

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, MAY 17, 1978

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Sir, I am happy to announce that the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is to be the recipient of a most significant award by The Public Relations Society of America. With seventy-six Chapters and a membership of 7,800, The Public Relations Society of America is regarded as the most prestigious body of its kind in the world today. The award - known as the Silver Anvil - is given for outstanding public relations programmes and they are the counterpart in North America in the public relations business of Hollywood's Oscar awards in the entertainment industry.

Mr. Speaker, according to The Public Relations Society of America, the Newfoundland and Labrador campaign in defence of the annual seal hunt was the best public relations programme to be undertaken by any government during the twelve month period under review in North America this year.

This award will be presented tomorrow in Houston, Texas, and accepting it on behalf of the Province will be the member for Grand Falls, Mr. John Lundrigan who played a prominent part in that campaign.

The Newfoundland and Labrador entry was one of 336 considered in 9 different categories embracing governments, trade associations, non-profit organizations and business and industry to win the coveted Silver Anvil Award.

PREMIER MOORES: Hon. members will recall that the Province's defence of the harp seal fishery was initiated earlier this year to place the true facts of the manner in which the fishery is conducted and the economic reasons for it before a public, in Europe as well as North America. It was basically considered an inhumane, economically unnecessary project, and in fact, it was said that it was a threat to the survival of the harp seal as a species. Propagation of these reports had led to legislation, actual and proposed, in several countries against importation of harp seal pelts, thus threatening the livelihood of the fishermen and had resulted in Newfoundlanders and even Canadians generally being branded as savages for permitting the fishery even to exist.

Disturbed by these accusations, the government contacted the public relations firm - Quantum Publications, and instructed them to put together a team of highly reputable authorities in marine biology, environmental studies, fisheries, and animal protection. And I think, Sir, the members of that team, people such as Mr. Mac Mercer, Mr. Tom Hughes, Mr. Harry Rowsell, Mr. Joe McInnes, and the others who partook in that particular exercise are well known to this House - the team, which I had the privilege of heading on some occasions, as did the Minister of Fisheries on others, and the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan).

Press conferences and public meetings were held in a score of cities in Canada and the United States and also in Western Europe to state the case for the seal fishery and to rebut the accusations against it.

PREMIER MOORES: One of the immediate, and I suppose, Sir, one of the most striking results of the defence - and I would say, Sir, at this time as well, groups like the Mummers Troupe, who deserve tremendous commendation for their particular part in this, and others as well - but the results of the defence of the seal hunt this year came in a gallop poll about the harp seal fishery taken in Canada in March. It showed that 51 per cent of Canadians favoured the fishery being continued, compared to 29 per cent in a poll a year previously, and that the number opposing the fishery had fallen to 35 per cent compared to 65 per cent the year before.

Associated with QUANTUM were two affiliated companies including Development Counsellors International of New York in the United States and Ketchum International of London, England, in Europe.

And I think, Sir, it is not a matter of just pride that this government has that we have been designated as having the best public relations programme of any government in North America on a special project. - I think it is a project, Sir, that all members on all sides of the House were glad not only to take part in, but to defend, and it is one from Newfoundland's point of view that I am very glad to announce the recognition of that today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, just to say a few brief words on this.

First of all, the PR Society of North America - are they a professional group? Is that

May 17, 1978

Tape 3262

EC - 4

MR. W. ROWE: an association or a society of professional PR firms, or exactly what is it?

PREMIER MOORES: As I understand it, Sir, it is all the public relations firms and advertising firms of North America which is an association they have, their own national executive, which basically are non-partisan as far as PR purposes are concerned. I would suggest that McConnell's, Goldfarb and all these gentlemen would be part of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: - likely to see all kinds of money pumped into -

MR. W. ROWE: The reason I asked that question, Sir, is without derogating from the merits of the award and so on, I would assume that The Public Relations Society of North America are delighted to see lots of money spent in PR activities. I mean, we should realize that fact right off the bat, Sir. Certainly, a professional group, whether it be lawyers, doctors, engineers, PR men Madison Avenue, they certainly like to see activities which go to

Mr. W. Rowe: the lining of their own coffers with something a little bit thicker on a day to day basis.

But, Sir, aside altogether from that there are one or two points that should be made. I hope the government has learned some lessons from the PR activity which took place last year, during the Spring this year rather and during the Spring of the year leading up to the seal hunt and during the seal hunt. One of the things that they should learn, I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be fair to say, is that one aspect of the PR effort was certainly counter-productive, and that was this circus-like atmosphere which was provided by the government in various of the major cities in North America and in Europe which provided, in my view, and this has been stated publicly a number of times as well by other people, provided a forum for every lunatic in North America, and in Europe, for every peripheral type or group in North America or in Europe, Sir, who wanted to get in on - get a little bit of publicity himself for his own lunatic cause, whether it was anti-seal hunting or anti-this or anti-that, that particular aspect of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: Anything, Sir. That particular aspect of it, I think, was probably counter productive and unfortunate. Now I am not blaming the government for it. They probably did it with the best of intentions with complete sincerity, and with the idea, obviously, of enhancing the seal hunt as an institution and getting rid of the adverse publicity and the slanderous accusations in association with it. But I do hope that the government has learned a lesson from that aspect of it, the providing of a forum for every lunatic individual and every lunatic group in the world to get a little bit of publicity at our expense, both our expense in terms of dignity and our expense in terms of money.

MR. NOLAN: Unknown malcontents.

MR. W. ROWE: That is right every malcontent, every peripheral, marginal malcontent, in the world, Sir, was attracted by that, and got probably as much publicity out of it or more than the Premier himself.

MR. ROWE: For example, Sir, one hundred thousand words cannot counteract the bias shown by one station where they showed fifteen seconds of a cute little white coat being clobbered over the head. And if you are going to get that kind of bias attracted to your PR campaign then you are bound to lose because the imagery there, Mr. Speaker, the imagery there is far more effective than the reasonable words which are uttered in defense of that activity.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must point out to the hon. gentleman that rules would not allow me to allow him to debate the merits or demerits of the particular campaign, but merely -

MR. NEARY: By leave!

MR. SPEAKER: - to comment upon the statement just made.

MR. NEARY: By leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. ROWE: All right, Mr. Speaker, there is no leave necessary. I will clue up my remarks now very quickly by saying that now one other aspect of the PR activity, and this is where I believe the award is merited, Mr. Speaker, and that is the funding of the Mummers Group, both in this Province and outside the Province to put on the magnificent spectacle, the magnificent play -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: My apologizes to my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition but I continue to be harassed by - I was going to say the dimwit, but that is wrong, Mr. Speaker - the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I am trying to hear what my colleague is saying. I know without even listening it is much more intelligent than what the Minister of Municipal Affairs is saying but that is another issue. But I am being harassed across the floor, being called names, and I would ask the Speaker to ask him to be silent so I can hear what my colleague -

MR. NEARY: Is it parliamentary or unparliamentary?

MR. SIMMONS: Well what he is saying is very unparliamentary, but that is very becoming of him. But he is interrupting, Mr. Speaker, unduly. I am trying to hear what my colleague is saying on this subject.

Mr. Simmons: We have listened with interest to the Premier. And I believe my colleague should be accorded the same privilege of being heard in silence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: That is not the case now thanks to the harassment we are getting as usual from the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. There was no name calling across the floor that I could ascertain. The only name that I just heard was the hon. member in his point of order. He is continually delaying the activities in this House by this kind of activity. And there is no point of order. It is specious, spurious, and ridiculous, and stupid.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The point made by the hon. -

MR. DINN: And undignified.

MR. SPEAKER: -gentleman to my right that every hon. member has a right to speak -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! - without interruption is a valid one. I can say no more than that because I did not hear anything which is alleged to have transpired. But the rule is that every hon. member has the right to speaker without interruption.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak

SIR. W. ROWE: to the point again, the award if it is merited at all, and I believe it is, is merited for this reason and this reason alone, that the Mummings Troop went throughout this nation, Canada, and received, Sir, no matter how hostile a review it might have been in any particular case, and there were no really hostile views, were given a great deal of credit, were treated with respect and their message, the message they put across was admired by critics and audiences everywhere in this nation. They got rave reviews in many cases.

Here in St. John's itself, Sir, and in St. Anthony where I happened to have seen it during the seal hunt, it was received, Sir, by our own people with something more than rave reviews and a rave reception, Mr. Speaker, it was something which touched the heart and soul of the Province itself. And, Sir, I think a very valuable thing because it lent itself to the dignity of the people in rural Newfoundland and the dignity they feel and the sort of identity they have for the seal hunt and other activities close to the sea and close to our environment.

So, Sir, I would say that this award is merited because of the support given by the government to the Mummings Troop, but not on the other grounds which we saw - the other activities which we saw the government involving itself in. And let me conclude my remarks, Sir, by a special plea on behalf of the Mummings Troop. I have talked to various members of the Troop, including the man who heads it up, and who does a lot of the organizing and a lot of writing for it, and, Sir, I told him that on the first opportunity I would privately and publicly support the efforts of the Mummings Troop both in this regard and in other regards as well, and ask that the government help out, not by way of a handout but by way of a legitimate and reasonable subsidy, help out other activities of this tremendous troop, Sir, this credit to Newfoundland and to all Newfoundlanders. And Sir, I do hope

MR. W. ROWE: that the government can see its way clear to help out this tremendous body of actors, this troop of players, the Mummers Troop. And, Sir, as I say, the award, if it is merited, is merited solely because, or principally because the Mummers Troop did such a tremendous job in getting the message across to the rest of Canada. And if this poll as indicated by the Premier is accurate then I would say, Sir, that a great deal, perhaps the lion's share of the credit is due to the efforts and activities of this troop, Sir, not only as far as the people who saw their actual play is concerned, Sir, but the word which spread far and wide throughout this country as a result of their tremendous visual activities on the stage across this Nation and in this Province, Sir, and they deserve, the Mummers Troop deserves a great deal of the credit for this particular award.

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. Minister of Fisheries I would welcome to the House on behalf of all hon. members two groups of students; ten students from grades five and seven from the John Christian Airthart Memorial School at Makkovik, Labrador, accompanied by their teacher Mr. Henderson, and also eight students from grades six to nine from the Boys School at Whitbourne, accompanied by two teachers, Mr. Nicholl and Mr. Reid. I know all hon. members join me in welcoming both groups of students and their teachers to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today the setting up of an advisory committee to examine government's policy regarding the issuing of fish processors' licences. This committee, which will be made up of representatives of the fresh and salt fish processing sectors, the Fishermen's Union, the Department of Fisheries, will recommend changes in the policy, if necessary,

May 17, 1978

Tape No. 3254

NO - 3

MR. W. CARTER: and recommend a set of guidelines which departmental personnel would use in assessing applications for processors' licences.

I should point out that in 1974 the Department adopted a policy which restricted the issuing of processors' licences because of the problems in the industry, particularly the depletion of fish stocks and the need for government financial support to the industry.

This policy, Mr. Speaker, should be examined in terms of the current situation; fish stocks are improving, the catching effort is surging, markets are strong and private capital is available for investment.

MR. W. CARTER: Government's policy regarding the issuing of processors' licenses will have to be carefully examined because of the number of companies and individuals wishing to get involved in the fish processing business. This policy should insure an orderly and controlled approach to fish processing in the Province.

I am happy to announce, Mr. Speaker, that members of the committee are as follows; Mr. W. (Bud) O'Brien, President of the Fisheries Association of Newfoundland and Labrador; David Hiscock in the Salt Fish Processors Association; Mr. Stratford Canning from the Newfoundland Fishermen Food and Allied Workers Union; Mr. Leslie Dean and Mr. Harvey Best from the Provincial Department of Fisheries. Mr. Best will act as chairman of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, in making this announcement I want to publicly express my appreciation and sincere thanks to people in the Fish Processors Association, the Salt Fish Association and the members of the Fishermen's Union and others. These associations have willingly seconded to the department and to various committees appointed by the department to investigate certain areas of responsibility within the fishing industry and have served willingly and without any pay on a number of committees assisting us in our efforts to put together a more progressive policy in matters dealing with, in this case, the issuing of licences and, of course, in other areas of the jurisdiction as well. So I am deeply grateful to these people for their obvious willingness to serve on these committees.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Minister of Fisheries is a great hand, Sir, for making Ministerial Statements and pumping out press releases. The announcement that the hon. gentleman just made, Sir, has to do with processors licencing. It is a good thing, Mr. Speaker, to set up this committee of people outside, most of them are from outside of the public service, outside of government and they seem to be a pretty good crowd, Sir, that the minister has lined up. It is unfortunate indeed that the

MR. NEARY: government does not have a realistic fishery policy, that we could not get a policy when the minister was doing his estimates. Now, it is sort of on a hit and miss basis, We are getting Ministerial Statements just about every day. The minister manages to keep himself out of the heat of battle, sits in his seat and remains quite while all the other ministers are under attack but makes Ministerial Statements once in awhile

As I say, Sir, it is too bad that the minister could not unveil a short-term and a long-term policy for the development of the fishery because things are changing. As the minister said, Mr. Speaker, fish today is like gold dust and everybody but everybody wants to get into the fishery, wants to start processing fish. It has to be done in an orderly fashion. I hope that people like Mr. Hurley who wanted to set up down in Argentia, down on the North side of the Argentia Naval Base, will now, as a result of the action taken by the minister, be able to get his licence in a hurry.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that we on this side of the House feel that the fishery is - if I could just get my hon. friend here, Sir, I find I cannot listen and talk at the same time, I have lost my trend of thought. But, Sir, we believe that the licencing of processing plants should be done in an orderly fashion, that the government should not concentrated all its efforts on big fish plants, that the price is up on fish today and everybody wants to get into the fishing industry and rightly so. The economy of the Province seems to have reversed itself, Mr. Speaker. Since Confederation prosperity in Newfoundland was in the urban centers, mainly because of the boom in the construction industry. Now we have a slump in the construction industry and we have a boom in the rural parts of the Province due mainly to the fishery. The economy of the Province has reversed itself, in my opinion, wherever you have a fish plant today you have prosperity. So I think it is a good idea before licencing fish plants en masse that it be done in an orderly fashion. And I am sure that the members of the committee which the minister just read out for us will do a good job in that regard.

