend -

MR. WELLS: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: No, I am on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am on a point of order.

MR. WELLS: A point of personal privilege.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman takes his seat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: We already have a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The point of privilege -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

There was a point of order before the Chair and another point of order cannot be raised when a point of order is already before the Chair, but a point of privilege can be so raised.

MR. NEARY: But we already have a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. It was ruled as a point of order, if you recall. I had to rule it as a point of order.

MR. NEARY: We had the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Peckford) making a point of privilege.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was ruled on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was ruled on. That privilege was ruled on.

A point of privilege is before the Chair.

The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, it is simply this-and perhaps the way this House is and the standard which seems to prevail in it, perhaps it is not worth making any point of order, privilege or anything else. But the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) can sit there, as he does time after time he can raise spurious points of order and he can stand up and say, apparently with impunity, things which are just not correct, such as other people's attendance in the House or what they do or do

April 6, 1978

Tape 662

IB-4

MR. WELLS:

not do, other people's language. He can call people galoots and all the rest of it with impunity and it does not seem to matter. But then he can stand up with a pious look on his face and talk about other people's performance or dealings in this House. My constituents, Mr. Chairman,

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, will decide what I do in this House or what I do not, and I think the hon. member should withdraw any kind of imputations about other members' conduct and performance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: On that point of privilege, Sir, That is not a point of privilege, Your Honour, that is a difference of opinion between two hon. gentleman. From what I can learn from the hon. gentleman, the hon. gentleman's constituents will not get a chance because -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - the hon. gentleman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - cannot wait -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - for an election to be called to get out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I understand that the hon. member for Kilbride has not placed a point of privilege before the Chair so we will revert to the point of order and I believe the hon. member was speaking on the point of order.

MR. NEARY: I was pointing out to Your Honour that my hon. friend, if he is referring to what happened several days ago, Your Honour knows full well that according to the rules of this Hon. House that you have to raise a point of personal privilege or privilege of the House at the earliest possible moment, and my hon. friend mentions it this afternoon several days after it happened, Your Honour. I do not know but it is several weeks after it happened, so there is no point of order, Your Honour, and I would ask Your Honour, from now on I wonder if we could have a ruling from the Chair on these points of order that are being raised on the other side. They are really political speeches. They are really not points of order. They are just - Mr. Chairman, they are designed to interrupt the speaker on this side of the House and to make a point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: These are not points of order and Your Honour should hear the first paragraph. If it does not look like a point of order, as the one just mentioned by my hon. friend, if it does not look like a point of order then Your Honour should cut it off immediately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The point of order before the Chair relates to a word that was alleged to have been used by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in referring - I have just forgotten to which hon. member to my left. The word in question, if I remember correctly, was 'yahoo'. It is my distinct recollection that I did hear the hon. member for LaPoile make the remark. That was the first point. The second point was that following making that remark there were several points of order brought before the Chair, several points of privilege and at least one, I believe, as a point of order, all of which were ruled as points of order. So it would seem to me that the first opportunity for the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy to raise his point of order in regard to the word 'yahoo' was at the time he made it because of the intervening points. So I think on those two points we are clear. Firstly, that the word, 'yahoo', was used by the hon. member for LaPoile -

MR. NEARY: Today, Your Honour?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, today. I -

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon, Your Honour, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I -

MR. NEARY: Send for the tapes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can quite readily. That was my recollection and I would be quite willing to send for the tapes but that was my clear recollection that the word was used today. That was the first point. The second point was that it was in my opinion raised at the earliest point so that I would have to rule that it was an unparliamentary word to use and I would ask the -

MR. NEARY: Would Your Honour indicate to me approximately what time that I -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it was in the interjection period approximately five or ten minutes ago.

MR. NEARY: Five or ten minutes ago, Your Honour? Five or ten minutes ago. Okay, I would submit that Your Honour send for the tapes and I would submit, Sir, that I have not been in the House for the last ten minutes and Your Honour will discover that I merely came in when the point of privilege and the points of order were raised, and I would suggest that Your Honour send for the tapes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I think that this can only be settled by reviewing the tapes and I will be quite prepared, of course, to apologize to the hon. member if my memory served me incorrectly but this is the way I remember it.

Committee is raised for a short period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I have consulted the tapes but there was so much noise, so much interjection at the time that the remarks that I referred to cannot be picked up on the tape. I have no doubt that I heard the remarks, but I cannot at this time because of the noise on the tape and also my memory of them, I cannot say who made the remark although there was no doubt that the remark was made.

So I would apologize to the hon. member for LaPoile in ascribing the remark to him. There is no way that this can be proven one way or the other. I am not certainly at this point in time going to say that he made the remark although, as I again emphasize, I have no doubt that I did hear the remark. It was made by someone. We do not know who and therefore the point of order is not existent.

I would just at this time say though that the word 'Yahoo' is unparliamentary for future reference and that of course I am sure hon. members will not use it in the future.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I humbly accept Your Honour's apology but I would like to ask Your Honour, as a point of information, can Your Honour overrule his own rulings or does that have to be left to the House? Because it is a very dangerous precedent if Your Honour makes a ruling and then comes in and changes his ruling without the authority of the House. Then we are creating some very dangerous precedents.

So is it the House -

MR. MARSHALL: A point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. NEARY: No, I am on a point of information.

MR. MARSHALL: A point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, which takes precedence over anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! A point of privilege has been raised and I have to hear it.

MR. MARSHALL: A point of privilege of the House, Mr. Chairman, about these particular procedures. I want to voice as a member of the House the strongest type of objection to the procedure which has been implemented as being both dangerous and possibly leading completely to the undermining

MR. MARSHALL: of the authority of the House and in the net result resulting in the House not being able to function at all as it was intended to.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I refer you first of all in making this point of privilege to Standing Order XI which clearly states that "Mr. Speaker shall preserve order and decorum and shall decide questions of order subject to appeal to the House without debate. In explaining a point of order or practice he shall state the Standing Order or authority applicable to the case." In the notes of procedure which appeared in the Standing Orders of 1951 and which are ingrained into the customs of this House and are based for authority on Beauchesne, the third edition, page 52 to 55 and May, 14th edition, page 233 to 238 and it said and I quote, and I would ask members to note this because I think this is a very important point of privilege.

"The Speaker is the official mouthpiece of the House and entitled on all occasions to be treated with the greatest attention and respect by the individual members because the power and dignity and honour of the Assembly are officially embodied in his person. He is responsible for the enforcement of rules, rights and privileges of the House and when he rises he is to be heard in silence. When the Speaker takes notice of an expression as personal and disorderly and calls upon the offending member to explain it it is that member's duty immediately to explain or retract and apologize for the breach of the order. The Speaker decides a question of order only when they arise, Hypothetical questions etc."

Now my point is this, Mr. Chairman; on several occasions I have noted that members have been drawn to order, and in both cases I think it was the member for LaPoile, but it could be any member, and the practice has grown up, send for the tapes. Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is a complete undermining of the authority of the Chair whether Your Honour or the Speaker is in the Chair. We can

MR. MARSHALL: not run this House by means of reference to the tapes. When the tapes are referred to they are referred to on the basis of a member raising on a point of privilege to get an extract of a word that is objectionable, or the Speaker of his volition requesting the tapes. But to allow a member of the House to say when he is asked to retract a matter, to allow him to say that, "No, Mr. Speaker, in effect I will not until you send for the tapes," which just occurred and has occurred in the past is, I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, to my mind is a very dangerous precedent. It is against all the precedents of this House since this House has begun. It is an undermining of the authority of the Speaker and it can only lead to a complete disintegration of the proceedings of this House.

All members of this House have a real duty to uphold the authority of Your Honour which is a very difficult job to perform whether Your Honour, the Chairman of Committees, the Deputy Chairman of Committees or His Honour, the Speaker, when he is in the Chair. And I think it is a responsibility of all members to uphold the rules.

MR. MARSHALL:

So I make this point of privilege in the hope that it will be followed in the future, but in the certain knowledge that if this is allowed to continue it can only result in complete chaos, disruption of order in this House and the emasculation of the authority of Your Honour and consequently, as I say, the complete disintegration of the House and the purposes for which we are elected here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The first duty as I understand it when a point of privilege is brought in is to decide whether it is a point of privilege or not and in doing so it may be desirable for the Chair to hear arguments or to seek the advice of hon. members. At this point I do not think I am required to do that. My understanding of the hon. member for St. John's East's remark is that the procedures in which we are engaging in keeping order in the House may not be the ones that are in keeping with the Standing Orders in our House. So it seems to me that this is a point of order as opposed to a point of privilege. I think this might be a difficult area. I think it is a matter of degree more than anything else. But at this point in time I am going to consider this as a point of order. I will now consider whether I should rule on it or not and I think that it would be desirable if I did rule on it at this point and time.

To go back a little, the hon. members will recall that not too long ago there was a point brought up and it was quite impossible to decide whether such and such a word or such and such an expression could be ascribed to an hon. member because there were so many interjections going on at the time and there was a considerable level of noise. And at that time a ruling was made from the Chair that this particular remark was not heard by the Chair but that if it was heard the nature of the remark would make it out of order. This seemed to satisfy the situation. However, it soon became clear that it did not satisfy the situation. And I might point out that a similar

MR. CHAIRMAN: set of circumstances arose a short time later.

So it seemed desirable that rulings should not be made where there was any doubt about what was said and that there should be reference made to the tapes.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now whether in actual fact this is going to cure the problem I think is uncertain. You will recall that Mr. Speaker did say that in other Legislatures there are shorthandwriters available at the time so that reference can be made to the record immediately and that it may be necessary for us to consider this although it would obviously be a very elaborate thing to do. So it is not an easy point.

Now in dealing with the point of order before the Chair, I would have to say that it seems to me that this was an observation made by an hon. member, a valuable observation, and I do not think that it is one that I need follow any further except to say that I think that it was useful to have these observations made and it may have some effects on allowing all members to preserve order in the House and to allow the proceedings to go forward more expeditiously.

Before the hon. member speaks I would like to say one further thing. It is my memory that the Chair should not be consulted by hon. members over points of law or indeed points of privilege or points relating to the Standing Orders because this really puts the Chair in a conflict of interest situation. So I would just caution the hon. member if he wishes to ask the Chair to clarify Standing Orders this would not be a desirable thing to do.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, a point of order then.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, in my opinion according to the Standing Orders of this House and the

MR. NEARY: precedents in the House of Commons and according to Beauchesne, Your Honour cannot change a ruling, the ruling has to be changed by the House. And Your Honour this afternoon made an error in judgement and then apologized for it and I accepted Your Honour's apology. But in order to get -

AN HON.MEMBER: Bull!

MR. NEARY: No. No, that is correct. That is correct and Your Honour apologized and I accept Your Honour's apology, but in order to get that decision changed I believe the Government House Leader really should make a motion seconded by somebody on this side of the House to change the ruling, to reverse the ruling of the Chairman. I believe that is the only way it can be done, otherwise we would be creating a very dangerous precedent, Your Honour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I think we are under misapprehension here. The point that the hon. member brings up, I think, has to relate to a specific issue. Now I would point out, and I have no intention at this time to go back to the tapes, my memory is quite clear and unequivocal on this, I made no ruling on that point. I stated that a point of order had been raised, that such and such a word had been used by an hon. member. I stated that I did hear such a word. I did not complete a ruling on that point. To have completed the ruling I would have had to say that the hon. member now had to withdraw that remark. I did not go that far because the hon. member, which is quite within his rights, at that point got on his feet and denied that he made that. I therefore gave the hon. member the benefit of the doubt. I had absolutely, and I say this without any shade of doubt, I have absolutely complete knowledge that the word 'Yahoo' was used but I

MR. CHAIRMAN: may have been mistaken that it was used by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I am now quite clearly willing to state that I will not say that it was the hon. member. I have doubt as to who made the remark, I have not doubt that the remark was made. I initially thought, and in the confusion I do not think this can be wondered at, I initially thought it was the hon. member. I certainly accept the hon. member's statement that it was not he who made the remark. This is not an error in judgement, in my determination; this was an error that arose out of the circumstances at the time. It was almost inevitable to make the error there were so many people injecting at the time.

The remark was made, I thought it was the hon. member for LaPoile, he said it was not, I accepted his statement,

MR. NEARY: No, Your Honour (Inaudible)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I accept what he said. The tapes do not clarify the issue because the remark cannot be heard in the general recordings on the tape. I accept without any hesitation whatever that the hon. member for LaPoile did not - I accept that he says that he did not make the remark. Someone made it and I would just point out that no one can be brought to order because an individual cannot be decided upon, but that the remark itself was unparliamentary and I propose that we would leave the matter at that

MR. HICKMAN: I move that the Committee rise.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker, returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, made

MR. CHAIRMAN: some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again presently, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: As hon. members are aware, at five o'clock I am required to inform the House of the three matters which will be debated at five-thirty. That was impossible at five o'clock due to intervening matters. By doing so at the earliest opportunity the three matters to be debated are:

The first; notice given by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture; the subject matter, the long period of time required to obtain a lease or grant of Crown lands.

The second matter; notice given by the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the subject matter, the provision for extension of deadlines

MR. SPEAKER: with respect to Crown lands and the possibility of having that extension before laying charges.

The third matter; notice given by the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower, the subject matter, Labour unrest in Labrador West.

On motion that House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
The hon. member for Ferryland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!
Order, please! A point of order.

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.
I know your Honour was not occupying the Chair when the Committee was rose, by the Chairman, by the way. It was not on a motion, the Chairman automatically rose the Committee to go and check the tapes and my hon. friend was speaking when Your Honour rose the Committee. I believe in all fairness, Sir, that my hon. friend should carry on with his speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): Order, please!
To that point of order. I was in the Chamber at the time and the hon. House Leader rose the Committee and I therefore recognize the hon. member for Ferryland.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, a point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): Order, please! Order, please!
A point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chariman, you have to keep the record straight otherwise the whole thing is just going to develop into a bear pit.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the point?

MR. NEARY: A point of privilege of the House.

MR. DINN: It was not fair warning.

MR. CHARMAN (Young): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I want to point out for the benefit of hon. members of the House, Sir, that I did not rise the Committee, the Chairman of the Committee rose the Committee. The Chairman did, rose it himself when my hon. friend was speaking and I believe my hon. friend should be allowed to continue with his address.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Mines and Energy was not -

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of privilege. Your Honour's ruling is absolutely right. When the Committee rises and reconvenes any hon. member who has been speaking before does not have any security or right of tenure to continue speaking.

MR. NEARY: Yes, but he was cut off right in the middle of his speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: It is quite -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: It is quite different from when the House is out of Committee and sitting in debate. Then, if the debate is adjourned and if the time of the hon.

MR. HICKMAN: member has not elapsed that hon. member has the right, the absolute right having adjourned the debate to continue until the forty-five minutes has been used up. But that does not apply in Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: It never has and hopefully never will. That is not a point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: It is not a point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Is that a new rule by the Minister of Finance?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance, the Government House Leader just mentioned, "It never has applied, never will. I hope it never will." But it has. I remind the Committee that in the last week or so when I was attempting to get the floor in Committee the Committee was risen - or whatever the term is, the appropriate term - for various reasons and when we came back the Chairman of Committees, not you yourself, Sir, the Chairman of Committees on four successive occasions recognized the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. WHITE: Right! Four times!

MR. SIMMONS: So it is not correct, Mr. Chairman, it is misleading the House for the Government House Leader to suggest, or to say that it has not been the case. It has been the case in this House; I was the victim of it. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us do one of two things.

MR. WHITE: He spoke for one minute.

MR. WHITE: 'Tom' spoke for one minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Young): Order, please!

I think I can rule on that point of privilege. There is not a point of privilege - I am sorry.

Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I move that we appeal Your Honour's ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

I have not made my ruling yet.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, there is no ruling made yet, and the hon. gentleman from Burgeo - LaPoile is wrong again.

DR. FARRELL: Bay d'Espoir.

MR. HICKMAN: Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

DR. FARRELL: The same thing.

MR. HICKMAN: When the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy spoke during Committee, it was simply that he was recognized first. It was not his right to get up because he had been speaking previously. There is no right of adjournment in Committee.

MR. NEARY: The Chairman left the Chair in this case, the Committee did not rise.

AN HON. MEMBER: He went to hear the tapes.

MR. NEARY: So what? The Chairman left the Chair while my hon. friend was speaking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman.
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!
MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!
MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman.
Well, the hon.gentleman has left because he knew what I was going to ask and what I was going to point out. I said -
MR. SIMMONS: Because of what? Because of what?
MR. HICKMAN: The hon.gentleman for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir -
MR. SIMMONS: Do not be such a chicken, boy.
MR. CHAIRMAN(Young): Order, please!
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!
MR. MORGAN: Name him! Name him!
MR. CHAIRMAN(Young): Order, please! Order, please!
MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. members may be aware that there is a procedure whereby when the Chair feels that there is great disorder and that the order and dignity and proceedings of the House are in jeopardy, he may on his own initiative adjourn and may adjourn for any reasonable period of time.

This is the first time that this has happened since my tenure. It is not my wish to deprive hon. members of the benefit of the proceedings at five-thirty under the Standing Orders. If it were not a Thursday I would probably adjourn until eight o'clock this evening. If I do that I will deprive hon. members of the five-thirty procedure. It is not my wish to do so unless it were absolutely necessary. I do not judge it to be absolutely necessary. I do however judge it to be a situation where the decorum and order of the House are being undermined and are in jeopardy and I adjourn for five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: A motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. The first matter relates to the period of time taken to obtain leases or grants for Crown lands.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to say first of all that this is a matter that concerns an awful lot of Newfoundlanders, and it is something that probably, though it should not be considered as political, there is a question here of why is it necessary for applications - I am particularly thinking of applications for residential purposes. Mr. Speaker, I have taken it on myself over the last couple of years to follow one or two applications in particular and they have gone, they have been on the go for two years or more. They have been in municipalities where the town council, in correspondence with the Department of Health and other people, has agreed that this piece of land is good for residential and this is what it was meant for by the municipality and so on. But still the application is dragged on and on.

