

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, AUGUST 7, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair,

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, on August 6th, during consideration by the Government Services Committee of the Estimates of the Department of Transportation and Communications, the minister of that department (Mr. Brett) was queried as to whether a detailed report on the road reconstruction and paving projects was available to members. The minister advised the Committee that this information was available to members and the general public shortly after the end of each fiscal year. I might mention that the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) on three occasions indicated to the minister that this was satisfactory. Subsequently, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition raised the matter in the House and indicated that some members were not satisfied that the information was not tabled before the Government Services Committee.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have decided, and I wish to inform this hon. House, despite those differing opinions on the matter, I will be tabling the list of projects for the current fiscal year within the next twenty-four hours. The Department of Transportation and Communications will have to compile this information and is in the process of doing so, and it is anticipated that the information will be ready for distribution for tomorrow's sitting.

Mr. Speaker, this government is making every effort to pursue a policy of openness in government in all matters affecting the public of this Province. The tabling of this information is in keeping with this policy, and as the hon. members know, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) previously announced that the number and amount of loans issued by his department will also be tabled. In this regard, some members of the Opposition have requested that the names of those people who have received loans or grants from the Rural Development Authority be made public.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise this hon. House that the policy relating to the tabling of this kind of information is under review by Cabinet. I believe, Sir, that government, in reviewing this matter, must be absolutely certain that individuals doing business with government are not compromised in any way. Moreover, Sir, it is my view that any such policy must not only relate to the Rural Development Authority but also to the Fisheries Loan Board and to the Farm Loan Board. In other words, it must be a consistent policy for all government agencies involved in the issuing of grants and loans for whatever purpose. Clearly, a number of factors must be taken into consideration, and, as I have stated, Cabinet will be giving this question a thorough review. As soon as Cabinet has made a policy decision on this matter, this hon. House will be so advised.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the Premier has decided to present us with this particular list, delighted because I was the person who raised it, who asked three times in the Committee—and I could not understand or appreciate the Premier's statement that there was some discrepancy, some difference of opinion between myself and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition; indeed, there was not. I had asked three times for the information of the Committee to be tabled; indeed, I was

MR. T. LUSH: going to propose a motion to ask the minister to do it when he did not agree. But, of course, understanding the structure, I knew that we would not win it by the motion, so I thought that I would bring it to the House of Assembly, through the leader, where I knew that greater logic would prevail. So I am happy that the Premier went along with this and I think everybody on both sides will be the happier because we have received this list and particularly the people of Newfoundland. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. the Premier, Sir. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he can tell us about some reviews in the operation of Newfoundland Hardwoods that is taking place at the present time that will involve the shut-down of the plywood plant at Newfoundland Hardwoods with the layoff of some eighteen to twenty employees down there in that operation right here at Donovans.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will get the information for the hon. member for tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. Is he in a position to indicate to the House the outcome of his discussions today, if they have already taken place with the Federal Minister of Interprovincial Relations (Mr. W. Jarvis) or to give some general summary of the kinds of matters that may have been discussed and his reaction to them?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, I thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition for asking me the questions, Mr. Speaker, because I did want to be able to inform the House of the meeting this morning.

I met with Mr. Jarvis, the minister responsible for Federal/Provincial Relations, and reviewed with him a number of matters that the Prime Minister of the country wanted raised by Mr. Jarvis with me and all the other Premiers. And Mr. Jarvis has now visited B.C., Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and is now doing the Eastern part of the country.

The first matter discussed, Mr. Speaker, had to do with the holding of a National Conference, a First Ministers' Conference, on the economy sometime this Fall. The second issue had to deal with the calling of a Constitutional Conference and when that would be most appropriate. There is some indication that one could have a First Ministers' Conference on the economy and the Constitution at the same time. My own view and that of a number of my colleagues on that is that would not be advisable, that we would rather see a Economic Conference, a First Ministers' Conference on nothing only the economy and let us concentrate our efforts on that, and the constitutional review process should be left until the Spring, albeit no later than the Spring. And thirdly, that the whole question of energy was an

PREMIER PECKFORD: extremely important, ^{one} and should be perhaps a part of the First Conference on the economy in the Fall. Outside of those matters, I then reviewed with the minister matters of concern to the Province and that related primarily to the transfer of jurisdiction on offshore and that we would very soon be ready to communicate to the Prime Minister and to Mr. Jarvis' office a position on how this could best be affected because we have been working on it since early May. And also the whole question of fisheries jurisdiction and that we are in the process of communicating with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. McGrath) in Ottawa on that point, now in the next couple of days and that we would see the fisheries jurisdiction one as being part of the constitutional review process if some interim arrangements can be arrived at. Then we talked generally about other matters dealing with the Trans-Canada Highway, CNR, Labrador power and Labrador transportation development. I indicated to Mr. Jarvis that the five year plan which has started, the process has started, that we would be in a position within two to three months to present a fully rational plan of development for the Province as related to transportation and resource development to the Government of Canada for a five year period and then would ask for their reaction to it, but in the meantime, we would be very soon pursuing the question of transfer of jurisdiction offshore in the interim and a number of outstanding DREE agreements which would have to be signed imminently.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: I do not wish to monopolize the Question Period, and my colleagues have a number of questions to ask, but that report of the Premier's raises a number of questions. I will perhaps spread them out over a couple of days. With regard to the timing, I, by the way, thoroughly agree that the economic conference should take precedence in the light of the forecasts that we have been hearing and which are worrisome to everybody and particularly to us in Newfoundland.

But on the matter of the constitution, I am not sure if it was in the Throne Speech or in some other document, an indication was given by the government that there was to be a public airing, or some form of discussion among the public on the constitutional position which the Newfoundland Government will ^{Propose} ~~purpose~~ to advance. I think I am interpreting that correctly. Given then that the Constitutional Conference clearly cannot go beyond the Spring of next year, which gives it, say, eight months or so, what kind of time frame does the Premier anticipate for putting before the public of Newfoundland these constitutional issues which, while they may sound a bit airy-fairy, perhaps, to some people are nevertheless of vital importance since, as the Premier says, he is linking such things as offshore and fisheries with them?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I view the offshore as being somewhat special and outside of the normal constitutional review process. I think most people would agree to that, that there has been a fair amount and there has been a White Paper and so on as it relates to our regulations and the position that Newfoundland takes, the Heritage of the Sea document and so on.

AN HON. MEMBER: On offshore?

PREMIER PECKFORD: On the offshore. On every other constitutional question, we are now reviewing them and hopefully by this Fall we will be in a position to issue a statement as to what the Province's position

PREMIER PECKFORD: would be so that we would have time for public discussion and debate before the Constitutional Conference in the Spring.

MR. D. JAMIESON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: One final supplementary for this afternoon. With regard to offshore, which the Premier has indicated is a separate kind of issue, did his discussions with the Minister of Federal-Provincial Relations go so far as to indicate whether or not the issue is going to be resolved on a Newfoundland/Ottawa basis or is it, in fact, a Provincial/Ottawa basis? That is, is the contemplated change, one that is going to be primarily on the basis of Newfoundland's special claim or are we now in a way being lumped in with all of the other provinces in the manner in which this is going to be negotiated or discussed?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are looking at this in a bilateral way between the Province of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada at this point in time. Additional detail on that point and other points which are rather technical of that nature are now being reviewed and communication to the Prime Minister will be occurring in the next number of weeks, within this month.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Forgive me. I am sorry, I repeat, to take up so much time but I do not want to leave that particular issue dangling if I can get a little bit more information from the Premier on it. Is he saying now that Newfoundland will negotiate with Ottawa on the basis of, what I have called in the past and

MR. JAMIESON: what hon. members opposite have called the 'special claim,' or are we in the position, as undertaken by the Prime Minister, that he is prepared to make the same kind of concession to all of the Eastern Provinces at least? I am not sure what his attitude is with regard to the others. I think the Premier will get the gist of my question. In other words, do we have to now negotiate in company with the Maritime Provinces and Quebec, or are we going to continue on in a way which will put the Newfoundland case and its special status forward independently?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition is sorting of asking me for some federal position. If the Prime Minister of Canada's position has to do with the transfer of jurisdiction for all the provinces, that is a position of the federal government. All that the Province of Newfoundland is interested in at this time is seeing that there is a transfer of jurisdiction to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. If the Prime Minister and the Federal Cabinet so desire it, consider it expedient to see that that kind of transfer of jurisdiction is also offered to the other Province, so be it, and that is quite in order for either the Federal Cabinet or the Prime Minister to do. We will be talking to the Federal Government directly about the transfer of jurisdiction of offshore ownership as it relates to the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Grand Bank, then the hon. member for Lewisporte, followed by the hon. member for Port au Port if time permits.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy. As the minister knows, when Alcan unceremoniously pulled out of St. Lawrence, they held the surface rights to large tracts of land around St. Lawrence. Some people have been trying to obtain some of this property for cattle raising and have not

MR. L. THOMS: been getting much satisfaction from Alcan. My question is; did the surface rights to this property revert to the Province after Alcan pulled out, and if they did not revert to the Province what does this government intend to do? In my own opinion I think we should yank the stuff back from them.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this is an example of the inadequacy which existed in some of the agreements struck in the past with mining developers and other developments in the Province in that there was no provision, as I understand it, in the agreement with Alcan and in the arrangements made by government at the time to have their surface rights terminate at the close of mining operations.

 This government has recently brought in

Mr. Barry: a new Minerals Act back in 1976, I think it was, and that Act now provides that at the termination of any mining operation, within a period of five years the rights, all rights related to it, including surface rights, revert back to the Crown. It is our intention to bring before this House a proposed amendment to have the Minerals Act apply to the Alcan operation, so that if once that amendment is passed the Act would then become applicable - the Minerals Act, as you know, is not now applicable to all mining operations, only to future ones, but with this amendment we propose to make it applicable to the Alcan operation.

MR. ROBERTS: Only to Alcan or all of them?

MR. BARRY: We have to consider. I would like to have it applicable to all but I am not sure that that is going to be feasible. We will look at that possibility.

In which case the surface rights, assuming that that was passed in the next session, say, the surface rights, you could anticipate five years from the close down would be what? - another three years before they would become available. I believe you have to give a certain period of time because there could be a possibility of another startup, another operator coming in, when one terminates, and reactivating a mine. You have to have a period of grace there within which this sort of thing could come about.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) or the Premier, but probably the Government House Leader. It relates to coverage of the House by the media. As the minister knows, I have been attempting for some time now to get a resolution on the Order Paper in the last few sessions relating to T.V.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: What I want to ask the Government House Leader about now is whether the government is in agreement with the

Mr. White: possibility of letting the press, the electronic media, use the audio tapes from the House directly on air, if they so desire, in terms of a clip or something like that which would greatly speed up coverage of the House and help the media as well, whether or not the government would be in agreement with letting the media use the audio from the House?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the whole question of broadcasting the proceedings of the House has many aspects to it and many ambits to it. The broadcasted procedure in any form or telecasting would certainly change radically the character of the House and the characteristic of the way the House is carried on. We are in a new age, obviously, where this kind of media is one of the major means of communication.

All I can say to the hon. member is that it is a matter of ongoing consideration, and that the government is still in the process of considering the situation.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER : A supplementary, the hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader says the government is still in the process of considering. I wonder if he could give the House some information on what they are considering in terms of a committee or making arrangements to have hearings on this matter so that we can get some idea of what time frame we are talking about?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Hearings, Mr. Speaker? I think you only hold hearings when you want to find out information. I think everybody really knows the nature, the impact and the difference and the change and the effect it would have on the operations of the proceedings of the House. So we are not at the present stage contemplating a meeting as such, but the government in the course of its duty to govern the Province is considering it. You know, it is a matter, as I say, is under active consideration and there is nothing more I can add to it, really.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education. I am wondering if the minister, and I am sure she must be aware of this because it is an object of some controversy in her department, does the minister or the Department of Education intend to accept for school use the series of films known as the Heritage Series and I believe the other series is called the How To Series, how to develop small business and all that sort of thing which was commissioned by, I believe, the Premier's office and made by McConnell Advertising?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MRS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the department does intend to use the Heritage films and the How To Series in the schools.

