



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 50

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the House will, I am sure, be interested to hear of certain conclusions reached by the Government in sessions held for several days past and culminating in a meeting today.

We are thoroughly convinced that the work of the past year in classifying every job or position in the Civil Service is one of the most useful things ever done by a Government in Newfoundland. Every one of the 13,000 persons who draw their pay from the Treasury of this Province will be classified, and the scale of pay that he or she will receive will be part of the classification. The same work, wherever done, will have the same classification and the same scale of pay. It would be a crime against the public interest of this Province if this great reform were to be dropped. Most certainly we have not the slightest intention of dropping it.

There are, as there were bound to be, anomalies, inequities, even injustices, and certainly many inconsistencies. Unless they were perfect, no group of men could examine the jobs of 13,000 individual persons in this Province without making some errors of judgement or fact. Such errors have doubtless been made. A few of them have already been drawn to our attention. Representatives of the firemen and prison warders, who called on me two days ago, drew my attention, and through me the Government's attention, to several such inequities. The representatives of the Newfoundland Government Employees Association who called on me yesterday invited my attention to such inequities and inconsistencies.

These do undoubtedly exist, and undoubtedly they must be removed. To do so the Government are setting up two separate ways of removing them: in the first place, as I announced in this House yesterday, we have set up an appeal board consisting of citizens of outstanding ability and integrity. In the second place, we are instituting a modern system of collective bargaining. Under this system of collective bargaining the representatives of Government employees, and the representatives of other persons who draw

their salaries or wages from the Government, will have every opportunity to represent their members in negotiations with the Government. These representatives of the Civil Servants and others will be able to conduct these negotiations efficiently, with the law of the land on their side.

The appeal board will be able to hear complaints of any and all civil servants or other persons involved, whether these persons appear personally and individually before the appeal board, or in groups, or through their duly appointed representatives.

This procedure should be very successful in removing anomalies, inequities, injustices, inconsistencies, or anything else that is fundamentally wrong in the system.

As I declared in my Budget Speech it is the Government's intention also, to institute a system of conciliation and arbitration.

All of these things taken together, when added to the Government's decision to accord the check-off to the N.G.E.A., do represent a great improvement in the bargaining position of Government employees and all others who receive their pay from the Treasury of this Province.

There remains, Mr. Speaker, one extremely important matter, and that is the actual size of the wage scale built into the new classification system. Many people have declared that the idea is good, to classify all jobs and to tie the scale of pay into the classification; but many of them added the thought, and did it with great conviction, that the size of the scale that has been written in at this particular time is unsatisfactory. What they want is a larger scale.

The Government have announced, by means of the Budget Speech, its intention to ask this House to vote a sum of just under \$5 million to enable the Government to pay these increased rates of salaries in the new scale. The precise amount is \$4,700,000. This new scale will give varying rates of increase to various employees, depending on the nature of their jobs and their classification. For example, when all the members of the police, fire and penitentiary services are counted, they number just under 500. Three of these are to get \$26 to \$30 a month increase:

one is to get \$31 to \$35 a month increase; fifty-five of them are to get \$36 to \$40 a month increase. But 430 out of the 500 are to get from \$40 to \$75 increase each month. This refers to all ranks in these three services. This is an average monthly increase for all of them of \$58, an average increase each month for all of them, the whole 500 of them, of \$58 a month or just under 10 per cent. In the lower levels, of these three services the average rate of increase will go to 15 per cent and 16 per cent each month, as against 10 per cent average for all ranks.

In the Budget Speech some examples were given of salary increases to hospital workers. These increases run from a minimum of \$20 a month for some classes, to a minimum of \$31 a month for other classes. These are minimum figures. Many of these employees will receive more closer to \$35 or more in the case where \$31 is mentioned, and closer to \$25 or more where \$20 is given as the minimum. That is hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, everybody is complaining, and complaining rightly, that these pay increases are not high enough. With the cost of living, and the raging inflation we have all across Canada and the United States today, these increases undoubtedly are not enough. There is no room for argument about that. But, Sir, these increases would cost the Government \$4,700,000 a year to give, and the Government have felt that this was as much additional money as they could afford to spend on salaries and wages, on top of the large additional amounts which they must spend this year and in coming years on education, public health, public welfare, municipal services, and the whole range of Government services that have to be paid for.

It has been suggested that the surplus of about \$1½ million for which we have budgeted in the present year could be used to increase the amount of money for salary increases. Unfortunately, this is not so, for \$1,100,000 of it has already been spent, as the Budget Speech explained. This leaves \$500,000 of this year's surplus, and the Government had planned to spend that on capital works for the improvement of public service in

this Province. This is half a million dollars that the Government felt they would not have to borrow this year for capital works.

We have in recent days reviewed the situation, as we strove earnestly to find additional money, over and above the \$4,700,000 that we have earmarked for salary increases, to see if there was some way to improve the situation somewhat. It was completely, and it remains completely out of the question, that the requested increases can be paid. It would take more than \$1 million a month every month of the year to give the employees the increases they requested. The Government have not got it, and are not going to have it, unless we are prepared to ask this House to impose new taxes on the Newfoundland people, or increase the present rate of taxation on them. This we have no intention of asking the House to do.

There seemed, therefore, to be two ways open to the Government to increase the figure above the \$4,700,000 announced in the Budget Speech. One of these I have already mentioned ---- the possibility of using the half million dollars available to us in this year's surplus; and the other is to endeavour to obtain some money from the various Departments, by asking them to spend somewhat less than they felt they must spend.

We have in this way been able to agree that we will increase the amount mentioned by a sum of \$1,300,000. This would bring the total amount to \$6,000,000 for the year instead of \$4,700,000.

Having as we hope, over \$1½ million more than we originally planned, that is this \$1,300,000, what should we do with it? We have decided to use this money in part, use some of it, to restore to those who previously were entitled to receive it, the annual increment that was formally paid but which was dropped in the new classification wage scale. We have decided to make this a flat increment of \$100 a year. This payment of \$100 a year, or over \$8 a month, will be paid in addition to the scale already announced.

Now to pay this amount it will not be necessary to use the whole of

the \$1,300,000, and so we intend to use the remainder of it to remedy certain anomalies to which our attention has been drawn by the N.G.E.A. and other bodies of civil servants. The first of these anomalies has to do with what are known in the Civil Service as "red-circled" employees. This is a term that the general public will know very little about, but one that is extremely well known within the Civil Service. We are determined that these will be given justice, and if the House permits us to spend this additional \$1,300,000 that we propose it will give us the money with which to do so. Another group for whom this money will provide a remedy is made up of persons who will receive, under the new classification scale, less than the minimum of \$20 per month, or 2½ per cent, whichever is the greater, that the scale provides for all civil servants., all but 300 civil servants. Their case will be remedied.

I have thus mentioned only two of the anomalies within the Civil Service. There are others, and the Government, with the help and advice of the N.G.E.A., are determined, so far as we have the funds to do so, to remedy these anomalies and injustices.

Mr. Speaker, it will be understood, I hope, that everything I have said today applies to the present financial year, that began on April 1st, and will go to the end of the year. But, Sir, it must be understood equally clearly that in the coming year, the next financial year, it is our intention to propose to this House that the annual incremental increase, the annual incremental increase in the new classification scales will be not less than 5 per cent a year, not less than 5 per cent a year incremental increase in the salary scales.

Mr. Speaker, the Government gave categorical instructions more than a year ago to Public Administration Service of Chicago, when first they began the review of our civil servants, instructions that the rates of pay to be given to our public servants had to be competitive with comparable jobs outside the public service in this Province. Job for job, always allowing for a variation here and there, they have, so they inform us, compared the

work and responsibility, and the wages paid, and have made the salary scales now payable in the Newfoundland Government public service fully comparable with those paid for similar jobs in the Province outside the public service. This was so before the decision to pay this extra \$1,300,000., which will put our public servants on the average appreciably higher in pay for comparable jobs in this Province outside the public service.

Mr. Speaker, we would be very pleased in the Government if we could pay even higher rates for comparable jobs than private industry and private enterprise are paying in this Province, and we would gladly make it substantially more if we had sufficient funds to enable us to do so.

Copies for the press, the matter is of such importance that I would hope that the press would report this statement, the salient facts of this statement very carefully and very completely and very adequately if ever a press of this Province, and by press I mean not just newspapers had an opportunity to serve the cause of the public interest it is giving ample coverage to this report at least equal to the coverage that has been given to all the rest of the stuff that has been said.

MR MURPHY: I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier would just permit one question with reference to bargaining? Will there be just one collective bargaining group or can any group of employees select their own, in this bargaining agreement?

MR SMALLWOOD: Their own.

MR MURPHY: Their own?

MR SMALLWOOD: Their own. They will select their own representatives, as employees do everywhere.

MR CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, that statement, of course is a welcome one. What the reaction of the people concerned will be, we will have to wait and see what their reaction is.

Mr. Speaker, what we would like to see is a debate in more detail on all these matters, certainly this week - and that is possible.

Now what the Premier has said raises several queries. The Government is going to institute a modern system of collective bargaining, but I think it has already been made clear, in the budget speech, that binding arbitration is not to be a feature of that.

MR SPEAKER: We cannot have a speech on this ~~general~~ matter. I ruled on this on three or four occasions. "The leader of a group may ask a question and make sufficient remarks in order to clarify his question." Other than that, we cannot enter into a debate.

MR CROSBIE: On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker: I would like to address myself to that Point of Order.

Under our Standing Rules, Standing Order (1) says: "In all cases not provided for hereafter or by Sessional or other Orders, the usage and the customs of the House of Commons of Canada, as in force at the time, shall be followed, so far as they may be applicable to this House."

Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne is the authority followed in the House of Commons, on these points. And Beauchesne, on page 84, says this:

"When a minister makes a statement on government policy or ministerial administration, either under routine proceedings, between two orders of the day or shortly before the adjournment of the House,

MR CROSBIE:

it is now firmly established that the Leader of the Opposition or the chief of recognized groups are entitled to ask for explanations and make a few remarks, but no debate is allowed under any Standing Order. Mr. Speaker, Beauschesne says; "... are entitled to ask for explanations and make a few remarks. And anyone who follows the Parliament of Canada or reads the newspapers knows that when the Prime Minister makes a statement, the Leader of the Opposition and all other groups of the House are permitted to make a few, short remarks and ask for an explanation. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is what the Leader of the Opposition in this House and the chief of any group in this House are entitled to do. And I am not starting any debate. I am making a few short remarks and asking for several explanations.

MR SPEAKER: Before we raise any other points of order or anything else - I have given my ruling on a similar situation on more than one occasion this year. My interpretation of Beauschesne and the Rules of the House is to this effect: The leader of a group or the Leader of the Opposition or any other party in the House is entitled to ask a question, but he cannot start a generalized debate. He can make enough remarks in order to make his question intelligible. That is the way I interpreted it. I have said it on more than one occasion, and I do not think I should have to repeat it any more. I do not think that any hon. member, who is the leader of any group or party or the chief of any group can go beyond what I have already stated before. I still maintain that ruling. It has been debated before. It has been challenged before. I still make the same ruling, and this has to stand as far as I am concerned.

MR WELLS: I would like to address Your Honour on that Point of Order: It is, Sir, Rule (1) and no Beauschesne that I want to refer to in particular. Our Standing Order, Rule (1): "In all cases not provided for hereafter or by Sessional or other Orders, the usage and customs of the House of Commons of Canada, as in force at the time, shall be followed, so far as they may be applicable to this House."

Now, Sir, if anyone has sat in the House of Commons in Ottawa or has read the newspapers or has heard television reports, I am -

MR SMALLWOOD: To a Point of Order.

MR WELLS: I am addressing myself to a Point of Order.

MR SMALLWOOD: He is arguing, Mr. Speaker.

MR WELLS: The Premier has no right to speak, Mr. Speaker, while I am on a Point of Order.

MR SPEAKER: Order! Order! Please! Continue, but I will say this; I have given the ruling. I just permitted the hon. member to make his comment on it. If hon. members do not like it there is only one thing that they can do, to appeal it.

MR SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, may I?

MR WELLS: Mr. Speaker, would you direct the Premier to refrain from comments until I am finished.

MR SPEAKER: Will the hon. member resume his seat, please.

MR SMALLWOOD: Is he permitted to argue as well?

MR SPEAKER: We are not going to argue nor debate. The matter is closed. If the hon. member does not like my ruling now is the time to appeal it; otherwise the matter is concluded.