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. House and through it the general public the opening of a craft exhibition in St. Mary's Hall today, and an official opening tonight, of a craft exhibition which has in it something more than 1,000 items produced by senior citizens on the Avalon Peninsula.

I would invite all hon. members, Mr. Speaker, to visit the exhibition and see the fine work done by our senior citizens in the Province.

MR. NEARY: It was on the radio all morning.

MR. HICKEY: While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, and in this same area, I would like to inform the House as well that government has seen fit to designate a week in June as Senior Citizens Week this year. I have written the mayors of all municipalities in the Province asking them to recognize the tremendous contribution to this Province in so many ways by its senior citizens and to do whatever they can to make life a little more pleasant for the people who live in their area.

Once again I invite all hon. members and I hope that the general public will take time out to visit St. Mary's Hall to see a real fine effort by those senior citizens in terms of this craft exhibition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition of the required number of names on behalf of people in Labrador who have been petitioning for some time, and have been calling for some time on the building of roads in Labrador, not only in my own district but also in the district of Naskaupi and also in Labrador West district.

MR. STRACHAN:

The recent situation, Mr. Speaker, concerning the road being built by Quebec, which has been built by Quebec, is being built by Quebec even though it has been stopped at the moment, constitutes a problem for the people in Labrador West because it is in essence - the road is the Freedom Road through Western Labrador to Quebec. It will allow the people in Western Labrador to then travel on to Montreal. It will also cause economic and trade and physical links with Western Labrador and the rest of Labrador, eventually, through to Quebec and I think it is a very serious situation where Quebec in some ways are beating us to the gun, beating us to the punch. They are building roads trying to, as I have stated before, through economic colonization obtain Labrador if not in a physical means, as we discussed this morning with the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), if not by physical means certainly obtain Labrador by economic colonization, by slowly infiltrating and allowing business, instead of coming to this Province, and through the other parts of this Province, to move further West into Quebec.

I have stated many times before in the last two and-a-half years that it is a serious situation and I think that we are faced now with this Province being ashamed or shamed into the position of having to move very quickly on a road to link up Western Labrador with Happy Valley - Goose Bay and through that the ferry link on to the islands so that the people of Western Labrador can maintain their ties with the people of the Island where most of them originally came from in the first place and that the Freedom Road really will be a freedom road and will end its isolation.

There has been talks of making this a priority a number of times and we will probably hear more talks of making this a priority, and I suggest that the \$1 million

MR. STRACHAN:

allocation in the DREE

proposal certainly will not make this a priority and certainly will not go very far toward building the necessary road from Western Labrador through to Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker,

as the petition states, I suggest that this should be given top priority so that this Province will not lose out to the economic movements, the trade movements, the subtle incidious movements by Quebec into Western Labrador. Not only will this road allow Quebec a major link but it will also from a service point of view in Labrador West, from a service industry point of view which is being lost to the Quebecers, it will allow them to have these trade links so that almost all the service industries in Western Labrador will become Quebec owned, or Quebec subsidiaries. And the people of this Province will not be able, in the face of this pressure, to maintain any existence. And I suggest that it is part of an overall movement. I believe that road has been under construction, the road to Montreal, down through Fermont, Gagnon,

Mr. Strachan: Baie Comeau and on to the Trans-Canada Highway on to Montreal. It has been built or is being built, in the process of being built by striking miners of Quebec Cartier Mining, and I believe they have been doing it, although I understand they have pulled off recently because of some bad publicity, or what they call bad publicity. But I believe we as a Province should view this with utmost urgency, and push as quickly as possible to build the road which will link this Province together.

I know there are some discussions whether vis-a-vis a road versus a railway, but I do believe we have to link our ferry terminus link at Happy Valley-Goose Bay with Churchill Falls, which is now there, upgrade that road, push through to Eskier, and complete the Eskier to Labrador West, Labrador City - Wabush area. And this must be done with urgency so that we are not caught with our pants down years behind the forces of Quebec who are insidiously, as far as I am concerned moving into that area, moving into other areas, who are showing by their maps distributed by the Department of Tourism in that Province, that Labrador does not exist that, in fact Nouveau Quebec exists right to the Atlantic Coast. And I think that we should resist this strongly, that we should move as quickly as possible to alleviate this situation there and to take over that part of the Province which is rightly named Labrador, that part of the Province which has been neglected in many ways and which I feel we are being pushed into now through shame, through neglect, we are now being urgently pushed to do something about.

And I think that a major priority, a major priority this year, not next year, two years, or three years down the line, a major priority of this government should be to catch up on the promises which they made in 1975 to build this road, the promises they made to the people of Western Labrador to Churchill Falls, and to Happy Valley-Goose Bay that this necessary link would be made. Because unless we do it the Freedom Road will not be a Freedom Road linking this great Province but the Freedom Road would be a road which links Labrador and Quebec. And I think

Mr. Strachan: this is unnecessary. I think that we should push ahead and make sure that the Trade Movement and the links, the physical links, the cultural links will be towards this Province and to join, hopefully, Newfoundland and Labrador more solidly together, a point that we have always raised, instead of forcing through economic means business people to start dealing with another province rather than deal with their own Province.

I support the prayer of this petition. And I wish to place it on the Table of the House and refer it to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I do not assume that we have the same petition. I have one as well -

MR. SIMMONS: You cannot have the same one.

MR. ROUSSEAU: - from Western Labrador.

PREMIER MOORES: Support that one and table it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But certainly there is no question about the support of that one. That was one that I assume was gathered by Mr. Smeaton, is that the same petition we are talking to?

AN HON. MEMBER: We are (Inaudible)

MR. ROUSSEAU: I had a letter from Mr. Smeaton asking me to present the petition. But in any event I will assume they are two different petitions, Mr. Speaker, and I will speak to this one when this is over or should I present it? I do not know the procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If there are two different petitions, they could be two different petitions very similar, they could be identical but presumably they are then two different petitions. So it would appear that the hon. gentleman would present it later after this one or he could present it now, if they are identical.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The prayer of the petition is, I presume, identical.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Your Honour.

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, I believe, had the petition in his possession now for three or four days, and the prayer is the same,

Mr. Neary: Sir, they may be identical petitions.

MR. ROUSSEAU: That is a copy of a petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STRACHAN: No, no, no!

MR. NEARY: No, no it is not, Mr. Speaker. It is not a copy.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Here is the original right here.

MR. NEARY: Well, the minister has had the original for three or four days and the people were not sure if the minister was going to present the petition or not.

MR. DINN: It must be out of order.

MR. NEARY: So my hon. friend has presented an original petition along with a copy of the petition that my hon. friend has on his desk.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. Your Honour has -

MR. NEARY: There is no point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: Well anyway, on a point of order. I did not realize the hon. gentleman from LaPoile had used up his time in speaking in support of the peititon. I thought he was up on a point of order. You can only rise in one of two ways.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall hear the hon. gentleman on a point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The rule with respect to the formation of petitions which Your Honour very kindly reminded both Caucuses is that

MR. HICKMAN: with respect to the petition itself the best evidence rule prevailed and obviously if we have two petitions one has to be a copy and the other has to be original. They both cannot be originals, there is no such thing as two originals. Now, I would think that Your Honour with Your Honour's very keen eye can very quickly by looking at both ascertain which is the copy and which is the original. If the first one is the copy then it is not properly laid before the House, if it is the original it is properly laid before the House and the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Labour and Manpower will not have to table his petition as well. If the reverse situation is correct then the proper one to be tabled is the one in the hands of the Minister of Industrial Development. It is a very easy point that Your Honour with one glance can rectify.

MR. W. ROWE: A point of order, Mr Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order and then I will hear the hon gentleman.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, I have not seen the hon. gentleman's petition but I would assume that they probably are similar petitions, Mr. Speaker, maybe even identical in some particulars, but, Sir, my hon. friend has not presented a copy. This one has in addition to names which may appear on that petition as well, has the required number of extra names on it, three names I believe, new names which do not appear on that petition and therefore, Sir, is a petition in its own right so I do not know why we are getting hung up on technicalities here. My hon. friend has put in a petition in its own right, a petition which may be similar to the one that the hon. gentleman opposite has had now for a number of days and waited till Private Member's Day to present, sat on the petition, Sir, so I see no reason why he cannot get up and speak to the petition now, I intend to speak to both petitions. If they are similar in content or even identical in content we can have a go at them now. But the petition presented by my hon. friend definitely is a petition which differs in one material particular from the one presented there and that is that there are at least three original and different names appended to the one which he presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker. Standing Order 91

MR. MARSHALL: says "A petition may be either printed or in writing and if more than three petitioners sign it, at least three signatures must appear on the page containing the prayer of the petition." Now I have not seen the petition, Mr. Speaker, but I understand the hon. minister has taken a look at it and has indicated that it is in essence a copy of the one that he has and I would submit that a copy of a petition with a copy of signatures are not signatures. It is quite obvious that there might have been three signatures appended to it since for the purpose of giving it technical authenticity under -

AN HON. MEMBER: The cut-off (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: I am not interested in talking to the hon. member I am talking to His Honour in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! There should be no interruptions.

MR. MARSHALL: It is quite obvious or it appears to be obvious from what the Leader of the Opposition is saying that three signatures have been appended to it since then and this is probably the type of gamesmanship that the Opposition continues to play from time to time, you know childishness. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there is only one petition that has been sent from Labrador, it would appear the member for Menihak (Mr. Rousseau) is the one who has it and it is a rather silly charade that the Opposition continue to play in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. gentleman who presented - I will have to say document because I have to make a decision on what it is. I will hear the hon. gentleman's submission and then I will make a decision either immediately or in a short while.

The hon. member.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I can clear up the matter very succinctly. The people who originated the petition in Labrador West felt as many people do and as we pointed out in this House a number of times before, that petitions which are submitted to government often never see the light of day and the people requested by an accompanying note that I present the petition. I informed them, Sir, that I could not present a copy of a petition if it

MR. STRACHAN: were strictly a copy of a petition because the petition would have to contain original names attached to the prayer of the petition as are the rules laid down by this House and as you have explained earlier in the session. That was done and the petition I tabled today - they informed me that the petition was only mailed to me a number of days after they had mailed the petition to government and the government obviously, therefore, been waiting for Private Member's Day to table the petition, and I decided that in order to present the petition I had every opportunity, I had the first opportunity to present the petition and I did so today. I find the petition is in order and I signed my name to it and placed it on the table of the House.

MR. NEARY: With three extra names on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I said that I would not hear any further submissions but since the hon. gentleman is one of the two presumably who have the most knowledge on it, then I think I will hear a final submission from the hon. gentleman.

MR. ROUSSEAU: First to the point of order, the minister or the member did not sit on the petition. The member did not wait until Private Members' Day. The member did wait until Wednesday, which happens to be Private members' Day because today there happens to be a resolution on Labrador being discussed and the member thought it would be most advantageous to do it at that point in time.

Number two, there was a letter affixed to the petition asking me to present it. You know it has been that I have had it a week or two, I have had it a couple of days and I thought today would be the most appropriate day. I suffer with head high the embarrassment of the situation obviously, touché you know. That is good enough. I will live through those. But it is a very embarrassing situation. I did receive it. I have not sat on it. I decided on Wednesday, not to hold up Private Members' Day, Mr. Speaker, but rather to bring it the significance that it would in discussing the points on Labrador which is to be discussed in a private member's resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! What I shall do is - I cannot very well reserve a decision and then give it tomorrow because the matter is in process now so I will adjourn for a few minutes and give my decision then.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Before giving the specific ruling on this specific matter, what I would do to draw to the attention of hon. members the essential rules with respect to petitions because there has been some, I think, misunderstanding thereof, and I will do this by reading to the House a copy of a letter which I wrote the hon. Government House Leader and the hon. Opposition House Leader, identical letters on March 10th., and also the independent member who is a member of neither caucus, the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. E. Dawe). So I will read this first for the benefit of all hon. members and this is the copy of my letter

MR. SPEAKER: to those three gentlemen, the hon. Opposition House Leader, the hon. Government House Leader, and the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. E. Dawe), who sits as an independent.

"Dear" whomever, "I am writing you and the Government House Leader and, ' or the Opposition House Leader, " with the request that you advise members of your caucus on the requirements of the rules with respect to presenting petitions.