MRS VERGE: This I believe will be done in the coming school year. I do not have the details of how those films will be incorporated into school programmes, but it is an intention on the part of the department to use that material.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A supplementary. The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Is it the practice of the Education Department to accept films from outside sources? And would not the minister agree that films of this type would be better either purchased or developed - I believe the Department of Education has the capability of developing films of this type - would it not be more to the interest of the Department of Education to develop their own films rather than have them foisted on them by the Premier's office?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MRS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, this material is now available and I understand that it is quite high quality. The subjects of the Heritage films are characters, persons and events of historical significance for our own Province and since this good quality material is already available it will be used by the department. We are

MS. VERGE: reviewing our policy dealing with use of locally published material, however.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: I was amazed by the minister's answer that the films were of good quality because I understand that there has been a lot of criticism voiced about the films and, in fact, my information is that they of notoriously bad quality and some of them are really not worth using and that they will not go into every school.

My question to the minister is,

Under what circumstances were the films purchased from McConnell Advertising and under what circumstances were the Department of Education asked to use the films? Was it forced or did the request come from the Department of Education?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I do not have that information as to how the films were purchased or how they were obtained by the department, but I will undertake to get it for the hon. member.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port au Port, followed by the hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary to the Premier. Could the Premier tell me under what circumstances the films were developed and whether there had been a request from the Department of Education, and, in fact, whether the curriculum consultants in the Department of Education had asked for those films, how much they cost and how much will the cost of duplicating those films be?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not have a clue, Mr. Speaker, but I will undertake to get the information. I know there are films on the way at the Department of Education. I do not know if the hon. member is getting at something that I do not - I do not appreciate this -

MR. HODDER: (Inaudible) McConnell Advertising.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, yes, McConnell Advertising.

Good. Well, we will find out for the hon. member and table the information indicating costs, whatever is necessary to table, whatever costs were incurred and whether, in fact, it was requested by the Department of Education or requested by whom. Whatever the hon. member wants in that line he can have.

MR. HODDER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

I believe I allowed you a final supplementary before. The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. ROBERTS:

Ask for a final final supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins). I believe a number of weeks ago the minister met with the Premier of Quebec and it was subsequently reported in the media by the minister, and I believe also in an interview in The Toronto Globe and Mail with the Premier of Quebec, that the Quebec Premier was giving some serious consideration to at least opening up for negotiation the power contract between Newfoundland Hydro or the Province of Newfoundland and the Province of Quebec. Could the minister tell us whether there has been any follow-up on that bit of bait thrown out by the Quebec Premier, whether there has been any discussion with him since and if, indeed, anything concrete has been achieved along those lines?

August 6, 1979

Tape No. 594

NM - 1

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think the best way of answering that is to say that there is a Premiers' Conference arranged in the very near future.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Next Wednesday.

DR. J. COLLINS:

I believe next Wednesday, for several days from next Wednesday, and I have no doubt that the hon. the Premier will be pursuing any discussions needed on that particular subject.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Premier of Quebec has openly indicated, at least if we can believe press reports and I believe the hon. Minister of Finance sort of said that it was so when he came back from the trip, in view of the first steps being taken by the Premier of Quebec along this very important line, could the minister tell us whether or not any steps have been taken at all by this government to follow up on at least the indication that the Province of Quebec might be willing to talk about the renegotiation of the power contract? Certainly goodness this government has not waited a couple of months now and done nothing about the almost open invitation given to them by the Premier of Quebec?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that negotiations with Quebec are only done after a careful consideration and this government certainly has been considering its position carefully in the meantime, and the Premiers' Conference coming up in the near future really is the first opportunity to go into the matter further.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the hon. the minister's answers, I just want to be sure of one thing, what he is saying is he has done nothing, and the government have done nothing in

MR. ROBERTS: response to the bait, hooked or not as it may have been, proffered by the Prime - he calls himself the Prime Minister, it does not matter, the Premier of Quebec, Would the minister confirm or deny it straight out; has he done anything, has the government done anything or not?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Opposition House Leader is asking if we have had meetings with Monsieur Levesque over this matter, the answer is no. If the hon. member is asking has this government given any thought to the matter of the development of hydro electric power in Labrador and possible connections thereto with the Province of Quebec, the answer is yes.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Really I thank the minister and obviously he is gone as far as he is going to go so we will come back at another time, another place on that point. I just want to know whether the minister will make public - I realize you cannot negotiate publicly - will the minister make public the lines along which he thinks the government should proceed, since I read into his answer they are prepared to open negotiations with Quebec, as they should be in my view, would he make public

Mr. Roberts: the general lines along which he thinks negotiations - when I say should proceed, I do not mean the tactics, I mean the strategy towards which we should aim - what are we trying to do? Are we trying to renegotiate the contract to get more money, to call it back or just what?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, this opens a very important area for our Province, and I think all ^I ^{we} should say at this time is that I have no doubt whatever that the hon. the Premier will be reporting on the substance of his talks with the other Premiers, including the Premier of Quebec, on his return from the planned conference.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Judging by the number of phone calls that are reaching my office in connection with people who worked in the June 18 election that have not been paid, would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House if all of the cheques have been sent out? If they have not been sent out for people who rented their homes and people who were hired on as poll clerks and agents and returning officers and so forth that they have not been paid, could the minister - first of all, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the cheques have gone out? And if they have gone out, will the hon. gentleman check and see if all of the cheques have been mailed out to the people who were involved in the June 18 Provincial election?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am not really in a position to know if all of these matters have been processed by the Chief Electoral Officer, but I certainly will see if that has been so, and I will see if the Department of Finance has done what it is supposed to do in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A continuation of a question I asked Mr. House -

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please! You have to refer to hon. members by their title or their district.

MR. STIRLING: I am sorry. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We have been meeting in Committees morning and evening, and at the Committee level the Chairman has gotten us into the habit of referring to people on their first names. I apologiza if I have made it any great breach. I certainly would not want Mr. House to be thrown out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: But anyway, the hon. minister did not have the answers and he referred me to two other ministers. The question is the same question; how many of the thirty-three recommendations of the Task Force study on the fluoride have been completed? He referred part of it to the Department of Labour and Manpower and the other part to Consumer Affairs and Environment. The second part of that question, it is a two-part question, ^{was} has the general public been warned that berries in the area of a number of miles of that plant are contaminated or might be contaminated? The Minister of Health (Mr. House) did not have the answer.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of getting that sort of question in the House of Assembly, I did prepare a reply.

August 7, 1979

Tape No. 596

DW - 1

MR. DINN: there are thirty-three recommendations. I have the answers for the hon. member on all thirty-three. It would take some time to go through all thirty-three this afternoon but I can if hon. members wish.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Why not table them in Hansard? Why not append them in Hansard?

MR. DINN: Yes, well, I can do exactly that, table it and have it appended.

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, on that point, if I may be allowed to respond to the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling), if there is additional information that the hon. member wants in addition to what the Minister for Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) just offered in the absence of the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook), I will undertake to see whether they have additional information that we can provide the hon. member in a day or two. The hon. minister is away today at a funeral in Gander.

MR. L. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: We can probably get the answer very quickly. The question was recommendation 29, recommended that the public be warned that the berries might be contaminated. He might be able to give us the answer to that very quickly because we are in the blueberry season. Some people may get poisoned.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you addressing your question to the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower?

MR. L. STIRLING: Yes.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I just went to the table and got twenty-eight and twenty-nine Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment

MR. DINN: tests the water supply and advise people of the community. That is twenty-eight, I guess. Twenty-nine - well, I do not have the answer to twenty-nine. It refers to the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment. The hon. Premier will get that answer.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please! The time for -

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, just to tell the hon. member that it is recommended that people who do have garden vegetables and things in that area that they wash them before they are eaten.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: This is a report from the Government Services Committee. The Government Services Committee have considered the various Heads of expenditure referred to it and wish to report having passed Head Number 19, Municipal Affairs and Housing, without amendment; Head Number 18, Public Works and Services, without amendment; Head 17, Transportation and Communications, without amendment; Head 4, Finance, without amendment; Head 5, Labour and Manpower, without amendment, and will sit again upon request of this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is debatable and even if it is I do not intend to debate it. I just wanted to raise perhaps a point of order of procedure because this is bit of an historic moment. The hon. and learned gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has just presented the first report, at least in my time, of a committee on the Estimates presented to the House. Do I understand that the procedure now is this, merely as the motion stands,

MR. E. ROBERTS: and in due course the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) will on a government day call the report as an item of government business and then we will have the so-called concurrence debate? Is that the procedure to be followed?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: That is the procedure, Mr. Speaker, ^{This} report now will be received presently and we will then put it on the Order Paper and it will be called as a concurrence debate.

MR. E. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) So we adopt the motion to receive the report and then in due course another motion is moved saying that -

MR. W. MARSHALL: It will appear on the Order Paper and we will call it in the ordinary course of events on the Order Paper and of course then it is provided in the rules that there are three hours to debate but we have agreed that the extra time will be divided equally between the committees.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Around three hours.

MR. W. MARSHALL: It will come out roughly about that.

MR. SPEAKER: Just to clarify technicality, there will be no motion now to accept the report.

MR. ROBERTS: No, presently.

MR. SPEAKER: It will be referred to the Order Paper and then called at that time.

MR. ROBERTS: Then there will be a motion to concur.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow move that this House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolution related to the "Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957." And I give notice that I will on tomorrow

DR. COLLINS: move that this House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the raising of loans by the Province. And I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions for the granting of supplementary supply to Her Majesty. I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting An Increase In Certain Pensions."

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)
Justice.

The hon. Minister of

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Enable Unifund Limited To Become A Federal Corporation."

000

MR. NEARY:

On a point of order,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order. The member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. the Premier, Sir, offered to get me some information, he told me he would have it in a day or two, in connection with Mount Scio House from Memorial University but the hon. gentleman has not given the House the information yet.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

It is a point of order. He made a commitment to get the -

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order. The hon. minister - no.

MR. BARRY:

(Inaudible) after the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On the point of order. I would have to rule there does not appear to be a point of order at this particular point in time.

The hon Minister of

Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, in response to a question by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) concerning whether the government was going to release the study which had been carried out in the Stephenville - Port au Port - Bay St. George area, this study was prepared in March 1979. A consultant was engaged by the

MR. BARRY:

Department of Industrial Development. It was funded jointly by the Department of Industrial Development and by DREE. It cost almost \$73,000.

The objectives of the study were to identify the physical and human resources of the area; to review the possibilities of economic activities and to estimate the potential viability of the various opportunities for economic activity and to outline the measures necessary for their implementation and to identify sources of venture capital to try and stimulate the economy in the area.

Now the consultant has:

1. Reviewed existing reports and other relevant data.
2. Contacted resource departments on all levels of government.
3. Interviewed local businesses and development agencies.
4. Identified potential investors from outside the area.
5. Determined and described the resources of the area and their potential utilization.
6. Assessed the infrastructure of the area and identified necessary improvements to accommodate economic growth.

The study area was divided into three regions: the Port au Port Peninsula, the Stephenville - Stephenville Crossing area, and the Bay St. George area and development priorities were determined for each of the subdivisions.

Upon receipt of the report the staff of the Department of Industrial Development were assigned to follow up on the industrial opportunities identified and this is presently ongoing. The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has already been in touch with the department concerning opportunities for the Stephenville area and is making sure that the opportunities are being followed up by the Department of Industrial Development. The copies of the report are available from the Department of Industrial Development upon request. So the hon. member can obtain a copy of the report.

As a complementary effort

MR. BARRY: to this study, the Department of Industrial Development has also commissioned a study of the Stephenville Harbour which will result in a proposed master plan for the harbour, taking into account such matters as land ownership and availability, harbour access and the need for such access, and operational and environmental considerations.

This study was also undertaken with the assistance of DREE and is estimated to cost \$41,000. The harbour study is scheduled for completion on August 24th 1979.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, could I have leave of the House to respond briefly to the minister's statement?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave. A few

brief remarks I assume.