Mr. Speaker, I think that something should be done. I do not know what can be done but obviously the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture in consultation with the people in the Crown lands department must be able to come up with some kind of a solution. Compared with the Fisheries Loan Board for example, the Fisheries Loan Board have applications, hundreds of them and they meet every three weeks and they expedite most of them. People do not have to wait even though sometimes - I have a little bit of beef there which I will talk about on another occasion, but in most cases in a couple of months for sure they have an answer back. So why is it that two years has to elapse before a person who wants to build a house - most people today who build houses, most people build them through mortgage companies, they have to have clear title to land for Newfoundland and Labrador Housing

MR. CALLAN: or for any other mortgage company, the banks and what have you, why is it necessary when a person decides, well I think it is about time that we build our own home now, and so they apply for a piece of Crown land, why is it necessary for them to have to rent for two extra years after they have made a decision that I think we can settle down in this town, we like it here and so on, why do they have to wait for two years in order to get clear title to the land so that they can go to the bank or to Newfoundland and Labrador Housing or what have you and say, "Okay, we have clear title to this piece of land. We want to borrow \$25,000 or \$28,000 to build a home," why must they have to wait two years?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier this afternoon that I have checked on applications that have been sent in. I checked on one that was sent three months. This person asked me to check, I asked "How long ago did you send it?" "Three months ago, approximately." I phoned up and I checked and the person who answered the phone said, "It is in the process of being expedited!" And I said "The person who sent in the application has not got the receipt for the one dollar yet. How do you explain that if it is being expedited?" "Well just a minute, I will check. The receipt was sent out two weeks ago." Now why was it two weeks ago when the application was sent three months previously indicating that there was something wrong. Anyway I phoned up this person and I said, "Your receipt was sent out two weeks ago. Would you check the date on it when you receive it in a couple of days time," because they had not received it. When they got the receipt, they checked it and the receipt was issued two days ago and the letter was dated two days ago, not two weeks ago. You see, there is a cover up going on and I think the minister needs to investigate these things.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in five minutes I cannot say very much but these are just two examples. Another one I checked

MR. CALLAN: on was gone four months. I am wondering how many, of all the applications in this Province, how many people are just sitting at home thinking that their application for Crown land has been expedited and it is not even open? The secretary has not even opened it for some reason. I hope that the poor little secretary does not get the blame. Obviously somebody should be checking - it is too important, it concerns too many people throughout this Province, especially the rural areas of this Province, that they should be hung up for months on end when their application has not even moved, has not even been opened let alone moving.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter and perhaps if we had investigative reporting perhaps pressure could be brought to bear that way. But I do not think that investigative reporting is necessary and it should not be necessary for me to bring it here before this House. There is something wrong. Let us find out what it is and let us get the problem cured.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: It was brought up in this House of Assembly. Last year I remember the former member for Twillingate, the former Premier, talked it out. He saw the problem years ago, he hired an expeditor and so on. Something needs to be done. The problem is getting worse every day. Every day, every month the problem is getting worse. It is one of the divisions of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture. I know that department is a large department but then if that is the problem, if the department is too big for the minister, perhaps the department needs to be split, perhaps the division of Crown lands needs to be a department on its own. Perhaps we need a action group to look after that.

Mr. Speaker, I see a serious problem here and I hope that the minister when he replies will promise that something will be done because I am not

MR. CALLAN: just talking off the top of my head, Mr. Speaker, I can, if the minister wants me to, I can get the names of these people. The two of us can go together and check the dates, when they were sent in, and to check the date when the receipt was issued for that \$1 which indicates that it was open. I hope the minister will solve it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Now before the hon. minister speaks, actually the hon. gentleman started at 5:32. It was a couple of minutes after 5:30 when we started, so I would suggest I will not call it 6:00 o'clock until about three minutes after six to make up the difference. Everyone will have their five minutes.

The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, in order to explain the complications in dealing with Crown lands in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador would take many hours so I will not attempt to deal with it in the next few minutes. There is no question that in some cases it takes a fair amount of time for Crown land applications to be dealt with. But I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the percentage of applications that takes a fairly long time is very small. In the Crown Lands Division in my department we received thousands of applications every year. The ones that come to the MHAs attention are the ones that have some problems with them.

Now Crown land is complicated in Newfoundland simply because there has never been an adequate record and registry system of Crown land over the years, and we have been around this Province now for something like 400 years or 500 years, and Crown land or land belonging to the Crown has been dispensed in various ways and means, and to various people. Unfortunately there has never been a record system. And because of that lack of a record system of who owns land in the Province, and because of the fact that in the last great fire in St. John's many of the records that then existed were burned, it is almost impossible to deal with lands on a speedy basis. That is one problem.

Mr. Maynard: The other problem is that we have to deal with other agencies of government, especially the municipalities. And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases, in many cases where Crown land applications within municipalities have taken a long time it is simply because the municipality probably has not given its go ahead to issue that Crown land lease. Many cases have come to my attention.

Now I can take any hon. member down and I can show them the procedures that we have to go through in order to deal with an application. I said the other day that it takes an average, an average of about six months at this point in time to get to the approval stage for surveying of Crown land applications. An average, Mr. Speaker, is down from about two years back in 1971, 1972, 1973. I cannot say that all applications are going to go through in six months, that is impossible. Neither can I say that all leases are going to be issued in six months. I have had people come to my office, Mr. Speaker, not too long ago and say, look, why cannot this man get his lease? He made the application four years ago. So I checked the file, and I find out that he was given approval to survey three years ago and had not bothered to get a survey done. Now I cannot do anything about that. That is not my problem. And that happens in many cases. Now, of course, I am blamed for it, but I cannot go out and do the survey for him. I am not saying that the Crown lands system is perfect, it is far from being perfect. And I will tell hon. members something, that within the next couple of days I am going to distribute a little item that came out of the Annual Report of the B.C. Department of the Environment which handles lands in the Province of B.C. And if you read that report you will find that Newfoundland is not the only province that has some problems, that B.C. even has worse problems than we have in many cases in dealing with land, because it is a complicated system, and it is not something like the Fisheries Loan Board where an application goes in,

Mr. Maynard: a group of people sit down around the table and they make the decision there. I cannot make the decision on Crown land leases by myself. I have to have the approval of the Department of Health, the Department of the Environment, the municipality where it is located, if it is in the wilderness I have to have the approval of the Department of Tourism, and this is where the complication comes in. It is pointless for me to give a lease for someone to build a residence if he cannot then go to the Municipal Affairs Department or to the municipality and get the permit to build. That is foolishness. So these things have to be checked out first. And that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that it takes a long time.

But the amount of time is being brought down, and it is being brought down every year. And I would doubt that Crown Lands Administration will ever reach the ultimate degree of efficiency. But we are doing the best we can under the system which we have to work.

MR. SPEAKER:

Now, the next matter for debate, the provision of extension for deadlines before laying charges with respect to homes built on Crown lands.

The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I am sure we can all appreciate the many problems in the Crown lands system as those referred to by the minister in his few remarks. But I want to zero in on a little different aspect of the problem this afternoon. And the basic problem that I want to talk about as I see it is the almost total lack of communication between the minister's department and various municipalities around the Province in notifying councils about change in regulations, change in legislation and so on.

Now in the past, the traditions of the past, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, were that when no appropriate regulations or legislation existed, a person wanting to build within municipal boundaries, within town boundaries, would go to the town council and look for a permit to build. Now if the town knew that it was Crown land it would suggest to the individual concerned that he would have to make an application for a grant in past years or a residential lease, as it is now, to the Crown Lands Division for permission to occupy that piece of land. And of course after a little while the Crown Lands Division would come back to the municipality and ask if they had any objections and so on. And once that point in time was reached the tradition has been that municipalities—rightly or wrongly is not the question, Mr. Speaker. It has been done years and years and years. Rightly or wrongly is not the question. The tradition has been that municipalities had then given the individual a municipal permit to build. And they went ahead and they did that.

Now, the problem arises that when the legislation was changed two years ago there was a cutoff date by regulation set January 1, 1977, I think, when you were not allowed to build on a piece of Crown land no matter where it existed unless you had this

MR. RIDEOUT:

permit, you had permission from the minister's department. The problem I am referring to in communications, Mr. Speaker, is that municipalities were never notified of those changes in regulations and municipalities up until a few days ago when one of the municipalities in my riding, the town council of Roddickton, phoned the minister's department and asked because they had given people town permits to build once they knew they had submitted their application, they had given people permits to build only this past year. And now those people who have done it illegally according to present regulations, despite the fact that they had a permit to build within the town boundaries had been taken before a court, have already been prosecuted and have already been charged. Lo and behold though the regulations turn up in that municipality a few days after the phone call was made to the minister's department.

Now I am not blaming this totally on the minister but it is a total lack of communication between one department of government concerned with the administration of Crown land and the other. It is not the point whether it was done illegally in the past and so on. That is immaterial. It was done and it was done traditionally down through the years in this Province. And now people have been dragged before a court through no fault of their own, through no negligence on the part of the town council in question, fined \$200 and have been made common criminals of in the eyes of the community.

I suggested to the minister in Question Period a couple of weeks ago that he extend the deadline beyond March 31, that he go on, if necessary, a great publicity campaign to let everybody know what the rules and regulations are, that where people have already been dragged in court and fined that some means be found of undoing the harm that has already been done and not keep doing it. I had a phone call a couple of days ago where there are two more people down there who have been dragged in now in another week or so. Certainly there

MR. RIDEOUT:

must be something we can do about it. Those people did not break the law intentionally. The town council did not give them permission to build intentionally. Yet they have been made common criminals of and I think the onus is on the minister's department to do something to help out those people.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. member is confusing a couple of things. Number one, the deadline that he is talking about of March 31, 1978 has nothing whatsoever to do with the granting of land within municipalities or outside of municipalities under the regular sections of the act. The deadline refers to the occupation of Crown land under the so called squatter's rights provision. An amendment was passed in this House about two years ago allowing people to acquire title to their land, outright title, if they occupied the land previous to January 1, 1957 and continuously from there on. In other words, a period of twenty years up to January 1, 1977. They were given a period of time in which to register it if they were on the land. Well of course if they occupied it within that twenty years they can come in and get a title any time because they are presumed to have a clear title to the land. If they have occupied land since 1957, Crown land since 1957, what we have said to them is come in and tell us about it and tell us that you want a lease on it. Because it is illegal, it always has been illegal to occupy Crown land. In the history of Newfoundland it has

MR. MAYNARD:

always been illegal. We have not changed any laws in that regard. The only thing previously regarding squatters' rights, the changes that we made, was that previously if a person had lived on land for approximately sixty years under the English Common Law and wanted to acquire title to that land they had to go through the court system. What we have done is make it much easier. They do not have to go through the court system, the expense of a lawyer and the time-consuming effort and whatnot. They can come to the Department if they have been occupying land for more than twenty years or since 1957 and get title to their land. Now what we are saying though, from now on we will not recognize squatters' rights because there is ample opportunity for a person if they want to occupy Crown Land to go to the Department, this Department or whichever one Crown Lands are going to come under, and make the application for a lease and get their lease, and then they have the legal document to it. All we are doing is making it easier for people who have traditionally occupied land but have no title to it, no legal title, except through the courts, to come to the Department and now get the title.

As far as land within municipalities is concerned, municipalities have never had any control over the administration of Crown Land other than for planning purposes, and municipalities should know that. I suggest to you that there are probably municipalities who are not quite familiar with all the acts, rules and regulations and this sort of thing. But I would also suggest that any people who are thinking and who are serving on municipal councils, who are thinking, and I have served on them myself, will find out what the law is before they give out a permit whether they know whether they can give it or not. I believe in the Municipal Act it sets out the functions of the municipality and what they are capable of doing or what they are able to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, the thing has not changed as far as law is concerned except to make it easier for people to get title to the land they now occupy and I believe that more changes probably will be

MR. MAYNARD: needed in the future to make it still easier and more simple. But as I pointed out previously, Crown Lands is an extremely complicated thing and Lands Administration is an extremely complicated thing, and the necessary changes and the ultimate solution to it is not going to come overnight.

MR. SPEAKER: The third matter for debate, Labour unrest in Labrador City.

The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush).

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I preambled my question to the Minister of Manpower and Labour with my concern over the tremendous unrest, the tremendous labour unrest in Labrador, and I asked the Minister if he could indicate the present status of the negotiations and whether a settlement was in sight particularly in view of the fact that the labour dispute between IOC and its workers would shortly spill over into the Wabush Mines operations because of the fact that the Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway workers were out also. I think I mentioned the strike but the Minister explained the reason for that but, Sir, I pointed out that there were fifty-nine workers in Wabush already laid off and it is only a matter of time before other workers are laid off and it relates to the stocks and the fact that Wabush mines are now stock-piling the ore. This can only go on for so long and if the strike continues in Labrador City then there is no question that the Wabush Mines operation are going to have to close down.

So in view of the seriousness of the situation I further asked the Minister to verify the major reasons for the strike. I indicated that the major reasons expressed in the media as attributed to the union are for these two reasons, health and safety measures and contracting out. Mr. Speaker, the reason why I ask these two questions is because it is my impression that the satisfactory resolution of these two matters rests with the Government, rests with this House. On the matter of healthy and safety measures I understand that in order to come up with any satisfactory settlement, any long-term settlement, that there must be legislation passed in this House to that

April 6, 1978

Tape No. 672

RT-3

MR. LUSH:

effect and this is not being done.

Secondly, contracting out is a matter that was referred to in the Bartlett Enquiry, a matter, as a matter of fact, that took up great concern by the Bartlett Enquiry and some firm recommendations made respecting it.

So here we have two important matters in a labour dispute that its solution, the resolution of these two points seems to rest with Government action and every time I mention it to the Minister, the Minister stumbles and waffles on these two points. Now, why?

Certainly, and as I have said before, my reason for asking the question is that I cannot see how there can be any satisfactory resolution to the labour dispute in Labrador and in Baie Verte whilst the matters of dispute, or the resolution of these matters of

MR. LUSH: dispute rest with the House of Assembly, with the government with action here. So my question to the minister is how can we expect a satisfactory solution to the labour dispute when this seems to be the matter, this seems to be - when it is contingent upon government action and upon action by the minister. The question is then what time are the government going to take the appropriate steps so that we can get a long-term satisfactory solution to the labour unrest in Labrador and indeed in Baie Verte?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, you know everything was hunky-dory until the hon. member says I waffled and stumbled everytime he asked the question. I do not think I have waffled and stumbled yet on the question and I can say the question of whether a settlement was in sight, I do not know if there is a settlement in sight and my conciliation officer does not know if a settlement is in sight. Only the company and the union, who are the two parties to the collective bargaining process, know whether a settlement is in sight or not.

The layoffs in Wabush - unfortunately that is a fact of life. The same union brothers are connected with the Quebec North Shore Railway as with the Sept Iles - IOC operation as with the Point Noir Wabush Mines operation and as are involved in Labrador City and Wabush and if they choose not to cross picket lines set up by their brother workers then there is nothing that the minister in St. John's or in Labrador City can do to tell a group of Steelworkers down in Quebec to let these people go by. That cannot be done.

Now the important matter is this, it is the question of occupational health and safety. I could say without hesitation that I think that we will soon see this and before the end of the month I think it will all be in place I hope. It may be a long time ago at St. Lawrence we should have started looking at it and we did not and I can say thanks really to Local 5795 in Labrador City of the Steelworkers which was the first union that really started to get involved in the occupational

MR. ROUSSEAU: health and safety question. We have now being studied by government an act which I hope and I will be very proud, I will guarantee the hon. member, when I can stand up in this House on Notice of Motions to introduce an act, an act respecting occupational health and safety. It will be one of the proudest moments of my life in this House. That is on the way. It should have been done three years ago. It should have been done five years ago and no question. It should have been done ten years, it should have been done twenty years or it should have been done thirty years ago, no question.

But there is one thing that the hon. member should remember, being the critic for labour, that is a very important point that no matter what is on the books in legislation of this province, that does not mean that a union and a company in their collective bargaining process can go beyond that. That is the minimum set of requirements. So the answer may not be as far as a union is concerned or as far as a company is concerned what is on the books in legislation; maybe they want more. Our hope is to provide at least a minimum set of requirements. That may not be satisfactory to resolve the strike in Labrador City. It may not be satisfactory to resolve the strike in Wabush, if there is a strike in Wabush, or in Baie Verte. But nevertheless this House will be asked, I hope in this session and I would be very disappointed and government would be very disappointed in this session -

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible).

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh I am hoping. I say and very importantly too and I have said as a minister that I hope that it will not go as a white paper because I will not get it in this session. I have the Interim Advisory Council six, really elected and democratically elected members of management and members of unions across this province, who have put an input into it and we assume that is the reading from labour and management and I am very hopeful, I am hopeful that by the end of this month that I will be able to stand in this House and be able to spread

MR. ROUSSEAU: the good news to this House, to this province, introducing an act respecting occupational health and safety.

I think it has been too long coming, government thinks it has been too long coming and, as a matter of fact just this morning the Premier mentioned it to me, 'Where is it? It is a matter of priority.' It is a matter of priority but when you start thinking about the problems we had - the Workman's Compensation Board, the Department of Mines and Energy,

Mr. Rousseau: the Department of Health, the Department of Labour and Manpower, the Department of the Environment, you just do not snap your fingers and everything comes together. This is such an important Act that we want to ensure that everything necessary at least as a minimum standard, at least as a minimum standard to protect the workers of this Province is in that Act, and we intend to take our time because we waited a long time for it, and a couple of more weeks is not going to matter. And I would hope before the end of this, like I say, I will have the opportunity on behalf of one very proud government to stand up and introduce that Act into the House, and I would hope that the hon. member will stand up some time when the bill is being debated and say, 'A wonderful job, you crowd on the other side!'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members are aware that the sessional orders set the hours of sitting and for Thursday being 8:00 to 11:00. However a motion to adjourn is automatically before the House under this procedure, I have to put the motion.

The question is that this House now adjourn. Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Nay".

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the "Nays" have it. I leave the Chair until 8:00 this evening.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

APRIL 6, 1978

APR 6 1978

QUESTION #7

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

Since January 1, 1977 and as of a current date, what is the total value of amounts which have been paid by Government or by the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission as fees or as retainers in respect of services rendered or to be rendered by legal counsel for or in behalf of the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission, showing for each person or for each firm of Barristers and/or Solicitors the total amount that has been paid him during the said period?

ANSWER

Payments to solicitors by the Newfoundland Medical Commission, January 1, 1977 to date amounts to \$585.00

Total payment was made to the firm of Stirling, Ryan, Reid, Wells, Harrington and Andrews.

March 30, 1978

APR 6 1978

QUESTION #8

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

During the fiscal year which began April 1, 1977 and as of a current date, what are the names of those persons who were granted bursary assistance during their years of study of medicine or of dentistry or of fields of specialization within each of those disciplines who, upon graduation, indicated to Government in any manner that they did not intend to honour any undertaking made with Government at the time such bursary assistance was rendered by which they undertook to repay Government for each such person and the names of the schools of medicine or of dentistry that he attended and the total amounts of bursary assistance that Government had paid to him?

ANSWER

Since April 1, 1977 the number of students under bursary contract for medicine or dentistry training who upon graduation indicated that they did not intend to honour their undertakings, is Zero.