"I have always regarded the right of citizens to petition the House of Assembly as a fundamental one. It is not my wish to embarrass any member or cause inconvenience to petitioners. It is my understanding, however, that I am required to apply the Standing Orders as they are. To be selective in this matter, to decide to apply certain Standing Orders and to ignore others would be improper and would establish a dangerous precedent.

"In my opinion it is not necessary that a petition be a duplicate of any one rigid form. You will find attached a photostatic copy of the format in Beauchesne which is the general format traditionally followed in the House of Assembly. As was pointed out by one member, some of the words are archaic. It is not, in my opinion, necessary that any particular word formula be employed. Certainly the language can be modernized. While therefore it is not necessary to reproduce any particular words, it is necessary to follow the general formula.

"It is essential that what is supported and tabled under the routine order Presenting Petitions be, in fact, a petition, which I understand is a request whereby the petitioners ask that something be done. It is not a demand. Moreover the petition must be addressed to the House of Assembly

MR. SPEAKER: and not to one or several individual members, or anybody else.

"I am always available to any member who wishes to consult with me on this or any other parliamentary matter on a confidential basis. The officers of the table are also available to be of service to members on these matters.

"I would appreciate it if you would draw this to your caucus' attention."

Those are the general rules or format or guidelines which I have adopted and communicated to the House.

With respect to the particular matter now before us, I will draw to the attention of hon. members two citations from Beauchesne which are relevant here. Section 333, the first paragraph.

"Petitions may be written, or typewritten, or printed, and may be in French or English; they must be free from erasures or interlineations. The signatures must be written, not printed, pasted or otherwise transferred." I will not read it all but that is the relevant part.

Also section 334, paragraph (1), "A petition must have original signatures or marks, and not copies from the original, nor signatures of agents on behalf of others, except in case of incapacity by sickness;" and that is the relevant part there.

The petition tabled by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) has four original signatures to it. It has numerous copies of other signatures. I have deleted the portion of the petition which has copies of signatures

Mr. Speaker: because 334 (I) is quite explicit there, and have obviously left the part with the four original signatures which now makes this petition somewhat briefer, but it is a petition with four original signatures.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, -

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

MR. NEARY: I rise, Sir, to support the abbreviated version of the petition that the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) will add a few names to in the next few minutes in this hon. House. It is probably, Sir, the most significant and the most important petition ever to be brought before this hon. House, and I congratulate the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), Sir, for bringing the petition onto the floor of the House without delay.

MR. W. ROWE: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Because it is a matter of urgent public importance. It has to do with Labrador, Sir, that has been so grossly neglected by the present administration.

Mr. Speaker, the petition has to do with a request, with a prayer, with residents of Labrador beseeching and begging and pleading with the government to put some money into the Freedom Road so that the people in Labrador West will have access to Happy Valley-Goose Bay and to the ferry to the Island part of the Province. And instead of looking Westward as they will now when the new road is complete from Baie Comeau to Mount Wright to Labrador City, when that road is complete the people will have a tendency to look Westward instead of Eastward. And as my hon. friend so rightly pointed out the people will look to the Province of Quebec, both socially, economically, and culturally. And, Mr. Speaker, it might alarm hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House who have so grossly written off, neglected Labrador, written off Labrador since they became the administration, ^{last} today in Labrador West, Sir, the Province of Quebec has made its presence felt in more ways than one. There are government officials stationed in Labrador West this very day while we are talking in support of my hon. friend's petition. There are cars and vehicles being licenced from the Province of Quebec

Mr. Neary: and that is likely to be challenged in the Supreme Court and which brings into focus, as my hon. friend for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) is aware, the British North America Act because they are claiming they have just as much right to licence these vehicles in Labrador as the Newfoundland Government has. It is a very serious matter, Sir.

I was shocked recently when I was driving in from Gander with one of the top businessmen in this Province when he told me that it did not make any difference if they put the road from Quebec to Labrador City or not, that the business people in this Province would still not do business in Labrador West. I could not believe what I was hearing from this man.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Why?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Why?

MR. NEARY: Why? Because he said this happened to be a gentleman who was dealing with heavy equipment - that it is easier to bring in the equipment from Quebec and to service it from the Province of Quebec. They would not be bothered with it, would not be bothered with it. It is easier to service the equipment, he said, from Quebec than it is from the Island of Newfoundland. We are just going to give up, Mr. Speaker, by default. Write off! The administration has written off Labrador that is what it would appear to me, Sir, to be.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope, Sir, that members on both sides of this House, and not just pay lip service because the government has it in their own hands to spend money on that Freedom Road, and to make representation to the proper authorities if this government does not have the authority to get a railroad, if necessary, operated by the power that is generated in Labrador, or build a highway across Labrador. I would prefer to see the highway myself. Maybe we will have to build a railway first and open up the last frontier of natural resources left in the world.

And so, Sir, I congratulate my hon. friend who seems to be so dedicated to Labrador, Sir. I do not think you would find another hon. gentleman apart from maybe the hon. member who was born and

Mr. Neary: raised in Labrador, you will not find another man on the face of this earth who is so devoted and so dedicated to the people of Labrador as my hon. friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), who is doing such a fantastic job on behalf, Sir, of the people, not only in his own district, but the people in Labrador South and in Labrador West. So I again congratulate the hon. gentleman, Sir. Maybe we will get a second crack at it, I only have one minute left, maybe the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) will want to present the petition that the hon. gentleman has separately, if so, Sir, I will get a second crack at it, because

MR. NEARY: We could not say enough about this situation, Sir, which is so serious at the moment. So I support the prayer of the petition, Sir, and I hope that all hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House will do likewise.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have the occasion to present for the first time in six years in this House of Assembly my first petition, a petition that I fully and personally support, that this government certainly fully supports.

If I may read the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker: "To the hon. the House of Assembly and to the government; that since 1960 the citizens of Western Labrador have contributed greatly to the provincial and national economy; that between the years of 1974 and 1976 alone \$1.2 billion worth of iron ore was produced in Western Labrador, and our taxes and expenses including the travelling costs, already high, have escalated faster and higher than our income; that unemployment in both Western and Central Labrador is at an all time high; that a roll-on, roll-off ferry service has been inaugurated between Goose Bay and the Island; that a motorable road exist between Esker and Goose Bay; that to alleviate unemployment and to provide a road connection between the Western Labrador and the ferry terminal at Goose Bay, the prayer of our petition is that the existing road be upgraded and that a road connection between Esker and Labrador City-Wabush be started this Spring of 1978."

MR. ROUSSEAU:

As I say, Mr. Speaker,

I fully support that petition, and if hon. members would give me a few moments to explain the situation, for those who may not be aware of it, there is a road now - a tote road, I guess would be the term for it, but it is a little better travelling road than that - between Happy Valley-Goose Bay and Churchill Falls and from Churchill Falls to Esker which is the railhead for the railway. There is no road or no connection outside of rail between Labrador City-Wabush and the Esker area, which is an area of about forty to sixty miles depending on what route the engineers finally determine to be the path of the road.

The road in Quebec, Mr. Speaker, of which I have been accused of not reacting to, is one of which I spoke on, I think, the Wednesday before last, for forty-five minutes on the feelings of myself and the government with respect to that. Unfortunately, it did not receive wide coverage and very few people were aware of the fact that I did speak on it - the Wednesday before last, I believe was the day, it was not last Wednesday - that the road indeed was being built, but that we should at that time have no fear for what might happen to Labrador because of Quebec. There is a concern, of course, because of the insidious way it is being done from an economic, social and cultural way, but I think the people of Labrador and the people of the Island part of the Province would not stand by and see another province encroach on a part of the Province that we represent in this House of Assembly - neither the people in Labrador nor the people in the Island part of the Province.

We would hope, Mr. Speaker, that a submission that was made to DREE to assist in this road -

MR. ROUSSEAU: because it is a resource road in a highly resourceful area - would be given very sympathetic consideration. The submission was made last year. I know that my hon. colleague, the Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs and his predecessor worked very hard on this. And I know that I have spoken on many occasions with the hon. Marcel Lessard on this road. We would hope that DREE would see fit that they would be able to sign an agreement with us with respect to that road, but eventually the road has to be done and undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, one way or another. I would hope that before this year is out we would have an agreement with DREE with respect to that unfinished portion of the road between Labrador City-Wabush and Esker and the upgrading of the road between Esker and Churchill Falls and on to Goose Bay-Happy Valley.

I fully support the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, with 2,000 names affixed to it, of which one will be mine.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented, albeit belatedly, by the member for Menihek, the Minister of Manpower, and in so doing, Mr. Speaker, would like to support also and particularly, the petition so ably and promptly presented by my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). The two petitions address themselves to exactly the same subject, as the House is aware now, and therefore, I thought it only fit that I should yield to the minister a moment ago so he could present the petition and we could then have the comments on both petitions at one time.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to a point of order, did admit to the House that he had held over this petition until today. So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that will put an end and thanks to the minister for this -

MR. ROUSSEAU: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. ROUSSEAU: What I said was I did hold it over until today, but not for Private Members' Day, if that is what the member is inferring. But because today was Wednesday and the Labrador resolution was on the -

MR. SIMMONS: What I said, Mr. Speaker, is that the minister held it over. I understood him to say that, and if I am misquoting him, then he should correct me. I understood the reason the minister gave for holding it over - clearly.

The minister has now admitted to the House that he did hold the petition over, Mr. Speaker. So I would hope that the minister really has done us a favour by putting an end to all this accusation about who are using petitions to delay the business of the House to their own advantage. And, Mr. Speaker, also of course, it reinforces this whole procedure today what we have felt on this side for a long time, that government sits on petitions.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must point out to the hon. gentleman that the prayer of the petition is - I will read it straight here: "to alleviate unemployment, provide a road connection between Western Labrador and the ferry terminal at Goose Bay, the prayer of our petition is that

MR. SPEAKER: the existing road be upgraded and that a road connection between Esker and Labrador City-Wabush be started." The overall procedure on petitions or the government's or Opposition's attitude thereto would be somewhat outside the allegations. The hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I quite agree, Mr. Speaker, it does boggle the mind what we have to do on this side of the House to get this government to attend to even a routine matter such as presenting a petition.

Mr. Speaker, what is the government's position on this road? I know they have gone to Ottawa for another handout, but that is also its position on roads generally, on tourism, on fisheries, on job creation, on everything under the sun, Mr. Speaker. But what, in particular, will someone tell me - what in particular is the government's position on this road? I listened intently to the minister and he did not tell us, and I suspect the reason he did not tell us is because he does not know. How much longer, Mr. Speaker, is the government going to sit around and stand around and posture on this one?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must point out that the hon. gentleman is entering into the realm of debate. The rules do not permit it. I endeavour not to interject during petitions unless I feel required to, because every hon. member has five minutes and when I speak I am taking up his five minutes, but I cannot abnegate my responsibility in that respect, and I will point out that the hon. gentleman is entering the area of debate.

The hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the government would see fit to take some decisive initiative to let the people of Western Labrador know that they are not being abandoned. They have that feeling right now and they have reason to have that feeling right now because of the lack of action of the government, including the member for the area concerned. The government cannot plead, Mr. Speaker, they have only recently been apprized of the problem, because the sitting member for that area also happens to sit in Cabinet.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: We are, Mr. Speaker, I submit, fast approaching on this Labrador West situation, a genuine Rubicon situation, a point of no return. Notwithstanding, we see the government, Mr. Speaker, fiddling while Rome burns. I would hope that the fiddling will stop, the posturing will stop and we can hear some definitive policy, Mr. Speaker - perhaps even during the debate today, or the discussion today on these petitions we can hear some definitive policy of the government as to what it intends to do now to rescue, to salvage the situation while there is time. And I repeat, Mr. Speaker, there is not much time on this particular issue, I assure you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to stand in my place and support the prayer of the petition presented today in relation to a road I refer to as the Trans-Labrador Highway or the completion of the Trans-Canada Highway across Labrador. I think it could be more aptly classified as a road to resources, because that

May 17, 1978

Tape 3272

EC - 4

MR. GOUDIE: is certainly one of the benefits which would accrue from such a road across Labrador. I think one of the main issues here which was discussed through another forum this morning by

MR. GOUDIE: the hon. member for Eagle River and I. There are other issues which relate to this cultural issues and so on, which I will not attempt to deal with now. But I think the point made in the petition, I have forgotten the time span in terms of years referred to in the petition but the total amount of money involved was \$1.2 billion accruing from the harvesting of the iron ore resource in Wabush and Labrador City and that is one clear and definite example of benefits which are coming out of Labrador. And it is, I think, an example of what can be done with the construction of a road or a highway across Labrador. The tote road as it exists now running from Goose Bay-Happy Valley to Churchill Falls and the other section on to Esker is in a bit of a sorry state. It has existed now for a number of years but government has been doing patch up work every spring and the money is literally going down the river, if you will, because the three or four rivers involved and brooks, wash out the culverts and the repair work every spring and I suggest that is going to happen again this year.