MR WELLS: Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I am asking Your Honour to rule on Rule (1) of our Standing Orders.

MR SPEAKER: I have given my ruling on the point of order that is before the House and on which I have ruled at least on three occasions in this session. I do not intend to go into it all again, stating why, and I do not want to hear arguments. I am sorry but I do not want to hear arguments concerning the same Point of Order on which I have given the ruling. The ruling is concluded, it is not subject to debate. The only way out of it is to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

MR WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I will ask Your Honour a question so that I will understand clearly what Your Honour's ruling is before we decide whether or not to challenge it.

MR WELLS:

I am asking if Your Honour has ruled on our Standing Orders, Rule (1)? That is the practice and custom of the House of Commons, not, to hear comments from leaders of recognized parties (I do not care what Beauchesne says), is that what Your Honour has ruled?

MR SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please take his seat. What I have said, and I have said this on three or four occasions; if we are going strictly by the letter of the law or by usage; the usage in this House, since I have had any knowledge of the procedure in this House, has never been to permit comments on a ministerial statement, of any kind.

We opened the doors to this extent when I said that in accordance with Beauchesne we would allow a question and comment sufficient to make the question intelligible, but further than that I am not prepared to go. Now I said that on three or four occasions and I do not want to repeat it any more. The matter is closed. The precedent is already in the book. If hon. members do not like it, the only thing they can do is to appeal the ruling.

MR CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal the Speaker's Ruling.

MR SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is that the Speaker's Ruling be sustained.

Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay". I take it that the "Aye's" have it.

MR CROSBIE: On Division.

MR SPEAKER: Let the House divide.

Call in the Members:

Those in favour please rise:

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. the Minister of Labour, the hon. Mr. Lewis, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Noel, Mr. Smallwood, the hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Strickland, the hon. Minister of

Education, the hon. Minister of Public Works, the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the hon. Minister of Community and Social Development, the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, Mr. Barbour, the hon. Mr. Hill, the hon. Minister of Supply, Mr. Moores, Mr. Wornell.

Those against the motion please rise:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickey, Mr. Collins, Mr. Earle, Mr. Wells, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Myrden, Mr. Burgess.

MR SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried:

MR CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, to get back to my question in connection with this statement - the hon. the Premier said there is going to be a system of collective bargaining

MR. CROSBIE: We would like to know, and we would like for the hon. the Premier to explain whether the Civil Servants or people involved would be entitled to choose their own bargaining agent, if there is going to be a system of collective bargaining. In connection with his statement also, the hon. the Premier said that there would \$500,000 left from the surplus, and some other savings amounting to \$1.3 million to be used for these purposes. And he said that it would require \$1 million a month to give everyone the salary increases they were looking for. That figure is given in the Budget Speech - does not that amount include amounts of some \$3 million or \$4 million for teachers, who are not, the Government has already announced to receive salary increases this year, at least in the Budget Speech there are 6,000 teachers included in that \$12. million figure? Those are several of the questions that arise. And the annual increment that the hon. the Premier mentioned - does that apply to non-hospital government workers, police, firemen, penitentiary guards as well as to ordinary Civil Servants? Who is that to apply to?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The first question I already answered here today. The second question is answered in the Budget Speech, and the third question was answered in the statement I made here. All three have already been answered.

Mr. Speaker, I have great personal pleasure in representing forty of the people who with myself live in the district of Port-de-Grave. These forty people are students in Grade VII and Grade VIII in the Coley's Point integrated school. And they are led by Mr. Snow, and as they live in Port-de-Grave district, and I live in Port-de-Grave district, we are all from the same district. So therefore, I welcome them here very warmly today. I do not know anyone I would rather have here than students from my own district where I live, where I reside. They must surely be the smartest students in the Province, I am sure they are the best looking,

And they are the most intelligent, and they are the finest young men and women we have in any school today in this House of Assembly, whatever might be tomorrow or yesterday. I am glad to welcome them here,

and I am sure that all members of the House welcome them. If they stay long enough in this House, they are bound to learn something. I am not sure what it is that they will learn, but they are bound to learn something or other if they stay long enough in the House. For some members of the House have been here for years and they never seem to learn anything. I do not know why it is, but then they are not students, bright and intelligent students, who have acquired the habit of learning doubtless they will learn something here this afternoon, and maybe they will be able to teach some hon. members something or other before they are through.

I am happy that they are here. I know that the Leader of the Opposition is bursting to get a chance now to get up and express a very warm welcome to them, as I am doing this present time. I would be very greatly surprised if their member in this House, they have a member in the House. They have one member in this House who lives in the district, but is not the member, and another member of this House who lives in the district and is the member. And I would be surprised if we do not hear from him. A very warm word of welcome to these forty students from Coley's Point Integrated.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Premier in welcoming these forty students of Coley's Point Integrated, the district of Port-de-Grave. And I am very happy to hear the Premier say that these are very intelligent young people, so the P.C.'s have a lot of hope in the next election, because intelligence I think is gradually becoming a part of Newfoundland's scene. And when these young people sit down to consider the future of their country, I am sure they will bring that intelligence to bear and results will be known. It is indeed a great pleasure to have them here. They have come a fair distance to come to visit our House, and I certainly hope their visit here is enjoyable, and that they will learn something - what they will learn I do not know. Some of us are here seven or eight years - we have learned a little, but there are some in the House nineteen or twenty years, and I think they are sort of failing

as each year goes on. I do not know if it is age or just familiarity this sort of thing. But basically, Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome these students and teacher Mr. Snow. And I would say that we are very lucky to have these young people visit the House to see just what is happening. How our Province is being governed, and we look forward to seeing them come back again some other time.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we would like to join in and welcome these students from Coley's Point, which is in the electoral district where my grandfather was born, Brigus, to which I might return some day on a visit. I am glad also to note that this is the district where the ~~Premier~~ Premier resides, and there are a few rumours that he might even be running there in the next election, that the West Coast is getting too hot for him, that he might return to Coley's Point for the next election. And if he does so, I am sure he will receive a warm welcome. Mr. Speaker, we are glad to see the students from Coley's Point, Bay Roberts coming to the House. Some of the members in this House have learned a lot from the Premier, who is the oldest hand in the House with the President of the Council. Some have learned a lot from Beauchesne, and those who have learned from Beauchesne have learned a bit more perhaps than they would learned otherwise. And we have all learned a lot in the past few weeks, Mr. Speaker, and we intend to go on with this learning process, as long as this Session continues. But we hope that these students will also learn something today and that they will enjoy their visit, and find it of interest to talk about when they get back to Port-de-Grave, and I know the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs will give them a warm welcome also.

HON. E. M. DAWE (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to be associated with the remarks already been made in welcoming the group from Coley's Point, with their teacher, Mr. Snow. I think it is the first such visit that I can recall of a school group from district since I have been the member. And I certainly hope that this will not be the last of many such visits in the future. I would like to say that I have

been visiting their school for many years. I think I attended each and every year their annual Speech night and presentation of diplomas this last ten years, and I have always been impressed by the high academic standards that they established by the school under their principal, Mr. Sheppard. They are recognized by the people of the area as being one of the better schools in Conception Bay, and I am sure, with the excellent group we have here today, this record will continue. I would like to say that I do hope that their visit will be enjoyable. I understand from their teacher, Mr. Snow, that they have been looking forward to this visit with keen anticipation, and with a certain degree of excitement. I am sure that they will enjoy their visit here this afternoon, and I hope they will learn much from it, and I do trust they will have a pleasant visit on their way home. And I would say to the hon. the Premier, if he should decide to come and seek re-election in any part of Conception Bay, I think he will be welcomed not only in Port-de-Grave, but any part of that general area. And I say to those pupils that I do hope you enjoy yourself here this afternoon, and you take with us our best wishes from all members of this House and do hope as I say, have a very enjoyable evening.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I would like of course, to join with the others in welcoming the students. I am always very happy as Minister of Education to see students in the House here. But I rise particularly at this time, Sir, to draw to the attention of Your Honour and to the House, the fact that we have in the Speaker's gallery, the Mayor and three of the councillors from the town of Badger in Central Newfoundland, and which is in the district of Grand Falls. I believe this is their first visit, not to St. John's of course, they have been here many times, but their first visit to the House of Assembly. Mayor Stuckless and the councillors were elected last Fall, and of course they have been in public service here in Badger for quite some years. Perhaps in welcoming them, I should pay a tribute to the growth of that

town in Central Newfoundland, which only a few years ago was just a village without water, without sewerage, without electricity and without any adequate road connection. It has grown very rapidly in recent years, and a town of now nearly 1500 people with all modern conveniences, and as a result of the Trans Canada Highway, it is now able to derive great benefits from both Grand Falls which is eighteen miles to the east, and from Gull Bridge Mine which is some twenty miles or so to the west off the Hall's Bay Line. I should like as a member for Grand Falls, and I am sure I express the feeling of the entire House to welcome Mayor Stuckless and councillors Rowe, White and Newhook, who are here as a delegation from the town of Badger to meet with my colleague the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, and with the Minister of Community and Social Development, and of course with myself as well. I am sure I extend - in extending a greeting to them, I am expressing the feeling of the entire House.

MR. BURGESS: I join in welcoming the students from Coley's Point.- after all, Labrador West is only 800 miles away from Bay Roberts, and I do it on the basis that Labrador West is making a gigantic contribution to the welfare of this Province. I sincerely hope that these students do look, learn and listen while in attendance here today, and with reference to the remarks of the Premier being running in Port-de-Grave or any part of it, and being elected - I was talking to an individual from there not too long ago, and he told me that the Premier would be his second choice in the next election, and I said Oh, who is your first choice, he said anybody who runs against him. But I

MR. BURGESS: But I do welcome the students here today, and I hope that it is very revealing.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

MR. MYRDEN: I have a petition here, Sir, and the prayer of the petition is that the undersigned voters residents of Sally's Cove, St. Barbe South, do hereby request that the section of highway through our settlement be paved to eliminate the serious dust problems we have to contend with.

Each year with the ever increasing flow of traffic, this problem is getting worse. We feel it interferes with the local gardening, it is a health hazard and hinders the fishermen from using certain areas for drying codfish.

Mr. Speaker, Sally's Cove has been in the news for the last three years. It is in the centre of the Bonne Bay Park controversy. I have advocated in this House as well as outside, that Sally's Cove residents should be allowed to stay there. They are some of the hardest working people I suppose in Newfoundland and they have a great record of unemployment. They will go anywhere there is a job. I hope, Sir, that the Minister of Highways considers this very seriously because there is not one piece of pavement in the district of St. Barbe, and I am sure that if they tried to start paving the highway from Deer Lake to St. Anthony, maybe a good suggestion would be to pave all the settlements first, then we would be sure that they would be linked up.

I move that this petition be received and be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word on this. I could have waited I suppose until a little later, but I am going to take advantage of the opportunity now. I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, in this sense that, I think we need a program that will pave the road right up that coast, and I think that what the petition seeks is very much part of the program and of the plan the Government wished to implement on the coast.

The second thing is that in respect of Sally's Cove, I think if you consider improvements in that community at all, you have to do so in the

belief that that community will continue to exist. This is one of the problems that my hon. friend knows, and he and I have communicated on this many times that concerns us in the whole question of the Bonne Bay National Park proposal. Rather than get into that at this point, I certainly do support the petition, Mr. Speaker, in the sense that we fully agree that Sally's Cove, not only Sally's Cove, but other communities on that coast have the benefit of paved roads and that infact they all be linked together by one great road up that great north west coast. I have pleasure, Sir, in supporting the petition.

On motion petition received and referred to the department to which it relates.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

HON. E. DAWE (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer for question 429, on the Order Paper of April 14th. asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. The answer to the first part of the question is yes, all are occupied by nominees of the Electrical Redcution Company of Canada Ltd. The answer to the second part of the ^{second} question is \$61, 332. per annum. Therefore the answer to the third question do not arise.

MR. CROSBIE: No deficit

MR. DAWE: Correct, no deficit.

Answer to question no. 435, asked by the hon. member for Burin, on Wednesday's Order Paper, April 15th. Has the Government agreed to make the necessary grant to Grand Bank Town Council to permit the installation of a gravity fed water system in Grand Bank? The answer is no, engineering investigations have not yet been completed to determine a most feasible way to supply the necessary water. Present indications suggest that plans submitted by A.D.B., for a gravity fed system will not be successful and therefore we are investigating other alternatives.