MR. HODDER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Just a few brief remarks. First of all, I have not had the opportunity to read this study before or to get the study. I did make an effort to get the study and was told, no, that it could not be released. It is interesting to find out that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) had it. But nevertheless, I do believe that - and I must say also, Mr. Speaker, that when I did ask in the House whether I could have the study or not, it was now until I found out whether it was available or not. But I will say this about the study, I know

MR. J. HODDER: the authors of the study. I believe that good work went into the study. The Bay St. George region is an area of high unemployment which the Abitibi Price opening of the mill will not solve. And I do hope that the good implementations, those implementations in the study that should be taken advantage of will be, this will be done by the government. And I do believe that perhaps it will be something that will mean that the future of the Bay St. George area will be more assured than it has been in the past and that we will be able to take advantages of the rich resources and perhaps overcome some of the high unemployment that we have in the area. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please.. I perhaps should point out to hon. members that this procedure is highly irregular. I do not believe that procedure allows for questions to be asked after this point in the procedure, but you did have leave. I just wanted to mention that.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order 3.
Committee of Ways and Means. The Budget debate.
The hon. member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.
When I adjourned the debate yesterday, I was dealing with the two central themes of this administration as set out in the Throne Speech and I was looking for a follow-through in the Budget Speech.

The two central themes again as set out by the Premier were, one, accountability of this government and two, the identity of Newfoundlanders. And I must thank the Premier because one of the examples I used yesterday, in the Budget, in talking

MR. L. STIRLING: about the identity of Newfoundlanders and looking for the financial commitments in the Budget to help see where we were going in that direction. And as of my remarks yesterday, I was saying that I believe that the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. J. Goudie) really wanted to give this information on a complete, open, setting out of all the information on all the loans that the people of Newfoundland had granted to whoever they might be, and I was saying that I was a little bit disturbed about the comments of the Premier that we should be tightening up the regulations and making it tougher for people to get these Rural Development loans and that maybe some of the reasons for giving these loans would now be withdrawn. And I am still - since that discussion we have had the Fisheries Department before the committee and I would like to recommend to the Premier that he suggest that the practice followed in the Fisheries Department would be followed in Rural Development in that the Fisheries Loan Board has \$8 million of new money put into that body and they do not offset that new money by the \$5.4 million paid by the people who had the loans. In other words, the government is committed in the Fisheries Loan Board to putting in \$8 million of new money, not just \$3 million or \$2.6 million whereas in Rural Development, Rural Development which is, and I agree with the Premier, is one of the master strokes, one of the master instruments of bringing about this identification of the Newfoundlander and the development of rural Newfoundland.

In Rural Development, in the Loan Authority there, first of all the Budget was cut from \$2.7 million down to \$2 million but unlike the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) and the Department of Fisheries where they do not offset this money, in Rural Development everything that is shown to be paid back this year, the \$1.5 million, is being used as an offset against that \$2 million so that the Minister of Rural Development

MR. L. STIRLING: (Mr. J. Goudie) is unlike the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) and I would hope that the Premier can get them to consult and maybe the Minister of Rural Development can get the same kind of thing that the Minister of Fisheries has and that is that there should be \$2 million or \$2.7 million of new money put in instead of having it cut back to \$500,000. Because in this area of the

MR. STIRLING: identity of the Newfoundlander and in the campaign on which this government won its mandate, it was for the development of rural Newfoundland and the giving of opportunities to young Newfoundlanders all over this Province to get involved in business enterprises. With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Goudie) has not been given the tools to do the job. The \$2.7 million, in effect, was cut to \$500,000. And the news media thing is going to give the new government the reputation of having developed a new disco number, one step forward and three steps back. How can we talk about a great step forward when one of the key departments, the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, that key department, has its budget cut from \$2.7 million to \$2 million and then \$1.5 million of that coming in from people repaying, so there is virtually no new money to be given to that very able minister to do the job that he has set out to do - and he is in the forefront of trying to complete that job. So I hope that in the same sense that the Premier said, 'This whole question of the releasing of information through Rural Development is being looked at,' maybe at the same time he can adopt the very good policy of the Fisheries Department of putting in real new money, \$8 million of new money into Rural Development loans.

Now, we had the Minister of Fisheries, (Mr. W. Carter) since the last discussion, and the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) on the opposite side brought up some very, very fundamental issues which should be debated in this House at great length. The member for Placentia said in front of the Committee, that he had studied the Kellogg report. He had a very basic concern about the concept of a superport, and if you accept the superport concept, he had some very basic doubts about the Kellogg report. And, as a matter of fact, he made a very serious charge which I hope the government is not going to ignore. He made a very serious charge, in that the Kellogg people were told what to do and what the conclusion should be, that this should be developed in Harbour Grace - a very serious charge. And the member has some very serious doubts about

MR. STIRLING:

this whole superport concept.

One of the things that we have been very concerned about on this side of the House - and I have questioned the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) - is this federal conference which is being held in Corner Brook at the height of the fishing season and which will not involve very many fishermen, in which they are going to discuss the Northern cod stocks, the Hamilton Bank cod stocks, and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are going there to present their case, as the Minister of Fisheries tells us. We have very real concerns that there is nobody presenting the Newfoundland case at that meeting.

In the Budget there is also an indication that \$400,000 is going to be spent for the acquisition of land and in that same area a hope is in the Budget that they will get some federal money to help them out. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been through this exercise before. It is like an old movie playing back. I remember in 1975 - I was not a member of the House - but the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) was the minister at that time, and we saw with assurances that everything was going ahead where we blasted two holes on the Labrador side and the Newfoundland side and, I believe, spent \$100 million on the assurance that everything was going ahead.

MR. JAMIESON:

\$110 million.

MR. STIRLING:

\$110 million, I am told by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition.

I mean, if we had not been through this before in 1975 we could be very much concerned, but the Minister of Fisheries says, 'Well, we are going ahead with it.'

We saw last night on television an indication the consultants are going ahead with a project that we have been told repeatedly in the House has not yet been approved - the Upper Salmon. And they are starting to go ahead with it as if it all had been approved and accomplished.

MR. STIRLING: we hear that the government on one hand is concerned about preserving the Newfoundland community and the Newfoundland character, but we do not seem to be able to tie that in with the superport concept. What happens if we take all the fishery off the Labrador Coast in order to satisfy that superport and the surrounding small plants? And then what happens if the next logical step is, "Well, we had better centralize that in one place?" What happens on the Northeast Coast and the Labrador offshore? I only have a few minutes left I think - one minute?

We have a very serious set of questions which we have to ask the government. In this interim six months or interim year in which they are talking about a five year plan or a four year plan, there is a very real possibility that we are going to make commitments that will send us in the direction that we cannot retreat from.

I asked the Minister of Mines (Mr. Barry) this morning, do we at this point have a letter from the Prime Minister of Canada that says, "Yes, when I committed to transfer jurisdiction, when I committed to say that yes, the mineral resources, the offshore resources are owned by the Province of Newfoundland, when I said that before the election I really meant it and now as Prime Minister I confirm it, "Because we all know they have backed off on many other promises, and the Minister of Mines and Energy said, "No, we do not have any such commitment," and he was shocked that I would suggest that he needed to make such a commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I have been very pleased by the information coming out in the Committee. I am pleased with the co-operation that we are getting and I intend to continue to ask questions to allow the government to show where they intend to take us in this way we want to grow because so far I cannot see it, I cannot see it transferred from the Throne Speech to the Budget, to the long-range planning anywhere

MR. STIRLING: in that whole series of documents .
I cannot see this direction that we are heading in, I cannot see
the proof that we are moving in that direction.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Humber West.

MR. R. BAIRD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I made an
attempt at it yesterday but I think you recognized one of the ministers
instead of one of your old, used to be, friends

I did have a beautiful speech all prepared,
typed out and written, but my brother and I are sharing one suit and he
is gone with the suit and my speech so we will have to do the best we can.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to
congratulate you on your election to high office. I imagine Grand Falls
must be pretty elated. Also, the member, John - oh, sorry about the
names, the districts - for Conception Bay South on the Deputy Speaker and
I am sure that Humber West must be really happy, I think
they have got a very fine individual there elected to the Deputy Chairman
of the Committees. I think we really picked a good man and I must say
I am pleased with him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD: First of all, I had better look at the clock
like I see most of the members doing here now. I do not know if it is
looking for six o'clock or to see how long they have to talk.

Mr. Baird: But I have no intention of speaking at length, I will try and say just as much in half the time. I have listened to a lot of the speeches. I must say a lot of them I was impressed by, some others I have listened to. I am afraid we have one individual I suspect who might have been vaccinated with a gramophone needle among us. No names mentioned.

MR. STIRLING: On that side?

MR. BAIRD: You are closer to him than I am.

AN HON. MEMBER: At least (inaudible).

MR. BAIRD: As many of our hon. members stated, I like a lot of others, I owe nobody anything in election promises, finances or anything else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD: Also, I would be remiss in my job if I did not congratulate the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the House Leader of the Opposition in the co-operation they had in enacting the new rules.

MR. ROBERTS: Wick Collins would be just hilarious.

MR. BAIRD: He is not here.

Again I would like to, before I was rudely interrupted there, congratulate the two hon. gentlemen and the opposition members for enacting the new House rules which I think will enable an input from all members of the hon. House. I am a newcomer here like about fifteen or sixteen of us, but I will say I was quite pleased with the new Committee system, having talked to some of the older people and making my own observations. The meetings I have attended, now approximately sixteen hours in a week, I find them very informative, a little chance to say what we have to say, ask a few questions. I think, for one, that the new system certainly will be beneficial to all and particularly us newer members.

Now, let us get down to the district which I represent, the district of Humber West. As we all know, it was represented by the former Premier, and the former Premier to him. Now I am representing Humber West which is known as the Premier's district. I would like the hon. member for Green Bay (Premier Peckford)

Mr. Baird: to take notice. I am driving a similar car now. I may be wanting to get use to it.

The Humber West district, I guess some of you people have not heard too much about in this past four or five years. Well, I can guarantee you you will hear a lot about it in the next four or five years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD: The district of Humber West comprises about 40 per cent of the population of the city of Corner Brook. An interesting fact, we hear everybody is looking for dollars and money, we too are like the others I guess. A few little interesting statistics, Humber West has a population of approximately 13,000 people. We have twenty-two miles of paved streets, twenty-two; five miles of gravel streets, and thirteen miles of open ditches. So hon. Charlie Brett and hon. Mr. Windsor are not here this afternoon, but I wish you to take note that there are certainly a lot of needs in the Humber West district and I will be bringing them forth as time goes on.

Much needs to be done in the recreational facilities in my district. Our fields right now are not fit to play on as regards to soccer. The hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) take note that we did have a soccer team in the all-Newfoundland finals only two years ago, travelled 400 miles to our district to play the all-Newfoundland, when they sized up the condition of our fields it was agreed by all they were not fit to play on. So that is another need which I will be pressing very heavy, that our recreational facilities for our youth who are growing up. to keep them busy and keep their minds clear, there is certainly a lot of attention needed.

One very important thing that I think we should be looking at, and I will be fighting for, is in the Municipal Affairs Department. There has been some talk of the alleviation of taxes for the senior citizens. We have about 5,000 out there with names

Mr. Baird: on the petition that - it has nothing to do with this now because the election date is over, but I am sure that for our senior citizens, after contributing to the various areas for some sixty or sixty-five years, that if at all possible some relief should be given. And I am glad to see that the minister has already mentioned it, and they are checking into it, and I would like to say that this is one of the priorities that I will be looking after for my district and; I guess, every other district.

Also, there are a few

MR. BAIRD: bouquets and a few bricks, I guess. We are all talking about the new P.C. Government in Ottawa and the new P.C. Government in Newfoundland. I would like to congratulate the members of both governments. We heard enough talk about arterial routes in Corner Brook and industrial parks at - I guess at the time I got thrown out of Grade II for not shaving, it was on the go then.

Two weeks after the new government was in Ottawa, I was very pleased to see that through Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Peckford in respect of both governments, the agreement was signed. I understand that the contracts will be lat in a couple of weeks and work will begin, wheraby we can get a lot of our men off the welfare and relief and now get down to work at what they are interested in. So again, I would like to commend the federal P.C. Government and our provincial P.C. Government, for instead of ten years of talk we had about two weeks and we had action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD: There is a seventy-five acre industrial park and 3.9 miles of ring road being constructed at an approximate cost of \$11 million. That is a thoroughly needed thing in every district and I am happy to say that possibly this one, at least under the new government, happens to be in the district of Humber West.