There is quite an amount of work to be done on it. I would hope that the proposal into DREE now will be accepted and will result in funds going in to that sort of construction from both levels of government because I think both levels have a responsibility to become involved in this particular project. It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to support the petition today.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte followed by the hon. gentleman for St. John's South.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and support the petitions have been tabled in the House today with respect to the urging of government to take some action with respect to the development of a road from Western Labrador to Goose Bay and to the CN terminal there. It is very vital for me, Mr. Speaker, to impress upon the government the urgency of doing something about this particular matter just as soon as possible. Hon. members will know

MR. F. WHITE: that we in Lewisporte have been developing in conjunction with the people in Happy Valley-Goose Bay a very efficient transportation system over the last few years and this resulted in the deployment of a vessel there, the William Carson previously and now the Robert Bond which is being renovated and designed specifically for the run between Lewisporte and Happy Valley-Goose Bay and it will be a Lewisporte-Happy Valley-Goose Bay ferry operation. That ferry, Mr. Speaker, could operate several times a week if there were sufficient business to keep it going several times a week. Now, I understand it will be operating a couple of times a week carrying passengers and freight back and forth between Lewisporte and Goose Bay.

It has long been the hope of the people in the Lewisporte area that the road would be developed between Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Churchill Falls and Labrador City-Wabush. The commercial trade in Western Labrador is not related to Newfoundland at all at present and it should be. We feel that most of the wholesale products that go into Labrador should come from the island part of the Province and could come from the island part of the Province if there were a way to get it in to the central part of Labrador, Labrador City, Wabush and Happy Valley-Goose Bay. That commercial trade could be developed. We have tried to get it developed in the winter time by using aircraft but that has not come about and it is our hope now that this will happen should the government move with respect to the development of this particular road.

We feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is time to move on this road. It is time to get the thing moving not only from the perspective of Quebec moving into Labrador and doing things in Labrador that we would not want them to do there but also from the economic aspect of the Happy Valley-Goose Bay region. A road such as this would obviously have significant impact on the serious decline in the economy of the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area and it is our hope that something will develop with respect to this particular road.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say one closing

May 17, 1978

Tape No. 3273

JM - 3

MR. F. WHITE: word on petitions; that I do not think petitions are a waste of time in this House and I will continue presenting them here. Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to ask a question and that is when will the government present the petition signed by 9,000 people that was presented to the Premier on Friday night.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's South followed by the hon. member for LaPoile.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this petition presented by the hon. minister I am not sure if it is an identical petition with the one presented by my friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). The hon. minister read the substance of his petition and as far as I understood it was a petition for a road from Western Labrador to the Eastern Coast of Labrador. whereas the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) I think he mentioned it along the way but most of his remarks seemed to be directed towards the connection into the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly would be in favour of any road construction in this Province. This has been a tremendous lack in our Province and now a tremendous need which is rapidly being rectified but we have a long way to go yet. I would make one plea, that any roads that are constructed would be proper roads. The area we are now considering I am not familiar with it at all but I would suspect that it is a very difficult terrain. Road construction and road maintenance there would be very difficult. Many of the roads in our Province are very inadequately constructed and they do not stand up to the harsh climate that we live in and I would hope that any road construction up there will be done to the highest and most adequate specifications.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the point of connections to Quebec. I personally would be very much against deprecating connections to another Province. I do not see how anyone living in an Island Province can say that we should not have connections to other parts of the world. It would be equivalent I would say to our turning our nose up at connections say from Argentina, from Port aux Basques via the ferries or say from St. John's or Gander or what have you by air. I think that connections to other parts of the Province are very desirable. I think it is a total side issue to concentrate on when we are talking about interprovincial communications and that is what the substance of this petition is all about.

DR. COLLINS:

In regard to the petition I do not think it is good enough just to say that it is desirable to have these roads. We have to look at how we are going to get them. Therefore, we have to look at our provincial priorities. The priorities here are funding. Funding has to come from two sources, federal and provincial and I would hope that all hon. members including those opposite and I am sure they will be sincere in this, in pushing our federal confreres as hard as we can to get adequate funding from that source for our legitimate needs in this Province. We also have to do our side of it and where do our funds come from? They have to be related to the priorities we set for the expenditure of funds that we can collect. This is an area that we have to look at most sincerely. We are spending funds now in certain areas in this Province and I would say particularly in the social areas where they are not needed as much as they are needed in other areas. In this area I include health, I include welfare, I include education. Funds from these areas can be directed into developmental areas and this is something that we have to face up to despite the fact that it is politically desirable to argue to the contrary.

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

MR. W. ROWE: Another opportunity, Sir. I am deprived of the opportunity to speak twice because another petition was unfortunately presented before I got an opportunity to speak to my hon. friend's. It is my hon. friend's petition, Sir, which the hon. minister had an identical copy of or the original copy of or something, it is my hon. friend's petition I wish to speak to because, Sir, he presented it well and he presented in a timely fashion. He received a copy of this petition within the last day or so and recognizing the urgency of this matter something, Sir, without getting into the realm of debate, which was not recognized by the hon. minister or any of his colleagues opposite. When he got the petition he presented it to the House. The subject of the petition he tried to raise by way of Standing Order 23, a motion, last week which was turned down by Your Honour as it happened but with the distinct approbation of the members opposite at the time, if memory

MR. W. ROWE:

serves me right. They did not want to talk about it. Last week sometime someone on that side, I think it was the hon. member for Menihek district (Mr. Rousseau) indicated there was no problem with regard to this road, no road being constructed in the Province of Quebec to link up Quebec with Labrador.

Now, Sir, before going on

MR. M. ROWE:

me say that neither I nor anyone else on this side of the House, are against a road linking up Labrador with Quebec and the rest of Canada. We are in favour of it. There should be such a road. But, Sir, we also say that just as important and perhaps more important from the point of view of identity of this Province, and the joining of the two integral parts of our Province, and the people's in that large land mass of Labrador, Sir, there has to be a road from Western Labrador, Labrador City and Wabush, to Churchill to the Goose Bay - Happy Valley area, on to the Coast of Labrador. That is essential. That is the sine qua non without which Labrador, I feel certain in my bones, will not at some point in the future, will not remain as a part of this Province. And for anybody to get up here and try to pretend no problem exists, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Quebec takeover bid, is sadly deluding themselves and is showing incredible naivety on the subject.

René Levesque has mentioned publicly on several occasions that he is trying to take over Labrador. He will do it by hook or by crook. He is going to do it. It is a stated policy. The member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) said, "When did he say that? How did he say it? What were the words used?" As if words make any difference in this particular situation. The concept, the plan, the policy of that gentleman, the Premier of Quebec presently, is to take over Labrador and one of the ways he is going to do it is to hook it up geographically with the Province of Quebec. And then people will start to move in from the Province of Quebec. And what happens I ask the hon. member for Menihek district (Mr. Rousseau) if by this policy of aggressive settlement of Labrador by Quebecers and hooking up Labrador, and this policy of benign neglect, perhaps even malignant neglect, well let us call it at its best benign neglect by this government of Labrador, what is

MR. W. ROWE: going to happen when a greater number of people populate portions of Labrador, whose ties are with the Province of Quebec, rather than with Newfoundland or with Labrador itself and a plebiscite or a referendum is taken, Mr. Speaker, and the majority say they would like to join Quebec as a result of the neglect and lack of action by this administration or any other administration in this Province? Then we will have a problem that nobody will be able to say does not exist. It will be a serious political problem. And I say, Sir, that it is incumbent on this government and any other government in the Province to deal with it realistically, not bury their heads in the sand and pretend it is going to go away. Recognize the problem, recognize René Levesque's stated aims and policies with regard to Labrador, and let us get in there with material development as with the road and resource development and so on, and with social and psychological encouragement of the people of Labrador to become identified with this Province as one Province, Newfoundland and Labrador. We need to do it, Mr. Speaker, and if we do not do it then Labrador is going to be a problem with regard to this Province and a problem to themselves as to where they are going to go, what they are going to do. It is going to be a problem. It is going to be a problem anyway but it is a problem we can overcome by the exercise of intelligence, by the spending of money, by the involvement of the Government of Canada and by the involvement of the Provincial Government.

I want to congratulate once more the initiative shown by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) in this matter, on several occasions in this session and several occasions in previous sessions of this House of Assembly. He did not sit on the petition, Mr. Speaker. He did not keep it for an opportune moment or when he felt like it. He did not

MR. W. ROWE: sit back and say, "Well when I feel like this now, when I can get up the energy, or the inclination I will present this petition." When it came into him he recognized it for what it was, an urgent matter of great public importance, an urgent matter of great moment in the development of this Province and he presented it to the House of Assembly. He did not sit on it for three or four days and wait for his own inclination to take hold or to get up enough energy to stand up to present it, he presented it immediately. And I am glad we have an hon. member like him on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, who will seize the initiative and will make these grave and momentous matters known publicly and to the members of this House, Because, Sir, they are important, they are grave, and they have to be dealt with on an urgent basis.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I too want to stand in my place and support the petition as it relates to transportation facilities in Labrador and the absolute crying

MR. PECKFORD:

need to develop a transportation system which involves that part of our Province becoming more tuned in with the rest of the Province and linking the various people within the Labrador section itself together. I want to compliment the member for Labrador West, Menihek (Mr. Rousseau), the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) for the ongoing efforts that all three of these gentlemen have been making over the last number of years as it relates to trying to bring issues in Labrador to the forefront of this House and then, hopefully, to the people of -this Province. I think all three gentlemen, all three hon. members have very strongly and forcefully pointed out to this hon. House and to the people of the Province the problems that Labrador has which are somewhat different from those that are experienced in many other regions of this Province.

It goes without saying that after one identifies the problem as the Leader of the Opposition says, then governments have to address themselves to providing the assistance and money needed to build the roads, to develop and do the feasibility studies on Port Labradors and all the rest of the things to ensure that Labrador not only gets a fair deal, a fair shake in the overall business of disbursement of money from the public treasury, federally and provincially, but it gets a chance itself to develop in a reasonable, sensible way that the people of Labrador want and why it is extremely important that any issues facing Labrador particularly, and the Province generally, of course, that the people themselves have a real say in what occurs. The Labrador Resources Advisory Council is playing a very lead role in this regard and must continue to do so.

The ongoing liaison that the government is having now in Labrador with our newly appointed man there through rural development in Happy Valley-Goose Bay is going to assist in this two way street in this dialogue that is necessary. But transportation, Mr. Speaker, I suppose in Labrador encompasses all the other sectors that are so vital down there. The transportation is vital. Either the landing strips, the Trans-Labrador Road, Port Labrador, the development of the minerals and

MR. PECKFORD:

oil all hinges on a properly developed transportation policy which both levels of government have got to admit belongs in their domains and I do not think it is incumbent upon me to say, well the federal government has got to do this. We have got to acknowledge that we have to do something and the federal government has to do something but we have to do it together so that our aims are the same, our objectives are the same and then we move along that road together collectively towards the solution of the transportation problems cognizant that they must be in the overall framework of what we are going to do economically and otherwise in Labrador. I fully support the petition and recognize that we have to move quickly with the people of Labrador towards developing these things, putting the funding in place. If it is going to take ten years, so be it, it takes ten years but let us develop and identify the problems, move along with the federal government through DREE agreements and whatever, quickly and with the people concerned to get into fruition some of the things that we have been saying in this hon. House for the last seven or eight years which are starting to come slowly but surely and which I think through the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, through having government representatives in Labrador who have some power and some clout, through DREE agreements to put into place these kinds of things before, as hon. gentlemen have said already, before we lose that kind of contact with the people of Labrador so that the ongoing nationalistic ambitions of those people who pretend to want to be separate from the rest of Canada get a foothold in that part of our Province which is not only valuable from a natural resource point of view as it relates to minerals, but is extremely valuable from a people point of view because we have such a diversity of cultures in that land mass albeit the population is low.

It is incumbent upon us as legislators and as leaders of this Province to ensure that we get on with the job of doing those things for Labrador which are reflected so well in this petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the me to petition presented by the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau), Sir. And in so doing, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to repeat the remarks that I made in supporting the petition presented by my hon. colleague, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). But I do want again, Sir, to stress the urgency of this situation. The Minister of Mines and Energy just mentioned that it would take ten years to get the plans

MR. NEARY: to get the financing in place. That is too long, Mr. Speaker. We cannot wait that long. The financing must be arranged quickly to get that road down from Churchill Falls down towards Happy Valley-Goose Bay so that the people can connect with the ferry, the CN ferry from Happy Valley-Goose Bay to the island of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to throw out a suggestion now for the hon. administration, especially the hon. Minister of Justice who just cocked up his ear. I believe, Sir, that it is about time that the Newfoundland Government made its presence felt in Western Labrador. We have public servants in Labrador in these beautiful public buildings that have been put up down there but they have no authority. They cannot even issue a temporary license in Labrador West. Is the hon. gentleman aware of that? But, Sir, we have heard quite a bit of talk over the last several years about expanding the Newfoundland Constabulary to police other parts of Newfoundland. I could think of no better gesture, Sir, for this government to show its presence in Western Labrador than to have members of the Newfoundland Constabulary in there peacefully, unarmed with their Newfoundland Constabulary insignia to offset the Quebec Provincial Police insignia that the people down there are continuously seeing on the other side of the border in the Quebec Province. The hon. gentleman should seriously consider that. And if we are going to expand the jurisdiction of the Newfoundland Constabulary do it right on the border, do it right on the border town in Wabush and Labrador City and have these communities that are near the border policed by the Newfoundland Constabulary.