HON. F.W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the Order Paper of April 10th., the hon. member for Fortune Bay had a question 352, has there been a survey made of school bus operations in this Province, and has the Minister received any report or recommendations? If any recommendations have been

received? What are they and when will they be implemented? Something I believe, like two and one half years ago, we engaged the well known firm of Peet, Marwick and Mitchell to do a survey, private, confidential survey of the bus transportation system in Newfoundland for the Government. That report was received last year, I think about a year ago and was studied very intensely by the Department of Education in particular, and a number of the, in fact I could say a majority of the recommendations have been implemented. I could take some time of the House right now in outlining what has been done, what these are, but I think perhaps this afternoon would not be appropriate, and in any case I plan to do so at the time that the bus transportation estimates are under consideration. I will then be very glad to give the House and the Committee at that time some idea of what has been done to implement these reports.

The report was as I said a privileged document and not meant for public, these were the terms of reference and people who gave information there, Boards of Education, Clergymen and others who gave opinions and so on, gave it with the understanding that that was a privileged document and we have not published the report in full. Not that there is anything about it to hide or anything of that kind, except that on principle it is a privileged document of advice to the Government, but I shall be very glad to indicate to the Committee at the proper time to my hon. friend, the various recommendations that have been implemented. I can say that practically all these recommendations made by the consulting firm have been implemented.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. BURGESS: Before going into Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to, with certain references made in this House, as a point of clarification for myself, I would like to ask the hon. Minister concerned the public administration services who conducted the survey into the various job classifications of the civil servants of this Province. Was there an active participation on the part of either the N.G.E.A., or the civil servants themselves with the public administration services in the classifying of these jobs? I ask that question, Mr. Speaker, because particularly in industry today, and the mining industry particularly there is a system called the C.W.S., the

cooperative wage study wherein they investigate the, and they establish certain classifications for various groups of workers and it is with the active cooperation and participation of the workers themselves who form committees to deal with the people intimately who are making these services, and I was just wondering if in fact there had been any degree of participation on the part of the civil servants themselves or of public employees with this public administration service. Because,

MR. SPEAKER: That is a question which I think could be condensed somewhat and put on the Order Paper. There is no reason why it should be answered at this particular time on the Orders of the Day, unless the hon. member to whom the question is directed wishes to do so.

Motion 13, The hon. member for Humber East to move that on all Wednesdays during the balance of the present session of the House, the Speaker at 6:00 p.m. shall leave the Chair until 8:00 p.m. at which time the House shall resume and continue until 11:00 p.m. unless sooner adjourned by motion put. The hon. member for Humber East.

MR. WELLS: I have spoken and the hon. member for Burin, I do not wish to close off the debate, the hon. member for Burin was speaking when we adjourned last day.

MR. HICKMAN: It is so long ago, Mr. Speaker, since we discussed this momentous resolution that my words of wisdom completely escape me.

MR. NEARY: Sing us a song.

MR. HICKMAN: Like Lloyd George, He knew father or something like that? If the hon. member will name it, I am prepared to try and sing it and if I do not succeed in that I will certainly be prepared to give him a hand in trying to find manure for his mushroom fields on Bell Island.

MR. CROSBIE: What about "Bye,bye,baby, bye bye.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, we had a very lengthy debate last week or the week before last on this resolution that was very similar, but not quite the same as this one. I do not want to take the time of the House to repeat all of the arguments that were presented unsuccessfully at that time by hon. members sitting on this side of the House.

We have heard ever since opening day, not since opening day, almost since Confederation that the hero worship of private members days and hon. members on the Government side of the House will stand up and say, that the Government controls the House, that the Government calls the business of the day. If the Government wants to do legislation it is its prerogative, if the Government wants to discuss estimates it will discuss estimates, the Opposition has no say and that is quite correct. The Opposition does not have the opportunity nor the right to obstruct the business of the Government of the House insofar as the House is concerned, except of course on private members day and private members day, that is the day when the private member, regardless of where he sits on the Government side of the House or on the Opposition side of the House, that is the day when you really hear from the people of the Province. That is the day when the Private members stand and has the perfect right to have debated and insist it be debated in this House problems that may be peculiar to his district, problems that may be peculiar to any particular group of individuals, or problems that he may think are of Provincial significance. Nothing but nothing, Mr. Speaker, if we listen to the utterances that come from the Government side of the House, but nothing can interfere or diminish or take away that right of private members.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you have seen, the public have seen very clearly that on most private members days this is not an exception, but this I submit, Mr. Speaker, is the earliest time since this House commenced this session that we have been able to get on to reach Orders of the Day. Generally it has been five o'clock, this afternoon it was four, and Mr. Speaker, it must be obvious to everyone concerned that Government for four days of the week cannot find it possible to answer questions that have been tabled in this House back since opening day, but suddenly on private members day there is a great fount of knowledge burst forth and out come answers or statements alleged to be answers and the next thing we know it is five o'clock or five thirty and the debate on private members resolutions has not been able to start.....

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is giving the impression or trying to give the impression to this House that this side of the House, the Government in particular, select Wednesday as the day principally devoted to answering questions which could be answered on any of the other four days. The Point of Order is that this, Mr. Speaker, is a misrepresentation as any count in the Hansard will show as many questions have been answered on Monday or Friday as have been answered on Wednesday, and I resent - the hon. gentleman has made this misrepresentation before and tried to give to the people of Newfoundland the impression that we select Wednesday on which to answer those questions.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on that Point of Order...

MR. SPEAKER: Before the hon. gentleman continues, I want to say this: we should be careful about Points of Orders. Somebody wants to rebut a statement. There is an opportunity to rebut, but it should not be raised as a Point of Order, as a rebuttal and everybody will have his opportunity. I do not want to participate in the debate. Will the hon. member continue please?

MR. HICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. the Minister of Education came to the conclusion that I was attempting to suggest that the Government is deliberately delaying the amount of time used or available for Private Members, he is a pretty discerning hon. gentleman, because that is precisely what I was doing and, Mr. Speaker, if you check the Hansard and check the records and proceedings of this House, you will find that at 4:45 p.m., 4:40 p.m., 5:00 p.m., 5:10 p.m., you have been calling Orders of the Day on Private Members' Day. Compare that with any other day of the week and you will find, Mr. Speaker, that Orders of the Day will be called almost anytime, any other day before 4:00 p.m., and Mr. Speaker, there are two ways to answer - to delay the House in the answer of questions. One is to get up and answer the questions the way they are supposed to be, by giving factual replies and the other is to do as we witnessed here last Wednesday and the Wednesday before, when an hon. minister would get up slowly,

painfully slowly, read the question and then go on and give us a long, lengthy dissertation and may be if we followed it very, very closely, indeed, we might find somewhere hidden within the mass of words, an answer to the question that had been tabled.

But, Mr. Speaker, apart altogether from the delay in the fact that private members are not getting an opportunity to debate fully the resolutions that have been brought before this House and notice of which had been given many, many weeks ago in some instances. Apart altogether from that, Mr. Speaker, it is a great principle that has been advocated time and time again by the Parliamentarians, those who worship the House of Westminster and all the rules and procedures, that the private member, if you take away or if you restrict the right of a private member at all to bring his grievance or the grievance of his constituent or of his people, of the jurisdiction that he represents, if you restrict that in any way you are really destroying one of the main purposes for the establishment of Parliament and, Mr. Speaker, if there is any obstruction if there is any delay, you cannot blame it on this side of the House. There is only one side of the House that you can blame it on. We

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order in the House.

MR. HICKMAN: We sat here for days and days and days...

MR. CROSBIE: Let it all hang out.

MR. HICKMAN: And we waited every day to hear the House Leader call legislation and we went - the only legislation that was debated in this House from the time that this session began until the time that some hon. ministers went on a frolic of their own to Paris, was that dreadful interim supply Bill that took on until 4:00 a.m. in the morning. That, Mr. Speaker, was the only piece of legislation that was debated or called by the House Leader during the first three weeks of this session of this House.

Now who is obstructing, who had to sit here and listen for ten hours whilst your Leader spoke. That is right - careful I might keep going for the full ninety minutes.

MR. CURTIS: All right. We do not mind.

MR. HICKMAN: If I feel that I am bothering the hon. minister from Bell Island, I will have to keep going but then again, Mr. Speaker, I have to choose my words very carefully, because obviously, I am getting through to him and I must be talking in baby talk because he now understands what I am saying. But, Mr. Speaker, let us get back..

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must tell the visitors in the galleries that they must refrain from any participation whatsoever. We do not want to hear any sounds from any particular person in the gallery. It is contrary to the rules. I know it is barely possible for you to restrain your enthusiasm but will you please do so.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, you can also tell some hon. members sitting on the floor.

MR. HICKMAN: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, this is not a frivolous resolution. This resolution normally would not come before this House, because in other sessions of this House or, at least, the three that I have participated in, again out of deference to private members, on Wednesday's, as you your Honour will recall, we get to the real business of private members almost within a matter of minutes from the time the House opens. This has not happened this session. We have not seen anything like it this year, Mr. Speaker, and it is partly out of frustration and partly out of the realization on the part of private members that they are not getting an opportunity to take full advantage of Private Members' Day that this resolution is before this House. It is no great compliment to hon. members that we have reached the stage, that we have reached the situation where it is necessary to bring this type of resolution before the House, because Mr. Speaker, there is not a resolution on the Order Paper today that could not be fully debated, if we got down to the business of the House by 3:10 p.m. on Private Members' Day. The simple fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we

have not been able to devote more than an hour or an hour and a half to some of these resolutions. And, Mr. Speaker, ...

MR. CROSBIE: How much space did you devote to office space. Zero. None.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would like to get back and ^{great} debate all these principles over again, but again, let me remind hon. ministers that this is just one more bit of evidence as to what Government members are doing to try and stifle the Opposition, to try and stifle participation by the Opposition, to try and make it as uncomfortable and as unpleasant as possible for any hon. member of this House who dare sit on this House..

MR. WELLS: The disease is called "fear of truth."

MR. HICKMAN: Well, I do not know what the disease is, but whatever it is, I hope it is not sufficiently contagious that it will cross over to this side of the House. But, Mr. Speaker, let me put this question to hon. members..

MR NEARY: The hon. gentlemen need a portable office.

MR. CROSBIE: How is the N.D.P. these days? The hon. gentleman was N.D.P. originally. Then it was P.C.

MR. SPEAKER: Will hon. members try and restrain themselves until they take their proper turn in the debate. It is not against the rules, but there is another word for it which I will not repeat.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I never object to an hon. member interrupting, when he is giving facts, but be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, we do have this resolution that has been brought about, I submit, Mr. Speaker, by the uncompromising attitude of hon. members on the Government side. And, Mr. Speaker whether members of Government believe this or not, the simple fact is, the people of Newfoundland are demanding the certain issues that are of great importance to this Province, be raised in this House. They are not prepared to have only the issues that Government in its wisdom or otherwise sees fit to bring before this House.

Your Honour will recall that in this House on Private Members' Day, we had a very searching - I will not say that the results brought out what had

been hoped by Newfoundlanders, but at least a very searching debate on the proposed development at Come-by-Chance. There is now on the Order Paper a resolution dealing with the proposed development at Stephenville and, Mr. Speaker, these items alone are not parochial by nature. They are not restricted to any one district in Newfoundland. They are not simply of interest to those who reside in Trinity South or St. Georges or Port au Port, but rather they are of vital interest to every Newfoundlander be he in Labrador West or St. Mary's, because they know that if these proposals fail or if the financing of these industries stretch the Provincial budget to the breaking point that then St. Mary's District and Labrador West and Fortune Bay and every district in this Province will have to pay the price and these are the issues that must come before this House, Mr. Speaker. I do not care if we have to wait until 5:50 p.m., before we get a chance to start, I warn hon. members now that any issue that must be debated, will be debated on Private Members' Day. When I stand here and listen to this nonsense of obstruction on this side of the House and when everybody knows that only the Government decide the order of business, then I can only treat such suggestions with the disdain and contempt they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this resolution. I know what the outcome is going to be. Everybody knows it. The vote will be to stifle and take away the rights of private members, but I support it.

