



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 8

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 3 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. JOHN CROSBIE: I rise on a point of privilege, the point of privilege having to do with a breach of the privileges of this House. My point of privilege is this, that the hon. the Premier has breached the privileges of this House by showing disrespect for the dignity of a House by reason of his refusal on Wednesday, yesterday February 25, to provide the information requested in Part 4 of Question (71) on the Order Paper - which asks whether the Government had approved the appointment of an independent person by Newfoundland Refining Co. Ltd., to furnish to the Government an opinion confirming the feasibility of the Oil Refinery Project at Come-by-Chance, and if so what was the name of that person?

He refused to answer that question yesterday on the grounds that it would be injurious to the public interest he said, and there were certain negotiations under way. So he refused to answer the whole of question (71). Yet this morning February 26, on radio station V.O.C.M. at about ten fifteen this morning, the hon. the Premier announced to the world that the company had been appointed to do this feasibility study. Universal Oil Products of Chicago, he gave the name of the company. He said they had carried out the feasibility study. He went on to say that the study had found the project to be feasible.

Now Mr. Speaker, it is well known, a well known rule of parliamentary practice, that when Parliament or the House of Assembly is open, that the statement made having to do with government business by the leader of the government our ministers are given in the House first, not just given to anyone outside the House or the public. But this is even a greater breach Mr. Speaker, in my submission, that a question tabled in the House yesterday, the hon. Premier refused to answer on grounds it was against the public interest. He knew this House would be opening again this afternoon at three o'clock, yet at ten fifteen this morning he gave this information to the world, after refusing to give it to this House in response to a question tabled. And according to the rules I have a motion prepared that this House censure the hon. the Premier for his disrespect of the dignity of the House by his refusal on Wednesday, February 25, to provide the information requested in Part 4 of Question (71) at his subsequent disclosure of the information and requested to radio station V.O.C.M. on Thursday

morning February 26, and request an apology therefor. I have several copies of the motion here if your Honour needs them.

I submit Mr. Speaker, as ^aprima facie a question of the breach of the privileges to this House and all the members therein.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is wrong as usual. In the House yesterday I did not give the name of the independent firm that the Government are to employ to make an independent study on behalf of the Government. An independent study of the feasibility. I did not give it, and I have not yet given it in the House or out of the House. Out of the House this morning I gave the name of the firm that did the feasibility study for the Shaheen Natural Resources Company. The Shaheen organization have engaged the services of U.O.P., Universal Oil Products of Chicago, and I described ^{that} in my talk on V.O.C.M. this morning. U.O.P. are not the firm engaged by the Newfoundland to make the independent survey. U.O.P. are the firm engaged by the Shaheen people, so the hon. gentleman is making a jackass of himself again.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on that point, I do not accent that explanation -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who cares whether the hon. gentleman accepts it or not -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the question asked: Has the Government approved the appointment of an independent person by Newfoundland Refining Company Ltd. to furnish to the Government an opinion under the Agreement Newfoundland Refining Company Ltd. is obliged to appoint this company to furnish the opinion, and the Government is required to approve the appointment.

So this company Mr. Speaker, the information is given about this morning is the company appointed by Newfoundland Refining that gives that feasibility study. And that question yesterday was refused to be answered and in the debate the hon. the Premier refused to give the information, and today he went on the radio to give it.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we enter into any further debate on this matter I have to say this, that as yet I have not made up my mind if the hon. for St. John's West has established to my satisfaction a prima facie case of breach of privilege whether it is or not. I will take this whole matter under advisement briefly and I will advise the House later in the same sitting as to whether in my opinion there has been a breach, and whether or not I accept the motion. Can we continue for the time being with the routine orders, and I will give my judgement on

this before this Session is through - before this sitting is through this afternoon.

MR. THOMAS HICKEY: I rise on a point of personal privilege, arising out of the debate last evening with regards to a remark made by the hon. the Premier with respect to another hon. member of this House. That point Mr. Speaker, I rose to a point of order. I requested that his Honour the Deputy Speaker, who was in the Chair direct the Premier to withdraw that remark - or he afforded the same treatment that I had been afforded two years. I regret that I am unable to accept the decision or the ruling of his Honour the Deputy Speaker -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Out of order! Why let the hon. gentleman go on when he is clearly out of order?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, it is understandable the hon. the Premier thinks I am out of order because I am talking about him.