But certainly, Sir, I think it is a good point and a valid point and it would be a feather in the hat of the hon. Minister of Justice to do it. I would commend it to him, Sir, and I have no hesitation at all in supporting this petition. I think the time is now. I think we have to make our presence felt in Labrador West, Sir, and in the whole of Labrador not, Mr. Speaker, that René Levesque

MR. NEARY: and the Quebec Government are going to come in and legally take Labrador away from us. That could happen say fifty, seventy-five or a hundred years from now. Our grandchildren may never forgive us if we allow that to happen, if the foundation was being laid now. But socially, economically and culturally the people will look to the Province of Quebec and mind you, Mr. Speaker, the people in Labrador West will be glad to get this road so that when they get in their nice new cars that they have that they can drive out of Labrador West, that they will not feel like the people of Bell Island where I was born and raised where all you do on a Sunday afternoon is drive around the loop or up around Lance Cove loop. So they will be glad to get the road, Sir, but that is not the point. That is all beside the point and it would be a terrific legal wrangle to take Labrador away from us. Now I think I would personally fight before I would allow it to happen if I were still alive or if it ever came to the crunch.

But I believe, Sir, that we have to make our presence felt and that the business people in this Province are going to have to buck up and start doing business in Labrador West and not let it go by default to the Province of Quebec. And I commend my suggestion to the Minister of Justice. I think it is a darn good idea, Sir, and one that we would be proud of if we could see our members of the Newfoundland Constabulary policing these border towns of Wabush and Labrador City.

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to add a word of support to the petition. I do not wish to get involved into saying which petition is which but I certainly want to say, as the former Minister of Transportation and as one who has been involved in discussions with the Federal Government and other governments in connection with transportation in Labrador, I certainly want to add my support to the whole question of improving transportation in that very important area of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to stay within the

MR. HICKEY: confines of the rules and for me to say what I want to say insofar as the position taken by the Opposition insofar as this petition is concerned. I do not wish in any way to take anything from the member for Eagle River. I believe it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that he is sincere in his efforts in behalf of Labrador as are, indeed my colleague from Naskaupi and my colleague from Menihek. But, Mr. Speaker, some people have short memories. Does the hon. gentleman forget that the Leader of the Opposition, the member for LaPoile,

MR. HICKEY: the member for Fogo, the member for Conception Bay South, to name a few -

MR. NOLAN: Now keep it clean.

MR. HICKEY: - oh, I always keep things clean - hon. members of the former administration who would not, Mr. Speaker, even talk to Quebec about transportation in Labrador. 'Keep Labrador in isolation,' they said, 'if necessary, but do not ever put a road through.' And, Mr. Speaker, what government talked to Quebec? What government presented a proposal? What government laid the problem squarely at the feet of the federal government by way of a joint proposal? This administration, Mr. Speaker, this one?

AN HON. MEMBER: The rules have been broken.

MR. HICKEY: Sorry, Mr. Speaker, if the rules have been broken. I will get back to the main meat of the petition.

Mr. Speaker, nobody can but support the prayer of this petition, but in doing so, Sir, I think we have to realize certain things, and one is that we are not going to keep Labrador from Quebec simply by adopting the attitude of not letting them in to do this, or not letting them put a road through or anything of that nature. The real proof of ownership of a territory, Mr. Speaker, is in occupation by people and the development of business and industry in that area so that our people will live in Labrador - not just say of a line on a map - there is our boundary, we own that great land mass, but nothing going on there, which to the greatest degree, Mr. Speaker, has been the case with the exception of a kind of spotty development such as Churchill Falls and Wabush and Labrador City. It is too

MR. HICKEY: bad, Mr. Speaker, that the former government did not when they developed Churchill Falls, say, 'Yes,' to the Province of Quebec, 'we will agree, but put a road across Labrador.' Too bad. But no, Mr. Speaker, they had their blinkers on. And now we find hon. gentlemen awfully concerned, My, we have to move instantly to hang on to Labrador because we are going to lose it! What nonsense! Mr. Speaker, I do not question the fact - as I say, the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and my two colleagues on this side express concern, and so they should, but, Mr. Speaker, the thing must be put in proper perspective. And indeed, we have waited too long. A government in this Province prior to 1970 should indeed have recognized this problem. And I do not think my friend from Eagle River would indeed deny that, I think he is too sincere an individual to deny that - that it is not a simple matter of rushing to do things now. We should reflect indeed on what was not done before. That is not to say that two wrongs make a right, I am not suggesting that.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record and add my support to this petition and I hope when I have an opportunity to speak in the debate that I will be able to give some further detail as to the position taken by this government since we have been in office with regard to the whole question of transportation in Labrador.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition and to, if I may, cover a couple of points. I would assume I will be granted the

May 17, 1978

Tape 3278

EC - 3

MR. NOLAN: same levity extended to the hon. gentleman opposite.

AN HON. MEMBER: Levity?

MR. NOLAN: Do not ask me to spell it.

MR. R. MOORES: You cannot spell levity.

MR. NOLAN: In reference to the former administration which I would assume I can reply to, Mr. Speaker, this debate was on, I thought - or not a debate, but the comments in support of a petition - were on a fairly high plane until our hon. friend rose opposite and whang-o, Mr. Speaker, away she goes again.

MR. W.N. ROWE: (Inaudible) hard core debate.

MR. NOLAN: Hard core debate. There is no way, it seems.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) warmed up.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, well, I mean -

MR. NEARY: Things will get warm down on Duckworth Street -

MR. RIDEOUT: Not warmed up - it is when he warms it over is the problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

We are not dealing with a - road on Duckworth Street!

MR. NOLAN: I hate to interfere, Mr. Speaker, -

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Up she comes!

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. HICKEY: I think the hon. gentleman maybe is anxious to see 'up she comes', but if he wants to play that game which he has been playing for a while now, then I am anxious - indeed, overanxious - for him to play his little game. He said, 'Things will get warm down on Duckworth Street next month. What is that supposed to mean? Could he explain?

MR. SPEAKER: No. Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Would he explain?

MR. SPEAKER: No, order -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, if you would permit

Your Honour, I would be delighted to hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: Obey the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman take his seat.

I cannot hear any further argument on that. Some points of order when they are brought up the Chair hears argument, some the Chair invites argument, but it is always a discretionary matter. Sometimes things are so evident that it would be absurd, perhaps, to hear argument and there is no point of order before the House with respect to the matter eluded to, there is nothing for the House to make a decision on.

The hon. member for Conception

Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The late Governor Duckworth would surely roll in his grave if he could hear it all going back and forth here this afternoon. Getting back again to the former administration, Mr. Speaker, and the remarks by my hon. friend, is it any wonder that the people of Labrador have a sort of a gut feeling that those in responsible positions look upon that land and its people as, or the land as the land that God gave to Cain. Unless it is in our best interest to suck something out of it, whether it is to go hunting and fishing, if one can afford the necessary apparatus, or whether it is taken out in iron ore profits or any other kind of profit, then we seem to know where it is and we know how to get at, apparently, the life's blood of Labrador. As for the suggestion by our hon. friend from St. John's South (Dr. J. Collins) that we were not interested, or we were opposing a road to Quebec, this

MR. NOLAN: is not so. It is not my understanding. I am not against it for one minute. We do not, on this side of the House at least, live in isolation, not interested in it at all. And we want a road. It is needed and needed badly.

Now, I would like to make another reference to this business about the possible separation of Labrador eventually. I do not think it is going to happen certainly in the time of most of us here in the House, if it happens at all. But I believe it is the duty of those of us who are in the House, who can see any possibility of it happening down the road, that we have to take all necessary steps within our power to see that it does not come about by the benign neglect, as our friend the hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to. I would like to make a little suggestion now, there are so many things we hear about PR reports. By the way in the PR report we heard reference to this afternoon was there any Newfoundlander in this group at all?

MR. NEARY: The leader was.

MR. NOLAN: The leader, no, no, a member of the PR group.

MR. NEARY: The leader was paying the bill.

MR. NOLAN: Remember the PR North America, all North America? Was there a Newfoundlander who is a member of the group referred to? That is the question I ask.

MR. NEARY: Probably the Premier who was paying the bill?

MR. NOLAN: The Premier is not a member of it.

MR. DINN: They are all Newfoundlanders.

MR. NOLAN: What is the sense, Mr. Speaker?

MR. RIDEOUT: The dimwit has no sense anyway.

You should know that.

MR. NOLAN: I would like to make a suggestion

MR. NOLAN: now to the hon. the Premier if he is in the precincts of the House, and I suspect he is.

Not more than two years ago I sat in, I believe, the Senate Building in Ottawa at a Parliamentary Conference with the hon. Speaker, and the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young), and for thirty minutes I watched a film allegedly on how a Legislature works, in this particular instance in the Province of Quebec.

MR. DINN: You should be a reporter.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I resent the remarks that are being cast this side again by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He made a mess of Foxtrap, do not let him ruin this House please.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fling him out.

MR. RIDEOUT: Dimwit.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! All hon. members have the right to speak without interruption.

MR. NOLAN: Getting back to my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that film depicted quite clearly, for all of us to see as did the hon. Speaker, a map of Quebec and Newfoundland was also included in the film, a map there, and all of Quebec was covered in red, Newfoundland, the Island portion was in yellow I believe. But the indication is, as I am sure my hon. friend is aware, an indication again in a film that has been in libraries and for all educational institutions in Quebec, another indication, blatant indication that this land mass is owned by the Province of Quebec.

Now here is a suggestion, why not as a project this Summer have some of our students, or whoever the government wishes to appoint, round up all the information that is now available in Quebec through tourism, highways maps, films or anything else that is available and we will have one solid case

MR. NOLAN: to slap on the table of this House, or any other House I suggest, proving - if we were doing that, if we in Newfoundland were attempting to distribute this kind of propoganda and literature with a great territorial grab such as they are doing in reference to their land there would be murder. There would be a national news story tonight. We are too bloody soft here. And it is time we stood up. This should not be a partisan thing. It is not PC - Liberal territory, it is Newfoundland Labrador. So why do we not at least take a look at this? I think if we lay this information on the table of this House and it is readily available to the public I am sure in many, many places because members opposite, as well as myself, have seen it.

Let us gather this material and you would be amazed at the massive material that they have quite deliberately set out to distribute world-wide in some instances and I, as a Newfoundlander, resent it.

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

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by the hon. member for Menihok (Mr. Rousseau) and the similar one presented by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). And I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the people in Labrador care who support the petition. These poor people, I have been down there myself at least once and I have heard a lot said about the people of Labrador since I came to

MR. WOODROW:

to this hon. House. I think what they are looking for is some help and guidance from the members of this legislature. I do feel in fact discouraged, Mr. Speaker, when anybody, I do not care what side of the House he is on gets up and tries to play politics with poor unfortunate people. I think it is a shocking crime. Now, I also feel, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) certainly did not delay the petition as he was accused of doing because he was having it presented today seeing that we are talking about the resolution on Labrador.

Also, Mr. Speaker, in speaking on the petition I want to congratulate the three hon. members, the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau), Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) because almost every time you turn on a radio or a television they are on speaking about the problems of Labrador, especially during the past few days the hon. member for Naskaupi and from Eagle River certainly brought Labrador to the forefront. Now I for one, in fact, I certainly would join any member who said that he would fight to keep Labrador as a part of Newfoundland. I certainly would go down there myself because it is, as we all know, our land. Of course, like everything Mr. Speaker, we have heard it said on open line this morning and yesterday morning that Labrador was neglected by the former and by the present administration. Well let us, for example, forget all that and let us bury the past, let us try in a non-partisan way - I believe the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) mentioned the fact that we should try to work on this great land because after all I do feel that the future of the Province at large certainly depends upon the minerals that are found and hopefully will be found, the offshore minerals and the like along the Labrador Coast.

So, Mr. Speaker, probably I should add this, in all the problems we have there is one thing we have to think about, that is there is only so much money to go around. I would like to have, in fact, all the streets in the Bay of Islands district paved but I know it is unreasonable because we have not got the money. But we only have so much money and we have to use that to our best advantage.

MR. WOODROW:

So, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the petition which was presented by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) and signed by some two thousand odd signatures. A year ago or a year and a half ago there were three by-elections in this Province where the slogan of the government was, this land is our land. And the implication of that particular slogan was that we were very concerned about Quebec and that this administration was going to look after Quebec. But after those particular by-elections we did not hear very much afterwards. Now it has taken the action by the Government of Quebec to stir up the emotions on the government side of the House again. This is another example of government by crisis or government which reacts to crisis and nothing is done until there is a crisis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this road is a top priority. It is a priority more important than any other priority in the Province and we in the Opposition as long as I have been here, the past three years, have been calling for the implementation and the upgrading and the extension of that Freedom Road. Mr. Speaker, I lived in Labrador on two occasions and I know what the isolation of that area does to people and I know that there are people in Labrador who have separatist feelings and there are people in Labrador who do not feel that this particular government is doing much for them, that this particular Province is doing much for them. But they do not like Quebec either. Now I feel that if we do not counter this chess move by Quebec

MR. J. HODDER: then we will find because of isolation and because of feelings that Labrador will become not only economically associated, as it is becoming very quickly now, but also socially associated with Quebec and after that who knows what will happen.