MR. NOEL: MR. Speaker, it is with some amusement that I sit over here and listen to my learned and hon. friends on the opposite of the House, as they practise their ransackability. The thing that gets me is this: that there is not a single motion on the Order Paper that will not be able to be discussed when we get into the Estimates and into the Budget Speech. Time will then be not limited to Wednesday afternoon and also, I was rather hoping that the hon. members would agree to some kind of a proposition such as that: we must meet at

2:30 p.m. on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday and then on Wednesday night, they would have had their full day, but that does not seem to be a very popular bargain to make. It seems to me that what is happening now, is that the hon. members opposite have decided to make as much political hay as they can out of the fact that they are on the Opposition side of the House, and in order to this, they are continually holding up to the public the fact that they are over there. They keep saying the Government is against us. They never say, we are against the Government.

MR. HICKMAN: We are. I can assure the hon. gentleman we are.

MR. NOEL: You say it now, but you remind me of the advice that the old lawyer gave to the young fellow, when he was going to the court for the first time and the young lawyer was up against a big experienced lawyer. The old fellow said to him, "my son, get in there and cling on to the bottom rung of that ladder and cling on to it as hard as you can. Get yourself down on the floor. Elevate the other fellow up and then the jury will say, that poor unfortunate fellow, if only ^{he} was the big successful fellow, he would have been able to present his case so much better and he must be right." This is the way it is in this House, exactly that. The Opposition cling on to the bottom rung of that ladder, and they make the most of it. But actually this particular motion that is before the House today cannot really be taken seriously. When the House was given the opportunity to have a much better bargain and have all the time they wanted and the argument that they are using - the argument that they are using that they are not able to discuss these motions except on Private Members' Day is completely without foundation, because there is not a single motion on the Order Paper that will not be able to be discussed fully and without time limit, when we get into committee, without time limit, day after day, week after week, if hon. members want to. So this whole business about sitting on Wednesday nights seems to me to be nothing more or less than something to talk about on Private Members' afternoon which are now up to 4:25

MR. NOEL:

to 4:25 P.M. and it is a little difficult to see why if these resolutions are so important to the public that the hon. members opposite would not make the best use of the time that they had available. In other words, if you have an important thing to discuss and you only got twenty-five minutes to discuss it in, then one would think you would discuss that important matter in that twenty-five minutes and not spend the whole twenty-five minutes talking about the fact that you have only been allowed twenty-five minutes in which to discuss your important business. So the whole thing just does not make sense to me.

MR. WELLS: Would the hon. member permit a question before he sits down?

MR. NOEL: No, when I get up do not interrupt me, I am not used to being interrupted. Now see you have interrupted me and I have lost my trend of thought, and I am likely to have to stay here now until 5:00 o'clock while I am trying to think up where it was I left off. What was your question? Did you have a question?

member.

MR. WICKMAN: I have a question for the hon. / Would he please advise the House under what heading in the estimates would give us the opportunity to debate the CNR ferry calling at St. Pierre, unless there is a Department of External Affairs, which I know nothing about.

MR NOEL: When the hon. minister got up, who was appointed - I do not know - one of the hon. ministers on this side of the House was given special responsibilities for transport or something. You may have forgotten it but I have not. There is an hon. member on this side of the House who was given responsibility.

Just a moment: When I am trying to carry the ball for this side of the House, I wish the back seat would keep quiet.

Hon. Members: Here! Here!

MR NOEL: The answer to the hon. member's question is that we have a minister of the Crown, one of the Queen's Ministers. I do not know who. He has special responsibilities for this type of thing, special responsibilities, and I am sure he is devoting his whole time to it, or pretty close to it.

So you can ask him about the CNR.

3086

MR. NOEL:

To get back to what I was talking about first, I think that this whole resolution this afternoon is brought forward because hon. members opposite are not really prepared to proceed with the private member's business.

Hon. Members: Here! Here! Here!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we do not want to take much time on this motion because it is either going to be voted for or voted against but it is too important a matter to pass over without saying at least a short word. Now the hon. member for St. John's North made one of his usual excellent suggestions. Yes, he says you can discuss all these motions. Now what motions, Mr. Speaker? Private members motions! Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the Bonne Bay Park motion was put down on the Order Paper in this House on March 6, the resolution on Bonne Bay was put down in this House on March 6 by my hon. friend from St. Barbe South? Do you know how far we have gotten so far since March 6? We had a half hour or forty minute speech from the hon. member for St. Barbe South and we have been inundated with three hours of flatulent nonsense from the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources the rest of the time. That is how far we have gotten with the Bonne Bay Park.

MR. HICKMAN: Does flatulent have anything to do with sculpins?

MR. CROSBIE: I would not say here what it has to do with. You can look it up in the dictionary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since March 6 the Bonne Bay Park resolution was first debated in this House on Wednesday, April 8. The member for St. Barbe South could speak an unlimited amount of time under the rules, but did he waste the time of the House? No, in forty or forty-five minutes he made his points and the hon. the Minister for Mines, Agriculture and Resources got up to answer him and the hon. minister spoke on April 8. Then we came to Wednesday, April 15 and we got into an imbroglio about the rules, an agreement was not carried through. All Wednesday, April 15 was lost on that debate.

On Wednesday, April 22 Brother Shaheen was before the House and we surrendered private members day to get information for the public in Newfoundland. That was a waste of time as we were not able to get any information but the result of the televising of it is being very helpful, that was alright. We

MR. CROSBIE:

will sacrifice private members day every day for the rest of the session if Mr. Shaheen and his group will come back for questioning. Hoist your sails and run, they have run.

That was Wednesday, April 22 so Friday afternoon, April 24 back we came to the Bonne Bay Park. That started to be debated at quarter to five. The ministers were all surprisingly eager to answer questions. There were numberless ministerial statements of great moment, the hon. Minister of Education made a statement that affected the future of the Province. He announced seven or eight appointments in his department and everyone of them a page and a half of qualifications and he took about twenty minutes to announce that. A press release could have been handed out easily on that momentous announcement yet the hon. minister interrupts the learned member for Burin in that fine, fiery, ferocious defence of the rights of the members of the opposition and suggested that the Government was not deliberately wasting time on private members day.

So what have we had, now here is Wednesday, April 29. We wanted to have Bonne Bay debated since March 6, Mr. Speaker, we have had one speaker from this side in the brilliant, extemporaneous speech, the member for St. Barbe South. On the other side we have had a minister who under the rules is allowed to reply an unlimited time, it is unlimited, it is unbearable. Not only unlimited, unbearable. He has been three hours, the hon. minister has been three hours today and everything he said he could have said in forty-five or fifty minutes. Now when our resolution comes up this afternoon the hon. minister is going to still be speaking and there is nothing we can do about it. And if I know anything, if I know the portents it is just as well to flee this House now or we will have to spend the rest of the afternoon listening to him. Why, he wants to talk out, talk out the resolution. All right the hon. minister can do that Mr. Speaker, but we have given him fair warning that hon. gentlemen when we come to his estimates we are going to take those estimates apart, digest them, spew them up again, look into them further, we are going to investigate his department, such investigation that has not been given in this House in the last twenty-one years. If that hon. gentleman likes to talk he will talk when

MR. CROSBIE:

his estimates come before this House. Every item we are going to want an explanation, every item.

MR. NEARY: We are trembling, we are trembling.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. minister is going to have his chance to talk this session, June, July, August, Regetta Day.

Now that is the Bonne Bay Park resolution, Mr. Speaker. What else is on the Order Paper?

We have a resolution on the Melville Pulp and Paper. Not a scrap of information given on that project in the last two years and we have a resolution asking for some information and for a debate on the Melville Project. That is important public business.

The next resolution - the CNR and its ferry business down in the Burin Peninsula. Our hon. friend from Burin is very deeply hurt and disgusted by the fact that St. Pierre is going to be a port of call.

Another resolution by the hon. member for St. John's East Extern - that a select committee be appointed to recommend changes in the standing orders. That is certainly needed, Mr. Speaker. The standing orders in this House are a joke. That fragmentary little green book that we have here is a joke. No serious House of Assembly should be governed by just little standing orders like that, unchanged in the last twenty-one years. It is time we got some rules in this House that give minorities in this House some protection, we do not have it now.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have all kinds of important business that we would like to discuss on private members day. Now since the start of the session, Mr. Speaker, you have to meet in the afternoon, you have to meet in the night, right away, right at the start, a tremendous volume of business, whambo!" April in Paris", of they went, four weeks, three weeks over in Paris. I can always go into a singing career.

Yes, we had to work afternoon and evening in this House, Mr. Speaker, because of the tremendous pressure of Government business. The few spindly flank pieces of legislation we have seen now will not take long to go through. The House was adjourned three weeks, twenty-seven days. Two Wednesdays.

MR. CROSBIE:

Mr. Speaker, we were allowed to meet Wednesday nights on private members business, then the iron curtain descended, wham. Right, the iron curtain and we knew who was the curtain hanger. We know who the curtain hangers are, they are going to fall with the curtain in the next election. Down came the iron curtain, we have not been allowed to meet on a Wednesday night to discuss private members business since March.

MR. NEARY: When the hockey finals start we will not be here at all.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, now I always like to hear from that hon. gentleman, the Minister for Social Services, who needs to be rehabilitated. Now that reminds me, Mr. Speaker, we all have heard of the battered baby syndrome, the shocking thing where all over the Continent in the last few years people have been battering babies. Well that hon. gentleman is a victim of the battered babies syndrome because everytime he speaks up with his baby talk he gets battered, so he would be much better advised just to be quiet and try to learn, we are trying to nurse him through, we do not want to be accused of child beating by answering in his plantiff cries and wails and howls and moans and screams. The other day we were even decent enough to say he was doing a good job in welfare.

MR. NEARY: I appreciate it very much.

MR. CROSBIE: I only hope they can understand his brand of talk down there, Mr. Speaker. In any event, we find the hon. gentleman to be amusing. So as I said, Mr. Speaker, we do not want to take up any time on this subject.

The resolution just asks that on Wednesdays instead of the speaker automatically adjourning the House until Thursday afternoon that he automatically adjourn until 8:00 o'clock unless some other motion is put. That does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that every Wednesday night we are going to meet Wednesday nights but only if there is serious private members business to discuss and that seems to us reasonable. If the other side of the House agrees with this and these rule changes are still desired by the hon. gentlemen, I do not doubt at all that that could all be arranged. We are quite prepared to be reasonable. we hope. The hon. gentlemen opposite will be reasonable.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all hon. gentlemen to vote in accordance with their consciences if that is permitted and to vote for the same rules in

MR CROSBIE:

this House on Wednesdays, as on the rest of the days of the week, until such time as we can agree to further rule changes.

MR BURGESS: I would like to speak very briefly on this motion. When this ..

MR NEARY: The hon. gentleman knows how to be brief.

MR CROSBIE: He should know. That hon. gentleman should know.

MR BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentleman will never have to worry about being kidnapped because there will be nobody the kidnappers can contact for ransom. If it is the old adage of, what you do not know does not hurt you, you are invulnerable. The hon. gentleman is invulnerable. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed when this session opened with the statements of the hon. the Premier about the urgency, the great urgency of passing the legislation that has to be passed in this House and the statements made to the public at large that in order to get this tremendous amount of legislation through of vital interest to the Province that it would be necessary to sit afternoon and evenings.

Now as expressed by the other hon. speakers, the opposition, the only time that they have to express their opinions is on a Wednesday. Now the rules of the House are quite specific that on Wednesdays if the business of the House is not concluded Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair until 3:00 o'clock the following day, automatically. Now the Bonne Bay Park issue which is the only issue that has come forward on private members day, the hon. member from St. Barbe South is really interested in dealing with this motion in order that he can clarify for his constituents and for the people who are concerned about this problem. He is very interested to get this matter debated and it is obvious to me, and I have no axe to grind, that there is a deliberate attempt on the part of the Government side of the House to subvert the impressions and opinions of this side of the House.