March 30, 1978

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
8:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.
Thursday, April 6, 1978

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before putting the motion that I leave the Chair, I would point out to hon. members what I consider to be the appropriate procedure when a point of order comes up with respect to an allegation that some hon. member had said something unparliamentary toward another hon. member and that remark has not been heard by the Chair. If it has been heard by the Chair then obviously the Chair is in a position to make a decision. Frequently when there is a certain amount of noise and several members speaking at one time or debate is quite heated, the Chair may not hear the remark. I think the appropriate procedure there, except in the case of utmost gravity, is for the Chair to take note of the point of order made by the hon. gentleman. If the Chair has not heard, then having taken note, when the transcripts are available the Chair will be in a position to make a decision. The transcripts usually will be available in a one or two hour period, at most the following day.

Endeavouring to determine this from the tapes is not the most satisfactory. The tapes are quite short. They are about five and-a-half or six minute tapes. They are very short because they are taken off and given to typists as quickly as possible. So in a period of fifteen or twenty minutes you might have to listen to four tapes and you have no written record, nothing visual, all you have is a tape. So except in cases of extreme gravity, and a decision on that would have to be at the discretion of the Chair, certainly the preferable procedure would be for the Chair to take note of the point of order if it has not heard the alleged remark, then to make a decision on it when the transcript becomes available.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that I leave the Chair.

On motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN(Young): Order, please!

I recognize the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of personal privilege. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to the attention of the House of Assembly that tonight, unfortunately, in one news story carried through the electronic media was incorrect information. I am referring to the CBC network. A story was carried that an uproar occurred in the House this afternoon between - to use the names - Messrs. "Morgan", "Neary", and "Simmons", and as a result of the uproar caused by these three gentlemen the Speaker had to come into the House of Assembly and set a precedent by means of establishing order in the House by adjourning the House of Assembly.

I should like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that I was not involved, none whatsoever, in that uproar. I was not involved in that incident. I want to make it quite clear that that was an incorrect reporting incident.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, to that point of privilege, Sir. I wholeheartedly endorse the comments made by the hon. gentleman, Sir, and I would like to point out to the House that this is the kind of biased reporting that we have been getting from the CBC in this session of the House. I would like to also, Mr. Chairman, state categorically that I was not involved in that uproar. My crossfire was across the House on points of order in accordance with the rules of this House, points of order

MR. NEARY: and points of privilege.

I had made no contribution whatsoever to that uproar this afternoon, none at all. I hope that the gentleman who reported it will apologize to the public, because that is misleading information. And if that particular gentleman keeps reporting the House of Assembly as he has been doing in this session, then I think he either should be barred from the Press Gallery or brought before the bar of the House and made explain his actions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Or we should report him to the CRTC. Because we do not have to put up with that sort of thing in this hon. House, Sir. That is misleading, false information. I do not know why the hon. gentleman did it, whether the hon. gentleman was not sitting in the Press Gallery when the uproar, as he referred to it, occurred, because if the hon. gentleman had been there he would not have slanted the story the way that he did. It is a slanted story. It is misleading and distorted and the hon. gentleman who was responsible for it should apologize, should straighten it out first with the people of this Province and apologize, because it is a false story.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: To the point of privilege, and it is not necessarily to that point of privilege, but I sat here this afternoon and I am beginning to sit here again tonight but I will just ask all members of this House to start behaving like adults and not children, and try to get some decorum put into the House in meaningful debate rather than trying to abuse the Chair as we have been doing all day.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): I am willing to rule on that point of privilege as raised. I would ask the hon. members to respect not me personally but the Chair. And also I feel that it is not a point of privilege but it is just a point of explanation as reported by the press. And I therefore recognize the hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I certainly concur with the remarks of the Premier, and we will endeavour to abide by them. But this afternoon some of the confusion started while I was speaking, and right now in an attempt to protect myself against the venom of the Minister of Tourism I wanted to carry on and explain my situation with respect to the matter we were discussing at the time, and that was discussing this under the minister's salary, because that minister was in this department at that time getting his salary when he dismissed my delegation from Bunyan's Cove. And the analogy I was making, Mr. Chairman, was that the minister, in his fighting mood and with his concern for Newfoundland to get a better deal with respect to transportation, I was making the analogy that my constituents from Bunyan's Cove were doing the same, and they were here fighting for their area, fighting to get the road from Musgravetown through to Bunyan's Cove through to Port Blandford upgraded and paved.

And what happened, Mr. Chairman, was that I had made the appointment with the minister, the minister agreed to see them, but there was some difficulty in my attending that meeting. What happened was that on Tuesday, it was on a Tuesday afternoon I was speaking to the Budget speech and had just spoken for five minutes or so, then of course we went into Thursday, Thursday was the day the Delegation was

Mr. Lush: supposed to come. They could not make it on Wednesday. And the minister wanted me to come with the delegation but because I was speaking and did not want to give up my opportunity to speak I thought the delegation could go alone. Now I think the hon. minister was quite aware that I was going to say a few things about his department; and there was no trickery, Mr. Chairman, I was holding back actually, The minister said he would be there about fifteen minutes, and I was holding back on the points that the minister should hear in particular, and he was listening to the intercom when I made some reference to the amount of money that was being spent in Bonavista South and nothing spent in my own district. Of course, then the minister blew his top when I said that and came back here to the House on a point of order. And there was no quorum call. The minister came back on a point of order. And actually I knew nothing about the fact that my delegation was thrown out of the office. I heard some of it through CBC and all the media, because all of the media carried the story, but after the House was finished my delegation had told me.

And I not want to get into that other than to make the analogy that here was the minister, he was a fighter, went up to Ottawa with all of his vigor, and with all of his ability to fight for Newfoundland and he was not thrown out of the minister's office, and this was the thing that he did to my delegation, and that is the only point I wanted to make, Mr. Chairman. So there was no attempt of trickery by me at all, none in the world.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout), when he was talking so eloquently on transportation this afternoon, mentioned the importance of a transportation policy. Now the Minister of Transportation the former Minister of Transportation certainly had a policy, but it did not have much to do with transportation, probably more to do with communications, He certainly had a policy, and the policy was the promotion of his own malignant self-esteem, and every day

MR. T. LUSH: his goal was to get on radio and get on television and pursue that goal, pursue that policy. But it was inconsistent, really, the policy was inconsistent. Now, Mr. Chairman, I above all other people, would not at all condemn the minister for going to Ottawa and trying to seek the best deal that he could find with respect to the Trans-Canada Highway or with the CN ferry services or any of the services, transportation services and communications services. For this Province, would not object to that at all. But I have said there was some inconsistency within his policy. The inconsistency was this, that whilst he was in Ottawa trying to promote or trying to get from Ottawa funds to upgrade and improve the Trans-Canada Highway, there was no policy here in this Province. He had no policy for our major provincial roads, none whatsoever. And secondly, the same with respect to the ferry services, the CN ferry services. And Mr. Chairman we have a tremendous job to do in improving our own provincial ferry services. Now very seldom does the minister talk about these. Now I know that he made certain approaches to Ottawa again that they keep their subsidy and he did do this. But, Mr. Chairman, the point of the matter is this and the hon. gentleman when speaking this afternoon alluded to the fact that he considered the CN ferries to be an extension, really - I think words to that effect - to be an extension of the Trans-Canada Highway. Now I believe - nor believe, I am certain that it also was the policy of his government to regard the ferry services in this Province, the intraprovincial ferry services in the same manner, that they were an extension of our provincial roads system.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to this hon. House that that is not the case. Our intraprovincial ferry services have some of the worst ferries in operation that you could ever wish for, not at all fit for human beings to travel on, in a terrible, terrible condition; not at all suitable for the travelling public, not even - I was going say not suitable for sick people; not suitable for healthy people -

MR. F. WHITE: Not suitable for animals.

MR. T. LUSH: Yes, and as my hon. colleague from Lewisporte

(Mr. White) says not suitable for animals. In a terrible, terrible state, terrible,

MR. T. LUSH: terrible mess and it is only those of us who travel them know. Now, Mr. Chairman, a point that has always aggravated me about the ferry service, and this I used to find a source of aggravation when I would hear the minister talking about for improvement of services with the CN ferry services; here we had a situation here in our own Province of a service that was terrible and here we had nobody in control of it, really. Now the minister has objected to that statement in the past but, Sir, I have inquired into whose responsibility it is to insure that we have good intraprovincial ferry services. I am told at the one level it is the CTC, federal government; I am told at one level it is the provincial government. Now let us take for example with respect -

MR. T.A. HICKMAN: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

MR. LUSH: Yes.

MR. T.A. HICKMAN: Because, you know, that is the first time I have ever heard the British North America interpreted that a province would have any responsibility over Intraprovincial Ferry Service. But could he for the benefit of the committee indicate, without giving the name of the person, the type of the office held by a person, in Ottawa, presumably, who would make that totally incorrect statement because it is fundamentally wrong.

MR. T. LUSH: I will do that, Mr. Chairman, as I progress. Actually it was two people that I got that information from. But first of all, let me carry on and I will come back to that point. The ferry service, they have no regulations with respect to scheduling. Now within their contract it says so many trips per day up until a certain time in the year. Let us say, for example, the Summer schedule might begin in June and from then up until October they must make two trips a day. Then it goes into the Winter schedule, which is one trip a day. But there is nobody to enforce, nobody to see that these two trips are

MR. LUSH: none or when they are done. And again it states of course within the contract that they will be done at times of peak traffic. Naturally the operators should know what times to be there, when people are moving. But there is no agency to see that this is done and nobody that people can report to when it is not being done. If it is Ottawa then it is too far away, It should not be. How can people in St. Brendan's contact people in Ottawa? They cannot do it. It is too far away. Secondly, with respect to rate increases; Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not condemning the operators for raising their rates; they have to make a profit. But the point of the matter is they can raise them at will, they do not have to go to anybody. If an operator decides tomorrow he wants to jack his prices by five dollars, by ten dollars, whatever it is, he can do it. He does not have to refer to any regulatory body; he can go right ahead and jack up these prices.

MR. MORGAN: That is not true.

MR. LUSH: The minister says it is not true. It is happening. It is happening.

MR. MORGAN: The CTC, the federal body approves it and the MP for the area.

MR. LUSH: No!

MR. MORGAN: Oh, yes.

MR. LUSH: What happens is that first their subsidy is given on the basis of a certain theory, that is the way their subsidy is given. But after that subsidy is given, if an operator receives a subsidy today that subsidy is received on the basis of certain fare rates, and he states that, But tomorrow, having received that subsidy, he can then decide that the rates are going to go up without any reference to anybody. So, Mr. Chairman, what I have said in the past, and I will say it again, is that there should be some regulatory body here within this Province, with the interprovincial ferry service. Whether it is federal, whether it is provincial, I am not worried, but the body should be here so that the people that are serviced by ferries when they have complaints, when they are dissatisfied with inadequate service, they can approach this group and let them know about their dissatisfaction

MR. LUSH: and their complaints. But such is not the present situation, not the present situation at all, and I would hope that I can impress upon the minister the importance of this matter. I have been trying to think about the name of the person from CTC but it was the man in charge at the time that I called on this matter to find out about the ferry services here in this Province -

MR. MORGAN: Otto Lang? Marchand?

MR. LUSH: Possibly. I do not remember the name but it was the head man, it was the man in charge, but that is the chap that I went to, that is the hon. gentleman.

MR. HICKMAN: I have another question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: In your discussions with the representative of the Canadian Transport Commission, did you put the other question to him when you were asking or submitting that there should be a regulatory body in Newfoundland, that there was indeed an attempt under a delegated authority for the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities to regulate the CN bus service only within the Province and the hon. Otto Lang unilaterally took that away from them and said that anything concerned with federal transportation came exclusively under the jurisdiction of the CTC, how that could be reconciled? I would be interested in hearing that.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I cannot say that I can add anything to that situation. All I enquired about was the ferry service because there was a lot of double talk. On the one hand the provincial people in the provincial Department of Transportation and Communications, they were telling me that it was the federal government's responsibility, the whole bit. When I went to the CTC, their only responsibility, they told me, was to give the subsidy; after they gave the subsidy that was it, no other responsibility, that was it. So, Mr. Chairman, there is obviously confusion. Who is suppose to control the interprovincial ferry services? Who is suppose to do it? That is the kind of double talk I have been getting.

MR. HICKMAN: That is straight talk. The man is hon. Otto Lang, PC, QC, MP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: I did not write the British North America Act.
It was written in 1867.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, it is a terrible situation, the way
the ferry services in this Province are operated and I think we must
do something about it. If it is the federal government, if they are

MR. T. LUSH:

responsible, let us see a presence here in Newfoundland, let us see a presence so that when people in St. Brendan's have some problem they know where they can go. If it is in Ottawa, it has got to be removed from there we cannot have Ottawa controlling a ferry service for St. Brendan's.

MR. MORGAN:

They are paying the subsidy.

MR. T. LUSH:

They are paying. That is what they say, that is where their responsibility ends, that is what they are telling me; when they give the subsidy that it is no further responsibility on their part, just the subsidy. Mr. Chairman, that is the crux of the matter, that is what I am trying to recommend to the minister that this situation be solved, that we have some regulatory body, some control body here in the Province of these interprovincial ferry services and that every attempt be made to improve that service.

Mr. Chairman, in looking under transportation and seeing the statement that is here in the Budget Speech, a flowery statement, "further transportation infrastructure and subsidy programs must be linked directly to resource development opportunities. The importance of a resource development linkage cannot be overstated since access to resources, markets and employment is a precondition to development." Mr. Chairman, that is good stuff, that is a good approach and I would only hope that the new minister will follow this approach, because if the minister does then I can be reasonably sure, and the people of my district, that we are going to receive high priority with respect having our roads, the roads in the Terra Nova district that are presently in a terrible condition— and I refer specifically to the road from Port Blandford through to Musgravetown. This area, Mr. Chairman, is engaged in primary industry, the industry of farming, logging and fishing, all of which necessitate a good transportation system. Agriculture in particular, the Musgravetown-Lethbridge area is one of the largest farming areas in the Province, one of the largest, and I am going to find out one day from the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture just how large it is because it is my feeling in terms of the

MR. T. LUSH: production of vegetables, potatoes, turnip and this sort of thing, that it is one of the largest in the area if not the largest. And naturally all of the vegetables have to be trucked out of there, it is the only way that we can truck the vegetables out of there, and to have to drive over that sixteen miles of gravel road, a terrible road, there does not seem to be much you can do with it. I met with a certain not too long ago and they were telling us about the condition of the road and they said there seems to be no solution at all because they approached the transportation people and ask why they were not grading it, and they said they could not grade it when it was dry because the road was too hard and they could not grade it when it was wet because it made too much water, the road became too mucky. So it is in a real bad shape, Mr. Chairman.

I appeal, Mr. Chairman, to the minister that if we are going to abide by the policy then certainly the district of Terra Nova is going to have to be one of the first that he must look at. I mentioned fishing. Again a great degree of fishing going on there in recent years of herring, mackrel - particularly herring, tons of it shipped out of Harbour Grace, and again all that has to go over these gravel roads to be driven out. And then logging, trucking the timber out, the logs, a road that is used excessively and yet is in such a terrible condition. To say nothing about the promotion of tourism in the area: just sixteen miles away from the Terra Nova National Park, and I would venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that in a Summer that out of the hundreds of people

MR. LUSH:

that visit the Terra Nova National Park, not five per cent of them ever go down to this beautiful area of Musgravetown and Lethbridge because they just cannot venture over the road, they cannot do it, and they are not going to drive up around the Clarenville way to come because it is too far.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sop's Arm.

MR. LUSH: The Salvage road, we must put in that the Salvage road must be done.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) tourists.

MR. LUSH: Tourists, yes. But look at the fishing; a tremendous amount of fishing, one of the most successful fishing plants—holding units in the Province, again six miles of gravel road. The former minister did start something on this road, he started upgrading, reconstruction and now it is ready for paving, all ready, and I am hopeful that this year they are going to start that. Then the road to Burnside that takes you to St. Brendan's, the connection with that ferry, a road that again is used by thousands of people, particularly in the Summer—six miles of gravel road. I do not have the asbestos dust to contend with, but the thing about it is that the roads are so bad the people will not go over them anyway, not tourists, only those who have to use them. Thank you.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. STRACHAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STRACHAN: The ruling has been made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Usually we do alternate but if one member rises appreciable before another the Chair has no alternative but to recognize him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your kind ruling.

Mr. Chairman, in the twenty minutes available to me I would like to -

AN HON. MEMBER: You will not have (inaudible)

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if I could have silence while I speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. member wishes to be heard in reasonable silence.

The hon. member.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, I listened to the Minister of Transportation in his preamble to the estimates and listened very keenly to what he had to say about the situations within Labrador and I would like to address myself with three particular questions there: first of all, the Labrador highway; secondly, the situation with the transportation on the coast, on the Labrador coast; and then specifically with the transportation within a village or community on the coast. I will try to give examples of what points I feel should be made strongly.

Often in Labrador or in Nain, living in Nain, in Labrador, and I have raised this point before, we often feel that sometimes we are like the Sinai Desert, almost similarly to an argument between Egypt and Israel over who owns it. There sometimes seems to be questions of who owns Labrador, presented mostly by Quebec. Let us be quite clear on this, I have brought this up before and I am not trying to be an alarmist by any means, but there is, I stated earlier, concern that economically there are inroads being made by Quebec in certain areas and directions, especially into Labrador City-Wabush area and certainly into the Northern area to which I belong and of which I gave examples earlier. I believe that we must firmly and securely anchor the two parts of the Province together and the transportation situation is one of the most important for anchoring the situation or anchoring the two parts of the Province. The Labrador highway must proceed as soon as possible in my estimation because what is occurring in the Labrador City-Wabush area is that sooner or later there will be a linkage between that area and not this Province but towards the West, towards Montreal. And what we will be facing in a few years will be people and parts of this Province who feel often rejected enough and isolated enough to feel as though they want to go on their own and they will start automatically dealing with the West, dealing with Quebec, automatically. Again as I explained

April 6, 1970

Tape No. 680 (Night)

AM-3

MR. STASCHAN: earlier on, economically it is often cheaper to deal with the West and also therefore, if the transportation links are joined through Vermont and on to the West, then people will start going West and lose still more the feeling of belonging to this Province. So I feel strongly from this point of view that there should be a major attempt at trying to link up that part of the Province and trying to get the Labrador highway. It is well named the Freedom Road and the reason why it is called the Freedom Road is that people

MR. STRACHAN: do feel isolated. It is not badly named, in fact. The idea of this would be the road which gives us freedom it is very apt and very appropriate. What people are asking for then is to join Churchill Falls, eventually Labrador City and Wabush as quickly as possible to the Goose Bay - Happy Valley area and eventually from there on through a ferry system to our Port Labrador, which we discussed earlier on.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible) drive from St. John's to Montreal by that route shorter than going the present route.

MR. STRACHAN: I am not sure of the figures.