Back to our Throne Speech on some of the Women's Rights, as the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and his friend from Bonavista mentioned the other day. I am quite pleased also to see that some changes have come about. It has taken a long while. I am glad to see that a lot of changes are coming about. I certainly would not want to see too many too quick. But the rights between the husband and wife regarding property laws, I understand there is some more fact finding to be done on it, but I think it only fair and fitting that both partners enjoy the fruits of their efforts.

Again, I would like to congratulate our provincial government - we have for years and years, the Ball Diversion it was known as, now the O'Connell Drive in Corner Brook, not fit to

MR. BAIRD: drive on. We have had youngsters killed there - no sidewalks. There has been an announcement of a large commitment; this year there will be over \$1 million spent on the paving of it and sidewalks put in. I think that is another plus.

I did listen to the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) tell us last week about his children being up in the balcony and how proud he was to be here and how he hoped in a couple of years time that he would continue to be as proud and they would be of him. I would like to concur with you 'Len'. I feel the same way.

Mr. Speaker, I was not here this past ten or twelve years or five or whatever that a lot of the members have been around, and I am certainly glad from all reports that I was not or there would probably be a by-election in my district because I do not think that I would have the guts and the patience to put up with some of it. But I am glad to see that everybody, without exception, I would say, appear to be off on the right start.

I am getting down to it, boys.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) take your time.

MR. BAIRD:

I am getting around to you.

One other point, I think, that probably should be brought up and a lot of thought given to it - I know I have. Everybody in this day and age, we are all looking for what services we can get - water, sewerage, pavement, garbage collection, street lighting, and I think it only fitting that everybody is entitled to it as the money is available. However, I think, let us get some of our priorities straight. I know in the district of Humber West our population is decreasing, not increasing. The reason for that is the people are moving outside the city of Corner Brook, moving around to the outlying areas whereby they can get cheaper taxes. The resident who stays and helps build up his town pays from \$500 to \$700 a year, the other individual moves out of town - that is his own business, but it certainly does not help to build up your - and he expects the same services with a \$40 fee. I think that is something that we really have to have a good hard look at and get our priorities straight.

MR. BAIRD:

Again, I am not denying any areas.

Whatever dollars that there are available, they are entitled to as much as they can get. That is human nature, is it not? But I still do feel that people can pay taxes in two areas to subsidize the other to any great degree without at least serious consideration being given to the need of keeping them in the areas that they are in.

I am looking forward to serving

Humber West under the capable leadership of 'Brian Peckford'. First when I saw young 'Brian' there I was sizing him up and with mixed emotions, I went to the leadership meetings that he had, in fact, I attended every one of them in Corner Brook, did as much inquiring and reading about him as I could, and I must say, I am very pleased with his capabilities, his attitude. It does not seem to matter what time you come in here in the morning or what time you leave in the evening, the hon. the Premier is in his seat.

MR. NEARY:

Even on Regatta Day he was here.

MR. BAIRD:

Even on Regatta Day, the member for LaPoile says, he was here.

MR. WHITE:

He is making up for the last one.

MR. BAIRD:

So I am very pleased to serve under his leadership. I am looking forward to making a contribution to this government and the people of our Island.

It is

MR. BAIRD: interesting to note, talking about service clubs, and most everybody here, I understand, at sometime or in some way was of some service to his local area through service clubs, community councils and whatnot. I notice in this House that we have four members now or former members of the Kinsmen Club on the government side, and we have four members or former members on the Opposition side.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) five.

MR. BAIRD: Somebody tells me five. The figure I have is eight, so we will stick with eight until somebody proves it after work. We do have eight members. One of them, our hon. Speaker, was elected to the high office of being national president the first time, I think, for a Newfoundlander. That certainly speaks well for the individual and our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD: Again, as I have said, I am not going to use up the thirty minutes. I have twelve gone, I am doing better than I thought I would be. I am looking forward to serving the people of my district and in general. I think the new House rules - a lot of the bickering back and forth, I guess some of it has to be instead of letting it boil inside you, I know that anything I have on my mind I hope that I can get it out as gracefully as I can. This is the place to discuss it or in, at least if it is our own crowd, caucus. I think the new rules and the manner in which our committee has been functioning - maybe where I am brand new I was certainly not up on any of it, but going through the estimates, enquiring of the ministers, members of the Opposition and in conversation back and forth, I think that a lot has been derived, I think it is a good system.

I have to read this part of it for you.

I was particularly pleased with the government's strategy in the area of job creation, the creating of 45,000 new jobs during the next five years. With expanding oil and gas exploration activity off our coast, with the hiring procedures in the industry favouring our own work force, our own work force being very important, a

MR. BAIRD: new housing programme to both provide the badly needed accommodations for the middle and low income people stimulating the construction trades and new initiatives in the forestry and fishery areas, our employment opportunities will be greatly improved.

I will conclude, Mr. Speaker, with a little poem that I have read on several occasions. No doubt some of you have heard it before, some may not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is it clean?

MR. BAIRD: It would be or I would not be mentioning it here. With your permission, I will continue. I do not have the voice that 'Paddy McNicholas' or most of those Irish transients do have, but probably some evening at a social I can probably sing a few other ones that would not be permitted in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD: Again, I will continue and read it as I originally did schedule it. "The Philosophy of Life": Did it ever occur to you that a man's life is full of crosses and temptations? He comes into this world without his consent and he goes out against his will, and the trip between is exceedingly rocky/ The rule of contraries is one of the features of this trip/ When he is little the big girls kiss him/ When he is big the little girls kiss him/ If he is poor he is a bad manager/ If he is rich he is dishonest/ If he needs credit he cannot get it/ If he is prosperous everyone wants to do him a favour/ If he is in politics - and this is pretty fitting, I guess, for a lot of us here - it is for graft/ If he is out of politics he is no good to his country/ - So how do you answer that one? - If he does not give to charity he is a stingy cuss/ If he does, it is for show/ If he is actively religious he is a hypocrite/ If he takes no interest in religion he is a hardened sinner/ If he gives affection he is a soft specimen/ If he cares for no one, he is cold blooded/ If he dies young, there was a great future for him/ If he lives to an old age, he missed his

MR. BAIRD: calling/ So I think with that I will
conclude my time. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia
West.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I
think I will just start by saying that for some years it has been
my fondest ambition

MR. D. HOLLETT:

to be a member of this House. I finally succeeded and I am also proud to say that, to date, I am certainly not disappointed. I trust over the next few years that collectively we can contribute a lot towards the future of this Province and I certainly pledge myself to do my part on behalf of our riding to work towards that goal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. D. HOLLETT:

I certainly think I would be remiss, also, at this time if I did not bring to the attention of the House, particularly the new members, the name of the gentleman whom I replaced in our riding. P.J. Canning, I think, was a member of this House for twenty-seven years, I believe, and I think that both he and his wife gave quite unselfishly to what he believed in most, it was promoting the political atmosphere, the future of the Province and he was certainly a dedicated servant of the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. D. HOLLETT:

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that any gentleman who served in excess of a certain fixed period of fifteen years, twenty years in particular, there should be some special momentum or some plaque of appreciation or otherwise that should be given that way.

MR. NEARY:

There should be given some kind of special decoration.

MR. D. HOLLETT:

Mr. Speaker, I will try not to be completely riding oriented. If I make mistakes, I ask you to correct me. But in relation to the Budget and the Throne Speech and everything else, if I said I was disappointed I think I would be telling a lie. It was pretty much what I expected. I say that not in a derogatory manner but being involved in the political system for quite a number of years, any new government that gets in, unless it is Alberta or some other country, it is natural to assume that certain restrictions would be placed, certain priorities would be changed. Whether they are good or bad within the next three or four year^s, we will tell. Probably the most disappointing thing

MR. D. HOLLETT to me, was the complete lack of reference in relation to dollars, in relation to the medical services in the Province. I might add that down over the years there could have been somewhat of a hodge-podge hit-or-miss proposition. I thought quite some years ago there was a relatively good plan put in place, nothing has been done to pursue that plan since 1972. And in particular on the Surin Peninsula, the hospital was promised in 1971, 1972, 1975 and I do not remember a firm promise in 1979. There is one thing I do know, that there is a dire need for improved medical facilities

MR. HOLLETT: in that region. I can say quite proudly here, Mr. Speaker, and quite factually that I am not just speaking for the people who supported me during the campaign, I think I am speaking for every man, woman and child in Burin-Placentia West, and over the years their dedication to their Regional Hospital Committee, their aspirations have been exemplified. I would also like to give due credit to that Regional Hospital Committee. They have toiled long and hard with no funds, literally speaking, transportation out of their own pocket and within the last year or so they have done a complete review on the aspirations of the people and the basic needs and I think they themselves suggested to the government that instead of the 158 bed hospital that was originally proposed and considerable money spent on in design and architectural work, they have it now reduced down to somewhere in the vicinity of 70. And for the record, Mr. Speaker - the Minister of Health (Mr. House) has left - I would like to remind both the hon. Minister of Health and this House that the hospital that exists in Burin now was not originally a government institution. It is not the first occasion that people had to work towards better medical facilities. Back in the early thirties, when times were very rough in this Province, there was a group in that region who got together, approached all levels of government without any response and they took it upon themselves to build that hospital. They went as far as to organize and have legalized one of the first major lotteries in this Province. And I would like to say how proud I am of those people and the same determination still exists in the region.

The cottage hospital in Burin was opened, equipped, and passed over to the government of the day back in 1935. I agree some improvements have been made since, but certainly there is a terrific need there and I can assure this House right now, Mr. Speaker, that every opportunity I get in Committee, in the House, through the media, and elsewhere, I will, on behalf of that riding, promote the need for improved medical facilities.

MR. BOLLETT:

Mr. Speaker, also in the area there is a new problem which, to me, and to most people who lived in the area, and I think to some people's surprise within government, the announcement made by the Minister of Finance regarding the Marystown Shipyard. I for one will go on record and say that I do not disagree that there should be a review and a revision of that yard but I do not think it only applies to the yard. I do not think it should only happen once every ten years. I think any business or any organization should be subject to a continuous review so that we get

MR. BOLLETT: with maximum efficiency and productivity. Mr. Speaker, I am quite confident I speak on behalf of the majority of the people who work in that yard. They feel the same way also. However, unfortunately what has happened because of the way the announcement was made is that a lot of the workers in that yard now find themselves in a position where even credit is denied. They are scared and worried. There are young people there now, new family units who have been working there for ten years, have their journeymans in, say, plate fitting, and there is literally nowhere else in Atlantic Canada they can get a job. But unfortunately they are burdened with heavy mortgages, nice homes and an investment in what they felt was a secure future. I have had quite a few phone calls from those people and I have talked to a lot. Just last Thursday one chap who thought he had a mortgage negotiated for a new home found it was denied until he could assure his banker that his particular position would not be redundant within the context of the Marystown Ship Yard.

And, Mr. Speaker, further to that subject I think the government has been somewhat derelict in either appointing the wrong directors - I am not sure of all the new ones now, I will find out in due course, but certainly there must have been a complete lack of control in the operation of that Crown Corporation when the owners had to wait some twelve months or longer to realize that they were \$8 million out of pocket. To me, it is inconceivable. Anybody operating a business would not wait, I suggest, to be over \$8 million in the red before they feel they should take some corrective action if necessary. And also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on the record as saying quite emphatically that I do not believe that the problem in that yard is because the average work force, the average workman there has neither the will nor the ability to be very productive. Without proper co-ordination, without proper management, without proper leadership, without proper planning, without proper estimating, anyone of those particular areas and I could name

MR. HOLLETT:

very many more in that yard, can bring around a major problem.

I will say that I trust that the review being done by the Board of Directors, which I find a little difficult to understand, how a Board of Directors can go and figure out their own mistakes and then come out and give a report and not blame themselves. Maybe it is the way they would like to resign, I do not know. I would feel much better if the review was being done by professional independent people. However, I am anxiously awaiting the report. I trust that government will see fit to make it public and then everybody will know where the cause was and I am sure work towards insuring that it will not happen in the future. I followed that yard quite close^{ly} since construction started back in 1966. It does great work. They have had growing problems from day one but I think right now there is ninety-odd per cent of the work force there who are native Newfoundlanders and at the opening it was something less than fifty. So Newfoundlanders can adapt, they can turn out quality products and take a great pride of accomplishment which most workers in that yard have done and I am sure are willing to continue.