I feel that -

MR. BURGESS: In order to quote the hon. member from Burin, justice has not alone got to be done, it has got to appear to have been done and I do not think that any Government members on that side of the House have any option but to vote in favour of this motion as it appears on the paper now.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, not wishing to delay the House on private members day, but I can say that private members day in this House is the shortest day of the year. My feelings, and I do not want to come back here nighttime, I have expressed it on many occasions, but in fairness to those private members to have motions, on the Order paper, if the business is not finished and there is not enough chance to discuss it, and the hon. member for Burin I think has elaborated to a great extent, of what has happening on the three or four previous Wednesdays, were there is approximately one hour left to discuss private members day, I feel in fairness to that member, and he is a private member, he has got all the rights of any other member of this House, whether he be Premier or Vice-Premier, or Acting Premier or any other designation he may have, he has got a right to have his motion discussed. And I feel, Sir, that if the Government showed consideration to this side of the House, we began our debate at a reasonable hour say 2:30P.M. or 2:40 P.M., I believe there would be ample time to discuss the motion, and give it all the airing that is needed, but in view of the fact, and I think this is what precipitated this motion, is that the Opposition members particularly who bring in private members Bill, and I think every member of the House actually, every backbencher, if you like is entitled to bring in a private members Bill, it is not restricted only to the Opposition, it is respected to any private member, and should have the right to have it properly aired. And I feel that ^{if} this were done, there would be no need for this motion, and Wednesday night as such would be a night off for the House, the House would close. But I have to support the motion, because for the reason that, I think ample time should be given, and if it is not given in the afternoon's we would have to avail of the couple or three hours at night time to get it on. Again, if the House, was considered enough to allow private members to discuss all their business, I do not think that this motion

MR. MURPHY ; would have been necessary. And I think it is a reflection actually, it is a reflection on this House, this great democratic institution. That motion such as this has to be brought forward, and discussed. So I would favour it, but I would much rather that we were given ample time on private members day in the afternoon to go through our business, and then have Wednesday night off, as now stands in the Standing Order.

MR. NEARY: You on this side of the House, we are in the unique predicament where, "we will be darned, if we do, and we will be doubled darned, if we do not". No matter what we do Mr. Speaker, we cannot win. We gave the hon. members on the opposite side of the House an opportunity to have their Wednesday Night, and they turned it down flat.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twice, twice.

MR. NEARY: Twice on two occasions, Mr. Speaker, And Mr. Speaker, during the debate that is being carried on here now there has been a lot of wasted time, obstruction again, delayed tactics, I think we could have gotten on with some of the other motions that are on the order paper, but the hon. gentlemen have preferred to hang-up the House, Mr. Speaker, which reminds me of a story, just to show the hon. Paisleyite down there, that he is not the only one in the House, who has a sense of humor. But this situation now, Mr. Speaker, reminds me of the story of Mrs. Smith, who had just given birth to her thirteenth child. And the doctor was talking the whole thing over with her husband, Mr. Smith. He said, your family has increased every year since you were married. You have quite a large family. Do you think you should continue to have children? That is the last one for me, answered Mr. Smith. Before I will have another, I will hang myself. The doctor went abroad on a holiday, and when he returned he met Mr. Smith on the street, he said, Well, Sir, said the doctor, how many children do you have now? Fourteen, said Mr. Smith. But what did you promise me, asked the doctor? Well Doc, he said, I was already up on the barrel with the rope around my neck, and when it got to thinking about it, he said, I thought I might be hanging the wrong man". I think that is what the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are doing right now, Sir.

MR. HICKEY: After that contribution to the debate, there is not much left for me to say. I do not think I can outdo that. No I would not think of even trying. Well, Mr. Speaker, just a couple of questions I wanted to raise before voting on this resolution. I obviously will support it, because I believe it is a reasonable request, the hon. member is making. It applies primarily to private members day. But before we take a vote I would like to have an answer to one question, and that is the suggestion that the House meet mornings, and afternoons. It is my understanding that a consensus was taken on Government side, and by a large majority hon. members were in favour of meeting in the morning and in the afternoon. A consensus was taken on this side and a majority or all I believe, agreed to mornings and afternoons. And this was taken last week, and I am wondering what happened to it.

MR. NEARY: An answer did not come back.

MR. HICKEY: Well, there was a note sent over, Mr. Speaker, and to my knowledge a note went back to the effect that this side agreed.

MR. NEARY : No, note ever came back to us.

MR. MURPHY: It never did.

MR. HICKEY: We did not write back did we?

MR. NEARY: You did not agree.

MR. HICKEY: Well, at least it is never too late to tell the hon. gentleman.

MR. MURPHY: I am like George Washington, I must always tell the truth. I am sorry, my colleague, the answer did not go back.

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, it does not make any difference, my question is still valid. Before we vote on this issue, we might consider the other. It seems that some hon. members I think on the other side are not in favour of the resolution that is before the House now. And if they are not, then why do we not go on the other suggestion meet in the mornings, and afternoons, and on private members day, if necessary, and if the House should feel so inclined meet in the night as well, if we want to clear up any important business. O- if it is important enough to do do. Well, certainly I think we should do something to get away from this rankling that is going on, as to when we are going to meet, what hours we are going to meet, or what issues

MR. HICKEY: we are going to discuss? We must be given the impression to the public that we are like a bunch of children, continuously bickering. And, Sir, I would suggest that we consider the suggestion of meeting morning, afternoon and at night, if necessary on private members day. Otherwise I would feel duty bound to support the resolution before the House.

MR. BARBOUR: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for St. John's East Extern. I would like to meet in the morning, in the afternoon, and not in the evening. I was never for night sessions, because I have other important duties to perform. And this afternoon, this last twenty minutes have been nothing more than a circus in this House, as far as I am concerned. Dialogue not even worth talking about.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the hon. member's for St. John's East Extern, if he would put a motion to that effect, I do not know how long the motion will be before it can be heard. But I would certainly support on the grounds, that I do not think after working hard all day, that we should have to come back here every night and work until 11:00 P.M. I think it should be done in the day, and not in the evening. And I support the hon. member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, on this motion, I do not find that it is one of any great wit, or satire, or anything of that nature, other members of the House apparently do. But in this session of the House there has been accusation of delays deliberately planted by this side of the House. We only have to recall that right from the start of the opening of the House, we were told over radio, the local oracle, on all things, and particularly procedures of the House, that to begin with, we only did about three hours work a day any how. And this was simply ridiculous, nobody does any work in this place, and consequently we should not be afraid to come back afternoons and nights. Now, a peculiar situation has arisen in my opinion, I have noticed in this session of the House, that every time a leading question is put or a leading statement, or something that really means something, there is immediately an uproar on the other side, such crys as scandal, this is

MR. EARLE: particularly interesting in the Shaheen debate which we had. There was a very leading question put by myself, the immediate cry was scandalous, and the whole thing was hush, it was not carried on. Now this is a tactic that has been used. There were questions asked at great length and in great long statements made by members on the other side. When things began to get interesting and truthful, there were statements of all sorts of things about, ships butting into piers, about prevailing winds, about all sorts of nonsense, nobody can be accused of wasting time in this House, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the hon. member from St. John's North when he got up to speak about this, had the opportunity to ask all of these things that were in the estimates, when we were in committee. Time and time, again, when something is said in committee, there is always a cry of, stick to the particular vote. There is always a cry of, stick to the particular vote, you are not talking about this, that or the other thing, you are talking on particular vote, and you cannot wander all over the place. So many of these particular relative subjects never get an opportunity to be discussed.

On top of all that, Mr. Speaker, in this session of the House, to begin with we have had to listen to one ten hour speech, all of which could have been said in at least ten minutes, all of the relative matters that were in that speech. We are threatened with two other ten hour speeches on the same subject. I think we better sit every morning, afternoon and night to allow the hon. gentleman to get in these extra ten hours of speeches, because Newfoundland is going to be missing something, if we do not have more of these ten hour speeches. And some of the hon. Ministers on the other side, are beginning to take their cue from this, they are finding that things which could well be covered in very short periods of time, are now compelled to take up two and three hours of utter, absolute nonsense, not relevant to the subject at all. And therefore, I feel in supporting this motion, Mr. Speaker, the very least that this House can do, is rather than fill up the whole afternoon with the silly answers, and lengthy answers, and unnecessary

MR. EARLE: answers to questions at a time when we have the opportunity to be, when I say unnecessary answers, I mean unnecessarily long answers. And answers which do not apply in many cases.

Now without taking up the hon. members of the House's time, with all sorts of cross-fire and debate, when we get down to discussing serious matters, let us discuss them. And let us use the time in private members day to clear away the private members business. Then we will co-operate to the fullest extent. When there was this discussion on co-operating, when we were offered the time on the other side, the only thing we were trying to get at was there or was there not a gentleman's agreement that we would carry on? And the members on the other side would not admit that there was a gentleman's agreement. Frankly, I do not think they know what a gentleman's agreement is. If we were able to prise that out of them, we would have gone on. But we could not get this admission of a gentleman's agreement.

Therefore, we had to conclude that they would use every tactic to bar us. So Mr. Speaker, the delay is not on this side of the House, the delay is from the other side. And I think, it was quite within our rights to ask the House time to carry on afternoon and night, and if necessary mornings to clear up, not only private members business, but all the business of the House.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member does not turn up at night anyway.

MR. EARLE: The hon. member turns up as much as the other hon. members.

MR. WELLS: Check the records over there. And it is about time I would suggest Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I rose twice before

HON. F. W. ROWE (Min. of Education): Mr. Speaker, I rose twice before to speak and other hon. gentlemen were ahead of me. I had not intended to speak. I thought they were going to discuss what might be more substantial motions this afternoon. There are two or three insinuations that I feel that I should express my views on them. Let me say first of all that with regard to my hon. friend's suggestion from St. John's East, the possibility we might meet three times a day, morning, afternoon and night. I have been here now for twenty sessions and in, I would say half of those sessions we did meet morning, afternoon and night, not right through, but for fairly lengthy periods, several weeks at a time, morning afternoon and night, especially when we got into estimates and so on. And this should not impose ordinarily too great a hardship on hon. members because in no legislature in the world is every hon. member expected to spend every minute of every session in his seat in the House. Everybody knows that hon. gentlemen do have other duties and responsibilities. They have their districts to look after and in the case of ministers of the Crown they have their departmental and ministerial duties as well. It should not be too great an imposition, too great a hardship to meet even three times a day. This year it has been particularly difficult over here on this side, for reasons well known. The numbers over here are fewer and in order to maintain a quorum of fourteen on this side of the House, with three or four members at a time in the hospital and others absent on other duties it has not been too easy.

On the other hand I do not think anybody regards it as too great a hardship and I would not object, and I do not think most hon. members would in the interest of expediting the business of the House if we were to meet morning, afternoon and night. However that is something that could easily be discussed later and I would certainly be agreeable for my part, and I believe everybody on this side of the House would be to have some sort of a committee set up as we have done so many times in the past, private committee to look into this thing and to bring in to the House perhaps in

private session as we have done before to bring in some recommendation, enough about that.

There is ~~as~~ I am speaking seriously now on this, there is one misrepresentation in my mind that has been made here frequently. The impression has been conveyed to the people of Newfoundland over and over again. If you were outside listening, if you did not come to this House on Mondays, and Tuesdays and Thursdays and Fridays and were outside listening to the points and arguments that have been made as reported from here and has made on the various television interviews and radio interviews and so on. One would get the impression that the only time the member for the Opposition is permitted to open his mouth is on Wednesday afternoon. Now apart from the Speech, the lengthy Speech, I was not here, I understand the Premier gave, of ten hours, he did speak here one time for five days and I might say that hon. members on the Opposition have spoken for as many as three and four days. Three and four entire sessions here nobody objected to it on this side of the House, not even the present Opposition, my hon. friend must remember some of the speeches made here by Major Cashin when he was a member over there and by Mr. W. J. Browne and by Senator Hollett. I will come back to that in a moment.

You would get the impression, if you were listening to the radio or looking at Television and you will get the impression, the only time the any hon. member over there is permitted to open his mouth is on Wednesday afternoon, and that is, this side of the House is dedicated to preventing them from saying anything anyway. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that apart from the Premier no member on this side of the House has spoken so much or so often as the hon. member for St. John's West in this session. And no member on this side of the House, not one, has spoken so often and so much as the hon. member for Humber East, and nobody has tested his right to do it. Nobody has objected to it and for that matter during the enquiry or whatever you wanted to call it we had here a couple of weeks ago regarding the Come by Chance. Who did ninety per cent of the talking anyway?

For the final session, morning afternoon and night, who did, I object to that and I refute that Mr. Speaker it was not the Premier. That last three hours here the Premier did not speak for ten minutes. In that last three hours of the enquiry, the speaking was done over there, and nobody tried to stop them. And so I object Mr. Speaker, these people who get up with a halo around their heads they represent the people. Here we are told this afternoon by the member for Burin, we the people are demanding, I would like to inform the hon. gentleman that he is not the only representative of the people of Newfoundland in this House. And they all over there are not the only representatives, I happen to represent 20,000 people. And there are other 20,000 people represented over here. We, too, are in touch with those people and to give the impression, that here we are trying to hide information; trying to prevent free and democratic discussion is a lot of logwash. There is nobody who has tried to prevent any hon. member over there, for the very simple reason that nobody can prevent them and let me say again what has already been said here this afternoon. We have two major debates here, and then we have a free-for-all when we come to the estimates. The major debates are the address in reply. When any hon. member can speak on anything under the sun and not be called to order by the Speaker, and the same thing applies to the budget. Any hon. member can get up and discuss any activity, any function, for my hon. friend to try to pretend that there is no opportunity to discuss the ferry calling at St. Pierre. Is it, I mean it to be such-but if he is to be taken seriously ~~he~~ is a deception, pure deception.