MR. DOODY: It depends on whether it is Winter or Summer, I would say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: The distance from Deer Lake to St. Anthony is the same as from Deer Lake to Port aux Basques.

MR. STRACHAN: The part of the road I am talking about here, of course, is another part linking St. Anthony across from the Straits there up through to Goose Bay. I think that is a major undertaking which I think is away down the road somewhere. I think what we are talking about here is the Happy Valley - Goose Bay to Churchill Falls, Labrador City and Wabush so that, number one, during the Summer - and this Summer hopefully - that people can who are Newfoundlanders can travel to the Province of Newfoundland instead of having to put their cars on the railway and go farther south or else fly out to Montreal, which is much cheaper. So what we have to think about then is immediately to try and put some funds into that. And I say to you this very sincerely that there should be an appeal when we see \$67 million and we know that is not a very great deal of money for the jobs that have to be done. Well, I listened to the complaints with the Trans-Canada Highway. I sympathize because I have driven it often enough, too. When I listen to the complaints about it taking an hour and a half to get to work in the morning through the Kenmount Road area, I sympathize as well. But what we have to do very soon

MR. STRACHAN: is that I think the minister and the administration should make an appeal to Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders that some things are going to have to stop, some things, bad as they are on the Island part of the Province, will have to wait and take the money and that money must be transferred to a project within Labrador to try to make transportation reasonable, sensible and sane, because as long as we carry on this position and the stance that we have in which we have to show certain benefits, then the people of Labrador will become more and more frustrated and will start to head more and more towards the West and when that occurs trying to change that trend will be more difficult. So I think on the basis of Labrador Highway there is a very, I think, very strong emphasis should be placed on that part, on the Freedom Road, that money should be allocated. I noticed this year, for instance, not one penny, as I understand it - or maybe the minister in his reply can indicate exactly how much money is going to be spent on that road but I feel very strongly that that road should be completed, regardless of the confusion with the Sir Robert Bond and let us leave that aside for another argument. I have as strong feelings as the present Minister of Tourism on that situation there, and that is not my argument at the moment and it is not here for me to discuss it with the minister here. But I feel very strongly that we should start to spend some money and not continually neglect or or continually feel that we cannot spend that kind of money there because the project is too high. I would say very clearly that the minister stated that the Labrador Highway, when you looked at the feasibility of it from a point of view of economics, it amazed them that it becomes so feasible economically. Let me point out there for years and years and years that Happy Valley - Goose Bay was arguing for the William Carson and CN told them all along that there was no economic base for a ferry service into Happy Valley - Goose Bay. It was CN's own acknowledgement that the year they put the William Carson into operation that they saved their operation \$800,000 - the figure was stated by they themselves. So in other words what happened they were extremely surprised to find that the Carson was often overlooked, that there was a great deal of traffic there, traffic that they

MR. STRACHAN: never thought ever would be there.
What I am saying here is similarly with the Labrador Highway, that if one looks at the economics of it you could almost say that there is nothing there. But I guarantee that once that highway is in place, the amount of traffic and that is stupendous, would amaze the people to see what would occur because people will use it and will travel on it.

MR. DOODY: Nobody on the Prairies when they built the railway.

MR. STRACHAN: That is right. And I have never subscribed to the fact that the you cannot put the things there because the business is not there; the infrastructure has to be put in place and then others will follow, but it is amazing how quickly it does follow and the William Carson is an example how local groups push for years and years and finally when it did come in one of the real problems then was that the Carson could not handle the load.

MR. DOODY: No room for user pay concept (inaudible).

MR. STRACHAN: I have no argument there at all and I have already stated that very clearly. But I think there is also something far wrong with the CN service as it stands on the Labrador coast because as it is, and especially in parts of the Labrador coast, it is a mess, a total mess. The whole set-up of it as far as I am concerned is wrong.

Let me get on to the next point. We only have twenty minutes on this and I want to get on to the next point. The Labrador highway I am talking about is a regional part - I am dealing with the whole of Labrador - and I cannot emphasize too strongly how that must be put in place to connect up with some ferry service, hopefully in years to come and not too distant years to come, not a ferry service which is available only five or six months of the years but a ferry service which could be available for ten or eleven months of the year. There are already discussions under way with various people, and local groups within the Happy Valley- Goose Bay area who are doing a great deal of work themselves to investigate this and to try and see whether around the Goose Bay area, the Northwest Point area, the Port Labrador that we are talking about could be created there instead of creating the Port Labrador on the Southern part of Labrador and having to build an expensive highway to Goose Bay, the central area. The hub of the wheel is Goose Bay-Happy Valley and it must become the service and distribution center in Labrador, it has to become that. Looking at the Labrador highway I would like the minister to respond to this hopefully, and tell us whether people can look forward to funds being spent on it this year or whether he is prepared to say if not this year whether he can turn around and say that we are going to have to make an appeal to people on the Island that the monies which are available for highway construction, there will be no construction that year, or limited construction that year because if you do want to belong to a Province and have the two parts of the Province made into one whole, then money has got to be allocated to Labrador, and that people on the Island, much as we are behind Canadian standards, will have to hold on for a year because in Labrador they are far, far behind the standards of this Island, let alone talk about the rest of Canada.

On the Labrador coast situation, again I appeal

J. STAGGER: to the minister that what we are talking about here, and it is a long way down the road, I do not think that the master plan that they have come in with for the twelve airstrips - it is a start. But there are, and I know it full well, there are many years down the road before we can see an intergrated travel system on the Labrador coast. Because even with two or three airstrips it still does not become economical to put a twin engine aircraft on to these two or three communities alone and bypass six or seven communities which cannot be serviced by anything else but a single engine plane. What we are arguing for here is, hopefully, that obviously if it is not economic, surely the government, the administration can make available what we are asking for - I believe \$125,000 or \$130,000 - to allow an aircraft company, and I do not care whether it is Labrador Airways or who else it is, I am lobbying for them; I am lobbying for the constituents in my district who have got to suffer the things that we have to suffer. I listen to the hour and one half it takes you to get from Mount Pearl to the Confederation Building. It may interest the non-member who was bringing it up that the House of Assembly closed on Mundy

Thursday and I arrived home in Nain on Easter Sunday at five P.M.

It may also interest the member who brought this up that I left, or attempted to leave on Friday to get back for the House opening on Monday and I finally arrived here on Tuesday morning. We are not talking about an hour delay, we are not talking about a ten hours delay, we are talking about days delays. The longest record I had was a delay of twenty-one days stuck in Goose Bay trying to get on the coast, twenty-one days. Every morning getting out of your bed at six-thirty and looking out the window and then getting back into bed. I will tell you if that is not depressing, if that is not frustrating, well what is? I could have gotten out last week on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, Nain weather was good, Goose Bay weather was good, but in between we could not fly visually VFR rules because essentially a busn plane or single engines must fly by the seat of their pants, they must see the ground all the way. Because if an engine gives out, which can occur in single engine planes, especially these type of single engine planes. It is no reflection on the airline company and for this I think

April 6, 1978

Tape No. 682 (Night)

4B-3

MR. STRACMAN: The media has done a disservice, it is no reflection at all on single engine bush planes, the type of planes they are, the type of gasoline engines they are, the type of design that they are, these

MR. STRACHAN:

are the problems they have faced. And to fly in that if the engine gives out one must be able to make a landing around your area. You must be able to see the ground to land. If it is Winter you must be able to see a pond and land on skis or in Summer you must be able to get the floats down. So therefore the paths one has to follow are certain defined paths. The only way around that is to go IFR or fly with instrument rules and in order to do that one needs a twin engine aircraft. So you could take off from Goose Bay, fly over the ridge and land in Nain because our weather was perfect. And it is as frustrating to sit in the sun and the blue skies of Labrador - blue skies you never see on the Island, the blue skies of Labrador - and to sit in that and know that you cannot fly! So what we are stating here then is why can we not get \$125,000 or \$130,000 to put into operation a twin engine aircraft which can handle 5,000 people on the Labrador Coast, give them the service on the whole Labrador Coast, give them safe, fast and efficient service, because people want a fast service, they want an efficient service and moreover they want to fly in safety. And we could go on with tales and tales of bush flying and everybody has the tales of bush flying. That is the way it is going to be until we get twin engine aircraft and we can fly in safety. And I, myself, could tell quite a number of stories about what we have to do on bush aircraft, try to do the landings and try to take place. So I would like to hear the minister respond on this. One hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars out of a budget from the Transportation Department to me is not a great deal of money to allow people to have fast, efficient, comfortable and moreover, safe travel, because as long as we are going to be with single engine planes it is amazing, and it is through the skill of the bush pilots alone that people are not killed. These bush

MR. STRACHAN: pilots in Labrador are some of the best in Canada and one of them has been heralded in many journals as one of the best in the world. He has more hours on a single engine Otter, barring one person in Australia, than anyone else in the world.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is a local man?

MR. STRACHAN: And he is a local man - Ian Massey, whose father from Hudson Bay married a girl from Rigolet and was born in Happy Valley. And what I am stating here is that these pilots do a tremendous job and under terrible, terrible conditions, often taking chances which they have to take because by the time you leave Nain and the three hours later you arrive in Goose Bay, one has to be prepared for every emergency. The weather can close in, trouble can arise and you may have to put down anywhere in the middle of the woods.

So I ask the minister, could he give us an answer on whether this year we can expect the subsidy to give us this twin engine service instead of having to continue with the single engine aircraft service that we have using old Otters. The last Otter was built in 1959. You cannot obtain a new Otter or a more recent Otter because the last one was built in 1959. So the aircraft we use are pre 1959. It is like asking Air Canada right now to do an operation within Canada on DC3s. It cannot be done. Air Canada cannot supply a service using DC3s. That is what you are asking airline companies to operate in Labrador using these types of 'planes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Some are older than 1959.

MR. STRACHAN: 1949, 1950. The one I came out on last week was 1953. And you cannot obtain more modern aircraft of a better type than a single engine Otter. It has not been designed. It was a Canadian designed bush 'plane and there is no better one.

AN HON. MEMBER: Twin engine Otters (inaudible)

MR. STRACHAN: Oh yes, there is a market for twin engine Otters. In fact, what has happened is that Canada has receded, ^{as} the airlines have come into other places in Canada, we are one of the most backward and one of the last places in Canada which is still relying for major passenger service on single engine Otters, and there is a surplus of single engine Otters, but all pre 1959. So therefore you cannot obtain new aircraft and people can laugh at these aircraft, but how can the companies, if they wanted to, buy a better or a newer aircraft?

Do I have a couple of more minutes?

Lastly, I would like to get down to the situation within one community in my district, and I would like the minister - because I had had discussions with the previous minister and had some commitments from him - and hopefully I would like to hear the minister give a commitment that it will be undertaken this year. We have a community in my district in which there is no road around the community, in which

MR. STRACHAN: children have to don life jackets at 7:30 in the morning and go on speed boats and motor boats to go across to the school. There is no road around the harbour, that is the community of Fox Harbour, and CBC have done some film work on it and so on. But regardless of it, I think that in this day and age we should try to see an end of that and it is one of the few communities left in this Province which does not have a road around the community. The people themselves have worked very hard to try to maintain a pathway around the community, but I think it requires a major work within it and suggested the next community that the barge and the equipment go to is the community of Fox Harbour so we can end this nonsense and possible dangers which are involved in children either trying to cross by the ice to get to school or their fathers taking the boats across through ice to the schools or in the break up and freeze up having to travel four miles around through the ponds to try to get to school. I think this is a serious situation in a small community and I would the minister can give us assurance that that community will receive the equipment in it this year to build the road.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. L. WOODROW: Mr. Chairman I would like first of all to endorse the remarks made by the hon. the Premier when he indicated that we should all try to act like gentlemen. I feel that we are here to represent a district, we are paid by the taxpayers' money and they expect some representation from us.

Now I would also like to congratulate the two previous speakers, two extremely conscientious people ^{whom} I admire in fact very much. I almost felt like weeping when I heard the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) speak.

Now I would like to preface my remarks first of all by congratulating the former Minister of Transportation and Communications.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. WOODROW: I found him to be progressive, conservative and aggressive, prompt in answering correspondence, courteous always, a hard worker and helpful where help could be possibly given. Apart from all of the fine qualifications of his successor, his good sense of humour helps one to realize that our problems are only one of many that exists in every district throughout the Province.

MR. NOLAN: How do you (inaudible).

MR. L. WOODROW: Mr. Chairman I would like to make some general comments if I get the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) to listen.

MR. F. WHITE: The words of the little ones.

MR. NOLAN: A political treprechaun!

MR. L. WOODROW: I would like to make some general remarks about the transportation in general and also about my own district. I can say this, Mr. Chairman, conscientiously that I can defend the government that I am a part of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. WOODROW: - and I say that from the bottom of my heart.

MR. RIDEOUT: You are better than some of your colleagues over there.

MR. L. WOODROW: Now since 1971, I think this is worth mentioning, there were 300 miles of road paved and also upgraded, 880 miles of gravel roads built or constructed. And in 1977/78 there was approximately 169 miles of road paved, thirteen and a half miles of new road built. I think this is significant. At least it shows that we have not been negative, at least the administration have not been negative over the past six years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. WOODROW: Absolutely right. And also worthy of note is the fact at peak periods 3,400 people are employed and some \$32 million

MR. WOODROW: are put into the pockets of our taxpayers. We have 5,331 miles approximately of road in the Province, 2,954 miles are paved, in other words about fifty-one and one half per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say and am very proud to be able to say that the road in the district of Bay of Islands, that is to say the main highway, is completely paved. There are twenty-six miles from St. Mary's bridge in Curling to Lark Harbour, twenty-five miles on the North side of the Bay of Islands, that is from Hughes Brook bridge down to Coxes Cove; in other words, the main road in Bay of Islands is completely paved.

Perhaps the members do not want to hear this, I do not know, but if they do not at least I can say I am trying conscientiously to represent a district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: And doing it well, I would say.

MR. WOODROW: Thanks a lot, Mr. Premier.

There are also, as you know, many local roads in the district as well; some are paved, a lot more remain to be paved, but we are getting there. We did have a rather unfortunate thing happen last year, and I have discussed this already with the former and the present minister, the chip-seal that was put on the North shore of the Bay of Islands, and this happened in the Exploits as well, as you know, was a failure. I think that some of it was ripped off by the tractors during the snow clearing, and the like, by the graders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: It was probably laid during the by-election.

MR. WOODROW: No, it was not. It was well and truly laid.

AN HON. MEMBER: Now, was it laid during the by-election or what?

MR. WOODROW: No, Sir, indeed not - long after the election. As I said earlier, I brought this to the attention of the hon. minister and I hope he does not use all the money on Eagle River this year. I also note that our budget this year is \$125 million and the gross expenditure

MR. WOODROW: is going to be \$111,500,000, net expenditure \$83 million. Looking back over the last six or seven years it makes one wonder where all this money comes from.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ottawa.

MR. WOODROW: Ottawa. I would also like to mention that in the Bay of Islands also there was a depot, a salt and maintenance depot constructed during the tenure of office of my hon. friend the former Minister of Transportation and Communications. By the way, these can be seen. If you drive the Trans-Canada highway you can see lots of these monuments which were erected in his tenure of office, I speak the truth. At peak periods, that is to say especially in Wintertime during the snow clearing periods, there is anywhere from sixty-five to seventy people employed at the depot over in what is know as Wild Cove. But the wisdom of getting this thing done was that before it was constructed all the mechanics and everybody else who had to work on the equipment had to come all the way down from Deer Lake and go as far

MR. L. WOODROW: as far as Cox's Cove on the North side of the bay and down to Lark Harbour on the south shore of the Bay of Islands. So I think really this has been a great thing for the Bay of Islands in general. Also I would be remiss in my duty if I did not speak of snow clearing as well. Snow clearing, of course, can always be improved upon but there were only two days this Winter—and I guarantee you it was a hard Winter over in the Bay of Islands - there were only two days when the road was closed in these areas, and that was really just not twenty-four hours but maybe twelve or fifteen hours during the period. Now we have had in fact from time to time—we have breakdowns but this of course happens because the machinery is going at full speed sometimes twenty-four hours a day—we have people impatient and it happens in fact in every district; they expect instant action which is almost impossible. But I would like to remind the hon. minister that we have exceptional amounts of snow over on the West Coast of the Province and of course this, I suppose, could apply up the Great Northern Peninsula as well and I believe, I suppose, in the Baie Verte area as well. I do believe that some more attention should be given to snow clearing in these areas. In fact I was, I would say, a little bit annoyed on March 27th. when the minister and his officials decided that the Winter maintenance would terminate, he had to let some of the crew go, and however since that time we have had a lot of storms over in the area.

But all in all, I suppose, Mr. Chairman, we cannot expect everything. I think what is involved for all of us, and if we really have a little bit of common sense and understanding, the whole thing amounts to money. If we had enough money we could do a whole lot of things for the whole of the Province and for more for our districts.

Next, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word about the air services. First of all, I would like to say we have seven Canso water bombers and, just to compare this with the other Maritime Provinces, in the Province of P.E.I they have none, in the Province of Nova Scotia they have two float equipped aircraft, just equipped with floats, and in New Brunswick they have four what

MR. L. WOODROW:

they call Commander single aircrafts.

I am also happy to say, and of course everybody knows this, that one of our Canso aircrafts has been on loan to the Province of Nova Scotia and it is nice to know that we have such co-operation with the Maritime Provinces. It is too bad we have not got the same co-operation with the Province of Quebec. And also, Mr. Chairman, speaking of the air ambulances, and of course I am referring now to the King Air and to the helicopters, last year, I suppose-or this present year, there were 124 mercy flights made by King Air and helicopters. There certainly must have been flights made - these were made, by the way, within the Province - there must have been others made outside the Province as well. When I get to speak on the estimates for

MR. WOODBROW:

the Department of Health I hope they record a very touching story which happened between Corner Brook and St. John's and Halifax. And this administration was responsible for paying every cent of it. When we get to the estimates for the Department of Health I hope to be able to record that story.

Now I will also mention your case as well, the case you mentioned with the \$1,400 going back and forth to Labrador.

And I also understand that there were eight tenders put out in 1977 for helicopters. Two tenders we could call invalid and the lowest bidder was the Sealand for three years. Now there is also something about this as well probably which we do not understand and which we have probably failed to bring out. It is this, that they have their own training schools and their head office is at Gander and they are employing Newfoundlanders where possible. So I think that is alright.

Mr. Chairman, I think I could go on and on, but in trying to be a gentleman I shall in fact practice what I preach. As I said at the beginning, there are other people in this House, there are fifty-one districts and I am sure others want to speak. And I wish that every member would give each of us an opportunity, because we all have something to say and if our constituents do not hear something that we have said they will wonder what kind of a dumbbell they have over there in the House of Assembly, I think we all should have an opportunity to speak so we can represent our district conscientiously. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Dr. Collins) The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, I just have a very few words to say on Transportation and Communications.