I believe that the Freedom Road as a link with this Province would also open up Labrador economically. The road there would give us easier access to those resources. I believe that this government must do more than to build a road to win the hearts and minds of the people of Labrador but I believe that the building of this road would be a start.

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

MR. W. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice in support of the two petitions presented to the House this afternoon by some 2,004 people from the Labrador area. It is certainly the stated intention and intent of everybody in Newfoundland to try as quickly as possible to get that road situation, that road network established in that huge landmass of Labrador. The urgency is there, the need is there and certainly the support is there. I think that the will and the purpose are there. It has been pointed out by speakers previous to me that the problem is a very obvious one and it is a financial one. The Department of Regional and Economic Expansion have been presented with a rather large and substantial package which is a matter of common knowledge and I am sure that most hon. members have seen it. Certainly those who want to see it have seen it and those who have not are certainly quite welcome to look at it. I told some people recently in the district of Fogo that we had their road situation on the top of the list with DREE. I subsequently discovered that that was an erroneous statement and I had misinformed these people but I have subsequently corrected that error and the package that has been so well presented in the House by the people of Fogo has subsequently taken a very important position on that list to DREE. I just take this opportunity of getting that message in here because I do not want to give anybody the impression that I am trying to mislead them.

MR. W. DOODY: But I also want to give the impression very clearly to the House and to the people of this Province that although we can look to DREE and can ask DREE and the Government of Canada for help and assistance in these programmes and projects the ultimate responsibility is here in this Province, in this legislature. The road situation in the Province of Newfoundland is the responsibility of the Government of Newfoundland and the assistance that we can get from the Government of Canada is assistance that we will certainly welcome and assistance that we will urgently chase after and hope for.

Many items have been mentioned in support of the petition, Sir, and there are one or two that I would like to touch on. It is unfortunate I know that the money that was spent in the development of the Western Labrador area when the mines were being opened, the money that was spent for instance in the building of the Quebec North Shore Railway, the value in purchasing terms of that money at that time had it been spent on a road connecting Western Labrador to the Coast would have certainly gotten us off in a very, very substantial way towards the goal that is now, Sir, obvious to all of us. I can remember distinctly a very prominent Newfoundland statesman at the time saying that the iron of Labrador would go South to Sept Isles over his dead body and we were all very proud of that particular stand and stance of that government and of that. But unfortunately that did not happen. The iron ore headed South and the economic benefits which my friend from Naskaupi mentioned earlier that were derived and are being derived from the mines and from the water resources and other resources of Labrador very, very small portions of it find their way into the Treasury or into the pockets of the people of the Province of Newfoundland. And that was primarily, Sir, because of the transportation arrangements that were made at that time. Had we known then what we know now I have no doubt that different arrangements would have been made. It has cost

MR. DOODY:

a great deal more to make them now and it will be a great deal more difficult but at least now that we have the opportunity we should press on and try as quickly as we can to get in these hookups. I do not think it is a matter of as somebody has said, the Province of Newfoundland sucking the profits out of the people of Labrador or the mainland part of the Province of Newfoundland as I prefer to call it. The people of this Province have sucked very little profit out of Labrador. The rest of Canada has managed to be the beneficiary of the great giveaway programmes in that part of our Province. I think you will see a different situation in the offshore development of the Labrador Coast and I think that the people in Labrador and the rest of our Province will benefit to a great deal from that particular programme which is a change in direction, Sir. I am only too happy to support the petition, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I want to lend my support to the petitions so ably presented by my colleague, the member for Eagle River and also the member for that area. Sir, there is one thing we must all admit and that is that it is going to be a monumental task to provide all the roads that are necessary in Labrador. Having said that, Sir, I firmly believe that money and machinery can do it. There is no doubt in my mind about that. I have seen roads built in Labrador especially in the Northern part around Saglek Bay and in Hopedale when the Americans started to build bases there. Up to then nothing but a gull, a sea gull would pitch on top of the mountains where they now have roads where you can drive certain vehicles, four-wheel drives I would assume, but certainly it is possible to do. And, Sir, the terrain in the section of road which we are thinking about is a difficult terrain to build roads, and I am not an engineer but from observations I would suspect that that is the case.

There is one thing we must admit and that is we must show our presence and we must show the intent and that can only be done

CAPT. WINSOR:

through this government and, of course, through this government and the federal government at Ottawa. Because, Sir, once that road is started then it is going to be not only the construction of it, but after it is constructed the maintenance and keeping it cleared during the Winter season and we get an awfully early Winter in Labrador. Those things all have to be borne in mind. But, Sir, we are not against the people in Labrador West having an outlet to the Province of Quebec. It is human nature to be very happy if there is an outlet from one community to the other. We have no more hesitation on that than we have, for instance, driving from the Province of New Brunswick into the Province of Quebec or from the Province of New Brunswick into the Province of Nova Scotia. What is the difference? You know people want a free transportation to and fro from one province to the other. Of course, I believe also that Mr. Levesque is thinking very seriously of providing that road link all the way down to Labrador City because this is going to enhance his referendum. I firmly believe that this is in the back of his mind. If he can get that score then, of course, that is going to enhance that referendum and make his party that much more popular.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition that we have to act. It is immaterial how we do it. If it has got to be done through the federal government, then we must go and impress upon the federal government how important this is for Newfoundland to retain its identity in the Province of Newfoundland and, of course, especially in that part of Newfoundland called Labrador. Because, Sir, right now I feel that Quebec has no recognition at all, no recognition of Newfoundland's claim to Labrador. They are trying to edge in every day and if we are not careful it will be, as someone said, the Russians will dominate the world within a fifty year period without

CAPTAIN WINSOR: firing a shot, it may not take that long for Quebec to dominate that part of Labrador if we are not very careful. So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly support both petitions.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I rise also to support the petition. It was supposed to be Private Members' Day where Labrador was the item to be discussed, but certainly to support this petition is certainly no problem whatsoever from where I sit.

The road network in Labrador, as everyone knows, is going to cost a colossal amount of money. As an example, Sir, the Goose Bay to Gull Island road which is seventy-five miles only of what we are talking about, has been estimated to cost some \$35 million. But that, of course, is a lot of money and if we talk from Goose to Churchill to get that upgraded and done you are talking about - the total from Goose to Churchill being approximately \$100 million.

Now, if we take from Churchill to Wabush via Esker which I understand is about 155 miles, of which 115 is there in a rough sort of a road now and the balance of 40 miles would be from Esker to Wabush, that would be an extra \$150 million.

So in other words, Sir, the road from Goose to Wabush, or Labrador City, you are talking approximately \$250 million. Now, Sir, that is a lot of money but once again, as has been said here today, that is also something that helps, not just open up Labrador, not just access to other parts of the world and so on, but it does more than that which I will deal with in a moment.

Before doing that, the road of course from L'Anse-au-Clair to that highway, how much that

PREMIER MOORES: would cost over that particular terrain I think the Lord alone knows because there has been no surveys to my knowledge done of it to any great degree. I do know that the Straits Road, just from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay would cost some \$17 million to put in shape. I forget the exact length of that road. I think it is about fifty or sixty miles. I can be corrected on that. But when we talk about the Coast of Labrador, of course, we are going to have to be talking about airstrips and connections of this sort for quite some time.

Now, Sir, in my opinion the way that the communications network in Labrador is going to be developed is through the industrial development of Labrador which gives two reasons for it to be connected up in a great many cases. Reasons such as connecting hydro sites, connecting mining sites with other areas and so on. This is the natural way for it to happen and I want to make one thing clear to my hon. friend from Port au Port who spoke a few moments ago about the lack of concern for Labrador, we have a proposal into Dree now for \$130 million, and of that proposal \$70 million is for highways, or for communications and transportation needs.

I suggest, Sir, that one of the things, I guess, that we use as an excuse if you like, or sometimes not giving it the proper credence is the fact that in the whole of Labrador we have 38,000 people. It is very difficult when we talk of spending \$130 million, or \$250 million for a road, it is very difficult to identify the \$250 million bill to be spent with 38,000 people. 6,000 of those, of course, live on the Coast. But, Sir, I would suggest that in Labrador we are talking more than just the people and the use of the highways themselves. As I said the tourist potential of the area, the fisheries potential of the area which would not be affected

PREMIER MOORES: so much by this road, the mineral development of the area, the connecting of the hydro sites alone, and when we talk, Sir, of Labrador South, I mean when you think about the Pinware River, the Fig River, the St. Lewis, the Alexis, the Eagle, the Paradise, all these rivers I would suggest eventually, at least, have the potential of being developed for hydro sites, and if that is the case, of course, they will have to be connected up. And when you talk about the hundreds of millions of dollars, and billions of dollars that it cost to build those sites, then the road becomes insignificant compared to the site development itself.

I am saying, Sir, that the communication situation in Labrador is one of major concern. The identifying of the isolation in Labrador I would suggest is of greater concern and transportation is a part of that cure.

The difference in isolation between Labrador City and Nain I would suggest is uniquely different. But then I would suggest that probably the people in Nain are more used to isolation than the people are in Labrador City. I may be wrong on that.

But, Sir, what I will say in closing, I am sorry there is one minute left here.

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave.

PREMIER MOORES: No. No. But what I want to say, Sir, - I will speak later when the debate comes on - but what I want to say, Sir, one thing is that the one way that Quebec

PREMIER MOORES:

could never have any hope of taking over Labrador or having the sympathy of the people who live in Labrador, and they are the people after all whose destiny you are talking about, the only way, Sir, that that can be avoided and must be avoided at all cost is that Labrador resources as they are developed for export to Ontario or export to the Island part of the Province or whatever, the first beneficiaries of those resources have to be the people of Labrador themselves, there is no question about that. Whether it is through a Port Labrador, through a railway in Labrador that allows a development in that regard, whether it is transportation in Labrador or industrial development, and if there is secondary industrial development that can be spinoffs from energy or what have you, in my opinion, if at all humanly possible they should be established in Labrador first.

In closing, Sir, what I would say is that it is the intention of this government and I know any government in the future that the priority of the resource development in Labrador must and has to be for Labradorians first, the Province second and Canada third.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I noticed the Premier knows the fishing rivers well. In his long lists of fishing which well he should. I do not object to that. He is well acquainted with them. In support of this petition, this second petition on this subject, I would like to point out one or two things about this. I think the petition was caused recently because of the building of the road by Quebec Cartier Mining by other interested people in the government of Quebec in the Province of Quebec. I listened to the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins) talk about the feeling of being in isolation. We are not talking about isolationism here, we are not talking about the road being not required. We are not talking about, we should not have it, we feel definitely that the road should be there, of course. Who would want to be an isolationist living in an area and not want to have dealings with another Province. We cannot fault Quebec for building the road. Of course, they are building the road to satisfy their

MR. STRACHAN:

own needs and well they may.

Our basic argument is that we feel that this road was done and my belief is that this road was caused to be constructed, got underway - the Freedom Road west not the Freedom Road east - in a very insidious, very quiet, very hidden way. Because for a number of weeks now that equipment has been working. What are we talking about? We are talking about joining up approximately 100 miles on that side of Labrador City using to a large extent striking iron ore workers, using Quebec Cartier Mining equipment, using a number of things like this plus the government of Quebec helping and assisting. Also, with pickets placed at Fermont, so that one could not see what was going on. Now why place pickets on a road if a road is being built? Why deny as there have been many denials, even up until as recently as yesterday, denials that the road is taking place at all? Why deny the fact that the road is being built? They are denying the road is being built and, in fact, have stopped construction on the road right now. And the statement that I have heard passed on to me, I must admit passed on to me, is that they have stopped construction until the publicity dies down on it, until there is no more publicity about the road and it all dies a natural death and then up comes the Quebec Cartier mining workers again, their equipment will go in place, the Province of Quebec will move on and the road will be constructed to Labrador City and Wabush.

That is why that petition has 2,000 names and I believe other petitions following with 3,000 or 4,000 names on them. The reason is that they believe that there is more than just a road link. And our argument is not that it should not be there, our argument as this petition puts down is that the road link should also be and probably first of all, be to Happy Valley-Goose Bay not to the west.

The Premier mentions the amount of money, \$250 million. I do not want to enter into debate but we must remember that the road that is being built in Quebec is being built as a rough, dirt road.

MR. STRACHAN:

What we are talking about to link up Wabush, Labrador City with Happy Valley-Goose Bay is forty miles of road which could be like all the rest of the road, dirt road because most people in Labrador driving are accustomed to driving four by four vehicles. Most of them going down the Quebec Road into Baie Comeau or on to Montreal wherever they want to go will be driving trucks or four by four vehicles. So what we are talking about is not \$250 million, we are talking about a small amount of money to link up the forty miles to allow you then to drive from Labrador City-Wabush round through Esker and then down through Churchill Falls and down through Happy Valley-Goose Bay. And that could be done I would suggest. If it is being done on the other side for 100 miles by striking iron ore workers using

MR. STRACHAN: Quebec Cartier mining equipment then surely it can be done for very little funds on our side in order to give us the Freedom Road and the real Freedom Road.