MR. SPEAKER: What I want to do is hear enough of the hon. gentleman's statement to know what it is he is seeking. It appears to me at the present time that what he is now trying to attempt to do is to challenge the ruling of the Chair last evening on another matter. That challenge should have been made then, and put to the House - if he wished to challenge the ruling it should have been done immediately, obviously it is plain to see by all hon. members that the challenge of the Chair should have been made at that particular time and not at the next sitting. So his point of privilege is not a point of privilege that is well taken.

MR. HICKEY: May I just add another few remarks to that? I did challenge the ruling last night -

MR. SPEAKER: There was no challenge that was effective at least. If the hon. member wishes to carry the matter further, there could be other methods, but I am not going to attempt to instruct him in that. If he wishes to challenge the ruling of the Chair, it should have been done right there and then. Next order.

MR. HICKEY: I rise on another point of privilege. My point of privilege this time is that I have been discriminated against this House. I was suspended two years ago for making a statement - why does not the Premier listen, why does he not let me speak? I am sick of being interrupted.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member say what he is attempting to say so that I

can understand whether he is in order or not.

MR. HICKEY: I will be glad to do that Mr. Speaker, if the Premier will keep his mouth shut and listen. I am getting fed up with this. The rules of this House your Honour apply to all hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER: We are not talking about the rules of the House. Will the hon. member please make his point of privilege which he is now begging the House to hear?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I will do just that. My point of privilege is this, that I have been discriminated against inasmuch as I was suspended for three sitting days for making the same remark the hon. the Premier made last night.

MR. SPEAKER: I must interrupt the hon. member. That is rehashing something that occurred last year and the remedy was last evening for the point of order that was taken before. I am afraid on both accounts I have to tell the hon. member that he is not in order right now.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I respect your ruling - I will accept your ruling and I will take other action.

MR. SPEAKER: Next item.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I intended to make a brief statement when your Honour called order, but I deferred the hon. member for St. John's West, so that he might rise to a point of personal privilege.

The point to which I rise to to express as I am sure I do, the sentiment of this House, when I say that we feel considerable satisfaction over the speed and efficiency and relative accuracy of the Hansard so far in this present Session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a credit I think to the system that was set up last year at the suggestion of the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. It is a credit to the staff who are doing it. It is a credit to the young ladies who are doing the typing and I think we should all show our appreciation, and I think we have already done that.

MR. HICKMAN: Will the hon. the Premier permit a question, with reference to Hansard? Since this Session of the House commenced, it has been indicated that last year's Hansard has now been edited and ready for publication. Could he

give the hon. members -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not ready, and it has to be done all over again -

MR. HICKMAN: Will we get it this Session of the House?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am extremely doubtful that this Session - the Hansard of the current Session will be done and at the same time, the re-editing, the re-doing almost of last years, which was an utter atrocity. A complete atrocity in its editing. That has to be all done over again, it is a monumental task.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (Minister of Health): May I on behalf of the Government, made a brief statement with respect to the report of the Royal Commission on the St. Lawrence Fluorspar Mines. I think it is a matter of some interest Sir to the House.

Since the Government received the report of the Royal Commission, which was several months ago my colleagues and I together with our officials have been making a detailed study of the report's recommendations with a view towards implementing them. The recommendations Sir being examined are many I believe, they number about eighty, and they are highly complex. The problems of implementing them are also very highly technical.