MR. HODDER: The first question I would like to ask the minister concerns the Highway Safety Advisory Board which travelled throughout the Province two and one-half years ago just after the last provincial election. I first ran into them in Stephenville and I at that time presented a brief on the road conditions in my district at that particular time. Now we were told by the former Minister of Transportation and Communications that he - I think it was about this time last year he received the report from the Highway Safety Advisory Board; however, it has never been made public. Two and one-half years ago it travelled the Province with all attendant publicity and I believe some of the newspapers were represented, at least one of them was represented, who had travelled with that board on the West Coast. But we have never received that report here in the House of Assembly and the report has never been made public.

Mr. Chairman, the one thing that I am concerned about is that looking at the district of Port au Port, the one that I am most familiar with, the roads in that particular area are not only in bad condition but they are unsafe. Some of them were built back in the 1900s and then chip seal was put on top of them and then a little later pavement was put on top of that. And some of the things that I put in when I presented my brief to that board have been carried out, like guardrails and road signs, but some reconstruction that needs to be done in that area has not been carried out. And I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if perhaps that particular report from the board might be explosive, and I feel that it should be tabled in this House of Assembly so that we can see just what that board came up with. I had occasion to speak to the chairman of the board last year and he did tell me that he had conferred with the former Minister of

April 6, 1978

Tape 687 (Night)

EC - 3

MR. HODDER: Transportation and Communications
on a regular basis and that he was satisfied that some of
the things were being implemented. But I find it strange
that the report has not been tabled. You see, Mr. Chairman,
this dealt with safety in the

MR. HODDER:

Province and I think that this is crucial. I can only talk for one district but I am sure that that board had found things throughout the whole Province because they did travel the whole Province and I feel that it must be made public in the interest of public safety.

Mr. Chairman, just a few words on my district and one thing that I feel that I must say: For some years now there has been a push to put a road across the Port au Port Peninsula. The necessity for that road is becoming more evident every day and one of the reasons that that desire has been there is because there are two French communities in my district, the community of Mainland or La Grande Terre and the community of Cape St. George are both French speaking and they are about six miles apart across the peninsula. However, the order for people to visit back and forth, and over the years there are been inter-marriage between the two communities, they have to travel some forty or fifty miles. Now that is one of the reasons, but another reason is that in the district at the present time there are three harbours being built, three man-made harbours. In the Blue Beach area, through Canada Works projects and CES top-ups and small craft harbour top-ups, there is a new beach being opened, two massive breakwaters have been built there, also at Three Rock Cove and at Cape St. George. A road across the Port au Port peninsula would mean that fish pick-ups and transportation around the district would be much simplified.

MR. DOODY: Is it a new road or what?

MR. HODDER: It is a new road. I think it is a distance of about six and one half miles.

MR. WHITE: Built before 1977.

MR. HODDER: But this road I am talking about now has not been built. The other thing, Mr. Chairman, is that community services could be better rationalized on the Port au Port peninsula if that road went through. For instance, you have the community of Lourdes, which has no ambulance, the community of Mainland, which has no ambulance or fire truck and the community of Cape St. George has both. You have doctors

MR. ROSSER: at various places around the peninsula and with the building of that six mile road, six to seven mile road these things could be rationalized and better services could be provided for residents of the area.

As well, Mr. Chairman, the main trunk road in the district, the road which most of the traffic goes over and the one which I referred to earlier today when I presented my petition, the one that is crumbling into the sea, that particular road was built quite a long time ago; it is the road that prompted me to make my comments about the Highway Safety Advisory Board. The road is giving away, it runs by a cliff and there have been numerous times when cars have gone over there and last year two police officers went over there, miraculously escaping injury. That whole road needs to be rebuilt and regraded because, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the district is on the brink of prosperity. The people are going back to the fishery in droves and we need a good transportation system in the district more than we ever did before. Some of the major fishing areas now have unpaved roads leading to them. But there is one other problem before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, and this is one that concerns me greatly. The fishing community which I referred to earlier, where the small craft harbours is building a port, that particular community - it is a temporary community to which people go during the fishing season and leave after the fishing season with only about two people living there - that particular community is almost at the tip of Long Point; it is the tip when you see the map of the Port au Port peninsula. That particular road is about seven or eight miles long. Some money was spent on it during the last election. However, it is in disrepair at the present time. There were about 150 fishermen who fished out off that particular area last year - now that may be a little

MR. J. HODDER:

exaggeration, but from 100 to 150. This year I expect that quite a few more people will be fishing there because there was more space to dock their boats and I have written the - I first wrote the Department of Fisheries asking that that road be upgraded this year.

MR. DOODY: There is no harbour there.

MR. J. HODDER: Well, the harbour is being built. There are two large breakwaters and this Summer they are going to push through the beach -

MR. DOODY: Yes, I remember (inaudible).

MR. J. HODDER: Yes. But this year I wrote the Department of Fisheries and they told me that it was a fisheries access road but that they would have to use almost all of the funds of their department in order to maintain that road because it is such a large road and that they were hoping that the Department of Transportation and Communications would take over that road because, Mr. Chairman, at the present time that particular road needs speed signs, it needs curves straightened out, it needs the things that are required to make a road up to standard because during the Summer you have large fish trucks travelling that road almost hourly, you have fishermen commuting back and forth between their homes. But the problem is it seems that neither the Department of Fisheries nor the Department of Transportation and Communications wants to take responsibility for the road. The last official word that I got on the road was that it would be maintained, but maintaining the road is not enough, Mr. Chairman, it has to be upgraded and rebuilt and I am particularly concerned about this road because the future of the district seems to be in the fishery at the present time and people are enthusiastically going back to the fishery. The government has dumped about \$1.5 million into Blue Beach and are going to spend an awful lot more money on that particular area and I feel that the provincial government must come through with the funds to upgrade that particular road. So that is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman, and I do hope that the Department of Fisheries and the Department of Transportation and Communications resolve the problem and that some work starts this Spring on the Blue Beach Road.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Chairman I have been attempting to have a few words to say on this particular department all afternoon and evening because I know that if I did not speak on transportation while the estimates were going through that they probably would not let me into Lewisporte when I go out tomorrow afternoon because transportation is of such significant importance to my district. I suppose the town of Lewisporte almost more than any other place in Newfoundland, probably with the exception of Port aux Basques, is totally dependent on a good system of transportation in this Province. I find it strange, Mr. Chairman, that because of Lewisporte's unique location, being located about seven miles off the Trans-Canada Highway, that most people in this Province pass by it without even knowing it exists with the exception of a sign that is there now that took two years to get up. Prior to that the only indication that Lewisporte existed was a sign which said Road to the Isles.

Mr. Chairman, Lewisporte contains, and I take exception to what the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe) said today about wholesale firms, but Lewisporte does in fact contain the largest wholesale firm in Eastern Canada east of Montreal and I am referring to Lewisporte Wholesalers. And also, Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of more wholesale firms there as well. Lewisporte services in terms of food the largest section of Newfoundland and Labrador of any community in this Province. I do not think I would be talking out of turn if I said that the wholesale business in Lewisporte is worth, Mr. Chairman, in the run of a year in the vicinity of \$65 million. Now that is a pretty big industry when you look at it in that context. In order to maintain this kind of wholesale business in Lewisporte in terms of servicing Central, Northern, and parts of Eastern Newfoundland and Labrador, there must be an adequate and a very adequate system of transportation. Right now, Mr. Chairman, and figures will prove this because we have had studies done, the largest traffic area of any trunk road in Newfoundland is the Lewisporte Highway,

MR. F. WILHELM: the Notre Dame Junction Highway that goes seven miles from the Trans-Canada Highway to Lewisporte. The traffic figures, Mr. Chairman, I mean cars, trucks and so on, traffic figures for Lewisporte are higher than Gander, and Gander has two connections to the Trans-Canada Highway and Lewisporte only one. But the traffic figures that have been done in the past few months for Lewisporte show that the number of vehicles going into and leaving Lewisporte, including transport trucks, is higher than any other place in Newfoundland for a branch road. Now I do not mean the Trans-Canada Highway, I am not talking about Port-aux-Basques or passing through Grand Falls or anything like that, but, as I just mentioned, the traffic figures for Lewisporte are higher than for Gander.

Besides the wholesale firms, Mr. Chairman, Lewisporte is also the main centre for the supply of gasoline for the international airport in Gander, the main supply for Gander, and in the run of a day a dozen tankers or more will be taking fuel into Gander for the various aircraft. And some time ago it was announced that Lufthansa - no, not Lufthansa - the Aeroflot, the Russian airline, Lufthansa is German - Aeroflot, the Russian airline, started to land at Gander, and that meant, Mr. Chairman, to Lewisporte an extra two tankers of fuel a day going into Gander.

There is also a major fish plant in Lewisporte, Mr. Chairman, that is now operating on, I think, a twenty-four hour basis, and I would like to talk about that some other time, because the lady who runs the plant was recently in Europe on a tour with some fisheries people from here, and later on I will be getting into some of the things that are being developed in Lewisporte in terms of fisheries. And not far from Lewisporte, Mr. Chairman, is another fish plant that at the moment is running twenty-four hours a day from fish that have been taken through the ice.

MR. F. WHITE:

So the point I am coming to, Mr. Chairman, is that the transportation policy as it now exists in Newfoundland, I would say, is the biggest hindrance to rural Newfoundland that we can find anywhere in this Province - the transportation policy as it exists today.

The Comfort Cove/Newstead fish plant is going on a twenty-four hour basis. It has been going that way for several weeks. Fish is being frozen and taken out of Comfort Cove and Newstead by trucks over an eleven mile section of gravel road, and at the moment, Mr. Chairman, every day there are one or two or more transport trucks stuck in the mud and they have to be hauled out by tractors and everything else. Now that is my information. I have not seen this happening, but I am told that the road is in such a condition at the moment that trucks are going down to the axles and in many cases have to be hauled out.

Now we are in the midst in this Province, and the government is being supported by all of us in the determination it seems to have to promote the fishery, and yet we find that a place like Comfort Cove/Newstead and Lewisporte, Mr. Chairman, have I suppose, some of the worst road conditions that exist in Newfoundland. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the road conditions that exist in my district at the moment, exist because of one reason and one reason only, that I as a Liberal represent that district. I think, Mr. Chairman, that is the only reason at the moment that the roads in my district are in the condition that they are in. As a matter of fact, I would go so far as to say that I probably am totally and absolutely responsible for the condition of the roads in my district. Because I am a Liberal member of this House, the government have failed, Mr. Chairman, to keep their promises with respect to the Comfort Cove/Newstead road and with respect to the upgrading of the Notre Dame Junction road that was paved seventeen years

MR. F. WHITE: ago. It was the first major truck road in this Province to be paved and there has not been one thing done with it since.

Three years ago, prior to the 1975 election, plans were laid for the reconstruction and upgrading of the Junction road, seven miles. Plans were also made and promises made and commitments in writing, Mr. Chairman, and I have seen the documents from the Premier and others, indicating that the Comfort Cove/Newstead road would be done in the Fall of 1975

MR. MITCHELL:

or the Spring of 1976. Of course they have not been done and the only reason they have not been done is because I am the member for the district. I can see no other reason that they have not been done, Mr. Chairman. I think the people in the district realize that the reason the roads have not been done in that particular area are because I am the member; if I were a member on the other side they would probably be done. I do not think it has anything to do with the quality or caliber of the individual who might occupy the seat, it happens to be which party they represent in this house, and I am sure all members on this side agree and probably most of the guys on the other side agree as well.

But the point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that this government is hindering its own rural development policies, its own resource emphasis that it is trying to create in this Province because of childish, silly political undertakings. Let me put it that way, Mr. Chairman, because that is exactly the way it is. Any sensible government, Mr. Chairman, would see the need to pave as quickly as possible the Comfort Cove - Newstead road and to upgrade the Notre Dame Junction road because of the industry that is developing there. Mr. Chairman, I make no bones about the fact that the unemployment problem in Newfoundland is not as relevant in my district as it is in other districts in the Province. The unemployment situation in my district is not bad at all in terms of the Province itself. I do not know what the percentages are but I would say that the percentages of unemployment in my district are probably about half what they are throughout the Province itself because of the tremendous economic base that Lewisporte has and the tremendous economic base that other communities surrounding Lewisporte have as well. I would call upon the Minister of Transportation, Mr. Chairman, to give some serious consideration to this Comfort Cove - Newstead road. I am sure the Minister of Fisheries would agree with what I am saying, that there is developing in Comfort Cove at the moment one of the most efficient fish operations in Newfoundland; as I mentioned a moment ago,

MR. WHITE: the ice is still in the bay but they are operating twenty-four hours a day. It is the same in Lewisporte, and we have wholesale firms in Lewisporte as well. The oil company is located in Lewisporte and this year, for the first time in history, Lewisporte harbour has been kept open all year round by an icebreaker because this year the export wood and export lumber that Mr. Van Beke is processing in Newfoundland is all being shipped out through Lewisporte. Because of the increase in flights going out of Gander there is an extra tanker a month coming into Lewisporte to unload gasoline, and yet it is reaching the stage now where it is almost impossible to drive more than twenty or thirty miles an hour over the Junction road, and over the Comfort Cove - Newstead road it is almost impossible to operate at all. So I say to the minister that in line with the government's stated resource based policy of development that he should give some serious consideration to looking at those roads in terms of economic developments and not in terms of social development. Social development we can all see is badly needed in many areas of Newfoundland in terms of paving roads and upgrading roads and so on, but in this particular instance, Mr. Chairman, it is an economic move to get involved in the pavement of those roads.

I have a few more minutes, Mr. Chairman, and I want to mention a couple of more things. The ferry services that the gentleman from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) was referring to earlier; there has been a four year battle going on, Mr. Chairman, at Change Islands with respect to getting new ferry terminals and earlier tonight when I mentioned to the gentleman from Terra Nova that the ferries - when the gentleman from Terra Nova said that the ferries were practically unfit for animals I am sure he did not mean it in that sense. What we mean is that the terminals would be unfit for animals to land. I am sure that a horse could not get aboard the ferry that is operating between Cobb's Arm and Change Islands. Mr. Chairman, at Cobb's Arm, as the Premier knows, when the Twillingate by-election was on the Premier went down aboard the boat -

PREMIER MOORES: Farewell, that is where she has to go.

MR. WHITE: That is where she has got to go, right. That is where she has got to go. And the Premier went down aboard the boat at Cobb's Arm. He knows the condition

MR. F. WHITE: of the terminal there. It is scandalous and it would not be tolerated in any other Province in this nation. At Change Islands the same thing exists. They bought the old Botwood, which is an old boat, they have turned it over, bottom-up, and that is the only thing that is used on Change Islands for a ferry terminal, an old vessel.

AN HON. MEMBER: Built the road.

MR. F. WHITE: You built the road, right! You built the road and I want to come to that. Now, Mr. Chairman, four years ago, back when the federal election was on, and a gentleman, a good friend of mine, Mr. Rupert Short, from Lewisporte, was running as the PC candidate, the Premier went down to Change Islands with Mr. Short and some people there confronted him with respect to their problems. And the main problem at that time seemed to be that they wanted a ten mile section of road built from Change Islands to the South end of the Island. If the order of things were followed, the people would go from Change Islands to South End and take the ferry across to Fairwell, which would put the entire ferry service in Lewisporte district because Fairwell is in Lewisporte district, and would cut the time to fifteen minutes from forty-five minutes and would also mean a year round operation because the channel -

AN HON. MEMBER: The channel stays open.

MR. F. WHITE: That is right. The channel between Fairwell and South End, Change Islands is open year round. And now for four years this has been going on. The road was built by the provincial government - I agree the road was built by the provincial government - at that time because it was an election promise and it was one of the few that were kept but the road was built and yet it is a road going nowhere! A million dollar road going into the trees, nowhere! All it is used for today is, as the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications knows because I have had some chats with him about this, all it is used is for guys going up and cutting a bit of firewood once in a while. And here is a million dollars that was spent to put a road to a new ferry terminal site that has not even

MR. F. WHITE: been designed. Now I am told by Ottawa that when the provincial government agreed to build that particular road that they did not even check with Ottawa, they just went and built it on their own assuming that after they had the road built that Ottawa would be put a ferry terminal at the other end. And Ottawa says, well, the Newfoundland Government cannot just go and build roads wherever they want to build roads and expect the federal government to then and come along and build a ferry terminal there. That is what they say.

MR. NEARY: Is that the logical place?

MR. F. WHITE: Oh, it is the logical place. It is the ideal place for the ferry terminal. It is where the ferry terminal has to go. But all I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that why does it take three or four years to reach agreement with Ottawa on two small ferry terminals to serve 500 people?

PREMIER MOORES: The road is in a logical place (inaudible) that is the reason why the ferry (inaudible).

MR. F. WHITE: Well, the ferry terminal should be built there, of course. But I hope you do not operate on logic only.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

MR. F. WHITE: But, Mr. Chairman, all I am trying to say is that I hope now that this minister, the new Minister of Transportation and Communications—and I believe that he will—in the next few months work out a suitable agreement with Ottawa to provide the ferry terminals for Change Islands because it must be done. Now what do we do, Mr. Chairman? I have gone down to Change Islands and Change Islands, as most people know here, has been a traditionally PC community ever since Confederation. And I guess that was one of the reasons why it was sort of taken out of Fogo district and put into Lewisporte district in the jerryandering process to try to shore up the member who was in Lewisporte district at the time, and some of the good Liberal areas were taken out and put into some other areas. But aside from that fact, I have gone to Change Islands on a number of occasions, many occasions, and it is pretty frustrating. The people say to me that they think I am concerned, they think that Mr.

MR. F. WHITE: Baker is concerned sometimes, they think that the government is concerned sometimes, but after three years what do you do I have gone to Ottawa and met with Lang three or four times, and I have talked to the former minister and the present minister, but get nowhere. It is just tied up bureaucratic red tape. So what do they do? The only thing that I know to do at the moment, and I have suggested this to the people of Change Islands, is that we might hire four or five buses and load them up with people from Change Islands and go up and sit on the steps of the Parliament Building in Ottawa for a few days. Now we are talking about that at the moment and that is what we might have to do to get some national attention, and then we might get Brother Lang -

PREMIER MOORES: If you are going to do that (inaudible).