I do not want to belabour the subject, however, once again, when the report is tabled - I would ask the hon. minister to try to have it done as fast as possible simply to allay the fears of the people who work at the yard, the suppliers to the yard, the ones involved in the service industries in relation to the yard. There is quite a range there and we are talking about in excess of 500 jobs and tens of millions of dollars in expenditures annually.

Mr. Speaker, in relation to Fisheries; some of us are probably too philosophical when it comes to the Fishery and its future in this Province. The Fisheries have been with us since the first settlers came here. Some people say we have not made any progress, others will say we have made too much. However, on the Burin Peninsula, in the total sense, and in Burin-Placentia West, in particular, ninety-nine per cent of our economy can be traced

August 7, 1979

Tape No. 606

RT-3

MR. HOLLETT: directly or indirectly
to the Fisheries. I think the very rationale for the construction
of the shipyard was the future of the Fisheries.

Mr. Hollett: And on that point, you know, what bothers me very much now, and I do not think has been discussed here yet, and I think it is high time it was, is that the present state of, first, the offshore fleet, I have heard mention of it having to be replaced, I know the figures on it, but really what distrubs me most and from talking to companies seeing bids, offers, that right now, unless the Provincial government and the Federal government work together, then the construction business, not only in Marystown, but in Atlantic Canada I think will have real problems. And I am happy to see the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) come back because I feel that he will concur with me on the replacement of the trawler fleet. Because, Mr. Speaker, the bids that are coming in from other countries are so low in relation to the best cost in Canada, not just in Marystown, then we could well find something like - is it a forty-odd per cent lower price from other companies than the best we can in Canada? And if in some way we cannot work out a system federally and provincially, companies and fishermen, to try and ensure that the amount of construction that will be required in this country over the next, even ten years, then we are not only going to find the Marystown Yard in trouble, we are going to find every yard in Canada, and also we could end up getting boats that really are not exactly what is best suited to this Province, in particular, and Canada, in general.

It is a very real concern to me, Mr. Speaker, simply because, traditionally, Canadians and Newfoundlanders have basically built their own boats. And if we get away from that - even for one swing, for one specialty boat, then it could well happen that it will be the tip of the iceberg or set a precedent that will be followed all the way through.

I vividly remember the problems faced by the present government or the P.C. Government when the Marystown yard was down some years ago. They took it upon themselves then to ensure that the yard would maintain a certain level and built a lovely refrigerated, not a refrigerated, but a stern trawler which is presently operating out of Ramea. Eventually, I think they did get some subsidy

Mr. Hollett: from the federal government on it. But it just goes to exemplify when there is a real need, things can be done and I certainly ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) along with his colleagues to work quite diligently to ensure that future construction for trawlers and other ships will remain certainly in Canada and certainly the Newfoundland requirements be met by our own yards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLETT: Further to the subject of fisheries, Mr. Speaker, in this Province and I think probably in this country, as yet we have not defined the fishermen in the strict sense, inshore, offshore, specialty, professional, and what not, and because of this regulations now cannot be interpreted properly by courts or by government in relation to different jurisdictions. And I think it is terribly important, especially when you look at inshore fishermen and offshore. I think the day has come, Mr. Speaker, when the fishermen cannot be efficient with all species, in all areas and all types of boats.

I feel that emphasis has to be put on the inshore fishery. If we look at the numbers, sneer numbers, however, it cannot be done to the detriment of the offshore, and it is a chicken and egg problem.

MR. HOLLETT:

The priority in certain areas would have to be offshore on a seasonal or ongoing basis where the work force is used to your twelve months - everything else - and to illustrate a point, what is happening, it may be in the Northern stocks, may be in the Grand Banks, but there is a whole lot of little areas in between, the mouths of bays in particular. I think my hon. friend from Placentia (Mr. Patterson) will agree with me that what is happening to the Placentia Bay stock, for the sake of argument right now which is a local stock, is that whereas most fishermen in that whole big region make a relatively good living each year, I find that the fishermen tell me that the fish are getting smaller and the numbers are decreasing. I do not think for a minute, Mr. Speaker, this is being caused by the inshore fishermen, because ^{WE} do not have near the numbers there now that there were a few years ago, but I strongly suspect where the problem is that the offshore trawlers, not just Newfoundland ones, mainland boats, and to a certain extent it was happening with foreign boats, that this stock goes off in what is called a gully in the winter months. There is a restriction, I think, of 50,000 pounds per boat to be fished out of that area in season. I do not think anybody can tell me for sure that is all that is fished there. However, as the number of offshore boats increase and the more that fish that gully which is basically the Placentia Bay stock, each year there is going to be less for the fishermen in Placentia Bay, and I think those are the types of problems that we have to work together and try and solve on behalf of the people who take a great pride in being professional fishermen. I would certainly like to offer now to work with anybody in this House, to work for the betterment of the future of the type of individual to which I refer.

I would like to point out also, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member from Placentia and myself share some common ground even though we are from the opposite sides of the bay. By accident or design some years ago, I think, all the islands with the exception of

MR. HOLLETT: Woody Island and maybe Sound Island are within the boundaries of Burin - Placentia West, and I am looking forward to every Spring and Summer to go down into that far greater bay and welcome the hon. member's constituents into our riding simply because I think this is where about 95 per cent of them come every Summer to fish, and I would like to extend an invitation to the hon. member to come meet me on Merasheen some Saturday night and we can discuss mutual problems.

MR. PATTERSON: And celebrates the (inaudible).

MR. HOLLETT: And there is a wedding in Monkstown on the following day, okay.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things one could discuss in the fisheries and I am sure we will get ample opportunity. However, there is one thing that is very - and I am sure the hon. Minister of Fisheries can give me a 101 good reasons why he should not, it is a matter of bait service in this Province. I realize under the terms of union, it is a federal responsibility. I realize the problems that fishermen, fishermen's committees and unions have to try and reach the regional man or get to somebody in Ottawa, and I would certainly prefer that the bait service would be provincial jurisdiction rather than federal. How it can be worked out in a manner by which this Province at present probably can afford it, or maybe we should say not afford it, I am not so sure. But I know there is nothing more frustrating to, I am sure, a fisherman, a member of a union or otherwise, when people need bait and just cannot get it or the wrong type of bait, and most people fluff it off as a minor problem. My experience over the last number of years, it is not minor, especially, when you would get into the Winter fishery, the lobster fishery in particular, to the guy who has a good run of fish moving and has to wait four days which, ironically, will most always turn out to be the four perfect days for fishing, and when the bait arrives it is five days of bad weather so he has missed nine, not four. I think this, Mr. Speaker, is one area where the Province

MR. HOLLETT: eventually, whether it wants to or not, will be forced into either greater liaison with the feds or taking over the outright responsibility of bait services. I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, as additional holding units, cooling units and whatnot are constructed around this Province, I think the

MR. D. HOLLETT: hon. Mr. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) is already starting to feel some of the pressures from the fishermen to better utilize some of the facilities we have and have better co-ordinated programmes.

Mr. Speaker, also in connection with fisheries, but it is an overlapping jurisdiction. Maybe I should not, but because of the hundreds of people I have talked to over the last year, I would like to refer to the proposed, hopefully, reality of the opening of the Come by Chance refinery. I think everybody in Newfoundland would like to see this refinery reopen. When first the House opened the hon. the Premier I think it was referred to an environmental study, I immediately went and found out what this study was and, of course, the answer was also given in the House subsequent^{ly} However, to me - and the question was also subsequently asked^{ed} the Minister of Finance, about if the government feels safe and secure with the navigational systems within Placentia Bay. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I am not. I was very close to the original system that went in that was about the best, at the time, we could get. Everybody, the best consultants, the best mariners, fishermen everybody agreed that it was, and probably still is, an excellent system. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel nearly as secure now since, today, and will be tomorrow and nobody knows for how long, oil that is suspected to be from the Kurdistan that broke in two off P.E.I last Winter is now presently coming into Placentia Bay. If we look at what was supposed never to happen because of computers, good officers and good equipment: With the collision of two supertankers in the Carribean just recently, if we look at the message of the Arrow in Chedabucto Bay some time ago, if we stop and think about the Tory Canyon and probably about ten more supertankers that I can mention, if we go back further and remember that when those boats were first designed, that Lloyds of London, your best navigational experts, everything, in the world they are about the cleanest and safest ships that could be floated, Mr. Speaker, I shudder at the thought of either human, electronic or mechanical error in one of those ships if they happen to hook the

MR. D. HOLLETT: end of Red Island or Merasheen Island or one of the thousands of rocks or hundreds of islands that are in the approach to the Come by Chance refinery.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibility is now with the government not just to do the other studies. But I will certainly feel better that in relation to the technology that has been learned since the original navigation system went in Placentia Bay for the supertankers, I think the whole programme should be completely reviewed, it should be made as safe as humanly possible. Because, Mr. Speaker, if one of those tankers ever rips the side out or cracks open in Placentia Bay, I do not know all of the chemistry but my feeling is that in an area as productive in just about every species of fish that one can catch in this Province, it can be a wasteland from all marine life for maybe up to a century. I think the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) will agree with me that the way the tide circulates, there are 365 islands in that bay which you can live on plus all the rocks, the deep water, the different temperatures, the shoals, if it ever happens with the right wind conditions and the right tide conditions then literally Placentia Bay would be full of whatever type of crude it might be. And nobody knows yet the full effects of this crude oil on marine life. They have been studying it now since the first supertankers got into trouble, it has been done in labs and because of tide conditions, different depths, water conditions, you know, nobody knows for sure what would happen. There is one thing we are sure of, that it will kill marine life, it will take oxygen out of the water, and it will adhere to beaches, it will disappear, but it is still in the beaches, on the bottom and everything else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am definitely afraid that unless every precaution is taken, that an accident in that area could well be doom for all of the fishermen and all of the people who have all their money invested in fishing equipment and supplies. And I would suggest to the government and to

MR. D. HOLLETT: the hon. Premier that whereas there is very little reaction to the reactivation of Come By Chance, most everybody, as I said earlier, would like to see it open, most of the fishermen in that whole Bay have friends and relatives who are looking forward to jobs there. I am not sure just how they all feel, but a lot of them are borderline, whether they would like to have it reopen or not and I am not saying anything here other than can be substantiated. But I certainly think that the government has a responsibility to give reassurances to all the people to whom I have referred, about the safe navigation and the procedures that will be used for when the refinery reopens, that all possible steps have been taken to ensure that we do not have an accident within a bay like that or anywhere near a coastline.

Mr. Speaker, I was not looking at the clock and I was the first one to agree to the thirty minute time thing, despite some of my friends. There are many things I would like to say and I am sure I will get an ample opportunity to bring them up. But there is one other matter that I would like to, I guess, refer to the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer). It is in connection with the Election Act and the proposed review in relation to the Election Expense Act, primarily, when it is worked out. But there is one thing that is imperative, in my opinion, that should be done prior to the next provincial election and that is that some minor amendments be made to that Act so that a large number of Newfoundlanders will get the opportunity to vote. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that it is not intentional that they are excluded, but I know on the Burin Peninsula alone there is well in excess of 400 deepsea fishermen, there are many people in hospitals and other categories, but it was quite interesting to me and I kept a close count on it. In spite of the two advance poles which were on Friday and Saturday, back to back, not week to week, we have to remember that those boats have a ten day turn

MR. D. HOLLETT: around so because of that, probably up to seventy per cent or more of the deep-sea fishermen of the Burin Peninsula and therefore, I surmise of the total Province, did not get the opportunity to exercise their franchise. And I might add, they were very, very disappointed because those are the people who contribute significantly to the economy of this Province, they are the ones who basically keep our fishing industry alive and well in the Wintertime, they are the ones who are paying, as a group, probably the highest income tax in the Province and I am sure that the hon. Premier will take this into consideration when any drafting of the Election Act is done and assure that people such as the deepsea fishermen of this Province will have an ample opportunity to vote prior to the next provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, there are several more headings that I could go into but certainly there is one that I can not resist on this occasion and I refer back to my hon. friend and colleague, ex-Chairman of our Committee and the member from Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) in his opening speech. I was somewhat surprised that a man with experience in the House, in his community and in his region, unless he has good reason which he did not spell out in his speech, would refer to the negative attitudes of the senior level of the civil service.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity and the privilege to work with civil servants federally, provincially and municipally over the past twenty years and I will say, without any fear of contradiction that the civil servants, in particular the senior level of civil servants, by and large, by far the majority, that we have here in this Province we should all feel very, very proud of. I have always gotten along well with them, they know what they are about and I honestly believe they have the best interest of this Province as a whole at heart. And I, for one, would like to go on record and say that I am very proud of our civil service and only wish that other jurisdictions in this nation had people of the same calibre.