In an effort Sir to ensure that we take the best possible course in this extremely important matter, my officials in the Department of Health have been working in the closest possible co-operation with counterparts in the Government of Canada. A medical specialist

MR.ROBERTS: Specialist in industrial medicine and hygiene. A member of the staff of Department of National Health and Welfare at Ottawa. Who was in Newfoundland recently for a period of several days. This man who has long been greatly connected with the situation at St. Lawrence met with several of my officials and I might add officials of some of my colleagues to discuss the various recommendations and proposals in the report. He has now returned to Ottawa to prepare his report to us, Sir, we expect to receive this within the next week or two. Receipt of the report of the Ottawa officials Mr. Speaker will enable us to take decisions on several quite important points. When it is received, my officials and my colleagues and I will continue the investigations we are making at the Government's direction we intend to implement as many of the reports, recommendations as possible, Sir, we intend to do so only on the basis of the best possible advice. As I said we are seeking that advice. Once we receive it we can decide our course and we will act quickly. I should add, Sir, that several of the Royal Commission's recommendations have been implemented others will be very shortly. The appropriate time we will gladly supply details of these further actions to the House.

MR.WELLS: Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us whether or not it is anticipated that he could advise the House before the end of this session which of the recommendations will be implemented? Is that anticipated?

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would hope well before the end of the session, within the next few weeks if all goes well Sir.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees:

HON. W.J CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table the Auditor General's Report and financial statements to the 31st of March 1969 of the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation. I might say that copies are being prepared to be forwarded to the Clerk's Office for distribution to the House.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to table several reports regulations and so forth that by statute I am required to table. These are Sir, the Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Beneficiaries and Enquiries Amendment Regulations 1969. Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Insured Services Amendment Regulations 1969. Food and Drug Margarine Amendment Regulations 1969. The Food and Drug Reconstituted and Recombined Milk Regulations 1970. And in addition Sir, the number of series of by-laws issued under the Dental Act.No. 82, 1968. All of these Mr. Speaker, were issued in 1968 and under normal circumstances indeed by

law they should have been tabled in the House at the last session. Recently, Sir, I directed my officials to check with the Clerk and he tells us there is no record they have been tabled, so I now table these by-laws which include the by-laws governing the practise of Dental Technicians. The by-laws governing the practise of Dental Hygiene and Dental Hygienists. The by-laws and the code of ethics of the Newfoundland Dental Association. These of course have been approved by the Governor in Council, Sir. In addition Mr. Speaker, may I table the report of Births, Marriages and Deaths in the Province for the year 1968. There are sufficient copies available to the House. May I add Sir as well that the annual Report of my department for the year ending 31st March last is now in the course of production, and advised by my officials of the Deputy Minister of Services has assured us that we will have that report on March 10. I will undertake to table it as quickly as I have it.

MR. CROSBIE: Will the hon. the minister answer a question, can he assure the House that these dental by-laws and regulations have plenty of teeth in them?

MR. ROBERTS: M The hon. gentleman has bitten off more than he can chew again.

HON. L.R. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting A Pension Plan For the Constabulary Force of Newfoundland, The Officers And Men Of The St. John's Fire Department And The Officers And Men Employed At That Prison Commonly Known As Her Majesty's Penitentiary."

I also give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Companies Act."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, could we revert to motions?

MR. SPEAKER: Notice of motion, yes.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills, A Bill, "An Act Respecting Motorized Snow Vehicles."

A Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Undeveloped Mineral Areas Act."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on today's Order Paper, Question No. 81. in the name of the hon. the member for Burin, I have to inform him that there has been no change in this matter since the date on which he ceased to be a member of the Cabinet. He would of course be very familiar with the situation up to that date.

Question No. 82:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker is that question supplementary? The rest of the member of the House and the public were not members of the cabinet then and does that answer mean that there is assistance or no assistance? The answer would only be sensible to the member for Burin not to us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have answered the question put to me by the hon. the member for Burin.

Question No. 82:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order the question has not been answered. It asks whether any assistance financial or otherwise has been given, and it has not been said whether it is or not?

MR. SPEAKER: There is no debate in connection with the question whether it is answered or whether it is not, is not to be the subject of comment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In answer to Question 82, on today's Order Paper in the name of the hon. member for Burin, I have to say there has been no change in the facts since.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame! Shame!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, God can forgive any crime or any sin, except that of stupidity. Stupidity, stupid men, stupid men. Are all ministers, presently ministers and all who have been ministers not all aware of the fact, fact that what happened when they were ministers they know all about. They are fully responsible for, and they have no right in this House to be asking questions on their own actions. I have no right to direct a question to any colleague any minister of the cabinet. I have no right.