MR. F. WHITE: - yes - and get something done about this situation. Because it is pretty frustrating for a community that has a total, solid economic base. There are no welfare cases on Change Islands, not a single one, everybody is working. At the present moment I suppose - not at the moment, nobody

MR. F. WHITE: is working because they are all on unemployment insurance, but I would say that in every house on Change Islands, or just about every house, there are two unemployment cheques coming in at the moment. In another month or so all the women will go back to work in the fish plant and all the men will go back fishing, and yet it is pretty frustrating when you see a situation that exists at the moment where two governments after three years cannot come to agreement to satisfy 500 people. I know that it is tied into the whole Northeast Coast area, but I would urge the minister to come to some agreement on this situation and maybe, if he gets a chance, to go out and look at the situation that exists at Cobb's Arm and Change Islands because it is appalling, it is scandalous and it should not be tolerated, and I am sure that in any other Canadian province it would not be tolerated.

One other point, Mr. Chairman, that I wanted to bring to the minister's attention - and I hope that he gives some thought to this - and that is with respect to communications. Nobody has mentioned this. I am wondering what this government is doing with respect to cable television in Newfoundland.

I read a speech a couple of days ago by Jeanne Sauve, the federal Minister of Communications, and she has stated categorically that she is prepared to release some of the federal responsibilities with respect to cable television to the provinces. I am not sure that this Province has done anything with respect to trying to get some control over cable T.V. I think they should. It would be an important step. Cable T.V. is one of the most significant electronic developments of the century. At the moment the Japanese have developed, with cable television, over 700 channels, and that is amazing when you think of 700 cable T.V. channels in Japan.

MR. F. WHITE: Last year in the Budget Speech in this House, the present Minister of Transportation, last year the Finance Minister, indicated there was a plan to put a tax on cable television. I notice that was dropped from the Budget this year. I guess it was dropped because you cannot put a tax on something you have no control over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible) on the subscription.

MR. F. WHITE: It is on the subscription, is it?

MR. DOODY: People who buy the service pay it (inaudible)

MR. F. WHITE: Oh, I see. Okay. Well, I thought there would be a more significant kind of thing because if -

MR. DOODY: It is the same thing.

MR. F. WHITE: - yes - because if we had gotten into cable T.V.-and the hon. gentleman from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) suggested last year that municipalities be given the option of trying to take over cable television and it would be a very significant step in terms of the -

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible) it would have.

MR. F. WHITE: - yes, that is right - of the difficulty that municipalities are having in trying to develop revenue sources at the moment.

So I say to the Minister of Transportation and Communications that some attempt should be made to try to start some arrangements with Ottawa in terms of getting jurisdiction over cable T.V. Within twelve months you will see Quebec, Alberta and Manitoba with jurisdiction over cable T.V. and I would hope that this Province will be not very far behind.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, so far for the last hour or hour and a half we have been hearing district speeches. If we can get agreement from the other side, I would just as soon go into an item by item analysis of the estimates. We only have slightly over an hour left and the minister can answer any of the questions that were raised on the various subheads.

MR. DOODY: If the gentleman will yield I will answer the questions now.

MR. NEARY: Well, I mean, I will yield, but how long is the minister going to take? Because we only have a little over an hour and would it not be better if we did it item by item?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: I have a few things to say, 'Steve'.

MR. DOODY: It would be a courtesy to these people who asked questions to reply.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, obviously there is no agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if we cannot get into an item by item analysis, Sir, of the estimates, then we may as well just carry on, I suppose, with the speeches. Well, that is not the proper way to do the estimates.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. F. WHITE: Well, let us start going down item by item.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what I am trying to get agreement on from the minister, but the minister will not agree. We only have slightly over an hour to go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: I have asked hon. members to let me take fifteen or twenty minutes to reply to some of these very interesting and worthwhile questions that have been raised.

MR. NEARY: Well, the minister can give us the answers as we go down through the subheads.

MR. DOODY: Well, I suggested in the beginning that we do the subheads, but hon. gentlemen opposite wanted to make speeches.

MR. NEARY: Well, it is not too late. We still have over an hour and we can do a fair amount of work in an hour if the hon. gentleman will agree.

MR. DOODY: If the gentleman will yield for a second, when I started the estimates I spoke for about five or ten minutes and said that I thought the Committee would be more interested in doing the subheads than in getting into long, involved speeches and I have been waiting ever since, but since that time I have got about eight pages or more of questions, many of which I think are very significant and worthy of answer and worthy of comment and I have absolutely no intention of ignoring them. They have been raised by conscientious representatives of various districts and I am going to do the best I can to respond to them.

MR. NEARY: Alright then, Mr. Chairman, I will flick a few questions at the minister and see if we - if the minister will jot these down and give us the answers when the hon. gentleman gets up.

MR. S. NEARY: The first question I want to put to the minister is found on page 31 of the Auditor General's Report, "Cost of extension of highway contract exceeding original contract." I want the minister to give us some information on this particular subhead. "The Public Tender Act, 1974, requires that, with certain exceptions, public tenders shall be called for the execution of public works. One of these exceptions applies where the work is an extension of an existing highway contract at the same unit price as that provided in the highway contract of which it constitutes an extension. In June 1976, according to the Auditor General, who is a servant of this House - this is not partisan politics - "the Department of Transportation and Communications called public tenders, as is required by the Act, for the paving of a number of roads in a particular district. However, there is documented evidence that by direction the work contained in the tender call was to be given as an extension of a contract awarded to a company in the previous year. The company was informed that the tender call was cancelled and it was being approached to undertake the paving of a number of other roads as an extension to the contract awarded to it in August 1975. It is on record that senior officials of the department were aware that the Public Tender Act, 1974 was being contravened because this extension was not at the same unit prices as contained in the 1975 contract but included some negotiated, higher unit prices. In August 1976, two months after the extension had been awarded, a Minute of Council was issued authorizing the Minister of Transportation and Communications to extend the existing (1975) paving contract with the company for an additional amount of about \$441,444. Of that amount, \$47,565 represents the amount negotiated for unit prices not in the original contract. The cost of the extension above, exceeded that of the original contract which had amounted to \$386,998. My audit of matters related to this transaction disclosed that it was highly irregular in that; (i) The Public Tender Act, 1974 was apparently contravened with the knowledge of senior officials of the department and (ii) Minute of

MR. S. NEARY: Council ordering the extension may have been ultra vires in describing the extension in terms at variance with the act." Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a pretty serious charge and so far we have not had an explanation from the minister or a clarification on why and how this happened. There seems to be a little bit of hanky-panky and skulduggery, Sir, involved in this transaction and it is incumbent upon the minister to straighten this out now while we are doing the minister's estimates and the only chance I may get to put the question because apparently we have gotten into a debate on district matters and the only chance I have to put the question to the minister is now while I am on my feet. And then, Sir, the minister might also explain the item on page 30 of the Auditor General's Report "Irregular payment to a company resulting in loss of revenue." The Auditor General refers to "Sub-division 1705 - 07-01, Transportation Development-DREE (Capital). An advance payment in the amount of \$460,000 was made to a construction company in lieu of Provincial Sales Tax Assessment. In the Spring of 1976 the department inserted a clause into its contracts for that year, intending by this clause that, if the Department of Finance levied tax on fabrication involved in highway projects, it would be absorbed by the Department of Transportation and Communications. In other words," says the Auditor General, "the department would pay this additional tax, if levied, as an extra to the contract. On August 3, 1976, the company was awarded a contract in excess of \$7 million to construct an overpass." So I presume the project being referred to here, Sir, is the harbour arterial road because that is the only place that I know that in last year that an overpass was being built. And so a contract was awarded for \$7 million, I believe to a mainland company.

MR. DOODY: Lundrigan's.

MR. S. NEARY: Lundrigan's. Well, it was awarded to - I thought it might be Pitts but the hon. gentleman says Lundrigan's. Well, Sir, the question here is would Lundrigan's have been the successful bidder, would they have been the lowest bidder if they had not gotten this concession - and later they discovered that they had to pay the sales tax - did that give

MR. S. NEARY: them an edge? I think this is the big point here. "After considerable correspondence between both parties, and with the Department of Finance and the Department of Justice, a Minute of Council dated the 29 September 1976 was issued, ordering that a sum to the maximum of \$460,000 be negotiated with the company. On the 8 November 1976 a cheque for \$460,000 was sent to the company. As a result of audit of correspondence and other documentation related to this matter I have the following comments: (i) The Department of Transportation and Communications should have consulted the Department of Justice for a legal opinion."

MR. S. NEARY: There is no provision in the Financial Administration Act for such advance payments; the intention of the Minute of Council should have been to pay this sum over the term of the contract, that is, the tax liability; the project is cost-shareable under the federal/provincial DREE agreement whereby the Government of Canada agrees to reimburse the Province for 75 per cent of the direct costs incurred on this job. A payment of SSA in this manner is not shareable under the agreement, therefore the consolidated revenue fund of the Province is deprived of \$345,000. These two items, Mr. Chairman should be clarified and explained to this hon. House.

These matters are not raised by members on this side of the House, these matters are raised by the Auditor General. And as members know, the Auditor General is a servant of this House, completely independent of politics. And the Auditor General says in the first example that I gave, "Cost of extension of highway contract exceeding original contract" that the Public Tendering Act was not only contravened but the awarding of the contract was ultra vires. These are pretty serious charges, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOODY: Might be. Might be ultra vires.

MR. S. NEARY: No, Sir. The hon. gentleman says the extension may have been ultra vires—that is right. And so these are pretty serious charges, Mr. Chairman, and they should be cleared up.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to have a few words also about the government air services. As far as I can hear, Sir, from my usual reliable sources of information, the government aircraft is still being abused and misused by ministers of the government. Again I am going to ask the minister to table the log of that aircraft, to table the log of all the trips that were made, why these trips were made, who was carried on board on these trips? In other words, a log of every time the aircraft went aloft and who used the aircraft. We have asked for this information, Sir, year after year and the government have refused to give it to us. This year we are hoping that the new

MR. S. NEARY: Minister of Transportation and Communications will agree to let us have this information because the reports that I am hearing, Sir, about the use and misuse of this aircraft would make your hair stand on end. And the hon. gentleman, the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) gets up and talks about the wonderful air ambulance service that is being provided by this aircraft and I am told you cannot even get a stretcher into it.

AN HON. MEMBER: What are you talking about?

MR. S. NEARY: Well, I am told that you cannot.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am told, Sir, that you cannot carry a stretcher case in that aircraft unless you take the person off, put the stretcher in then put the person in after.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. S. NEARY: That is true. The aircraft is not built for carrying stretcher cases, emergency cases and all of this is a camouflage. It is all a gigantic bluff, Sir. The aircraft is used mainly for bringing ministers back and forth across the Province and over to the mainland.

AN HON. MEMBER: What aircraft?

MR. S. NEARY: The King Air. Mr. Chairman, I will in due course introduce into this House a piece of evidence to show members of this House that this particular aircraft was used to convey an illegal weapon over to Montreal from this Province an illegal weapon.

MR. DOODY: Voluntary.

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, I will produce the evidence in due course.

AN HON. MEMBER: Like the evidence you produced last time!

MR. S. NEARY: And if the hon. gentleman wants to produce the evidence, all he has to do is ask his colleagues who sits to his right and he will get all the evidence he wants. And this is the kind of thing that that aircraft is being used for. And you know, Mr.

April 6, 1978

Tape 695 (Night Session)

DW - 3

MR. S. NEARY: Chairman, the government would have had a new aircraft which would have cost the taxpayers of this Province over a million dollars, a million and a quarter dollars, only I happened to go down to Torbay one day, down at the RCAF station and saw this big, posh luxury aircraft parked hid away behind the hanger and I went across tarmac with a camera and I took a picture of the aircraft and then the government backed away. The aircraft had been brought down -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: - they were going to trade the old King Air

MR. NEARY: and get this new one.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Well, I saved the taxpayers over \$1 million because, Mr. Chairman, it would only cost \$100,000 to overhaul the present King Air that the government have. They were going to buy a new one, but they were not long changing their minds when they discovered that somebody on this side of the House knew that the aircraft was parked down there. So, Mr. Chairman, let us hope that we will get some information on the use or the misuse and the abuse of this aircraft by ministers.

Mr. Chairman, another question that the hon. gentleman might jot down and give us an answer to and this involves the turnover of intraprovincial ferries by the government of Canada. How are these negotiations progressing?

MR. DOODY: Your colleague wants to know about that too.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I want to ask the hon. gentleman a couple of more questions about it, too. How are the negotiations going? The government of Canada is trying to buy its way out of their involvement in the intraprovincial ferry operations in this Province, which are really provincial jurisdiction anyway. They are provincial jurisdiction, every province of Canada. So the federal government got on the hook and now they are trying to get off the hook and they are trying to turn these ferry services back to the provincial government, they are trying to buy their way out. Well, I hope their settlement will be very generous to the Province because I happened to be born and raised on an island and had a lot to do with improving the existing ferry service between Bell Island and Portugal Cove. And that brings me to my second question with regard to ferry service operations. The minister had a delegation in to see him yesterday from Bell Island trying to find out if the government are going to put up the money this year to provide a second ferry operating, say, from the first of June till the middle of October or the last of October between Bell Island and Portugal Cove. I would like for the minister to give us some information on this matter and tell us whether or not that service will be operating this coming Summer.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, will the minister also jot down this question and give us the answer? I do not expect to get the answer, Sir, I am sure the minister will get up and make a speech and still give the house no information, but while I have a chance and I am on my feet, it may be the last chance I will have tonight, would the minister tell us what parts of the Trans Canada Highway are going to be upgraded under this fifty-fifty deal with the government of Canada in this fiscal year? Will it be the Eastern part, will it be the Central part, or will it be in Western Newfoundland?

MR. PECKFORD: Right around the Green Bay area.

MR. NEARY: I can tell the minister where the minister should concentrate his efforts and that is on the Trans-Canada Highway West of Stephenville; that is about the worst part of the Trans Canada Highway. I was out there two weeks ago and it is just like riding a bucking bronc going from Stephenville down to Port aux Basques. That is the worst part of the Trans-Canada Highway, then there is another bad section East of Gander. But I believe the minister should tell us where the money is going to be spent, what parts of the Trans-Canada Highway are going to be upgraded. The minister should also give us a list of the capital works projects for his department this year. We have been trying every year now for six or seven years to get a list from the minister of where roads are going to be paved, where roads are going to be reconstructed and where roads are going to be built in this fiscal year. I am hoping the minister will provide the committee with that information.

MR. DOODY: Another time honoured tradition.

MR. NEARY: Well, will the minister make a note of it?

MR. DOODY: I have that.

MR. NEARY: The minister has that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to the airplane again for a minute because the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) reminded me of something when the hon. gentleman was praising the government for their wonderful air-ambulance service. Well, Sir, I want to tell the hon. gentleman, and I can see my friend from Eagle River

MR. BENT: (Mr. Strachan) just outside the door there listening to me, that not only in Labrador do people have to pay for their air-ambulance service; they also have to pay for it here on the Island of Newfoundland. And I would like to know, Sir, how many emergency air flights were made from Gander in the past year

MR. NEARY: where the cases had to be flown in by commercial aircraft because the government aircraft was not available, it was being used by ministers for jetting around the Province and around the Mainland of Canada, and as I said, in one case carrying an illegal weapon up to Montreal.

MR. DINN: You cannot jet around in a Turbo prop aircraft, you have to jet around in a jet.

MR. DOODY: What kind of weapon (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I will tell the hon. gentleman at an opportune time about the illegal weapon that was transported to Montreal.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I would like for the minister to enlighten us, and just for the benefit of nobody else in this House but the hon. gentleman from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), to tell us how many emergency cases were flown in from Gander by commercial aircraft and then the bill sent to the people for the trip amounting in a good number of cases to several hundred dollars and in some cases thousands of dollars. That is the kind of an air ambulance service we have. And to listen to the hon. gentleman you would swear that it was not costing the people a cent. But it is costing, and it is costing the member's constituents a few dollars. Every time they are forced to use a commercial aircraft, the people are sent the bill. It is not at government expense.

So there are a few questions for the hon. gentleman, Sir. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will take my seat and give the hon. gentleman a chance -

AN HON. MEMBER: No, you will not.

MR. NEARY: - not to get up and make a speech but to get up and give us some information. There are enough questions there now to keep the hon. gentleman going for the next fifteen or twenty minutes.

MR. NOLAN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Young) Order, please! Before I recognize the next speaker, I must say for the information of the Committee that as the debate closes on T. and C. at ten minutes to eleven I will recognize the hon. minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY:

I do not know why that happens, Mr. Chairman. Every time I stand up the Minister of Municipal Affairs leaves. It is probably a coincidence, I do not know.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to try to handle as many of these questions and problems and areas of concern that were raised by hon. members on both sides of the House in the time that is available to me. I will resist the impulse and the temptation to make a speech. I realize that my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) would very much enjoy my so doing, but I will resist the temptation.

The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) spoke in the lead off and mentioned the fact that perhaps some of the statements that I have made in the opening comments were idealistic, and perhaps that is true. Perhaps I have been idealistic, but I firmly believe that these ideals are not worthy of being cast aside. I think they are worthy of consideration, should be pursued and hopefully can be realized.

The points raised about those roads which have been built with DREE money, and the statements made that without DREE funds the roads would have to be built anyway and, therefore, the money that was spent by DREE should have been in some way or other found in the provincial treasury to build roads in other places, is a simplistic situation really. If DREE had not come in with the assistance to build these major trunk roads, the Northern Peninsula Road, the Burgeo Road, the Burin Peninsula Road, the Bonavista

April 6, 1978

Tape 697 (Night)

EC - 3

MR. DOODY: Loop Road, the Hermitage Road
and other roads, it would take quite a while, Your Honour,
for the

MR. DOODY:

Province of Newfoundland to find the necessary funds to do them and there will be many, many small, secondary roads which need paving and upgrading which would not be realizeable for a great many years to come even today, Sir, with the help of DREE and the Government of Canada and with our own networks to try to get roads paved and so on. I understand that now in the Province we have a total paved mileage of about 2,955 miles and we have a total gravel mileage of about 2,400 miles, about 2,950 miles of paved road and about 2,400 miles of gravel road. And let there be no misunderstanding about it, Mr. Chairman, in this Province today there is no such thing as a good gravel road. If the road is not paved up to a reasonable standard it is not an acceptable road. The day is gone, the expectations are here, people want them. Whether it is reasonable or sensible to expect that these things can be provided is another item and perhaps we can have a debate on that somewhere along the line. The fact of the matter is that the only member of this House that I am aware of since I have sitting in here who did not bring in a delegation from his district asking for a paved road irrespective of any other problems or priorities or programs was the member for Twillingate.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Neither did I.

MR. DOODY: The hon. member for Menihek tells me that he also has not brought in such a petition.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Not a delegation.

MR. DOODY: You brought in a delegation. Not a delegation no, a petition. The simple truth of the matter is while hon. members on both sides of the House - I have heard the hon. members for St. John's Centre (Mr. A. Murphy) and St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and myself and others stand and support petitions from various parts of the Province asking for paved roads and for pavement and for improved road connections and so on. Despite the fact that we all protest that there is not enough money being spent on education and there is not enough money being spent on health and we cannot afford to have all these luxuries, there is really nobody in this

MR. DOODY: hon. House who is willing to face the facts when he gets home to his own district and tell the people that we just cannot have these things, we have other things to do.