The other argument basically is that, of course, there is only a small population in Labrador and I agree that obviously \$250 million sounds a lot of money to spend for a small population in Labrador. The point in the petition, stated in the petitions by the people is that in two years out of Labrador City alone \$1.4 billion I believe or \$1.6 billion worth of iron ore has been extracted. So they feel that regardless of the size of the population they are contributing by far a great deal to the economy of this Province and to the economy of Canada and as such, therefore, they are right in demanding that forty miles of dirt road be constructed and then let us consider the whole road after that. That is the point of the petition and that is why the petition came about. I regret in many ways in the last few weeks there has been attempts to down play that road, to make out that road has not been there, nennele heine ostriches and putting their heads in the sand because we will embarrass Newfoundland, embarrass the Province and embarrass the government and I do not believe that that should be allowed to continue like that. We should face up to the fact and that is why the petition was presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak very long to this but I do want to add my support to this petition. Having spent some years in Western Labrador I do have some feelings for the issues that have been raised here today, and certainly the issue of a road that would join effectively Western Labrador to Goose Bay thus directing the economic activities of Labrador towards the island part of the Province. So we have two major reasons coming really for this road, the economic reasons and the social reasons so that the people of Labrador can feel that they are indeed a part of this Province and that the island part of Newfoundland is concerned about the economics and about the social aspects and the needs of the people of Labrador. Transportation can be

MR. LUSH: very effective in determining these issues and in determining which way the economic developments or the economic benefits will accrue, in which way they will be directed and to which way social inclinations of people will be directed. And because the road from Quebec now joining to Western Labrador certainly makes this an necessity.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see much to be gained in blaming past governments for what they did not do or what they did do that needs change and circumstances change. It is rather unfortunate that not enough people had the foresight to see what was happening in Labrador and to be able to prevent the kind of movements that started in the last four or five years, the feelings of alienation. It was unfortunate that people did not see that but as I say I think things, needs and circumstances change and that possibly people did not have enough insight to look into these matters. But the important thing, Mr. Speaker, is that we know that a situation exists today, certain circumstances exist and it is up to this House of Assembly to wrestle and come to grips with these issues and try and solve them. I only wish that we could get into communications because this certainly too is a very important area to solve the problems that we are talking about. To bring people together socially, economically, to make them feel a part of one unit not only the transportation aspect must be taken into consideration but the communications aspect.

I think I have said in this House previously, Mr. Speaker, that when I went to Labrador and Churchill Falls in particular, I felt that I was more in Quebec than I was in Newfoundland. There were no Newfoundland newspapers and this is not something that a government can deal with, but this is just the way it was. The radio programmes came out of Toronto, I think, and there was nothing to make you feel a part of this Province. Certainly if we had a road communication to Goose Bay and directed towards the Province I think that would have given that feeling that Labrador and the Province of Newfoundland are indeed one, that we are one Province and I think this is what this petition is about so that we can eliminate the feelings of alienation that we are

MR. LUSE: one province, that we are one people with common goals, and this road system would certainly go a long way to promote that sort of feeling. And I certainly hope that the government will move in that direction. We already have some starts with the road. We have a road from Churchill to Esker, a road that I have travelled over several times, every mile of it, and the Freedom Road from Churchill towards Goose Bay, travelled over every bit of that road. So we do have something to work with. I realize the cost is going to be a rather excessive cost, but in terms of what it will do in bringing the two parts of this Province together, I think, Mr. Speaker, it will be well worth the expenditure. So I hope that the government will look into this matter and try to do everything possible to grant the request of the petitioners for the good of the people of Labrador and for the good of the people of the Island part of the Province - for the good of all of us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HICKMAN: How do you deal with the hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker? Yesterday they were complaining because government members were not getting up and supporting petitions - today they have been up, and now that a few of us want to have a few modest and succinct words -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: Not me, I never talk about the House on the air - never do.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Premier would.

MR. HICKMAN: Never do. My respect for this House is that we should always keep within the House

MR. HICKMAN: matters that belong in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with just two things, one, you know, it is a fact that a very detailed submission was made quite some time ago when I was still Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs, to the Government of Canada, for massive DREE participation in the development of Labrador. I went to Goose two years ago, and met with the hon. Mr. Lessard, who has, I find, a tremendous feeling for Labrador that I wish he could convey to his colleagues in Ottawa. And at that meeting, which was a rather modest attempt to get some work underway in Labrador, I suggested to him that what we needed was a development programme not just for transportation, but in other areas as well. And he threw the challenge out to me for Newfoundland to prepare that submission, and this we did, very detailed, very well documented and, I think, well put together.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not regard the request for massive funding for the construction of the Trans-Labrador Highway as that of a province going and saying to the national government, Give us some more crumbs from your table. Because I regard, Mr. Speaker, that kind of proposal as one of national significance.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: What is happening to Canada today, Mr. Speaker, is that Canada is becoming too fat and too lazy and too self-satisfied, and we must look back and see what developed this nation. What developed this nation was when men like Sir John A. MacDonald said, 'We are going to build a Trans-Canada railway.' Nobody living

MR. HICKMAN: out there or next to nothing - probably there were not as many people living in British Columbia at the time that the railway was built as there are in Labrador today. If the concept had been a 'user pay' one - the 'user pay' concept, as Premier Regan says, is very much in vogue in Ottawa today and is choking Atlantic Canada. If that 'user pay' concept had been around at that time we would not have had the kind of development in Western Canada that we saw as a result of the development of transportation.

Now it is the turn of the North, Mr. Speaker. What we need in Canada today, it will not be a band of steel, it will be a band of pavement stretching from Port Labrador right through to the Yukon.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Because that is where Canada's future lies. It cannot be done if the 'user pay' concept comes into play. It can only be done when we find Canadians who are prepared to, what may be regarded by some economists as taking a very reckless act, when we find some Canadians - Canadian political leaders, Canadian business leaders - who are prepared to gamble the billions of dollars that are going to be necessary to open up this last frontier.

I believe that the great frontier of the North is in the Labrador section of our Province, but there are other parts of the North of this nation that have potential that is equally as good

MR. HICKMAN:

probably not as plentiful. And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that what we need, and I gather from the comments that have been forthcoming from hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House that there is unanimity, that there has to be massive federal involvement along with the Province in this concept. We have taken the first step. The ball right now, I would submit, is in the court of our colleagues in Ottawa. I wish they would bounce it back to us so we can get a handle on it and get on with the job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George's.

MRS. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say a couple of words in support of both petitions. I would just like to say that I do not think the people of Labrador care too much where the highway comes from or where the money comes from as long as they are able to travel on it. But it is my understanding, and I may be misinformed, but I know \$250 million seems like an awful lot of money for 38,000 people but it is still 38,000 people in isolation. I would like to see the emphasis put on the road built towards the Island part of the Province naturally rather than in the other direction. I am wondering if this would be a new part of the Trans-Canada Highway or a new Trans-Canada Highway. Would we not get a much larger percentage than - I do not see the provincial government having to put in all that much money since it is a new highway. I may be misinformed but it is my understanding that the federal government would be paying the bigger chunk of it. It certainly would not be, I do not think, a fifty-fifty deal.

But regardless of what that may be I would certainly like to see the people in Labrador happy as far as the road link is concerned and a link towards the Island. I am also concerned about the fact that Quebec is taking such an interest in that area. For one thing I do not trust Quebec and I certainly do not trust Mr. Levesque and I believe that if he was in the position to get one inch of our territory, give him an inch and he will certainly think that he is the ruler of the Province. So I would like to see a lot of interest and a lot

MRS. MACISAAC:

of concern directed towards that just to find out what the intention of Quebec is in that respect. Their intentions may be honourable but on the other hand they may very well not be.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues on both sides of the House to support this petition so ably presented by my colleague and by our friend across the House. I think it is a very important petition and the fact that it has been signed by so many residents of the Labrador area I think speaks for itself. Mr. Speaker, the feeling of isolation is not a very good feeling. Some of us who have had the experience of living in isolated areas I am sure can well understand the concern that is being expressed by the people of Labrador and in fact, I suppose, by people in other parts of the Province where roads are necessary, needed. We can appreciate their concern. That is why I think most Newfoundlanders would be very happy to support this petition.

I believe the need for the road is very important at this time because, as the previous speaker pointed out, I think that Quebec is obviously anxious to establish that kind of a presence in Labrador and even though the cost, as pointed out by the Premier, would be in the many, many millions of dollars, probably far beyond the financial capability of the Province at this particular point in time, then I believe that if we are going to retain the good will and support of our fellow Newfoundlanders who live in Labrador that it is going to be necessary for us to establish that kind of a presence, establish that kind of a link with the Island part of the Province

MR. W. CARTER: that kind of a link
with the Island part of the Province.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I have
no hesitation at all in supporting this petition and I know
that my colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications
will do all he can, as indeed his colleagues in Cabinet, in
bringing about an early solution to this very serious
problem.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I rise also to
support the prayer of the petition presented so ably by my
friend and colleague from Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) and also
the petition presented by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan).

Mr. Speaker, this road is a very,
very important road, to not only the people of Labrador but to
all the people in Newfoundland, and certainly everything must
be done. I am sure the Minister of Transportation and
Communications, as Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, will
be pushing the case for Labrador and pushing the case to the
federal government to get this road, such a great need for the
people of that part of the Province of Newfoundland. I think
Mr. Speaker, we should get away from the idea of talking about
who owns Labrador, because nobody owns Labrador. Labrador
is part of Newfoundland. It will always be part of
Newfoundland. And, Mr. Speaker, if we can get just part of,
just a small part of, half of the return that we should be
getting from the development at Churchill Falls, as the hon.
Premier indicated, it costs \$250 million to do this road, and if
we could get half of the development at Churchill Falls, half of
what was given away on that one development, we could get that road
done. And we will work through Intergovernmental Affairs, through
Ottawa and through Quebec, but one of these days that road will
be done and we will do it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would hate like heck to be left out of this because there might be a headline saying that Ank Murphy was against this road in Labrador. But I believe we are on a very good tack today as far as this is concerned. I think everybody will concede it is a great worthy project to build the road across Labrador. In my own association with various areas of Labrador I can go back nearly thirty years before the town of Happy Valley was built there, when I stood there on the way down to the old Hamilton River Boat Club with a couple of friends of mine and one said, "Look, right here is going to be the main street through Happy Valley and right here -" and I look at my hon. colleague over there from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) and I think of that day when we came down from the mountain, clad only in our shorts, with a raincoat on us - we had just assisted the former Premier to blow the top off of the mountain in Churchill Falls.

MR. NOLAN: The Late Donald Gordon was with us.

MR. MURPHY: And Donald Gordon, and I will not repeat what he said coming down when we met him and the water squelching out of his boots, and he said, "If anybody mentions this," adjective, adjective, adjective, adjective, adjective, "Churchill Falls to me again," he said, "I will literally choke him."

But, Mr. Speaker, when I think of all of this debate about Labrador belonging to whom and Labrador belonging to Quebec or belonging to anybody else, I think of a very bitter debate that I took part in when I was on the other side when we went out of our way, and I think wrongly at this time, I do not want to get into another debate, to rename this Province of

MR. MURPHY: Newfoundland which consisted of all that area, to Newfoundland and Labrador. I think of that and I think it was with that concession right at the start, Sir, that we did acknowledge that we were not sure that we did own Labrador.

And when I was in Labrador quite recently, and I think if everybody gets worked up about Quebec having this and Quebec having that, and I looked at my watch, it is now approximately five-thirty here in St. John's, in Bellevue, in Buchans, in Corner Brook, Port au Port, Port aux Basques, what time is it in Goose Bay at this time? Will someone tell me?

MR. NOLAN: Half an hour earlier.

MR. MURPHY: It is five o'clock in Goose Bay at this time.

MR. RIDEOUT: Your time is right on.

MR. A.J. MURPHY: Well approximately I said and in Labrador City, is that Newfoundland time? That is Nova Scotia time. Right! I took a short trip up to see this beautiful town of Fermont - is that the name of it there? Fourteen miles, I think, from Labrador City. It is now 5:30 P.M. in St. John's and in Newfoundland and 5:00 P.M. in Goose Bay and what time is it in Fermont? Four o'clock. Why? Because the people of Quebec and Montreal that is their time, nothing else. Four o'clock in Quebec and four o'clock in Fermont which is a part of Quebec, but here we are in Newfoundland five-thirty and in Happy Valley-Goose Bay which we say is ours there is a half hour difference. How it happened I do not know really. But this is perhaps the first time that we have had the chance to debate this thing. It has taken all afternoon. I do not think it has been any waste of time, it is Private Member's Day - Labrador. But will someone say to me now to reinforce without a foolish change of Newfoundland and Labrador or Newfoundland and Corner Brook or Newfoundland and Bay of Islands or Newfoundland, will someone say to me now or say it to all of us, should we not now make it approximately twenty-five minutes to six in Happy Valley-Goose Bay and in Labrador and Wabush and Churchill Falls? Would that be any help to us psychologically and many other ways? Am I wrong? Am I stupid? Am I foolish? In my opinion we can preach all we like. Psychologically, if we have a presence there and your brother or my brother or my cousin when he or she phones me from Happy Valley-Goose Bay is talking the same language as you and I, it is now twenty-five minutes to six here where I am. I would be the first to vote. I would be the first to put it on Newfoundland time. There has been many say that we should go on some other time but we did not do that, it would be a tremendous upheaval.

But all I am saying is this, Mr. Speaker, if Newfoundland is going to be Newfoundland including all that great mainland portion let us for heaven's sakes do that one little thing, say that they share one thing in common with us and that is the time of day.