MR. WELLS: Why not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have no right, under the rules of the House I have no right. It is the rules of the House. It is the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Let us not have a debate concerning questions. As I said earlier the answer to questions or the absence of an answer is not subject to comment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can face anything but ignorance.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of order. I am not going to sit here and listen to that nonsense, the position is quite clear, the questions are asked for the information of all hon. members of the House and not for the information of any one particular member of cabinet or ex-cabinet minister.

MR. SPEAKER: This is not a debateable point whether the answer is required no matter who asks the question or who is replying to the question. The matter of the question itself or whether it is answered accurately or whether it is

answered at all is not to be under the rules of the House not to be the subject of a comment and another course must be taken if the questions are not replied to, to the satisfaction of any hon. member.

MR.SMALLWOOD: In answer to question No. 82 on the Order Paper of today I have to inform the hon. gentleman that there has been no change, no additional facts not additional information since the date on which he ceased to be a member of the cabinet up to which date he was responsible for everything that happened.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame!

MR.SMALLWOOD: Stupid!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame.

MR.SMALLWOOD: Jackass.

MR.SPEAKER: Order please. The word jackass is one the words, I do not know what page it is in Beauchesne, but is one of the things listed amongst unparliamentary phrases.

MR.HECKEY: On a point of order would the Premier take it back?

MR.SMALLWOOD: It is taken back, yes.

MR.SPEAKER: Order please?

MR.SMALLWOOD: In reply to question no. 87, in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West,

(1) Yes.

(2) Soon after the convention at which he was defeated, and I was elected.

SOME HON. MEMBER:: Is that an answer?

MR.SMALLWOOD: Are hon. members so ignorant that they do not know that they are not allowed to comment on answers. Not subject to debate not subject to comment. It is against the rules. It is the rules. The rules not the people. It is the rules of the House.

MR.HECKEY: Sr. Speaker, a point of order Mr. Speaker, since when did the Premier become so conscious of the rules of the House, he broke them last night a complete violation. He was not man enough to take it back.

MR.SPEAKER: Will the business of the House continue and let us have it done in an orderly manner?

MR.SMALLWOOD: I do not know if it is Your Honour's duty or mine or any, the duty of any hon. member of the House, I do not know, to inform ignorant members of their rights or their wrongs in the matter of questions. Is it the duty of every hon. member to read the rules and understand them. I did not make the rules. I did not make

them.

MR.CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a supplementary question? In connection with question 87, did the appointment have anything to do with the fact that the hon. minister removed himself from the leadership race in support of the hon. Premier?

MR.SMALLWOOD: The answer is yes. One of the reasons also why the hon. gentleman who asked the question is not deputy premier and above all why he is not premier.

MR.CROSBIE: He would not want to be.

MR.SMALLWOOD: He would not want to be Premier?

MR.CROSBIE: Not deputy premier.

MR.SMALLWOOD: This is a credible statement. This is credible.

MR.CROSBIE: He would not want to be deputy premier he said, not to you anyway. Not to the hon. gentleman.

MR.SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman's trouble is he does not want to be deputy to anyone. There is not anyone on earth to whom he would like to be deputy.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

MR.SMALLWOOD: I am answering that question, Mr. Speaker. That supplementary question.

MR.CROSBIE: And what about the hon. modest gentleman, who would he like to be deputy too?

MR.SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman will never get over it, will he? And I keep reminding him so that he will not get over it.

MR.CROSBIE: Yes, you do that, modest gentleman.

MR.SMALLWOOD: I will keep doing it.

MR.CROSBIE: The hon. modest gentleman.

MR.SMALLWOOD: And the hon. disappointed, frustrated and embittered gentleman;

MR.CROSBIE: Never been happier than the last three days. Never been happier.

MR.SPEAKER: Order. Will this cross fire cease because we are trying to get the answers to questions, that is the business before the House right now.

MR.HECKMAN: Let us cut out the lovers quarrel.

MR.CROSBIE: Hell that no fury like a woman scorned.