MR. F. WHITE: If they had not been promised they would do that.

MR. DOODY: Well, that could very well be so.

MR. NOLAN: Would you permit a question?

MR. DOODY: Certainly.

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

MR. NOLAN: Surely the hon. member must realize I am sure that if there was fair and equal distribution of the funds on transportation in all districts, then perhaps we would not have the same problems.

MR. DOODY: That might very well be true. I cannot argue with that. What I would argue with of course is the definition of 'fair' and 'equal'. There are some people in the Province who feel that they have been neglected for an awfully long while and have an awful lot of catching up to do and deserve a large amount of pavement. There are other people in the Province who have had a reasonably high standard of road transportation provided for them and who have had the honour of seeing a few miles or a few hundred miles of pavement laid some time ago and as the result of which take the extension and upgrading of it as a matter of course and expectation. How one applies fair and reasonable to the Province of Newfoundland in a by-partisan House, which we have, is very difficult. It is an ideal, it is one that is worthy of pursuit, I would like to see it being arranged; but I do not know how it is done quite honestly. The five year plan that my hon. friend discussed is an interesting concept and one which was seriously considered and put forward by this government. It fell apart shortly after it was produced because there were so many pressures from so many different parts of the Province to be on the first year.

AN HON. MEMBER: The first by-election.

MR. DOODY: The first by-election was the first year that the thing fell apart -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: - that is right! Exactly! And that very well may have been a factor in its happening but it is a fact of life that there are pressures

MR. DOODY: that are impossible to resist.

MR. ROBERTS: Fortunately the former minister would never give in.

MR. DOODY: I have heard people say what this government, what any government in the Province should do is first build a road to a fish plant. All those roads to fish plants which are not paved or upgraded to a reasonable standard should be those roads which get the first treatment. I have also heard arguments from people, who do not have the privilege or the opportunity to have a fish plant in their area, who do not have any work, and they say, "Are we going to sit here forever and eat dust and die and have nothing forever. You do not have a fish plant for us, you do not have jobs for us, we can not even get a road. What kind of citizens are we in this Province?"

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the farms?

MR. DOODY: The farms. The farms are in much the same position. We get down around the hon. member's area, down in that very lush, lucrative part of the Province, down in what I used to call Brownsville when I used to be down around there because of the great farmers in that part of the country.

MR. NOLAN: Why did you call our friends 'lush'?

MR. RIDEOUT: He would not say that.

MR. DOODY: I certainly would not. I think that would be unparliamentary and also inaccurate. To move along as quickly as I can under the guidelines that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has given me, the original Trans-Canada Highway the agreement was a fifty-fifty deal which was shortly thereafter expanded to an ninety-ten thing. We had to finish the drive in '65.

MR. NOLAN: Now, now!

MR. DOODY: We had to thank Mr. Pearson. But that was in a different day. We were not partisan then. There was equal distribution and all districts got the same sort of treatment. Now I do not want to suggest that this time-honoured tradition should be shattered completely, but I am willing to slide into it gradually and see if we can arrange some sort of a compromise situation. Subsequently, over a year or so ago, the government of Canada

MR. BOODY: invited the Maritime Premiers' Conference, and the government of Newfoundland participates in the transportations section of that conference, invitedly the group of four to participate in a fifty-fifty deal that there were offering the Atlantic Provinces for Trans-Canada Highway upgrading along the same sort of standard or the same sort of agreement that they had already worked out with the -

MR. JOLAN: The group of four? It sounds like China.

MR. BOODY: -The group of four? That is right - that they had worked with the group of three in the center, the Prairie Provinces. Our government agreed to participate in this on the proviso that we would go for a ninety-ten, which we eventually cut down to seventy-five - twenty-five. My predecessor, with the support of the other three Atlantic Province ministers, fought valiantly and hard for that, but there was no way it could be achieved. The detail of the new agreement is now common knowledge. It has been stated that the new agreement is built on hope. Well, fifty per cent is a lot better than nothing, The hope is certainly there, The agreement has been signed without prejudice to any recommendations made by the Sullivan Commission. Hopefully the Sullivan Commission will be more realistic in recognizing the needs of the Province of Newfoundland, in recognizing the fact that our problems are greater, that our substandard rail service, our substandard road service demands some special consideration from the rest of Canada. We have been living as a second or third class Province, we have been trying to do in twenty-five or thirty years what the other provinces have had a hundred or more years to do, and as a result of that we have got a horrendous debt problem and we have also got great expectations among the public of the Province who feel, and not without some justification, that they are entitled to the same sort of consideration that their counterparts in the rest of Canada have been receiving. I have no doubt in my mind that that is the basic reason that the people of Newfoundland voted, however reluctantly, to join Canada because they felt there would be some benefits for them. If they are to be treated on some basis other than equal Canadians then I feel that we were misled indeed.

MR. DOODY: As usual on that situation, when the four provinces went to Ottawa as a group, one caved in very quickly. In this case it was the province of Nova Scotia who were offered a retroactive deal on money they had already spent on their Trans-Canada Highway. They felt that this was an offer they could not refuse, they agreed to sign and the other two provinces quickly followed. We were left out on a limb on our own and so we made the best deal we could under the circumstances. It was certainly no discredit, as a matter of fact it was a great deal of credit to the previous Minister of Transportation and Communications who fought the fight as long and as well as he could and

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY:

- did a remarkable job on doing it. In any event, Ottawa certainly did not tell the Province who the minister should be, nor would Ottawa dare to infringe on the provincial rights to that extent nor did they suggest whom the minister should not be. It is effrontery and an insult to the Government of Canada to so suggest. We simply cannot afford to do all the work that has to be done on the Trans-Canada Highway. We should have started two, three or four years ago to work on it. The demands on secondary roads and trunk roads, on small roads and small communities and so on that have been outlined and articulated so well by my friends on both sides of the House are such as to make it obvious that the second most important thing in everybody's mind was the Trans-Canada Highway. The most important thing was that particular road through his particular district at that particular time when he brought in his particular delegation or his particular little petition into the House. And no one can belittle these things or say that they are not important, but the simple fact of the matter is, and every honest person in this House can admit it to himself, that there was never anybody or any group of people who came in with a petition or a request for a sum of money to be set aside to upgrade and do great work on the Trans-Canada Highway to the detriment of their own particular district. The Government of Canada certainly have a great responsibility in this area. The rail traffic situation is such as to demand increased wear and tear on the Trans-Canada Highway system in our Province. There was a 30 per cent subsidy for passenger rail service in the Province of Nova Scotia last year representing 30 per cent of the loss on that particular passenger service, on the rail service alone they threw that in. And any of us

MR. DOODY: who have had the privilege of driving over the major highway system in the Province of Nova Scotia and consider the fact that they also receive an 80 per cent subsidy on their rail passenger loss there can really feel with some justification that we do indeed have a legitimate right to ask Ottawa for a better deal on our Trans-Canada Highway work, or at least a reasonable sort of rail service. And so we will continue to press and push and do as much as we can along that line. If Ottawa holds tough, if Mr. Lang says, 'No,' and they will only give us 50 per cent, then 50 per cent is obviously better than nothing. But three years from now when we get down to the end of the line and if Ottawa refuses to open or re-open that negotiation despite whatever might be in that Sullivan Commission report, then the Province of Newfoundland is going to have to pay for 75 per cent of that third year and that is going to cost all of us something because that money is just not going to be available for district work and it is just as well to face it right now. The most important road in this Province is that Trans-Canada Highway. We have let it slide for far too long in the hopes of getting some federal assistance to do it. Now we have an agreement of some sort. Hopefully we can get it improved. If we cannot we are going to have to go it on our own toward the end of the agreement and the districts, all those people with those very legitimate and very reasonable requests, will just have to explain to the public of the Province that that major artery across the center is the most important part on the Island. And we have not even touched what is a second most important artery in the Province and that is the Trans-Labrador Highway which I spoke about earlier, and I will get to that in a little more detail when I get into the hon. the member for Eagle River's (Mr. Strachan) comments. But the situation is simply that we have gone the same route on that particular road

MR. DOODY: as we did on the Trans-Canada. We have been fooling around for perhaps too long hoping to get an agreement with the Government of Canada in funding that programme, and perhaps we should have been putting, as the member suggested, a relatively small amount in terms of our Budget into starting, at least, that road and getting some work done on it instead of going for the main course. And maybe that is the route we will have to take this year, but that remains to be seen.

The hon. the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) spoke about the attention to the roads in the Northeast Avalon. We hope to get some four laning done out toward Kenmount Road and in that area of the Topsail Road

MR. DOODY: under the Trans-Canada agreement when it gets started. DREE has made it quite clear that they have absolutely no interest at this point in time in the outer ring road, the cross-town road, the bifur - what is the other one called?

MR. DINN: Bifurcation.

MR. DOODY: I have great hesitation with my denture in attacking that third one, that bifur - something or other.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bifurcation.

MR. DOODY: That one, which is an absolutely ridiculous thing anyway. But anyway, DREE have made it quite clear to us that they have far too many other things of importance to get involved in in the Province. Until such time as the Harbour arterial agreement is just about finished, and the St. John's water supply is finished, they are not about to get involved in another DREE road agreement in the St. John's area.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can you blame them?

MR. DOODY: I am not saying that I can, I am just answering the question. I do not blame them. I think they have done a remarkable job in funding the St. John's area in that particular respect.

The crosstown is, as I understand it, a municipal matter but I will be talking that with Deputy Mayor O'Neill and some of his people later on in the week. We had had several appointments arranged, but for one reason or another he was tied up and never did quite make it, but hopefully during the coming week we will get together and go into that. There may be some way that the Philip Driveway thing can be worked out to the satisfaction of the city and that particular area.

Anyway, to get back to another

MR. DOODY: question that was raised by the hon. member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) concerning the Labrador barge. He felt there was a great deal of inefficiency in that piece of equipment which, in effect, was a mobile unit and it should have been brought down to the Province for repairs in Marystown sometime ago, before the freeze-up rather than left up there. So in effect, he felt that it would have to be brought down now.

The simple fact of the matter is that that barge has been left up there deliberately because we have had a lot of trouble with it. We have a new and bigger barge which is now in Argentia and it will be brought up there as soon as the season opens and it will take all of the equipment instead of only part of it, and we will be able to move it all in in units. It is a much more practical and sensible approach than the one that is up there now.

The North West River bridge; well, I am sorry, I got the message but I will be available again in another minute.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief and then I will yield to my friend from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan).

MR. MORGAN: Shot down again, 'John'.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I am in an alleged non-partisan mood so I will not reply to the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South except to tell him that people in grass huts should not stow thrones, if he talks about being shot down to my colleague from Conception Bay South.

I just wanted to ask the minister if he would deal very briefly - and I gather it must be very briefly because time is of the essence - with three matters of concern to my constituents, all of which

MR. ROBERTS: have been raised with him or with his predecessor as minister, all of which have received a sympathetic response, a polite response, but to date no active response.

The three are: First of all, the road to St. Julien's, or Grandois if one wishes. The minister and I had the pleasure of watching - I guess a film would be the best word, a T.V. presentation, courtesy of the Extension Service, prepared by the people of St. Julien's who spoke with great eloquence through the medium of the television. It is one of the few times I have seen it. I forget the technical name of it, but it consists of a television set and a small video tape recording outfit taken into a community and people can articulate their thoughts. I have seen it many times on the Labrador coast, and I think it is a marvellous means of communication. In any event, the minister and I had the pleasure of seeing this presentation. I think he would agree me that it was a very effective and eloquent plea. I would like to know what if anything can be done about it?

St. Julien's is one of the few communities left in this Province, Mr. Chairman, without a road link. I venture to say it is the only one on the Island to which it is easily practicable to build a road link that does not have a road link.

MR. PECKFORD: How many people are living there?

MR. ROBERTS: I will deal with that in a second. My hon. friend from Baie Verte - White Bay represents, among other communities, the community of Harbour Deep. I know Harbour Deep well, but it would take about thirty-five or forty miles of road through extremely difficult terrain to provide a road to Harbour Deep.

St. Julien's

MR. ROBERTS: has about 150 people - that would be an outside figure but it would not be very far off - about 150 people who have no intention of moving, with every intention of carrying on with what has become a reasonably prosperous fishing community.

Time is short so I will not go through this except to say I think the road should be built, and I believe the minister would like to see it built; the question will be whether he is able to find the dollars to have it built.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister what can be done this year about the road through Southern Labrador? We hear a great deal of talk about Labrador, a great deal of talk about the road to Labrador, all of it valid. But there is a road through the Labrador portion of my constituency - while it is still part of my constituency; hopefully in due course the wishes of the people will be heard and the people in Labrador will be given four seats entirely their own as we fought in this House to achieve despite the government's refusal to heed that request - there is a road from the border, from the Black Rocks just to the South of L'Anse au Clair which runs to Red Bay, about fifty miles to the North. The road is in bad shape. There are parts of it that are in better shape than others, but the best parts of it are in terrible shape.

And when I see that the government are doing - I saw the other day 9.1 kilometers, I believe it is, in the district represented by the hon. gentleman from St. Mary's and the Capes (Mr. W. Carter) down towards Cappahayden, a community which I am all for. That is the Southern Shore road and I am all for having it paved. Maybe it is in Ferryland district, I am

MR. ROBERTS: not sure.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is in Ferryland.

MR. ROBERTS: It is in Ferryland district but it runs into the district represented by my hon. friend the gentleman from St. Mary's and the Capes. If we can pave those roads, and I am all for it, then surely something should be done for the people in Labrador. What they are asking for is just two or three hundred thousand dollars to upgrade the road so the road can be kept clear of snow, and so it can at least be drivable and useable. A complete upgrading and paving job would cost at least \$5 million. I do not think we are going to be able to get it until we get DREE - hopefully, the next series of DREE agreements will reflect that and I would say to the minister that would depend on events which will come very shortly in another place. If they go as we believe they will and as we hope they will, I can assure the minister that he will find DREE as sympathetic toward the needs of Southern Labrador as they have been to the needs of Northern Newfoundland these last few years. The last figure I saw on that was \$34.1 million from the government at Ottawa toward the Northern Peninsula roads.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, could the minister tell us whether there will by any of the by-roads in my district paved this year? My friend from St. Barbe district (Mr. Maynard) will know whereof I speak. I gather that almost every road to every stage in St. Barbe district has been paved.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not quite.

MR. ROBERTS: "Not quite" the minister says with a smile or a smirk. I am very glad that he has done so well, but I would say, and I make no bones about it, the people in my district are beginning to wonder whether they are being punished for voting the way they did. I say to the minister that if that is their belief,

MR. ROBERTS: if I know those people, and I think that I do, they will not change their voting preferences by this kind of second-class political blackmail, they will just become more angry and more determined.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: But I do say, Sir - and I do not hold this against the present minister, as he has not been the minister - I do say there is considerable evidence and considerable belief that the people who live in the St. Barbe part of my constituency are being punished - punished is the word - deliberately because they voted Liberal. It might as well be said, and it might as well be dealt with, because people believe it to be the truth. Where the road comes up - you can drive down the Northern Peninsula Highway, Mr. Chairman, and you can tell there the physical boundary between the district represented by my friend from St. Barbe ends and the district which I represent begins. Because the main road does not run through the communities, the main is being paved by DREE - 90 per cent of the cost is paid by DREE, that \$34 million to which I referred.

The side roads through St. Barbe district are almost all paved. The community of Bellburns, birthplace of my friend the member for the constituency of Deer Lake (Mr. House), is paved. Well and good! All for it! Delighted!

MR. ROBERTS:

But how come a community as large as Flower's Cove, or a community as large as Anchor Point, or a community as large as Cook's Harbour, or Sandy Cove, and Savage Cove and Pines Cove and all the other communities, have not been paved? I say to the minister that this is the year which will tell the tale because this is the year when the main road will be paved, from Western Arm Brook, just North of the Forrester's Point area, running down as far as Eddy's Cove East. Western Construction did not do the work last year but I understand the contract is in force, they will be doing the work this year. So this is the year to pave the by-roads because the argument has always been, Mr. Chairman, the by-roads will be done when the main road is paved. With the big machines in the area, you know the equipment is in the area, the lowest unit costs, it makes a great deal of sense. And so I say to the minister in that sense, this will be a year of decision, a year when we will find out whether this government put no consideration except the cheap, scurvy, partisan considerations in mind. And if only Blue Cove and Pond Cove, which were promised to be paved last year, are paved this year, then the people in St. Barbe district will know, they will not need any argument from me, they will not need to be convinced, they will know that the reason they have not had their roads paved is that they dared to vote Liberal. And that the reason that people in St. Barbe had their roads paved, through their communities, is that they voted Progressive Conservative. And that will not change people's minds. If I am any judge of my fellow Newfoundlanders, Mr. Chairman, that will not change their minds. They will say, in Parliamentary terms, they will say, "We shall not be moved," and in the next election we shall see the results of their not being moved. But I think, Sir, that in this day and age, with a minister such as we have now, that this government will not descend to that level. That sort of thing, I would have thought went out thirty or forty or fifty or a hundred years ago. I am not talking by-elections, we all understand the pressures of by-elections.

MR. H. COLLINS: It went out in '70. I suppose.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I am very - because of a new role, which I have not entirely voluntarily assumed in this House, I would say to the hon. member for Gander (Mr. H. Collins) that he should tread dangerously. A gentleman, Mr. Chairman, with his record of achievement, a failure in every portfolio he has graced and now a disgrace to the Ministry of Health -

MR. H. COLLINS: I know all about -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the hon. gentleman knows he is a disgrace. If he had any courage he would take the biblical injunction, "And go thou and do likewise."

Mr. Chairman, I will stack my record as Minister of Health anytime against the hon. gentleman from Gander.

MR. H. COLLINS: You are only here tonight because number three leader is not here. That is all.

AN HCN. MEMBER: That is right, boy, that is right. Right on. Right on.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, where I am tonight I got on my own, which is more than the hon. gentleman from Gander can say.

Mr. Chairman, I began by saying that I did not want to be drawn into this sort of third class gutter politics, and the hon. gentleman from Gander, Sir, is a master at it and I apologize to the House and to him for allowing him to draw me into it.

Now to come back to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I make these points seriously. I think the minister will treat them seriously and I hope that he will respond in what I believe is a positive fashion. I think, Sir, these requests are reasonable. I think the people of Northern Newfoundland and Southern Labrador have a right to this kind of public service in this day and age. When I see what the government are doing elsewhere in this Province, and when people see it, because people travel, Sir, there was a time when people even on the Coast of Labrador did not know what was happening in the rest of this Province, but now they know and they know full well.