MR. A.J. MURPHY: I support the petition very, very ardently and I certainly hope that please God whatever balance the hon. Minister of Transportation will have left over in his capital account this year we will be able to put \$300 million or \$400 million into Labrador for the highway.

Thank you, very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Exploits.

DR. TWOMEY: I too, Mr. Speaker, support the petition from both sides of the House. I undoubtedly have to agree -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The hon. gentleman should be heard without interruptions.

DR. TWOMEY: I undoubtedly have to agree with the members who introduced this petition as I possibly more than anyone here in the House at this moment am aware of what a border can do to a country. I feel that this road although going to Quebec is an absolute necessity because communications and physical communications are possibly the most important way of creating a friendship and a feeling of fellowship and nationhood and patriotism. I have been in Labrador mostly in Labrador City and talking to the many people there and the children of the many friends that I have there I have been struck by the feeling that they were not Newfoundlanders at all, they were Labradorians. I am sure if the insidious imperialism of René Levesque keeps on as it is it can be a democratic way, but he is certainly doing it. He is using a psychology that we are not able to do at the moment. Soon you will have possibly French coming in more and more and I know of no better way to divide a country than to destroy its language. As a matter of fact there has been a carrying call. if I might use a foreign language in this House, pier na oige - there is no country without its tongue.

In Israel they have certainly promoted their language but Mr. Levesque on the other hand is giving all encouragement to the schools, to the people, to the business, to the construction industry, he is doing everything possible and he is approaching it in a very subtle way. His psychology is great. If you have a

MR. PATTERSON: I do not think for a moment we should allow ourselves to be swayed by suggestions and the threat that Quebec may walk in and take over Labrador. When one talks about one country infringing on the rights of another one has a tendency to become emotional and get carried away with it, and men have been known to follow leaders to their death through blind patriotism - they do not know what they are talking about in many, many cases.

I have a feeling, and I will make this prediction here today, that the people of Newfoundland Labrador will one day become a part of Quebec, not because they want to become a part of it, but because they would be economically better off. The more roads that go into Quebec the better; the more roads that go into New Brunswick the better. And people should be encouraged to seek their own destiny.

I doubt if there is a man in Newfoundland today, or in any other part of Canada, who would take part in any movement of a military nature to stop that. Because this is something now that is inevitable and as sure as night must follow day Newfoundland Labrador will become a part of Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

DR. R. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I just want to rise for a minute or two to put forth my own position in favour of this petition.

I have always had a very close feeling or a very strong feeling in my own heart for

DR. R. WINSOR: Labrador. My grandfather and father fished off the coast for many, many years - particularly my grandfather. Of course, I think his whole life was spent pursuing the Labrador fishery, and my father, I think just six or seven years before he left that location for another.

But in my own case, the first opportunity I ever had to see Labrador was in 1962, just after I got my private pilot's licence, and being rather young and foolish in those days, with another cohort, took a slight aircraft and we flew to Goose Bay. And I have never forgotten the awe I felt looking over that great land. And today when we were talking about a highroad - at that time, I remember talking with my compatriot on that flight about the opportunity for development that that country has.

I certainly feel in my own heart that Quebec has a long term plan to take over Labrador and I think that one of the main steps that this Province has to take is to improve the communications system with Labrador so that we can encourage our own people on the island to go and become settlers in Labrador.

DR. R. WINSOR:

I am sure there must be many opportunities for many people to have a good life style above and beyond the main mining towns that are there at present. But I also would like to endorse the Minister of Justice's remark and the fact that Canada's destiny really does lie in the North and I would like to see a highway going right from St. John's up through, a tunnel and a road across Labrador, a good one and right across to Alaska because Canada to develop in the future certainly has to use the resources of its northern parts. But this cost, of course, particularly the Labrador highway, certainly this Province at the moment has not the resources to do it. But it should in any event be a federal responsibility and I would hope that this government certainly uses all its power to put pressure on the federal government to get this road as quickly as possible. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by my hon. colleague from Menihek (Mr. Rousseau). When the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) spoke he talked about knowing what it was like to live in a border country, a country bordering on another one. I agree with him on that but I also know what it is like to live in isolation being born on the Northwest Coast, of course, and I believe I was the ripe age of twenty before I saw a car or there were any roads so I could see it. So I know what isolation is like and of course I have visited Labrador three times now. I have been in Nain for instance.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where were you born 'Wallace'?

MR. HOUSE: Bellburns.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bellburns?

MR. HOUSE: Right. Three times I have been in Nain and, of course, I felt the isolation there as I visited and it reminded me of the coast some twenty-five to twenty-six years ago. So there is that degree of isolation. And the only part of Labrador that I have not visited, of course, since I have been minister is the Labrador West area which I will be visiting now in the next two weeks for prize giving and an adult education graduation there. But there is isolation. Now, of course,

MR. HOUSE:

we know that is a little improved to what it was a few years ago when there were no airplanes. But nevertheless when people cannot move any great distance by virtue of the fact that there is no road I know it presents many problems for them and for their families in this day and age when, of course, we are a very mobile society.

The other problem is, of course, the Labrador - the idea of the Quebec strategy in Labrador now is just a step up from what it has been all along. We talk about the Quebec intentions, their ambitions and aspirations. One only has to look back at the signing of the agreement in Labrador for the Upper Churchill power when they would not accept the border. It is a point x -

AN HON. MEMBER: Point A.

MR. HOUSE: Point A, is it? Point A or X. Anyway it is a designation rather than a border and it shows, of course, that this has been a long-term thing. And the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) talked about the idea of getting all the materials that are available and putting it on the table and showing the world or the rest of Canada at least what Quebec is doing and I think I agree with him in that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is an insidious move by the Government of Quebec to try to infiltrate Labrador and to try to get designs on the territory. I think it should be stopped and I believe one of the things that can stop it is to try and get a highway across Labrador and I believe, of course, like many others that it should be part of a federal-provincial programme and I think we should be moving in that way. And what I am hearing here today is, of course, that everybody on this side will be supporting that to the extent that it can be done. I, of course, am one of this group and would heartily endorse what has been said and support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health followed by the hon. gentleman for Mount Pearl.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I could not sit by and let this debate end without adding my own voice to hon. members in the support of the so-called two petitions which were presented today.

MR. H. COLLINS: Your Honour and I had the occasion last Summer, if you will recall, to fly from Labrador City down through Churchill and on to Goose Bay. In the event, Your Honour, that some members opposite might misunderstand what the trip was about, we did have with us Mr. Elliott Richardson and his very beautiful wife. We were escorting them around Labrador so he could get a first hand view of the Labrador scene.

I might say that everybody knows who Mr. Richardson is, or who he was, and he is now the American permanent ambassador to the Law of the Sea Conference at the United Nations.

But flying that route, Your Honour, we could see the road which had been constructed, a very rough road, a very winding road, from Churchill Falls down to Happy Valley - Goose, following the course of the great Churchill River. But after flying over that, certainly it really sends home to one how isolated that part of the Province is. Those of us who remember reading the Morgan Report on Labrador City - Wabush, must certainly recognize that one of the real problems faced by the people in Labrador City - Wabush is the feeling of isolation. And, Mr. Speaker, that is a very real, real feeling. I do not know how many hon. members have really experienced it.

MR. PECKFORD: I have.

MR. H. COLLINS: I grew up on an island myself, on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland, and know what it is to be isolated. I also know what it was to travel to places in White Bay, such as St. Anthony years ago, and get off the boat and realize that you were isolated for two weeks or three weeks, whatever it was, until the coastal boat, the coastal steamer arrived again. And it is a terrible feeling to know that one is isolated and cannot get away.

MR. H. COLLINS: It cannot be said that this government has not been sympathetic towards the needs of Labrador. There has been a tremendous amount of money spent around the Coast and in other areas of Labrador. And I am sure that my colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, is aware of the problem. I am sure that he is doing everything he can and as the Premier mentioned, while it takes a lot of money - and it does take a lot of money - I still believe that we are going to have to make an effort to bring about road facilities to those people from Wabush, Labrador City down through Happy Valley and Goose.

It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: I usually alternate, but I had indicated that I would recognize the hon. gentleman for Mount Pearl next. I do not think the hon. gentleman to my right was standing so I recognize the hon. member for Mount Pearl.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I could not pass this opportunity to have a few comments about this petition. I support this petition whole-heartedly, and it is the first opportunity I have had to make any comment whatsoever, I think, about Labrador and I confess that my friend from Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor) has about seventeen years on me when he talks about having visited Labrador I think the first time in 1962.

Last year, Sir, was the first time that I had the pleasure of actually visiting Labrador. And my only other experience directly with Labrador would be my association with my friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) with whom I have been working in the Premier's Office for the past two and a half years. And I assure you that when you work on the same floor with the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) you hear a great deal about Labrador, as

MR. N. WINDSOR: he and the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) and the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) have been great patrons of Labrador and great defenders of their constituents.

Sir, there is no question in my mind that Labrador holds some of the greatest resources that this Province has and in that regard, obviously, follows a tremendous part of our future of this Province and I make no distinction between Newfoundland and Labrador. I recognize the name of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador out of respect for my friends from Labrador and their constituents. I consider it to be their decision but personally I would prefer to see, as my friend from St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) said, just the Province of Newfoundland. I think the fact that Labrador is there in the name sort of alienates them slightly. But I respect their wishes. They have decided that they would like it to be so and I make no argument with it.

But, Sir, to speak in relation to the road. I support this entirely. I do not fear at all the fact that

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Levesque and the Province of Quebec are building a highway to connect Labrador to the major centers of Quebec and Canada. In fact I think in the long run it will be a definite advantage to Labrador, to the Province in general. To go with that, of course, it is imperative that we put every priority on building the Trans-Labrador Highway from Labrador City to Churchill Falls and Goose Bay and on down the coast, Sir, to the Straits of Belle Isle. And if you look at a map of the Atlantic Provinces and you compare anybody travelling to the Avalon Peninsula from Central Canada, any goods that are being transported from Central Canada to St. John's or the Avalon Peninsula area, if you look at the road distance, Sir, and by travelling upon the route that is now used via Port aux Basques and through Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and on through Quebec and if you compare a similar route travelling up the Northern Peninsula of Newfoundland and along the proposed route of the Trans-Labrador Highway in through Quebec you will find that there is very little difference in mileage, very little difference at all. It has the advantage of passing through a much greater portion of our Province. It has the advantage of reducing the ferry in the Gulf Straits to I think it is a nine mile distance across the Straits of Belle Isle. Obviously, the cost could be reduced. And I think this highway if completed and if used to transport goods-and I am sure it would be used-would lower the cost of goods and services not only to Labrador itself - obviously it would-but it would be of tremendous benefit to the island portion of our Province.

So I have no hesitation at all in supporting this petition. I consider that this highway would be a major factor in unifying the Island portion of the Province with the Labrador portion of the Province. I think that is of critical importance. As I said, I do not fear the highway across Quebec for itself but I do fear the effect that it could have on the people of Labrador and the unity of our Province if we do not take the initiative, and if we do not put the proper priorities on the construction of the Trans-Labrador Highway.

MR. N. WINDSOR: I think it is absolutely essential to the future of this Province.

So, Sir, I have no hesitation at all in putting full support behind this petition.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, let me say first because I know I will get cut off that I totally support the petitions, both petitions so ably supported by my colleague from Eagle River and by the hon. minister and my colleague from Menihek. Now, Mr. Speaker, on a recent trip to Labrador - We talk about the Port Labrador and the Labrador road and I suppose we are talking about Labrador West, Labrador City to Goose Bay or to some port on Coastal Labrador then across to St. Anthony and I, too, agree that that road should be built, but it should be built for the purposes of developing Labrador, taking advantage of the timber resources, mineral resources that are in the interior and proving to the people of Labrador that we intend to have the economic development of Labrador flow towards Newfoundland. But anyone who thinks that building that road, if that road were a finished product today I think there would still be as much pressure on from Western Labrador for the road coming up from Sept Isles as there is now, and the road will come. I suspect if both roads were in place, any persons from Labrador West wanting to drive to Newfoundland today - I would suspect that nine out of ten would go the Southern route and across - even if they were coming to Newfoundland. Economics will dictate again that that particular road will be built, Mr. Speaker. The danger for this Province is that we do not build. When you withhold something from somebody they want it all the more, and if the feeling persists in Labrador that the Newfoundland Government is deliberately withholding or deliberately stopping the road coming up from Quebec they will feel that, they will demand it all the more. And then if they feel that the only reason we are talking about building a road from Port Labrador into Labrador West they will feel that that is simply an effort to stop them from taking advantage

MR. FLIGHT: of anything South of Labrador City or Churchill Falls or Fermont which they want to get down to.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is six o'clock and there is not much more I can say to that. Certainly there is nothing I can say to that that has not already been said. And it is good that Private Member's Day this session has been devoted totally to the Labrador issue. It appears that it will continue to be devoted. It appears that none of the other resolutions on the Order Paper will see the light of day. But it is appropriate and good that this particular debate has taken place and in light of some of the things that have been said here today maybe we should put another resolution on the Order Paper.

So, Mr. Speaker, I totally support the concept in the petitions.

MR. SPEAKER: It being six o'clock the House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 2:00 P.M.

The House has adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 18, 1978 at 2:00 P.M.