MR.SMALLWOOD: Or a defeated candidate. For leadership of a party.

MR.HICKEY: Only nonsense is going on here the Premier should get on with his work.

MR.SMALLWOOD: Question No. 91 in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West is somewhat difficult question to answer, the first part of it.

(1) The answer to that is yes or no depending on what is meant by the term Continental Shelf.

(2) British Newfoundland Exploration Ltd., popularly known as Brinex.

Pan American Petroleum Corp. which is owned by I think Imperial Oil & Standard Oil of New Jersey; Alberta Export Refining Co. Ltd; Shaheen

r Natural Resources Inc.; Canadian Homestead Oils; and Mobil Oils Canada Ltd. I will (repeat).

Has the Government of Newfoundland agreed with the Government of Canada that the Government of Canada has exclusive control over petroleum or natural gas or minerals located in the continental shelf or the lands under the sea off the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador? Certainly we have not agreed with the Government of Canada that the Government of Canada have exclusive control over petroleum or natural gas or minerals located in lands under the sea off the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. The answer is no we have not.

MR. CROSBIE: Then why in the budget speech in the hon. gentleman's Government last year did the hon. gentleman's administration state that we have no legal or constitutional claim in these areas?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government did no such thing in the budget speech of last year.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HAROLD COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise, Sir, to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance; namely the threatened close-down of the paper mill of Price Newfoundland Limited at Grand Falls for a period of possibly two months, because of a restriction imposed by Mexico on the importation of Canadian newsprint and the consequent interruption of shipments to that country from Price Brothers. The close down of this Mill at Grand Falls could seriously affect the earning power of approximately 1,200 mill workers and also the earnings of hundreds of employees in the woods' operations.

Not only will the town of Grand Falls be seriously affected but this will apply also to Bishop's Falls, Botwood and in fact to the whole economy of Newfoundland. This restriction is being imposed by Mexico as a retaliatory measure to the Canadian Government's policy ...

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a Point of Order, the hon. gentleman is only moving a motion and is he in order until it is settled by the House whether we will go ahead with this debate?

MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is not much sense in introducing something, if we do not explain it. This restriction is being imposed by Mexico as a retaliatory measure to the Canadian Government's policy of introducing a surcharge on the import of Mexican textiles.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is argument now.

MR. SPEAKER: What the hon. gentleman is doing now, he is moving his motion. The only information we require from him now is as to what the subject is and why it is urgent to debate it at this particular time. I think he has made that clear.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it is certainly urgent to debate it at this particular time because unless something is done to recover this market in Mexico, then we could find the Price Newfoundland Mills closed. To finish the few words that I was going to say, it is another case where the Federal Government by imposing restrictions...

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now making his motion. All he is seeking now is leave to make the motion.

The question that has to be decided by the Chair right now is whether this is a matter, the debate of which is urgent at this particular time. I will just state this first before I ask any other members to express their opinion. Because of the fact that we are now in the Address in Reply or what is commonly known as the Speech from the Throne, there is an opportunity to have the matter brought up and debated to some extent even now during this particular sitting this afternoon. I know that the matter is serious. The remedy for it is urgent, but I do not think the urgency of the debate is necessary as of now.

If I wanted to be guided by the House, if twelve persons or more want to give the hon. member leave to present this motion at this particular time, they may do so.

MR. WELLS: I appreciate what your Honour has said about the Throne Speech and it does make sense your Honour except that the hon. gentleman who is most concerned in whose district it takes place has already spoken in the Throne Speech and therefore, would have no opportunity to speak to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The urgency is for the House to debate this particular subject now. I want all hon. members to understand that. The urgency of the situation, the seriousness of the situation is important, of course, but the thing we have to consider is the urgency of debating it right here this afternoon and put aside all other other business pertaining to the country or to the House. If twelve members wish to grant leave to the hon. member, then that will make the decision for the Chair. Then the leave cannot be given.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I was expecting your Honour to call further Answers to Questions. May I by leave give some answers which I had prepared to give today.