Why cannot you discuss it under the Tourise estimates when they come up? Why cannot you discuss it in the budget debate anyway? Why cannot you discuss it when you are discussing ferries, we have to discuss ferries, it is an item in the estimates.

MR. NEARY: It is a federal matter anyway.

MR. ROWE: The point is, even on that Mr. Speaker, there is no member has ever been ruled out of order here in a general debate for discussing a matter

which comes under the jurisdiction and the prerogative of the Government of Canada. We have ^{had} hon. members talk about the quality of television down in Labrador West. Nobody ever called them to order and said, "look, you are out of order or you are wasting the time of the House." Although it is it is the responsibility of the Government of Canada and not of this House here but nobody objects to it. I suggest Mr. Speaker, that this is a form of brainwashing that is going on. And again we have this, here we are over here, here we are over here, we are too obstinate and too miserable, to prevent a meeting on Wednesday night. And on two occasions, and one of the roughest debates we had in this House was the very first debate when the hon. the Minister of Justice and House Leader proposed that we would meet on Wednesday night and every hon. gentleman voted against it. And he proposed it again. Now they found some excuses to do it. You can find some excuses at any time you want to on anything. If you want to object to a thing or embarrass the Opposition you can find excuses for doing it. You can find reasons for doing it. And that is what has been done.

The hon. member for Burin says we have obstructed over here. We are not the ones who asked the 400 questions that have been asked, which probably three times as many questions as ever were asked. Now I do not dispute the right of any hon. member to ask questions of any kind, dealing with the public business. And it is none of my business in one sense how many questions that are asked. I would suggest to Your Honour and to this House that half those questions need not be asked at all. Everybody knew the answers anyway, including the people of Newfoundland. Half of them were repetition. We have already answered 300 of these questions and the total number asked, the last one on this order paper here is 486, nearly 500 questions have been asked. They must be answered. And they have been answered. They will be answered. And yet we are the ones who are obstructing the business of the House. We are the ones who are delaying the business of the House. All of these questions do not have to be asked. Hon. members

want to ask ten thousand they have the right to do it, anymore, and speaking of obstructing, the people of Newfoundland ought to know that it was not the members on this side of the House who walked out here deliberately and thereby reduced the House below the level of a quorum and forced the Speaker to leave the Chair at 4.30 p.m. and we lost the entire afternoon and entire evening. We did not do that. And the following day Mr. Speaker a day or two afterwards an attempt was made to do it again. Yet we are the ones who are obstructing the House. Had they gotten away with the time before at 4:30 p.m. we would have again lost the rest of the afternoon and the night. Yet we are obstructing the business of the House.

There is one other point that I want to make before I sit down and I do it again it is not my concern, really, but not my concern personally I could not say less except from a sense of fairness. If I were in the seat of the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition there, I would resent the implication that the insinuation that has been put abroad and is constantly being put abroad by two or three of the other members on that side, not part, at least not all part of the official opposition and that insinuation is, that innuendo is, that up until this year there has never been an effective opposition in this House. Nobody has ever said that. This is the impression they have tried to convey. And I object to it. Last year and in previous years the opposition over here did their work and did their duty and I have been in this House for twenty sessions when we had MR. WELLS: The Minister of Health on a television programme said that, no one on this side of the House said that.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker we have over here, we have sat here for twenty odd sessions. We have sat here for twenty odd sessions and I want to say now that some of the most effective opposition ever in this House was in the early sessions in the early 1950's. When you had men like the present Justice Higgins, and you had men like the Hon. W. J. Browne now retired, you had men like Senator Hollett, and Major Cashin, these men did their job and these men did not sit down there and allow us to get away with anything they thought

we should not get away with. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact you could go on. There have been dozens of them, the late Gus Duffy, and Mr. J. J. Greene and Dr. Noel Murphy all of these men, they did a good job here. They did a good job here, just as the hon. members who constituted the official opposition in, during the last three sessions of the House who have tried to go a good job here and for anyone to imply that they did not do a good job and did not try to do a good job. The Minister of Health, if he did he is not the only one who has tried to convey that impression to the people of Newfoundland. My hon. friend has tried to do it.

MR. CROSBIE : Your hon. friend Mr. Speaker has not attempted to do it, the hon. minister of Health. I do not know who his orders came from?

MR. ROWE : The fact of the matter is Mr. Speaker, that no opposition in the history of—certainly of my experience in this House no opposition has enjoyed greater privileges and greater opportunities and more opportunities to express themselves, to get information and to attack the Government than the present opposition. And for anyone to try to convey that anything different to the people of Newfoundland is to misrepresent the whole issue. We have carried on a debate over here as the hon. gentleman has over there. We have not been no more guilty of obstructionism than they have. And I suggest that this afternoon is a very good example of what I am trying to convey.

MR. WELLS : Mr. Speaker, I just have a couple of comments to make and then we can put this question. It is a serious motion put two or three weeks ago with a serious purpose in mind, and that nobody be lead astray by the motion which preceded it. And the fact that it was defeated was defeated for an entirely different reason, as Your Honour knows. And with all due respects to the hon. member for St. John's North, I rather suspect that what he said was said with tongue in cheek and with a great deal of humour involved. This motion is serious with a serious purpose in mind to accord to the members of the, who sit on the opposite side of the House the opportunity to debate the matters they want debated. Of course the opposition members have every opportunity to speak when government matters are brought before the House there

is no, they have the right to speak at any time they want to the same as any other hon. member, when Government motions are brought before the House. But, Wednesday the purpose of Wednesday is to allow opposition members to bring up for debate the matters they want debated. And to say that there will be ample opportunity to debate it when the budget is being considered or when the estimates are being considered or during the budget debate is nonsense. Badically, it is none of the government's blankety-blank business Your Honour what the opposition wanted to debate on Wednesday. It is their right to decide not the government's right or duty. By what right do the government tell them you are going to have an opportunity to debate it when the estimates are considered. It is none of their business. It is the right of the members who sit opposite to decide what they want to debated on Wednesday. Let nobody lose sight of that.

MR. CALLAHAN: It has been lost sight of.

MR. WELLS: It has been lost sight of. Look that hon. minister should close up. He should be ashamed of the performance he has carried on here in the last two or three Wednesdays, he should not interfere. He might get an earful, Your Honour. The people of Newfoundland might find out just what has happened, we have seen it, here the last several Wednesdays, it has been quite clear, We are not all idiots, some of us may be, some of us may be, we are not all idiots. We can see clearly what is going on, There is no question Your Honour, and it is clear for anybody who wants to sit and look at it, either bit at all impartially, that the Government is clearly attempting to prevent thorough debate on the Bonne Bay Park motion and that was the purpose of this motion three weeks ago when it was first put to allow us to sit beyond the hour of six o'clock for that purpose. When we saw what happened here earlier this afternoon the points of order raised and under numerous other occasions this has happened. It is quite clear that what the Premier wants 's a kind of Greek democracy, with a chosen few are equal in the democratic sense and the rest are subdued or slaves or not equal. It is

quite clear that this is what he would prefer. And then while he was out this afternoon, while the cat was away the mice started to play, even the deputy cat played a little bit. And you talk about wasting the time of this House, plenty has been wasted, Your Honour, most of it has been wasted during this session and proper issues could well have been discussed and this is such a proper issue that concerned a great number of people in this Province and they want an opportunity to debate the Bonne Bay Park issue. They want an opportunity to debate it.

MR SMALLWOOD: Time is wasting and drags people away from the practice of law.

MR WELLS: What is that supposed to mean?

MR. WELLS: What is it supposed to mean? What is it supposed to add to the debate?

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): Order please.

MR. WELLS: More trash. That is 100 per cent form.

Mr. Speaker, I have never known it to be criminal to live in another part of this Province and to go home and try and earn a living, an honest one! an honest one! Now, if the Premier wants to discuss with me practising law..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. WELLS: And how I could have gotten rich doing it, while I sat in the Cabinet, I will discuss it with him, anytime he wants to.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Come on, come on, let us hear it, come on.

MR. WELLS: Anytime he wants to debate that..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Come on, tell us all about it, tell us all about it.

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): Order please. A certain amount of play across the House is a usual thing, but there are one or two members in the House who seem to make a practice of interrupting hon. members, when they speak, and the Speaker feels that this should be drawn to the hon. members' attention and that hon. members should be able to carry out the debate in an ordinary fashion.

MR. WELLS: Thank you. Mr. Speaker. Sir, I have spoken before on this and winding it up, let me say only this. The sole purpose of this motion is to allow ample opportunity to debate the matters that the people on this side of the House, the members on this side of the House feel are of importance to the people of the Province. They may be totally wrong, but because they feel that these matters are of importance, they have a right to debate it and Wednesday's are being cut down again and we have seen again today what has happened to us and every Wednesday will be the same thing. I ask, Mr. Speaker, I ask that all hon. members, all hon. members give consideration to making this a truly, democratic House and instead of one in the style of the

Greek democracy where only the chosen few are equal and that they vote in support of the motion. Thankyou Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour "aye." Contrary "nay." I declare the motion lost.

AN HON. MEMBER: On division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): On division.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I move that at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Speaker, leave the Chair..

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): Order. There is some confusion..

An hon. member stood, I do not know if he meant to stand to divide or not.

MR. WELLS: I move, Mr. Speaker, that at 6:00 p.m. today, Mr. Speaker, leave the Chair until 8:00 p.m. and that the House sit until 11:00 p.m. unless sooner adjourned by motion put.

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): Those in favour of the motion please say "aye" Contrary "nay." I declare the motion lost.

MR. WELLS: Divide, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): Divide.

Those in favour of the motion please rise: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition; Mr. Collins, Mr. Earle, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Wells, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Myrden, Mr. Burgess.

Those against the motion please rise: The hon. the Premier, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. Minister of Labour, the hon. Mr. Lewis, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, the hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs, Mr. Hodder, Captain Strickland, the hon. Minister of Education, the hon. Minister of Public Works, the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. the hon. Minister Minister of Community and Social Development, the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, Mr. Barbour, the hon. Mr. Hill, the hon. Minister of Supply, Mr. Moores,

Motion lost.

3107

Motion no. (9) today's Order Paper.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to carry on from where I was last day, in an attempt to sum up the numbers of questions being asked by the hon. gentlemen opposite, to sum up the position with respect to the Government's proposal for the St. Barbe Coast, part of which proposal is the proposed Bonne Bay National Park. Before I do that, Mr. Speaker, there are one or two brief references I wish to make. One or two misunderstandings, perhaps which need to be cleared up very quickly. One of them is and I had thought this to have been dealt with and clearly dealt with last day, the matter of the meeting which I have said that I am prepared and willing to attend on the West Coast in order to give people who live in the effected area a first hand opportunity to obtain information about this whole matter.

Now I think it was the hon. member for Humber East last day who asked whether I would be prepared to hold a meeting with the executives of the various Chambers of Commerce, and I assume the executive of NARDA in addition to or prior to, I am not sure which, a public meeting, and I think there is also a question as to whether the Federal minister might attend or sit in on these meetings. What I said, Mr. Speaker, and I think very clearly was that I certainly would be prepared to meet with the executive of the Chambers of Commerce and/or NARDA in addition to the public meeting. Secondly, I did not think the Federal minister, the hon. Mr. Chretien would be prepared to attend these meetings at this time, and prior to an agreement having been formerly arrived at between his Government and the Government of the Province. One way or another, Mr. Speaker, this has resulted in suggestions and reports published that the Federal member for the riding would not be permitted to attend the meetings. Mr. Speaker that is so much ^{errant} nonsense. I gather the hon. member for St. Barbe South has lead some credence to this and suggest that perhaps he might be barred to. I want to say now, in this House, at this time, Mr. Speaker, what I should have said had I noticed the report in the newspaper on Monday that - that is a tissue of - let me say, Mr. Speaker, that it is simply

not true. That it has not been said by me or by anybody. It was not said in this House. No such suggestion was made and if it were, indeed, it would be pretty nonsensical, because how does one, if one wished, too, indeed. How does one prevent anyone from attending a public meeting? I do not know how. The fact is, of course, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who wishes to attend the public meeting is quite at liberty to do so, and I think that should and would apply particularly to members of this House or other elected representatives of any level of Government who wished to attend, and I should think that they would be anxious to attend.