August 7, 1979

Tape No. 610

SD - 3

MR. D. HOLLETT:

Mr. Speaker, I think the five minutes

are about up. I would like to reiterate my opening comment.

I would like to say that I am here representing one of the more

prosperous ridings in this Province. To me, it is a great

responsibility

MR. HOLLETT: and I trust that the people in that riding, after my first term, will feel the same - as my ambition is, now, that after my having done a good job, they would like to see me back here again. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) The hon. the member for St. John's West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak on this, the Budget section of the debate. And my observations, obviously, are restricted to a very short tenure of service in this particular capacity. However, I was honoured to be named to one of the Estimates committees and I must say, I am very encouraged by the calibre of the members comprising this committee that I am a part of. There is every indication that every one of these people are providing a great deal of thought and consideration to their job of doing an analysis of these Estimates that have been referred to them. The questions are quite thought provoking, meaningful, and saying that, I have to congratulate the ministers who have appeared before these committees so far. They have been very responsive and co-operative and it is pretty nice to know that they have such an in-depth feeling for the particular departments which they serve.

It is also interesting to note, that in this particular committee structure, we do have an opportunity to see some of the senior civil servants in these departments and I would have to agree to some extent with the hon. member who just spoke from across, in that everything that we have seen so far of these senior people suggests that they have a very thorough knowledge and are very capable people and certainly do well by the departments which they represent.

I feel, as well - and this is probably contrary to the public utterances of some members from across - that the news media are giving these committees adequate news coverage. Now, I guess it is a matter of interpretation as to what is adequacy, but each newspaper that I happen to open each day that the committees have sat, each news radio station that I might listen to or television station that

MR. BARRETT: I might watch, seem to be addressing themselves at great lengths to the information that is coming out of these Estimates committees. I am very encouraged by this, but I think that I am most encouraged by the fact that there is so much participation by the members comprising the committees. To me it would appear to be a total involvement and it is certainly one in which all members are participating to their fullest ability.

To date, an indication of the extent of coverage that has been given by the committees on these Estimates, we have now spent a total of twenty-one hours of in-depth revision of three departments. Now this is approximately seven hours per department and I think that this is far in excess of the time that would be spent in meaningful dialogue should this system not have been attempted.

To pass a couple of remarks with respect to the Budget, itself, I personally was rather gratified to see that expenditures in the resource based departments have, in fact, increased

MR. BARRETT: rather significantly over previous years. \$32 million additional expenditures in these departments, to me, is rather significant, and I guess again it depends on interpretation, but with a province our size, with the cost of providing essential services, the deployment of that much additional revenues to the resource sectors representing some 22.6 per cent additional funds over last year, certainly indicates to me that this administration is stepping forward. The emphasis by this government is certainly suggestive and proven to be directed towards the resource sector. Now, there seems to have been some difference of opinion expressed by certain members on this particular point. However, I feel that government is approaching the issue in a very responsible manner and that given the fact that almost half the year had elapsed before a Budget had the opportunity of being brought down, I think it is rather significant that this approach has been taken. It would seem that some of the members opposite have difficulty with all aspects of mathematics. There seems to be continuous reference by certain members of the fact that they seem to enjoy being the representatives of rural Newfoundland. Now, personally, I feel much more comfortable being part of a party that represents all parts of Newfoundland, including the urban areas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: If someone were to take a few moments to do a bit of checking, they might find that of the 33 members sitting on the government side of this House 11 of them represent urban areas. Now to my way of thinking, that suggests that there must be 22 members representing rural areas. Now the total composition of the opposite is 19, so I would suggest that, if anything, we must be representative of more rural areas than those opposite. In any event, is it really an important issue? I feel that we are here to represent the people of this Province. The fact that we represent a specific geographical area is not really all that important, but if a parallel is to be drawn I would certainly

August 7, 1979

Tape No. 612

GH-2

MR. BARRETT: rather be party to those that represent both particular sections.

Having had just limited opportunity to make observations with respect to the Budget brought down under this government, in reviewing some of the Estimates of some of these departments and previously having made some certain observations while working in private business, it seems, to me, that there are many instances when a person approaching government for some form of financial assistance has great difficulty with trying to identify the proper department in government or the proper branch within a department from whom he should seek such assistance.

MR. BARRETT: Almost every department of government has some part of it involved in providing financial assistance to one degree or another. It may well be that there are some people in government who might readily identify the appropriate department or branch of a department to whom a person seeking assistance could be properly directed. I would suggest, however, that in a great many cases the person seeking the assistance approaches government by anything other than a direct route, and a lot of time and in some cases a lot of cost is involved in sorting out this apparent maze. I would like to put forward a suggestion that might permit the people of this Province and its business community that are seeking one form of government assistance or another to do so with the least amount of difficulty. That suggestion would be that one of the existing government departments, it could be Department of Industrial Development or some other facility, be the sole government agency from which government assistance of a financial nature should be sought. This would mean that the lending and grant facilities of each of the other government departments would be withdrawn from that particular department and placed under the control of one central facility. I feel that this would result in much greater efficiency, allow government to respond much more effectively, and eliminate what must be numerous areas of duplication that would presently exist between many of the present government departments.

Another issue that seems to have had a habit of continually rising to the fore is that concern has been expressed from various quarters regarding the effect on small Newfoundland companies and privately run businesses resulting from the takeover of some of these companies and businesses by large companies controlled from outside the Province. A couple of areas that come to mind would be the introduction of large mainland chain operations moving into various retail operations, and a growing

MR. BARRETT: interest in the smaller fish processing industries throughout the Province by large companies with outside control. On the one hand, we must consider the fact that, in most cases, takeovers by larger groups provide the consumer with possibly a larger variety of goods and services at more competitive prices, and the injection of outside capital creates much needed expansion and employment in many areas. On the other hand, however, this gradual but yet significant takeover in a growing number of our service and secondary industries sectors, is, in fact, significantly reducing the control that Newfoundlanders have over their own resources, and the resultant profits from the operations could be directed towards growth and development in other areas. The problem appears to be fairly readily identifiable, but the solution, as in many other cases, is probably much more difficult to find. It might be well said that Newfoundland cannot fully exploit its natural resource, either in the primary or secondary industry levels without a significant dependence upon capital from outside this Province. Government, however, must be prepared to assume fundamental responsibility for not allowing foreign control over the primary resource sector, and the Newfoundland people themselves and the business community should be encouraged to preserve as fully as possible our own control over our secondary and service industries.

Newfoundlanders have long been known for their ability to save and put away for that proverbial 'rainy day'. It is interesting to note that a recent survey indicates that, at present, there are \$750 million in various forms of savings with the commercial banks alone in this Province, and this figure represents an increase of \$100 million in savings over the previous year. The total liquid assets of Newfoundlanders are probably in the region of \$1.5 billion, when one recognizes the other institutions receiving savings deposits, such as trust

August 7, 1979

Tape No. 613

GH-3

MR. BARRETT: companies and investments in savings bonds and the like. Savings by Newfoundlanders are, therefore, substantially large, given the general view that we are considered a poor province with lower than average incomes and higher than average unemployment. In light of this information, however, I would suggest that it might be worthy of us to consider the formation of a Newfoundland business investment facility that could be known as the 'Newfoundland Opportunity Fund' or the 'Newfoundland Resource Fund' or by any such name.

MR. BARRETT: The purpose of this fund could be to provide an opportunity for the average Newfoundlander to invest, by way of share purchase or bond issue, in the Province's future and business. Several interesting thoughts occur in considering a plan of this nature, one being that it would provide the average person who has money to place in savings, with the ability to invest in a Newfoundland company and thereby derive both a pride of involvement in Newfoundland's economic growth as well as what would hopefully be an acceptable financial return on that investment. This return could be by way of a dividend based on the performance of the fund and possibly some additional encouragement could be accrued and incentive to make the investment by allowing such investment to be given some degree of deductibility from the Provincial Income Tax section.

There are many opportunities for investments in Newfoundland companies that are either developing or being supported and subjected to takeover by larger groups with outside control. These opportunities occur in fish processing, in forest products, in agriculture, in various retail and service related sales. It is not envisaged, certainly by me, that this fund would bail out businesses that are not economically viable; the contrary would certainly be my concept. And to restate that concept would be that the fund would allow Newfoundlanders the opportunity to invest in their own future by maintaining control in those businesses and industries that participate in the resource sectors. It is certainly not my intent and no doubt would be beyond my capacity to outline a blueprint for putting this concept into a meaningful and viable entity, however, I offer this concept as a basis of consideration and to invite comments from other members, on either side, as to their views on whether or not they might consider this idea worthy of further and fuller consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that after the Estimates have been tabled by the various committees I might have a further chance to deal more specifically with the financial matters of this Province, but I certainly am encouraged at this point in time by the manner in which it is being handled and I think that our Province is in good hands.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, this being the first formal debate that I have participated in I suppose I should, and I will congratulate you on being elected to that position and the others who hold the deputy positions. I am delighted that you got the post and in due course your picture will hang here in the Legislature, and that is good.

First of all I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am delighted with the political and economic reform that has been talked about today in the House and in the Legislature. I, for one, am delighted and I will say so here, that the rules of this House have been changed. Over the years it has been one of my pet peeves that, for example, you put a private member's resolution on the Order Paper and it never gets to be debated. I put down a private member's resolution three years in a row on the Order Paper here in this House and another election came and went, and that particular motion was not debated. I am delighted that the new rules have come in but I am also surprised, Mr. Speaker, in one respect and that is that the Government moved quickly to bring in the new rules but the Election Expenses Act has still not been brought in. And we were told a year ago that the Election Expenses Act would be brought before this House and I think the Government should level with us and tell us why it has not been brought before this Legislature yet. I know there is really no rush to bring it in in view of the fact that there is a number of years yet before another election comes, but I think if the Government can move quickly on the rules that they should also be able to move quickly on the Election Expenses Act.

I would also like to see the Election Expenses Act go before a committee, before it is adopted by this House, and I think the Government might well be advised to consider putting it before a Committee of the House before the next sitting of the Legislature so that members will have a chance to look at it and see whether or not it has any pitfalls.

August 7, 1979

Tape 614

RT-3

MR. WHITE:

The private member's resolution that I talked about, Mr. Speaker, that I put before the House for three years in a row, had to do with media coverage of the Legislature. And that ties in to the question I put to the Government House Leader today, the possibility

MR. F. WHITE: of having the electronic media, radio and television, tape the proceedings of this House and use it at will. A lot of research has been done on this. The former Speaker gathered up a great deal of information, several volumes of it, from all across the country, distributed it to members who were interested, and I had a chance to look at it. I frankly think enough research has been done on this particular thing and I think all that needs to be done now is a decision made, and I think a decision should be made quickly. For example, the audio portion of the House is already taped up there. It is taped now. There are jacking facilities there so that a media man could take a microphone jack and plug it in and could tape it up there and use it directly on the air if he wanted to. He can take it a thirty second clip and use it. In other words, if I get up and make a speech or some hon. member gets up and makes a speech and he is emotionally involved in that speech, well, the exact words that he says and the way he says them, the emotion in his speech and so on, should be made available to the public of this Province, in my opinion. And I feel the same way about television. There are a number of people who feel that we have to be careful bringing television into the House, that some member picking his nose might show up on the six o'clock news that night and all that kind of thing. Well, I am not as uptight about that as some members are.

For example, in the Ontario Legislature, the cameras set up exactly the same as they do for a press conference and if they want to shoot thirty seconds of a minister answering a question, they do that. In the House of Commons it is somewhat more restricted. In other words, they just zero in on the person who is speaking and if someone across the way makes an exchange there the cameras do not change. So, in my opinion, the House of Commons is too restricted. I would like to see the media have access to the Legislature and if they wanted to pan over there or shoot somebody over here, you know, I am totally open on the idea.