MR. SPEAKER: If the House gives its consent to refer to Answers to Questions, I have no objection, otherwise they can wait until tomorrow.

MR. CALLAHAN: One never knows, Mr. Speaker, there might well be.

Question no. 86: Mr. Crosbie. Has Hooker Chemicals (Nanaimo) Limited or any company associated therewith found any deposits of sodium or potassium sulphate or elemental sulphur in the area granted? I should say, Mr. Speaker, that the area has not been granted. It is under concession agreement and the answer to the first part is, yes. The answer to the second part - what are the prospects with reference to the mining development of such deposits? The answer is that Hooker Chemicals have not yet indicated their intention in that regard.

Question no. 94: Mr. Crosbie. The first part of the question, actually it is in two sections, Mr. Speaker, and again I have to say that I interpret in the first line, where the hon. gentleman asks how many breeding hogs were provided? None were provided but there were animals sold in the way of normal commercial transaction and in that regard the answer is, 357, 147 being sows; 20 being boars; 190 being weanling breeders. Very interesting. The second part of the first part, Mr. Speaker. To what farmers and in what numbers to each farmer were these provided? The answer, Mr. Speaker, in the first instance is eleven or I should say in the second instance eleven. What farmers? I think, Mr. Speaker, that since this is in the area of normal

144

commercial transaction, it is unusual and I think perhaps improper to publish the names of persons who simply bought these animals. In the second part, Mr. Speaker, were any farmers who applied for breeding hogs during the year unable to obtain such breeding hogs? The answer is 'no.' The rest of that section does not arise.

Question no. 95: Mr. Abbott. It is in eight parts. The answers to parts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 is that aircraft records are not kept in this form. The information as requested, therefore, requires the information to be especially compiled, Mr. Speaker and this will take time. I hope to be able to provide it later in the session. The answer to part 7 is no. The answer to part 8 is no.

Question no. 80: Mr. Hickman. To ask the hon. the Minister to lay on the House the information indicating which of the recommendations of the Royal Commission and the St. Lawrence Mines ^{be} are to put into effect. I think I have to say, Sir, that the terms of reference of the commission clearly indicate that principally it should approach its inquiry from the point of view of the health of persons employed in the mines and my colleague the hon. Minister of Health already this day has given the House a ministerial statement on that subject which I think covers the substance of the hon. members question.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, if I may address a question to the hon. the Minister of Economic Development? In looking at the...

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker to a Point of Order. I think the hon. gentleman has no right to ask oral questions of which no notice has been given except at calling Orders of the Day. Your Honour, I think, is about to call Orders of the Day and if the question then is one of the type that may be called under the rules at Orders of the Day, I will be glad to answer it.

MR. SPEAKER: On Orders of the Day of course an opportunity will be given to ask oral questions, yes.

MR. JOHN C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to Orders of the Day, I would like to move a motion for the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussion a definite matter of urgent public importance. And that matter, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of an incident happening yesterday, and today in Green Bay, Notre Dame Bay where representatives of the Government of Canada are forbidding inshore fishermen from those bays and adjacent areas to continue taking old seals, which are now taking from the water until the opening of the season for sealing vessels on the front, which is March 22nd.

If, Mr. Speaker, immediate recommendations are not made for the Federal Government to cease that, there will be a loss of income to these inshore fishermen in that area, up from \$100 thousand to \$300 thousand, because the old seals, bed lamers, and harps which they take from the fishing boats in open water, and they are shot, they are not white coats, they have to be shot by these fishermen. If that seal fishery starts at the beginning of February and by March 22nd. it will be over, those old seals will be gone. And at the present time, Mr. Speaker, representatives of the Federal Department of Fisheries are in those areas stopping the fishermen concerned, Little Bay Islands, Nipper's Harbour, Twillingate, from taking these seals.

So, I, therefore have a motion Mr. Speaker which I would like to present to Your Honour, for this to be discussed because it is of urgent importance to the inshore fishermen.