MR. ROBERTS: The people in my district know full well. And when they see what is being done elsewhere they begin to wonder if they too are Newfoundlanders, and if they too are Labradorians, or that we have two kinds of Province, two kinds of Newfoundlanders, two kinds of Labradorians, those who vote Tory, and those who vote Liberal.

So there is the challenge to the minister, and I would put it to him. I found him, in my dealings with him, to be fair and reasonable - partisan, yes. I accept that. This is a partisan business. It is a partisan House and so it should always be. But I found him to be fair and reasonable, Sir, and I would hope this year we will see some positive accomplishments in each of these three items. I believe they are the three most serious items that need attention in my district from a department of which he currently is the head. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: MR. Chairman, it appears now that we are not going to get into the estimates item by item which I would much prefer. I would prefer -

MR. PECKFORD: Sit down then and we will get into them item by item.

CAPT. WINSOR: Well, the time is gone now, we do not have the time to go through them all. There is only another twenty minutes left, Mr. Chairman, I want to question the hon. minister and I cannot but echo the sentiments uttered by my hon. colleague there that we have a lot of confidence in the minister and we hope things will go well. We feel that he will strive, and if there is any suspicion of any reaction against the public because they vote one way or the other, I think the minister now has an opportunity to prove that wrong and the only way he is going to prove it wrong is to carry out more upgrading and paving of roads in the Liberal districts. I am particularly interested at this time about Fogo Island. Mr. Chairman, the former minister visited Fogo Island, I had the privilege of visiting there with him, and if my memory serves me correctly I think the minister stated to the people who talked to him about the paved road that when the roads were upgraded then a major paving job would take place on Fogo Island. Now as far as I know practically all of the roads on Fogo Island are upgraded and are now ready for paving, and if they are not done this year, if the paving does not take place this year, then all of that upgrading will be lost because in another year you will have to do the same work all over again.

Mr. Chairman, it is a peculiar situation we have on Fogo Island. Last year it must have cost the department a tremendous amount of money when you had to truck sand—imagine having to truck sand from parts of Gander Bay across fifteen miles of water on the ferry, which takes an hour and a half, and deliver it on Fogo Island—in order to sand the roads in the Winter because salt is not permitted to be used on gravel roads; it has a tendency to deteriorate the road much more than the sand. So even that one cost alone would be eliminated, certainly

CAPT. JINSON: If not entirely it would be reduced. So I am not going to take much more time of the Committee, but I just want to point out to the minister that the people on Fogo Island are expecting year to get a start on the paving in their communities. We have ten communities on the Island and there are nine miles of paved road. In 1970 and 1971 there was a programme of stone crushing, there was enough stone crushed on Fogo Island to pave all of the roads on Fogo Island. That now has practically all disappeared and when the decision is made to pave then you are going to have to get the crusher over there again and crush another amount of stone in order to be able to do the paving. So, Mr. Chairman, we have seen the crushed stone disappear, we have seen the roads upgraded and ready for paving, most of them, so now the challenge is to the minister to make sure that that money does not go down the drain and a paving programme will be started.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Minister of Labour and manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It becomes very difficult with only twenty-five minutes left but I think as a member of the House I have a right to say something. I apologize to members opposite that we do not go item by item but there are a few things I would like to say and I will try and take as short a time as possible, five minutes or so, but I would like to say them. At another time and another place I hope to enlarge on them but a few items; number one, the question of the Trans-Labrador Highway which is a very important one to Labrador. I must say that for once in my life I agree with the hon. member for the Straits on the need for the Soutner part of Labrador. I think the questions in Eastern Labrador in respect to roads are quite important and especially in Western Labrador, the tie-up between Western Labrador and Eastern Labrador and hopefully the eventual tie-up between the packet over in the Western end of Labrador and down through the Eastern part of Labrador and down through Southern Labrador and some day hopefully to the Great Northern Peninsula. That may not be as far off as we think, but some day that certainly has to be something that we have to look forward to. We think the Trans-Labrador Highway will provide many savings in hydro electric costs that hopefully

April 9, 1978

Tape No. 704 (Night)

AM-3

MR. ROUSSEAU: will accrue in the future with the development of the Lower Churchill, but from our point of view, certainly in Labrador, we have to feel that the Trans-Labrador Highway has to be a matter of highest priority with us especially the connection between the two main towns in my district, Labrador City and Wabush and Esker. Suffice that to say. There are two other points I would like to make; one, as a former Minister of Transportation I would like to in just a few words to make sure that my position is quite clear, that I abhor

MR. J. ROUSSEAU: and violently disagree with the Federal Government's view on the user pay concept. Now it is their prerogative, of course, they are in charge of federal transportation, but I disagree with that concept. I remember when I was Minister of Transportation and Communications, we met with Mr. Marchand in Halifax and we agreed that transportation would be a tool of economic development, which I think is quite necessary to Atlantic Canada and possibly to Western Canada. All of a sudden out of the blue lands the sea gull on somebody's head -

MR. E. ROBERTS: I was out West at a conference last weekend and the one theme that underlined everything is transportation.

MR. ROUSSEAU: That is the one and I think it is unfortunate that in this instance there is only five hours that we cannot discuss that concept because while members roads are very important -

MR. E. ROBERTS: Otto Lang is not pleased with it (inaudible) people out West.

MR. J. MORGAN: That is right.

MR. E. ROBERTS: They are obvious differences.

MR. ROUSSEAU: While the members individually are worried about their own districts, and I am -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) certainly in Quebec.

MR. WHITE: Two Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: And a partridge in a pear tree.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Are you finished? May I interrupt?

But I think the concept for all members of this House and for all Newfoundlanders, the concept of the user pay is one that cannot meet with the approval of anybody in this House or any Newfoundlander or anybody in Atlantic Canada or possibly, on the other extremity, in Western Canada. The costs are fantastic and it is unfortunate that I do not have the time to really give my feelings on that matter. But as far as I was concerned the Federal Government position, according to Mr. Marchand in meetings he held with us, that transportation would be used as a

MR. ROUSSEAU: tool of economic development, changed very abruptly with Mr. Lang and became the user pay concept. That is just not something we can live with in Eastern Canada because of the cost of transportation and the result in cost and increases to the goods that we have to bring down from Central Canada.

And the third point, Mr. Chairman, and these are very quickly done, is the problem that we have in Labrador that I hope I share with my other three colleagues from Labrador, the fact that the Atlantic Provinces subsidy do not apply on goods in Labrador. The rest of Atlantic Canada get the subsidy east of Levis, Quebec, the only part of Eastern Canada, east of Levis, Quebec that does not receive this 15 per cent subsidy is Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is that?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Levis, L-e-v-i-s, Levis. The only part of Canada east of Levis, Quebec that do not receive that 15 per cent subsidy is Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is excluded.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is excluded from that and that I think is most discriminatory. I would hope that points such as these as the session progresses that the member for Labrador would be able to speak more thoroughly on and hopefully that some position might be taken and possibly a resolution signed on behalf of the four members representing Labrador to have Labrador included in the freight rate subsidy. And included in that would be a good idea, that I certainly would not mind at all co-sponsoring it, to induce the Federal Government to enlarge that scope of the subsidy to include not only Levis, Quebec East and New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and the Island of Newfoundland, and also enlarge it to include the mainland portion of our Province, the part of Labrador. As I said, I would only take a few minutes. These are points, obviously, Mr. Chairman, which we should go into much greater length on. But just to put our feelings on the record, how we feel, and as I say again I throw out to my other three colleagues who represent other seats in Labrador that probably a co-sponsorship of a

MR. DOUSSEAU: resolution from the House of Assembly asking the Federal Government to extend this subsidy to Labrador would be one that might be quite useful and might be thought about in the future and hopefully will bring some advice.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Chairman, to try to skim through as many of these as quickly as I can as I did the last time I was on, I just answered the questions on the Labrador barge for the mobile equipment. There is a job in one community there that has to be finished that was started last year. We will get in there this year and finish that and then hopefully we will get on to the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) suggests that Fox Harbour is the next priority so perhaps we can discuss that and he can explain it to me in greater detail.

With the mobile unit, did you say that Fox Harbour was the most pressing need?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes.

MR. DOODY: So I was suggesting we have a job under way there now which the mobile has to go in and finish this year, the one that was started last year, and

MR. DOODY:

then perhaps -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Rigolet.

MR. DOODY:

Yes, Rigolet, and then perhaps we will discuss the Fox Harbour one, but we can get into that at a later date. The North West River bridge unfortunately has not been raised. As somebody suggested, it is still up in the air. I was talking to the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) this morning on some detail. He was obviously interested in the situation regarding it. People are aware of the fact that we had a \$2.8 million DREE commitment. We had the low bid of \$3.8 million which came to something over \$4 million when the engineering costs and so on were added in. This was far in excess of what we were capable of providing and so we have gone back to the consultants and the engineers asking for a redesign. We are running into a major concern there. The big expense is in the foundations, the underpinnings of the bridge, as it were, and the superstructure which can be cut back on. It will not make a significant difference in the cost. And so we have gone back to look for a new design. Hopefully we should have that in a day or two and as soon as we can come up with something reasonable we will be in a position to make a more comprehensive report on that, but that is obviously a matter of vital concern in that area and one that has to get underway. As I say, in the next day or two we should have something more definite on it.

The Baie Verte road work, the hon. member raised that in some detail as well he might. I had mentioned it in my opening comments. I hesitate, and indeed I will not put a price tag on what will be spent this year; I am not in that category. All I can do is say that we will do what can possibly and physically and sensibly and reasonably be done on both these roads this

MR. DOODY: year. What I would like to do is have one more go at DREE to see if we can convince them that the extension of the Fleur de Lys could be considered as part of that peninsula road, and if we can convince them of that and get them involved in that end of it, we can take on the Seal Cove road and do that pretty quickly.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. DOODY: Well, that is right. But if they will not go along with that and then they have some good reasons, well - so far we have not been successful, but before I make a commitment here I would like to have an opportunity to have one more go around with Mr. Lessard. It has been on the shopping list - which they quite rightly call a shopping list - we send up a list of roads which we would like them to participate in and it is -

MR. RIDEOUT: It is a physical extension
(inaudible)

MR. DOODY: That is right, It is a normal and natural extension of what they have already been involved in and I think we can make a pretty legitimate and reasonable case on it and if hon. members opposite could perhaps drop a note to some friends up there and do a little bit of twisting it might help. In any event, even if we do not, we will do what can physically be done on these roads during this year, and it make take two to three years to get them up to what has to be done in Health and Safety standards but certainly it will be done and it is one of our major concerns. I have Don Jamieson's name written here as a note. Maybe it is some sort of a reflex action, I do not know. The Sullivan Commission not talked about. The member for Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe) raised the Roaches Line access road question, on the heavy traffic flow there and the attention it should have; the Carbonear by-pass, and once again the planning has been done on that, the costing

MR. DOODY: has been done. The Roaches Line road itself will be expanded, extended, upgraded and hooked on to the Carbonear by-pass when it is built. But it is in the planning stage and it would be futile to say that it will be done this year, but it is one of the items that the department has on the top of its list down there as a major priority item. And I was not aware of it until the hon. member mentioned tonight about the amount of traffic that is on that particular road. I had an opportunity to chat with the officials of the department who were inside here and they assured me that it was indeed a fact and one that we should give a great deal of attention to. And indeed, they have the planning already done on it and we have learned a great deal from that this evening.

I guess this might be an appropriate time, if we have time, to discuss a question that has been raised by several members and that is the situation regarding the provincial ferry system and

MR. DOODY: our relationship with Ottawa on that particular area. As one hon. member member has pointed out, Ottawa has been trying to buy its way out of its commitment to the Island ferry-or to the provincial ferry system, the six ferries which it has. Five of these ferries, the agreement with Ottawa expired on the end of March and they were perfectly entitled under the arrangement to cancel the ferry service on these five Northeast Coast ferries. The Bell Island situation is a slightly different one; the contract runs until 1985. We have agreed with the government of Canada, or they have been kind enough to agree with us. I should phrase it, to extend that agreement for another six months while we work out a reasonable arrangement suitable to both parties and I think it can be done. The government of Canada would like the Province of Newfoundland to have some input both in terms of dollars and in terms of regulation and in terms of management and organization of the ferry service, and I think that that is a reasonable and sensible approach. I do not honestly think that the ferry service in the Province of Newfoundland, even if the government of Canada is paying for it, can get the attention that it deserves from that distance. I think that if we have some small financial input in there we can take a more responsible and more active concern with the ferry services and with the terminals, which point has been raised. So what we are trying to do now, and Ottawa and Mr. Lang appear to be receptive, is to get an escalator on the shared cost part of it over a period of years to come, and a capital grant to upgrade and improve the ferry terminals which are now in a state of decomposition, as the hon. member so graphically described this evening. The government of Canada seems to be receptive to that. It has been suggested that this is the only province in Canada that has an arrangement with Ottawa on provincial services. That is not so. British Columbia has an arrangement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who?

MR. DOODY: The province of British Columbia has a very involved and complicated arrangement with the government of Canada. They cost share the ferry service among the islands. As a matter of fact, Mrs.

MR. DOODY: Campagnolo almost blew her top a few months ago when the federal government stopped the subsidy to the government of British Columbia and the ferry service literally stopped. She got quite excited about it and they eventually worked out a new arrangement. The previous arrangement had been, I discovered, that the government of British Columbia were paying eighty per cent and the government of Canada were paying twenty per cent. But when they finally put the ferry service back in operation the British Columbia government paid eighty-five per cent and the government of Canada paid fifteen per cent. So she was successful in getting the service back on although it cost the province a few extra dollars, but they did get that escalator clause in there so that it is indexed now, that fifteen per cent federal input is indexed to cost of operations and the cost maintenance and the cost of terminal facilities and so on. I think we will probably work out some sort of an arrangement like that, certainly not in that scope, we are not in a position to pick up eighty or eighty-five per cent of the cost of these ferries, nor do I suggest that Mr. Lang thinks that we should. But I do believe that he thinks we should participate in the operation and there is some justification, I think, in that stance.

For some reason the schedule of ferries that were discussed, who has the responsibility for seeing that they run on time or if they run or who enforces it or who is responsible, for some strange reason, which I do not quite understand but perhaps my friend the Minister of Justice may be able to tell me later on, the CTC that has the responsibility for all these ferries with the exception of the Bell Island ferry which is the responsibility of our Public Utilities Board. The Public Utilities Board, if you remember, the Bell Island ferry company, the company who operates that, applied for a huge increase a year or so ago. It was opposed by the people of Bell Island, opposed by ourselves and by others and our Appeal Board turned down their application for a rate increase, and if it is so there is some local control through the appeal bit.

MR. LUSH: Would the minister permit?

MR. DOODY: Sure.

MR. LUSH: This is not to sort of divert the minister from what

April 6, 1978

Tape No. 707 (orig)

ME-3

MR. LUSK: he is talking about, but it seems to me that I
can recall vaguely, and I may be wrong and may be the Minister of Tourism
is more familiar than I am myself, but it seems to me there is a regulation

MR. LUSH: within the terms of operation of the ferries that they can be placed under the Public Utilities Board with respect to rates. Now I am not sure, but it seems a vague recollection. I wonder if the minister would know?

MR. DOODY: I think you are probably right. I think that there is a provision in the agreement which says that that can be so, but I think you will find that that is also tied into the federal government's increasing requests for us to take a financial share. And we have been saying, 'No, we are not having any part of it at all.'

MR. NEARY: The only reason the Bell Island ferry is under the Public Utilities Board is because they granted them a franchise.

MR. DOODY: They granted them a franchise.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. HICKMAN: Plus the fact there is a ferry tax (inaudible)

MR. DOODY: It was a strange sort of deal that was worked out under peculiar circumstances, as the hon. member is well aware.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Under that act.

MR. DOODY: Yes, that is right, You are more familiar with it than anybody else here in the House and it is probably one that would not serve us as well to delve -

MR. NEARY: A good law.

MR. DOODY: The people on Bell Island are not very pleased with it.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) Why would it not?

MR. NEARY: They are not too pleased with the minister.

MR. DOODY: Well, they were certainly not

MR. DOODY: very pleased with their previous member either, but I am willing to go back and face them in the next election and that probably makes a bit of difference.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) if the minister had not gone back to face them and that is the trouble.

MR. DOODY: No, that is right.

MR. MORGAN: He would not do what you did.

MR. NEARY: Put on the old (inaudible)
Give us some real information. Never mind the pussyfooting.

MR. DOODY: The gentleman who is going to get the award for the track star of the year, the long distance runner -

AN HON. MEMBER: The LaPoile (inaudible).

MR. DOODY: Yes. Hopefully most of these things that we are dealing with now - and I am saying hopefully only, because I have no prior knowledge - but hopefully an awful lot of these things will be raised in that Sullivan Commission report which is to be presented to the Government of Canada in mid-April and the translation will be done during the few weeks prior to that and apparently it is scheduled to become public knowledge by the middle of May, and I would think that an awful lot of the transportation problems in the Province will at least be addressed or raised in that particular report. I am not optimistic enough to think that they will all be resolved at that time, but they will certainly be raised.

AN HON. MEMBER: Good.

MR. DOODY: The gentleman from Eagle River asked on the Labrador Highway - I touched on that briefly a few minutes ago and suggested that the Government of Newfoundland has certainly not applied enough attention to it, but I would like my friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) to have a few words on that. He has had an opportunity to look at that report and I am sure that he is quite interested in it.

MR. DOODY: The economic feasibility of that highway, as I said, has been demonstrated, and the William Carson, as was pointed out to me a few minutes ago as being another example of that particular situation. Unfortunately we have another transportation problem on that coast now and it appears as though the Ambrose Shea may be pressed into service there again this coming season. But it is a hit or miss operation, as the hon. member suggests, and there appears to be nothing definite, nothing that the people there can actually depend on as a certainty, and it appears to be an operation that both governments are passing around to the detriment of the people.

The North West Point area was mentioned as a possible site for the port. The hon. member is probably aware of the fact that the Province has possession of that site, that it is available to us for that use. We made application to MOT some years ago and have taken it over. Thank you, Your Honour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Dr. Collins) Does 1701-01 carry?

On motion, 1701-01 through 1706-20 carried.

MR. DOODY: I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and directed me to report having passed Estimates of expenditure under the following headings: XVII, all items without amendment and to report having made further progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that they have considered the matters to them referred, have passed all items of expenditure under Heading XVII, Transportation and Communications, and made further progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion Committee ordered to sit again

on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday at 10:00 in the forenoon and that this House do now adjourn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded the House adjourn until tomorrow, Friday at 10:00 o'clock in the forenoon.

Those in favour 'Aye'; contrary 'Nay'.

Carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow,

Friday, at 10:00 A.M.