The other thing, Sir, is the suggestion that I have been delinquent in not setting the date for and/or calling the meeting, and I say again what I said in the House last Wednesday that the meeting is being arranged or at least was proposed to be arranged by the Chambers of Commerce under the Corner Brook chamber at the request of the Northern Regional Development Association. They asked the Chambers of Commerce to arrange for this proposed meeting and any suggestion that the president of the Chamber of Commerce, and this suggestion has been made by my hon. friend from St. Barbe-South. The president of the Chamber of Commerce in some way ~~is~~ colluding with me or with anybody else to prevent the meeting being held, Mr. Speaker, to say the least shameful. That gentleman had nothing whatever, as an individual, to do with arranging that meet. The meeting was arranged at the request of the Northern Regional Development Association to the various Chambers of Commerce on the West Coast and the arrangements are being co-ordinated by the Corner Brook chamber and any suggestion that is different from that is at least mischievous .

Mr. Speaker, I read the letter to the Corner Brook chamber last week and as soon as they arrange the meeting, and it had better be fairly soon or I will have to go and arrange one myself, but I rather do it in co-operatio

with the bodies who are interested. As soon as they advise me of the time and date of the meeting, I will be very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to be there, and I hope that elected representatives whether at the Federal, Provincial or the Municipal level will indeed attend.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is perhaps appropriate and necessary to summarize or boil down or synthesize the total proposal that has been made. I have given the House the reason, the rationale, the thinking of the Government, the considerations that were given to the question of a national park and nothing else as to why we feel that a wilderness park, without either in it or associated with it, facilities such as exists in association with most national parks in Canada. That is one reason for our approach to this. We do not think that that would be equitable. We think that could be considered discriminatory as far as this Province is concerned. There are other factors, Mr. Speaker, and if I may just outline in a brief way what these factors are and what we think needs to be done in order to take full advantage of the developmental opportunities that exists on that great coast.

Mr. Speaker we

MR. CALLAHAN: One, we have asked for and it was our initiative, this Government's initiative to have a national park development in the first place. The Government of Canada who have been sarcastically described as foaming at the mouth in their anxiety to get this national park going, in fact Mr. Speaker, are very anxious to have between forty and sixty national parks if they can get them established in Canada by the end of the present century which is only thirty years away. They are concerned because the record over the past thirty years is not very good.

As I indicated to the House earlier Mr. Speaker, the only national parks created in the past thirty or forty years in Canada, have been very small and very minor national parks in fact, and the proposed Gros Morne park would in fact be that largest established in Canada in forty years. So the concern of the Government of Canada is very evident I think and it is that unless they can get forty to sixty new national parks established over the next say, quarter century, that Canada will not be well served in terms of national parks and the outdoor recreation associated with them.

Mr. Speaker, we want this development and the Government of Canada obviously wants it. There is something else that the Government of Canada wants Mr. Speaker, and they want it very much, and that is the development of the L'Anse au Meadows viking site near St. Anthony. Mr. Speaker, quite a large amount of money has been spent of this project already. The delineation of the area of inhabitation, the collection of artifacts and specimens, and the protection of these areas and these articles. Most of the money has been spent by this Government, principally I think in respect of the work of Dr. Helga Ingstad, the Norwegian archaeologist and his wife who spent several seasons there and in fact I think have established beyond any serious doubt the validity of the claim that this in fact is the place where white men first set foot in North America. That being the case of course Mr. Speaker, if we accept Dr. Ingstad's conclusion, then L'Anse au Meadows is absolutely unique not only in Canada, not only in the western world, but indeed in the world. Because this would mark L'Anse au Meadows a point on the northern tip of the Island of Newfoundland near Cape Bauld as being in fact the first place, the first site of settlement by Europeans outside their own continent, and that has a certain

very special historical significance.

Mr. Speaker, we have, my colleague the Minister of Provincial Affairs has carried on very serious negotiations with the Government of Canada on this particular matter, and these negotiations I think it is fair to say are very near conclusion. There are some outstanding problems, questions and among these outstanding questions are the matter of visitor accomodation, the matter of good highway access and other such matters that would make the project, whatever is done in that area, to make it a desireable place to visit. Where people can actually go and see something and satisfy their sense of history.

There are numbers of things that must be done which are very expensive to do, and which fall outside the ambit of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and particularly the National Historic Parks Branch. They do not have the authority Mr. Speaker, and the difficulty is that if they go in and spend money to do what needs to be done at L'Anse au Meadows, and if the roads are not provided, and the visitor accomodation is not provided, and other things are not done that are outside their scope, then what they do will largely be lost because it will be done in isolation. People will not be able to get up there. Last year it was very good, 3,000 people visited the L'Anse au Meadows site. But how many would visit Mr. Speaker, and we have some indication I might say as to how many might if interest on the part of groups, and particularly ex-patriots and second and third generation European and particularly Norwegian groups are concerned. There is plenty of indication Mr. Speaker, that this could be the single most exciting historic area in North America. On the whole North American continent. But people have to have access to it, it is a long road and when they get there they have to have a place to stay, because you cannot drive up to 300 miles and then simply turn around and drive back again. You have to have a place to stay, and the facilities ideally should be near the site.

So Mr. Speaker, we have two things now. We have the prospect of the Gros Morne Park which as I have explained in detail earlier, unless it has facilities associated with, comparable with those associated with other national parks particularly in the Atlantic Region, and I would refer hon. members, rather

than my own summary, or the summary of the white paper, to the, well in this case the Western Star of Monday, April 13th., where the facilities in all of the national parks in Canada are outlined in detail. I think that is a reprint from the Evening Telegram.

Hon. members will see Mr. Speaker, why we are concerned. We are concerned that unless the facilities provided are comparable to those provided elsewhere, and this may be outside the scope, at least in some measure, and I think is outside the scope of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Then whatever they do in respect of the Gros Morne National Park will not realize its full potential.

The same thing Mr. Speaker applies with L'Anse au Meadows. Unless things are done which are outside the scope of that particular department, whatever they do at L'Anse au Meadows will not realize its full potential.

Mr. Speaker, another point of interest is what is being done to help the industrial and social development of the St. Barbe Coast. This Government Mr. Speaker, built the St. Barbe highway at a cost of between \$12 million and \$15 million. It is there, it is not a super highway, it is not a freeway, but it did for the first time open up that great coast. In addition to that Mr. Speaker, as the hon. the Premier as Minister of Economic Development announced a couple of weeks ago, the Newfoundland Power Commission has just built a \$3 million transmission line, and there is an extra million dollars involved in stand-by equipment in that connection.

Those are two very large investments Mr. Speaker designed to improve the social and industrial or commercial climate or condition on the St. Barbe Coast.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that the Government of Canada through the Regional Development Program have designated the Port au Choix - Port Saunders - Hawkes Bay Area as a special area under DREE. They will be putting in there I assume, and I have not the details before me, large amounts of money in terms of bringing up the standard of public services generally. In addition to that they will be involved in assisting industry. Whether the new sawmill industry which is down there, or the fishing industry and I understand the particular fishing company have recently secured a very large grant from DREE in terms of

diversifying their operations and that this year they are going into the shrimp fishery, and these things Mr. Speaker are important. These expenditures of money will be very large, the expenditures of this Government on the highway and on the transmission lines has been extremely heavy. I say again Sir, that the danger is if that is the word, that unless certain other things are done these expenditures, and these contributions towards the social and towards the industrial fabric of that part of our Province will not achieve their full potential or anything like it unless certain other things are done.

We could consider Mr. Speaker, that down in St. Anthony which is the most northerly seaport in the island, and which is the designated regional medical centre for that coast, and nearby areas and by extension I suppose, parts of Labrador. The point is Sir, that we have created there the the very finest hospital and medical service, but the advantage of those services, the provision of the advantage of those services to the people on that coast who are so much closer say, to St. Anthony than they are to Corner Brook which is the next regional medical centre, largely is inhibited by something else that is lacking, something that must be done. It can fairly be said that these large expenditures and medical services perhaps are not realizing their full potential in terms of the health needs of the people.

In addition to that, you have the St. Barbe ferry service Mr. Speaker,

MR. MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister permit a question?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes Mr. Speaker

MR. MYRDEN: What has that got to do with the resolution that is now on the paper which deals with the Bonne Bay Park? The ferry service over to Labrador has nothing to do with this resolution Sir, nor does the St. Anthony Hospital, nor has the L'Anse au Meadows thing. The Bonne Bay Park resolution in case he does not know it, I will read it out to him again Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): I do not think that will be necessary. the resolution has already been read.

MR. CALLAHAN: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I think the House is aware of the connection, I think the House knows what the connection is.

Mr. Speaker, as I started to say, you have the St. Barbe ferry, you

have the Bonne Bay ferry service, and you have our suggestion, not that we install airports like Stephenville and Deer Lake say, but there would be a good useable air-strip on either side of the Straits of Belle Isle to supplement the St. Barbe ferry service.

Mr. Speaker, you have the proposed national park with all that entails. You have the Port au Choix - Hawkes Bay - Port Saunders DREE area, you have the various Dorset Eskimo and Indian sites which I mention now and have mentioned earlier, but not in the summary a few minutes ago. You have the L'Anse au Meadows viking site, the regional hospital services, the St. Barbe and the Bonne Bay ferries, the various natural resource potential along the coast, whether it be minerals or oil or timber or fish or wildlife, and the one thing Mr. Speaker that makes all these things really possible of fulfillment, of complete fulfillment, which gives each of these things a chance to reach its full potential is the linking up of them by the upgrading of and the providing of in place of the present gravel highway, a first class all-weather paved road from Deer Lake to St. Anthony.

Mr. Speaker, this is what the proposal is all about, and as the white paper says, the hon. gentleman wonders what the connection is with the Bonne Bay National Park. If he will refer Mr. Speaker, to the white paper he will find the statement there on more than one occasion that the Bonne Bay National Park should not be considered in isolation from the other developmental opportunities and needs of the region. We have made Mr. Speaker, in our concept of what needs to be done, we have declared the Bonne Bay National Park as the Forillon Provincial park in the Gaspé Peninsula of Quebec. This is a case in point Mr. Speaker, because it has been done. We have declared that the Gros Morne National Park shall be the core, the centre and the nucleus of the development of that whole coast. This is where it fits in.

Mr. Speaker, what we are saying simply is this, that if in order to have a national park, and we are all for a national park, we are the ones who asked for it in the first place, but if in order to have a national park we must and I use the word because it is the most descriptive word I can use, I can find, if we must lock up the timber, the minerals, the wildlife, the fish, and all the

other resources in that area which then Mr. Speaker, become a loss to the Province, as a Province, as I indicated the other day in the case of Ontario and Quebec and other Provinces they have taken this step. If we have to lock up these resources and they become lost, not only Mr. Speaker to the Province, but also to the people who live in that region, then we have to find something to replace that loss.....

MR. CALLAHAN: As I said to the House the other day, it is our feeling, it is our contention, it is supported by other government, it is supported by the National and Provincial Parks Association, it is our feeling Mr. Speaker that the Province should not lose in a matter that constitutes really a national purpose. If a national purpose is being served, it seems to us sensible, it seems to us normal, that the nation, not the Province, not the Tourist Province, Mr. Speaker we cannot afford to lose anything, the nation should bear the cost. It is a very simple principle. We think it is a supportable principle, and we think, Mr. Speaker, we have supported it. We do not think, that if the worst comes to the worst, and we do not manage in our bargaining to get a agreement on one or two matters, and if that means that 1500 people on that coast have to be uprooted, and have to move elsewhere, people who are used to fishing, used to cutting timber, sawing lumber, to harvesting the wildlife, to guiding tourists, or whatever it may happen to be, we do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that their livelihood and that their home and the schools and churches they have built in their communities, and any commercial businesses that they should have, and another activities that they have been involved in, whether it be supplementing farming or whatever, we do not believe that all these things should be just lost. That they should be just moved out and all these things removed from them, without there being some real expectation, that something else will be provided. And if there is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that has been pushed aside, and has been forgotten in this whole matter by some of those who have been raising the human cry about it, this is the point, this is what has been forgotten, the real effect on the people.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. member permit me, down that coast Mr. Speaker there are quite a few houses that are used by fishermen in the summertime along the beaches, and stages and they go their in summer, and they go back to their permanent homes in the winter. They go there lobster fishing and salmon fishing, and probably stay there all year around some of them. Would these places be moved if the park, you know, came, would they have to move out of there then? And if they did, where would they live while they are fishing?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of concern, and I refer my hon. colleague in the House to page 8 of the White Paper, where on number eight, one of the matters which we have raised, one of the matters which we are negotiating is and I quote, continuation of fishing rights and landing rights along the coast within the national park, as tourist attractions and the provision of wharves and landing and marketing facilities including a seafood restaurant concession. Mr. Speaker, we have had that in mind.