In other words, what I am saying is that there should be total and open exposure to the people of this Province.

MR. F. WHITE:

I run into so many people today in Newfoundland who do not have a clue that the Legislature is open. They do not even know it is open. And, you know, they may read the paper, but if they are sitting out in the park somewhere they are not going to read the paper, but I suggest if it were carried to some extent on radio and television that people would be more inclined to pay particular attention to what goes on in the Legislature.

I also think that the myth - and I call it the myth because I think that this so-called lack of decorum in the House is more a myth than anything else, it is hearsay, it is word of mouth, it is talk, it is not really what goes on here in this House. I have sat here for the last three and one-half years and there have been some hot moments and some heated exchanges and I know that is going to go on again during the next three or four years, but I think it is blown totally out of proportion among the people. Some guy comes in and sits in the gallery for ten minutes and I am arguing back and forth with the Minister of Forestry or something and the next thing, the general comment is made that they are acting like school kids, and I think it is only a general comment. And I think that if we exposed the Legislature to the people of this Province on the radio and television that you would get people changing their opinion of what goes on here to a great extent.

Mr. Speaker, there is one item in particular that I wanted to refer to concerning my district of Lewisporte that touches somewhat on what the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Hollett) talked about today, and that is the Come By Chance oil refinery. Since the Come By Chance oil refinery closed down, the talk in my area has dwindled to some extent, but it is restarting again now. And there is a big danger to a particular section of the Lewisporte economy that evolves around Gander airport. It is a concern that I want to voice here in this House and I am going to do it today, and that is one of the reasons why I wanted to enter into this debate fairly briefly.

Back when the Come By Chance oil refinery was first thought about and first started, there was some thought given to the possibility of fuel from Come By Chance going out to supply international

MR. F. WHITE:
domestic flights as well.

flights in and out of Gander and

Lewisporte is the main supplier of fuel to Gander International Airport. We have a tanker or two a week coming into Lewisporte, we have a large number of people employed trucking the fuel and pumping it into tanks in Lewisporte and so on. We also have a situation in Lewisporte where, because of the large tank farm that we have in Lewisporte, Lewisporte today on a per capita basis, is the best off municipality in Newfoundland. Most former Ministers of Municipal Affairs know this. The present Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. N. Windsor) knows it as well.

MR. WHITE:

For example, Mount Pearl has three times as many people as Lewisporte. Mount Pearl has 10,000, Lewisporte has just over 3,000, yet the local tax base in Lewisport is twice the tax base of Mount Pearl. A large portion of that comes from the oil companies, Shell, Imperial, others that are situated in Lewisporte. I had some talks recently with some people in Gander concerning the fuel problem they were experiencing with the international flights, particularly the Russians that were coming in. They expressed the opinion then that the thought of bringing fuel from Come by Chance to service the flights landing in Gander is still on their minds, and I am very concerned about that, Mr. Speaker. I am very concerned that if Come by Chance were to reopen, what is going to be the effect on Lewisporte? Are we going to see a situation where all the fuel for Gander comes from Come by Chance and all of a sudden Lewisport is left out of the picture and you have an economic slump in one sector of the economy in Lewisporte because of that situation? So, I want to issue this warning to the government and also to my own colleagues here, because I know there are some who disagree with me on this point, there are a lot who say we have to get the Come by Chance Oil Refinery open at all costs, and I do not say that we have to get the Come by Chance Oil Refinery open at all costs, I think we should look at it carefully and I do not want the situation in Lewisporte to be jeopardized by fuel coming out from Come by Chance to service planes in and out of Gander. It was talked about many years ago, it is being talked about again, and I do not think it should be brought into the picture, and I think that that should be left out of the context of reopening the Come by Chance Oil Refinery immediately.

There is also the issue of tankers in Placentia Bay. Certainly one of the major concerns we have to face is the tanker situation. My friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Hollett) went into that today and I do not want to go into it

MR. WHITE: again, but when you see the most recent incident of the two tankers colliding in the Caribbean, you have to be very, very careful of what to do in terms of bringing tankers in. Notre Dame Bay is not so bad, the tankers are smaller, the bay is pretty deep, the course is straight and the danger of an oil spill in that area is not as great as it would be in Placentia Bay. So, I just want to mention that, Mr. Speaker, and issue the caution concerning the Lewisporte situation because I do not think it has been raised here for quite some time and I think it should have been raised before, and I hope that people pay particular attention to it as time goes on.

I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, that the government plans to create some jobs in the next few years, the 40,000 jobs that we have heard talked about so much. I hope that does come about. It would be easy for us on this side of the House to say that we hope the government flops in the next four years so that we will have a chance to get in government and so on, but I do not think that is the case. I stand to gain as much support in my own district, Mr. Speaker, if the economy is good and buoyant and lots of jobs being created as I do as if the government flops, and I do hope that they proceed with their talk of economic improvement and I do hope that it does pay off. I think one of the best things that this administration has done in terms of creating new jobs was the Social Services Program, I think it was a delightful thing. For years many people have talked about how do you get social service workers to go to work, how do you put them to work and how do you come up with a program? Well, the program that is in effect at the moment is a very simple one. They are cutting brush or they are thinning budworm infested wood or they are making lobster traps or something like that, and it has gotten to a point now in my own district where they expect this kind of activity to continue, and I would like for the government to continue on that course. It is not costing

MR. WHITE: the government that much money because basically what they are doing is they are turning the burden of Social Services over to the federal government in terms of unemployment insurance. A person, a social services recipient, goes to work for twelve or fourteen weeks on one of those jobs, he comes off the provincial social rolls and he goes on unemployment insurance, not that that is a good thing but at least the man feels a little more pride in being on UIC than he would be on Social Services. So, I would like to see the government continue that to a greater extent than they are doing it now. If the government really wanted to, Mr. Speaker, I think they could eliminate all able-bodied relief in this Province, and they could eliminate it by a series of programs to employ them at certain period of the year, even in the Wintertime for that matter.

I am also delighted, Mr. Speaker, that, you know, we are getting into

MR. F. WHITE: the Newfoundland identity question.

We are having second thoughts about Confederation, not second thoughts in the sense that we should get out of Confederation or anything like that but what Confederation really means to us as Newfoundlanders. Sometimes I wonder if all we got out of Confederation were handouts or K-Marts because it seems to me that the mainland chains, the national chains who have moved into this Province, they come in here, they set up, they send in their furniture that is made in Ontario, for Newfoundlanders to buy, and then ship the money back to the mainland again. It is the same thing with the policy of getting money from Ottawa in the sense that you get money from Ottawa to build roads but you do not get any money from Ottawa to make the tractors to build these roads. I think it is time we looked at the Confederation setup, the whole federal/provincial arrangement in a different light. You know, it is okay for Ontario to make all kinds of equipment and then for the national government to send the money into Newfoundland so that we can buy tractors that are made in Ontario to develop roads programmes in Newfoundland. And I think it is almost the reverse of re-processing our own fish here and setting up a new economy, trying to restructure the economy a little differently from what we have had it and I would like to see a full-fledged debate on that and I am sure my friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) would have a great deal to say on this matter because I think it is time for some sweeping changes in the federal/provincial relationships as we have seen it so far and not just have Newfoundland as a place - it almost reminds me of India. Anybody who has studied any history of India will realize that when Mahatma Gandhi brought about the revolution in India, that all of the textiles were being shipped in to England from India, made into clothes and shipped back to India again. And I think that is a kind of similiar situation we find ourselves in in Newfoundland, where we take all of the goods from mainland Canada and do not have

MR. F. WHITE: the opportunity to manufacture them here ourselves. So really I would like to see us get into debate on that issue.

I am also delighted, Mr. Speaker, that the government are moving in terms of an Arts Council for Newfoundland. I think that is good to put some emphasis on the cultural development of our Province. I do not think they are putting very much money into it - \$180,000 in the Budget is not very much money. If they are really serious about cultural development, I think they have to look at the meagre amount that they have put into the Budget for cultural development in Newfoundland. After all, they put \$2 million in for the Action Group which brought about very few benefits to Newfoundlanders and yet we only see \$180,000 being put in for cultural development. Because I think there is a new awakening on the part of Newfoundlanders, there is a new awakening not just in terms of our rural routes or our city routes but there is a new coming together. I do not find now the same kind of anti-St. John's feeling around this Province that I used to four or five years ago. I mean, you could almost run in a rural seat on an anti-St. John's platform and get elected. I find that changing and I find that the cultural milieu and the cultural development of St. John's now is almost a melting pot of the entire Province. It is not just a St. John's culture or an Avalon Peninsula culture because so many people from various parts of Newfoundland have moved into St. John's and have mixed and married and so on since transportation has become so easy in this Province, that you are getting a new kind of cultural activity in St. John's particularly in downtown St. John's and the re-awakening of downtown St. John's is something we should be all proud of. I think the city is turning into being a magnificent city and something that we all should pay a great deal of attention to. For example, I have been guilty myself of being a little bit anti-St. John's throughout the years and I am going to change that tack. I have

August 7, 1979

Tape No. 617

DW - 3

MR. P. WHITE: gotten away from it over the last
few years and I think others should as well. The delineation
between rural and city should almost be done away with because
it practically does not exist anymore in this Province, and I
hope that other members are aware of this and I am sure they
are, that in years to come that the rural/St. John's conflict
will dissappear and I think it is dissappearing. For example,
in years gone by the London, New York and Paris was a symbol
of St. John's establishment and it was only available in St.
John's and that kind of thing. But now you can go into
Lewisporte and walk into the shopping mall and go into the
London, New York and Paris - I mean it has not changed very much -
it has changed a lot in terms of just

MR. WHITE: being located in St. John's, but that is the kind of thing I am talking about, Tooton's out in Central Newfoundland, and things that make rural Newfoundlanders aware that a St. John's exists are changing quite a bit and I am delighted to see that, because I think that it is time we got away from the old adage that St. John's gets everything and the rest of Newfoundland gets nothing, because I do not think that does anyone any good, although I would like to say to the government that some decentralization might not hurt, some more decentralization. I do not think that people in my district who want to deal with a government department should always have to come to St. John's. The Fisheries Loan Board, for example, how many people from my district have come into St. John's in the last two or three years to visit the Fisheries Loan Board, because they like to do business on a person-to-person basis and not just on the telephone or through their member. I would not mind seeing branches of the Fisheries Loan Board, for example, throughout Central Newfoundland and other departments of government spread out across the Province and spread out in some meaningful way, given some autonomy in Central Newfoundland. The Crown Lands Department in Gander, for example, is doing a fairly good job, but I do not think they have enough power in their own hands to make decisions right on the spot. It still has to come into the main office in St. John's, and I would like to get away from that as well, completely.

So, Mr. Speaker, those are a few of the comments I wanted to make in this debate. I know there will be opportunities later on when we meet again to say more points, but again I want to emphasize the one point that I made concerning the Come by Chance Refinery. I do hope that that registers with the government and I do hope that our own members pay some particular attention to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

AUGUST 7, 1979

August 7, 1979

Tape No. 618

GH-2

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt)
leave the Chair.

It is moved and seconded that I do now

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:
I was under the impression there was another speaker, but in view of the lateness of the hour if there is not another speaker, and since I gather we had agreed at the beginning, I have had words with my colleague, that we will tomorrow do the Labrador Bill on Hydro, but if there are no speakers that I suggest we adjourn.

MR. MARSHALL: There was another speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: - Mr. Speaker, but the situation is he is engaged in a district meeting now and he will give his speech during the concurrence debate, so perhaps I would suggest we could now move to conclude the Budget debate, and I do not see any point at this late hour getting into the Lower Churchill Development Corporation Bill, so we can start that tomorrow with the leave of the House.

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

MR. JAMIESON: A question again for the House Leader:
If it is agreeable I would rather than - did the hon. member say, "Adjourn the Budget debate"?

MR. MARSHALL: No, end the Budget debate now and adjourn the House.

MR. JAMIESON: I wonder, since I have not had an opportunity to consult if we might not just adjourn it, it may amount to the same thing, in the event that there is someone else who may wish to at some point. I am easy either way.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is better to end it now, otherwise you are stimulating an extension -

MR. JAMIESON: As you wish, as you wish. All right.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Butt) It is moved and seconded that I do now leave the Chair; all those in favour aye, contrary nay. Motion carried.

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Move that the Committee rise.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that the Committee rise; all those in favour aye, contrary nay. Motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) Hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. BUTT: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to them referred, reports progress and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee of Supply has considered the matters to them referred and directed them to report progress, and ask leave to sit again. When shall the said Committee have leave to sit again.

August 7, 1979

Tape 619

RT-1

MR. MARSHALL:

Presently.

MR. SPEAKER:

Presently.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now, Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment I will give the information with respect to the Estimates Committees meeting tomorrow.

Resources will meet this evening.

The Resources Committee will meet at 7:30 in the Collective Bargaining Room to consider the Estimates on Mines and Energy.

Tomorrow morning, ^{at 7:30} again in the Collective Bargaining Room, for the Estimates of the Department of Tourism.

Social Services will meet this evening at 7:30 in the Department of Health Board Room for the purpose of considering the Estimates of the Department of Health, and tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock at the Colonial Building where they will consider the Estimates for the Department of Health and then move into the Department of Education.

On tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, with the concurrence of the Opposition, because it is Private Members' Day, we will be getting into the Bill, the Lower Churchill Development Bill, the second reading of that, which appears on the Order Paper.

So that information, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3 o'clock, and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? Those in favour 'Aye', contrary 'Nay', carried.

On motion that the House at its rising stands adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 8, 1979, at 3:00 P.M.

STATEMENT TO THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

BY

HONOURABLE LEO D. BARRY

MINISTER

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

A study of the Economic Potential of the Stephenville - Port au Port - Bay St. George area prepared for the Department of Industrial Development was completed in March, 1979.

The Department of Industrial Development engaged Wolfgang Uebel Limited to undertake this work. The study was funded jointly by the Department of Industrial Development and the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Canada/Newfoundland Subsidiary Agreement for Planning and cost \$72,659.84.

The objectives, as set out in the terms of reference were to identify the physical and human resources of the area, to review the possibilities of economic activities and to estimate the potential viability of the various opportunities, outlining measures necessary for their implementation and identifying sources of venture capital.

In order to achieve these objectives, the consultant has:

1. Reviewed existing reports and other relevant data.
2. Contacted resource departments on all levels of Government.
3. Interviewed local businesses and development agencies.
4. Identified potential investors from outside the area.
5. Determined and described the resources of the

area and their potential utilization.

6. Assessed the infrastructure of the area and identified necessary improvements to accommodate economic growth.

In recognition of the distinct differences that exist in various regions of the area as to the structure of population, social attitudes and resource base, the study area was divided into three regions: the Port au Port Peninsula, the Stephenville - Stephenville Crossing Area, and the Bay St. George Area. Development priorities have been determined for each of the subdivisions.

Upon receipt of the final report, the staff of the Department of Industrial Development were assigned to follow up on industrial opportunities identified. Copies of the report are available from the Department upon request.

As a complementary effort to the economic opportunities study, the Department has commissioned a study of the Stephenville Harbour which will result in a proposed master plan for the harbour, taking into account such matters as land ownership and availability, harbour access and the need for same, and operational and environmental considerations.

This study was also undertaken with the assistance of the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion under the Planning Subsidiary Agreement at an estimated cost of \$41,000.

Fenco (Nfld.) Limited, the consultants performing this study, are scheduled to present the study's final report to the Department of Industrial Development on August 24th of this year.

August 6, 1979

1978

Recommendations

The Task Force recommends:

1. THAT front-end loader cabin atmospheres be regularly monitored by personal micron air samplers and that filters be regularly checked and replaced as necessary.
2. THAT in the pellet plant, each pellet disc be completely enclosed and provided with observation ports, or that the process be changed to a pre-wetting method.
3. THAT the rotary kiln discharge cooling and screening be completely enclosed and that a separate exhaust system be installed with increased fan capacity and a baghouse for complete filtration.
4. THAT replacement of air inlets for roof fans be strategically placed in order to provide effective air exchanges throughout the pellet building.
5. THAT proper enclosures and improved collection efficiency be implemented in the dryer operations area in order to reduce the dusty conditions and spillage at conveyer transfer points.
6. THAT in the proportioning plant the feed-points of the silo complex be properly enclosed and exhausted to a collection unit.
7. THAT monitoring of atmospheric dust concentrations and analysis of collected dust be carried out at quarterly intervals in the proportioning plant as part of the regular atmospheric surveys conducted by ERCO.
8. THAT corrective measures be taken in the conveyer distribution system in the upper floors of the furnace buildings; maximum enclosures for conveyors, better belt cleaners and reduction or removal of all spillage or overloading; and small isolated fabric collectors be required for each system for maximum collection and filtration of dust in this area.
9. THAT the furnaces and their equipment be regularly inspected and monitored.
10. THAT improved air changes and adjustments in the furnace building be required to prevent short-circuiting by movement of air through unnecessary openings.
11. THAT dust control measures be implemented in areas where the TLV for air contaminants is exceeded; and until such time as exposure levels in these areas are reduced, that protective respiratory equipment be provided to

1. On going program - one presurized system installed on one front end loader. All drivers must wear dust masks.
2. Experiments already done on pre-wetting and full equipment should be in place by 1980.
3. Dust collectors have been installed and the dust levels have now been reduced.
4. On going study to reduce the levels of dust at source continuing with improvement taking place. Heat exchange being controlled by placing extra "skins" on top of the furnace grates. This is a capital project costing approximately \$600,000.
5. In the dusty areas of the coke drying building extra roof ventilation installed. Spillage areas at conveyer transfer points controlled by improved maintenance.
6. This project completed in 1979. Hoods have been installed at transfer points and a ventilation system brings back dust collected to the pellet plant.
7. This is an on going program with dust being analyzed on a regular basis.
8. This project has been approved and the system should be completed by the end of 1979.
9. This has always been an on going program,
10. This refers to tapping area. The Company has carried out experiments with a system to collect all gases in this area and hope to have this problem overcome soon.
11. All employees wear approved dust masks in every area of the plant operation.

12. High Volume samplers are now being used in all dusty areas.
13. (a), (b), (c) Environmental considerations which are monitored regularly and any necessary action taken.
14. A separate facility for this program has been approved by the Company.
15. Implementation already carried out.
16. This has been done. Ten employees each week are having audiometric testing.
17. Suitable respiratory masks now being used. Consideration being given for special air supplied respirators for maintenance personell being studied.
18. Systematic health education programs have been instituted by visiting physician' and safety division.
19. Individual medical records of all employees stored under a new computer system.
20. Repeated analysis of slag heaps have not revealed any phosphine in the quenching process.
21. Company provides glasses opaque to infra-red radiation.
22. All dust levels are monitored on regular basis to ensure that the T.L.V's are not exceeded.

12. THAT high volume sampler methods be employed on an ongoing basis to monitor the exposure levels in the areas where the TLV is exceeded.
13. THAT, with relation to water pollution and its treatment,
 - (a) Seepage into the harbour be prevented by the maximum sealing of the slag quenching and pond areas and the recirculation of the collected effluents for treatment using collecting heating sumps for year-round operation, to improve plant area drainage.
 - (b) Atmospheric gases from treatment facilities at each pond, the electrolytic cell, mud treatment plant and slag quenching areas be monitored. Gas emanations from each pond and at collecting sumps also require monitoring.
 - (c) All effluent solutions to the harbour be analysed at short intervals. Also, analysis of the ponds and flow back to the plant is also required on a regular routine basis.
14. THAT the physical facilities of the occupational health program be consolidated and enlarged to provide two one-bed cubicles.
15. THAT the equipment in the medical department be augmented by an audiometer and a sound-proof booth.
16. THAT each employee be required to undergo an audiometric test as part of his pre-employment medical examination and as part of his annual medical examination.
17. THAT for extended exposure in areas where the TLV for respirable dust is exceeded, employees be provided with protective respiratory equipment which has automatic outlet and inlet valves, a replaceable filter capable of preventing the passage of particles down to 0.5μ in size, and the ability to fit a wide variety of facial contours.
18. THAT a systematic health education program be implemented for the benefit of all employees to teach proper work hygiene and healthy lifestyles.
19. THAT all individual medical records be preserved for at least 30 years following the termination of an employee's service.
20. THAT slag be analyzed to ascertain whether metallic phosphides are present and that employees be made aware of the risk of exposure to phosphine in connection with the quenching process.
21. THAT glasses opaque to infra-red radiation be provided to all employees who work in the kiln area or who are exposed to the heat or glare of furnaces or molten slag.
22. THAT all dust at the ERCO Plant be considered from the viewpoint of silica

23. Protective ear appliances supplied by the Company.

24.-25.-26. Repeat of #13 (a) (b) (c)

27. (a) (b) (c) (d) The Department of Consumer Affairs and the Environment undertake an ambient air monitoring program every summer.

28.-29. The Department of Consumer Affairs and the Environment test the water supply and advise the people of the community to wash all leafy vegetables.

content, and that the TLV's for silica-containing (mineral) dust be strictly applied.

23. THAT noise levels in the pelletizing plant be regularly monitored; and that every worker exposed to excessive noise be provided with ear protectors.
24. THAT seepage into the harbour be prevented by the maximum sealing of slag quenching and pond areas, the use of heated collecting sumps for recirculation of effluents on a year-round basis, and the improvement of plant area drainage.
25. THAT gaseous emanations from the treatment facilities at each pond, from the electrolytic cell, from the mud treatment pond, from slag quenching areas and from collecting sumps be regularly monitored.
26. THAT pond waters and all effluents to the harbour be frequently and regularly analyzed.
27. THAT for the protection of human health, an ongoing ambient air-monitoring program be implemented in the community of Long Harbour:
 - (a) Testing should include analyses for total fluoride, sulphur dioxide, phosphoric acids, suspended particulate matter and dust fall, as well as analyses for the total phosphorus and fluoride content of dust fall.
 - (b) Tests should be performed by acceptable standard methods. These methods as well as their precision and accuracy should be documented and reported with the findings of this program.

It is further recommended:

- (c) THAT a minimum of two sampling stations be operated by the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment. These stations should be located at sites where the most adverse atmospheric conditions can be predicted. As Provincial Air Quality Objectives do not specify the fluoride and phosphorus content of dust fall, it would appear essential to implement two or more control sampling stations for dust fall at sites that are not affected by ERCO or any other industrial emissions.
 - (d) THAT after a 12-month period, the test results be reviewed in order to assess seasonal variations of air quality as well as to determine the future needs and possible modifications of this air monitoring program.
28. THAT the community water supply at Long Harbour be tested annually for fluoride content.
29. THAT locally-grown garden vegetables be thoroughly washed and that outer and older leaves be discarded prior to consumption. The public should be advised that wild berries are not to be eaten within four miles north or south of the

30. No worker has to spend any prolonged time in the phosphate ore storage building. Radiation monitoring continues on an on going basis.
31. Slag deposit areas restricted to those workers authorized to work there. Fencing installed around area.
32. The Company forbids anybody removing any slag from this area.
33. All crushed slag which has been used to spread over excavations of basements for floors in the community has been removed by ERCO.

of the ERCO plant may be contaminated. If berries are gathered from these areas, they must also be thoroughly washed before they are eaten raw or preserved.

30. THAT in accordance with a general principle of radiation protection, personnel should not spend time unnecessarily in the phosphate ore storage building of the ERCO Industries Limited Plant, although the radiation exposure during a normal shift would be less than the permissible level.
31. THAT access to the slag disposal area of the ERCO Industries Limited Plant should be restricted to authorized personnel carrying out essential duties. The radiation exposure which would result during a normal shift would be less than permissible.
32. THAT in view of the confirmed presence of radium in the slag at levels above the normal background in this area, this waste product should not be used off-site without a comprehensive review of the radiological impact which may result from its indiscriminate use.
33. THAT to reduce potential and readily-avoidable external gamma radiation to the occupants, crushed slag from the plant presently spread over the excavation of basements to form an unfinished floor should be returned to the slag management area of ERCO Industries Limited before further finishing of the floor is carried out.