Mr. Speaker, to give the House an indication of concern, and I hear from people by telephone, and by mail, from time to time, most of them interweaving their concern with their private personal problems, and I think I should not therefore get into that kind of personal correspondence. But, I think it maybe that the secretary, the elected secretary of the Board of Trustees, the local improvement district of Cowhead, the public official might be a gentleman whose opinion the House could usefully consider. And he says in a letter to me, of April 8th. "that just in case you should get the impression, that those who have the park fever are the only spokesmen for this district. I now write to confirm the view I expressed last spring at the Woody Point meeting sponsored by NARDA". Now, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman asked some of the questions that this document raises, and the question my hon. friend, my hon. colleague raised a couple of minutes ago, the question of fishing rights, the question of rights to continue logging or cutting saw logs, the questioning of harvesting wildlife and all these other questions, he raised at that meeting. Mr. Speaker, he raises them again now. And I think it is a valid concern. He goes on to say, we want more than a park to provide jobs and income for a certain segment of our people. He says, we want all we can get. And the level headed folks this way will go along with you and the Government. We have sense enough to know that the Government cannot have a magic wand and presto there is a park, and the reason as he says in his letter, Mr. Speaker, is that we have to (and I will use his words) the Government have to drive the best possible bargain with Ottawa, and to see beyond the kind of thing we have been hearing which really in my opinion is so much opportunism and short-sighted political opportunism at that.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, the point in this whole matter is, that we have good ground, we do have resources that are going to be lost to us, we do have a large number of people who are going to be dispossessed, who are going to be required to move, and we have Mr. Speaker to provide for them and to be concerned about them, not only where they live again, where their homes will be, from whatever time they have to move onward, but also that there are jobs for them, and there is no indication in the present planning, or at least the planning up to the time that this document was prepared, that we could expect the kind of economic development as a result of the National Park that would indeed provide for these people economically and even socially in the future.

But, Mr. Speaker, to get back to what I said a few minutes ago, that whatever is done on that coast in terms of National Park Development, or National Historic Park Developments, in terms of the the development of the fishery, the development of the woods industry at Hawkes Bay or whatever it maybe, Mr. Speaker. But no matter what is done Mr. Speaker, it is not going to be successful so long as that road is there in the condition it is in now; namely, it is a gravel highway. So it is fine that people have to travel, but Mr. Speaker, tourists, peeople travelling on holidays, do not have to travel, at least do not have to travel on gravel highway, they also do not have to come to a ^o province, where there are not facilities in its national parks such as there are in other provinces. You have got to be able to compete, we have got to offer these people facilities where they can have a well-rounded holiday, if that is what it is they are looking for. We have to be able to tell them and assure them that they not have to drive over miles and miles of dusty road. And that is why when my hon. friend raise the petition from Sally's Cove today, I could not agree more, because Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Does the hon. minister intend to finish his speech this afternoon?

MR. CALLAHAN: I am trying very hard, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, we notice that you are really racing to finish this.

Does the hon. Minister realize that three afternoon now he has monopolized the House.

MR. CALLAHAN: I did not delay the House.....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, please.

MR. CALLAHAN: I did not delay until 5:15 P.M. today, Mr. Speaker, I had fully intended Mr. Speaker to clue up today in at least in half an hour.

MR. NEARY: Will the hon. member permit another question? Is the hon. member aware that recently the Power Commission installed electricity in Sally's Cove and that our investment in Sally's Cove must be protected and therefore we would not to see that community transplanted?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, electricity and electricity, there are two kinds, there are two kinds of electricity would the hon. gentleman agree to that? There is diesel power at a very high cost, and there is hydro-power at a very low cost, will the hon. gentleman agree with that?

Mr. Speaker, as I started to say if it had not been for the fillerbuster on the other side, I intended to clue up in half an hour today. And I am not too far off that mark right now. Mr. Speaker, the mention of Sally's Cove raises again, the question as my hon. friend from St. Barbe's South raised earlier, and all I can say to him again, at this time is that it is our opinion, it is our feeling, that the two communities of Sally's Cove and Trout River should be permitted to remain as the planning is now they would not have to go immediately, my recollection is that Sally's Cove in 1965 and Trout River three or four years later. But Mr. Speaker, we are not interested in Sally's Cove and Trout River being removed. if we can prevent it. And we are trying very hard to prevent it. We think that it is not in anyway a threat to the integrity of the national park, and that it does not in anyway diminish from a national park to have within it typical communities, typical fishing communities, which also Mr. Speaker, being at more or less the extremities of the park, could be places where visitor accommodations could be located. And we think, and we feel strongly that this would not in fact, this concept would not in fact rencounter to what the

MR. CALLAHAN: Government of Canada wish to do. On the other hand, they feel that communities should go, and I think there real concern is that which is merited in the debate, which recently has been in the House of Commons, and that is the debate concerned with the establishment of a Town Corporation to be responsible for leasehold properties in National Parks. Because there are very many, Mr. Speaker, in all the older National Parks, there are very many properties which have been leased on various terms, and the national parks administration as such is finding great difficulty dealing with the leasees and controlling development and all these other things.

So, it might be that Sally's Cove and Trout River might have to be like Woody Point and Rocky Harbour and other communities which specifically will be excluded from the Park boundaries, if that is necessary, or possible to be done, then we will do it that way. Then, of course, Mr. Speaker, it will be necessary to help these communities acquire facilities and upgrade themselves, so they will truly convey a good impression of Newfoundland to visitors, as they are now, they like so many Newfoundland communities that have simply grown up, without the benefit of planning or any rational development. And this is the kind

MR. CALLAHAN: This is the kind of thing I think that National Parks would be concerned about if the communities were in the Park as such. And I think perhaps Mr. Speaker, we can iron that situation out, and that these two major communities will be allowed to stay. Mr. Speaker, we are not planning on the St. Barbe Coast as has been so sarcastically termed a multi-million dollar kind of Disneyland. What we are trying to provide on the St. Barbe Coast is every possible opportunity for the development of the Coast, and that really means the development of its people.

The problem is not a new one in Newfoundland that we see here the opportunity, because of the obvious interest that the Government of Canada in the Gros Morne proposal, and in the L'Anse aux Meadows proposal, because of their interest in the Port-au-Choix area, we think that interest can be extended, heightened to the point that they will in fact, wrap all the developmental opportunities on the St. Barbe Coast into a package and agree with us that what we have proposed should be done.

Mr. Speaker, we are very confident that this will happen. We have I think, some indication of the possibility, and as I said in the House the other day, we hope that by sometime this summer, we will in fact, be in a position to sit down with the Government of Canada, and in fact sign an agreement, which may not be a final thing Mr. Speaker. It may not pin down the absolutely final boundaries, may accept certain areas because of exploration or development, or whatever that is now in progress, and might need to be phased out or closed down over a period of time, but essentially we want to get an agreement, in the first instance in principle on the whole proposal, and then in addition to that in substantial detail,

So we will not Mr. Speaker, be going back later, next year or the year before, or the year after, or the year after that, as we had to do last year and the year before - we tried to get improvements made to the Terra Nova National Park. We want to get all these things agreed now, because Mr. Speaker, we know if they are not agreed now, our chances of having them agreed later, will be very largely diminished. The simple

fact is of course that we will not have a leader, we will not have a case, we will not have anything left to bargain with if we decide now without having some kind of agreement to go ahead. And this is noted service, let me say to Mr. Chretien or to any of the people who are now in the National Park branch. As I said to the minister the other day, Mr. Speaker, he may not be the minister and I may not be the minister next year. And unless the things are written down, it is the hon. gentleman's opinion, I am prepared to face what I may not be, he is not able to face what he has not been able to become. Mr. Speaker, the point is, some of the hon. gentleman's henchmen may be waiting in many places. Mr. Speaker, the point is that Mr. Chretien may not be the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development a year or two years from now. And I think the negotiations now are absolutely vital because they will in fact, determine what the agreement will be, and that can only be solidified and made certain if we in fact get it written into an agreement now.

Mr. Speaker, we have not been delaying the hon. member's Motion ~~was~~ ~~made~~. The point is Mr. Speaker, we have not been delaying in this matter. We have been treating it responsibly. We have been doing what needed to be done to establish the resources that exist in the area. We have been doing the surveys of the communities in which the people live. We have been finding out how many people do live there and what their homes are perhaps, worth - where we could move them - under what circumstances we could move them - where the cost of moving them would be found. These are details Mr. Speaker, which are necessary to be examined. There are landowners. There are means and there avenues of acquiring privately held land. And we have to know what the land is, and we have a choice Mr. Speaker. We can attempt to expropriate it, and no one knows what that cost will be. Or we can attempt to bargain or negotiate with the people who now own it, and try to arrive at another accommodation. And I may say Mr. Speaker, that in one case I now have a very large area and indication that it will be handed back with the provision that if the proposal does not go through, or the land is not in fact, required for that proposal, the

rights will be returned to the present owner. And I think that is a useful compromise and I think it is a very reasonable position. We have some problems with other areas. We have timberlands for example in which we are asked to make some exchanges in other parts of the Province, but we cannot enter into those arrangements Mr. Speaker, and one very good reason is that the advice that we have been waiting for a long time on timber areas, is about to arrive. Mr. Speaker, until we get the advice of the Royal Commission on Forestry we are not prepared to make any exchanges or make any arrangements that have to do with significant forest areas. But these things will come Mr. Speaker, and they will come sooner than the hon. gentleman perhaps expect, or believe. We are not happy that these things take time, but Mr. Speaker, it would not be a problem, had the total area been a Crown land area with no complications in terms of communities or people or private rights, or private lands, or feasible titles or anything of that nature. So Mr. Speaker, these things had to be cleaned up and it has to be done in an orderly and a legal way. And we are proceeding to do it as quickly as it can be done.

But by and large Mr. Speaker, I say the Resolution does not take account of what has been done, and indeed what it does Mr. Speaker, and I am happy to have the word of the hon. the member for Humber East last week, when he on two or three occasions, said across the House, that he agreed completely with the proposal. I hope he has not changed his mind- I hope indeed that he perhaps worked on some of his colleagues and his near-colleagues on the other side and perhaps persuaded them to some agreement. Because Mr. Speaker, if they come to such agreement, or if they to do something useful, and I mean to do something useful, they would be of more use Mr. Speaker, than either in the first instance in respect of my hon. friend the member for St. Barbe South, withdraw the Resolution, or in the second instance, perhaps vote against it. Because Mr. Speaker, how successful we will be may depend in some measure at least, on the unanimity of feeling in this House and in this Province. And if it appears

that this is something that Newfoundland people and their representatives in this House truly want, then it may be Mr. Speaker, that our chances of getting what we are seeking in this matter, may be very greatly improved.

So Mr. Speaker, there is not much else I can say. I am very glad to attend the meetings that will be held. As I have said, I have stipulated at Rocky Harbour to meet with the Chambers of Commerce, to meet with the NARDA people, or anyone else who wants to discuss this. We have nothing to hide Mr. Speaker. We have made our position and our proposition very plain. We have put it in print and we are distributing it in thousands of copies, and we have it available for anyone who wants it. And we are not afraid to discuss it, put it on display and to tell the people of Newfoundland what it is all about, and Mr. Speaker, if the hon. and ignorant gentleman from St. John's West will forebear for about ten seconds I will finish. And Mr. Speaker, we are distributing copies of the White Paper, we are continuing our negotiations, and we are very hopeful and very confident Mr. Speaker, regardless of what may be said on the other side, we will be eminently successful.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I had a speech prepared this afternoon, but it appears to be six o'clock. Let me say this Mr. Speaker, that I will have quite a bit to say on this next Wednesday, and I move that the debate adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising do adjourn until Thursday at three o'clock.