MR. SPEAKER: The same remarks that I made last time are applicable to this situation where we have opportunity of bringing up these things in a debate which is now before the House, plus the fact that the urgency of debating it immediately, I fail to see why we have to stop all the business of the House to discuss this one particular item dealing with an activity in one section of the country, but at the same time realizing that it is important, it is an important item. But, the urgency of debating it now, I do not think it exists, but if twelve members rise leave will be granted.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE Mr. Speaker, on your point of order,

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a ruling, not a point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, every time there is a problem in semantics here, do we have the hon. the Premier speaking on the point. With reference to your decision, I would like to point out that I consider it still to be a matter of urgency, your ruling, but there is no remedy unless this matter is debated now, we do not know who is going to be speaking on the Address and Reply this afternoon, whether it is anybody who see the importance of this matter, there are being hundreds of fishermen being effected now.

MR. SPEAKER: As I already pointed out, the ruling is that I am not depriving the House of the opportunity of debating this subject right now. I say, I will leave it to the members of the House, and if twelve or more rise the leave is granted to the hon. members.

MR. CROSBIE: Can we rise now?

MR. SPEAKER: I have asked the House to indicate to me, if twelve members rise leave will be granted.

Leave is therefore not given - It is denied.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. CLYDE WELLS: On Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the minister without portfolio, the member for Labrador South - would he advise the House how many minutes, if not seconds he has spent in his office up stairs in the last four days when the House is not in session?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

The Address and Reply, we adjourn the debate.

MR. ANTHONY J. MURPHY: It seems so long ago since I spoke I am just wondering if we are still on the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: We are still on the amendment.

MR. MURPHY: I did have five minutes on I think it was on Tuesday Night, and at that time I put forward again the case of afternoon and night sessions, but I will get off that now, and go on with the reason why I feel, where this Government should be voted out of power. That seems very strong, because it is just a non-confidence motion.

I think, Mr. Speaker, most of the previous speakers have stressed the fact of more or less contempt for the Opposition, arrogant in their decisions, and general disregard for the feelings expressed by the members on this side, and through the members on this side to the thousands of people they represent. I think the day, Mr. Speaker, we had a very good example of that, where an hon. member in his capacity representing the great district of Burin put a question on the Order Paper, and the answer was, no change. Now I am sure, very sure that the people of Grand Bank, St. Lawrence and the other communities in his district are very, very much enlightened as to what assistance, financial or otherwise, has been given to the Mortier Bay Development Committee?

I am sure that these questions are asked, we know the answers perhaps, a lot of the answers, but again I must emphasize that we, all members of the House, not only the ten on this side, but the whole 41 sitting in this House, are sent here not by the Premier of the Province, not by the Leader of the Opposition, not by the Leader of the Independent Liberals, but by the rank and loyal voters of

Newfoundland. So in my honest opinion, I think it is an insult, an absolute insult to the people of the Province, who are the ones that we represent.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House seven years, and the members on this side when they speak, it is like a voice crying in the wilderness as far as getting information from the other side is concerned. I will go back about four years, and I do not know exactly if it was 1964 or 1965, the member for Trinity North is not in his place today, was the then Minister of Fisheries, and it is very interesting the matter brought up the hon. member for St. John's West with reference to the seals at this time.

I state that if action had to be taken in 1964, by the Minister of Fisheries and the Government at that time, that Newfoundland would still have a seal fishery and employment for hundreds of our workers who make a living from this, or a part of a living through this. Five or six days in a row, I stood in my place here Mr. Speaker, and I addresses an question on Orders of the Day to the hon. Minister of Fisheries at that time, the member for Trinity North.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Not a word - this was in reference to statements made by a Mr. Davis, the great new humanitrian in New Brunswick. Not a word did I receive on about the sixth or seventh, I do not know I cannot count them now, the hon. member stood in his place to answer me, and from the bench here says, sit down Max, sit down Max. Now, if this is the type of Minister we have looking after our department, or looking after any phase of Government, how do the people of this Province expect - who do they expect to fight for their rights?

I think at that time, if the Minister of Fisheries together with the Government had raised an enough of a howl, Mr. Davis could go back to his pet farm or whatever else he had without depriving the people of this Province, a great number of people of a good means of earning a few dollars in the off season.

And I say, again, and I will repeat, the same thing would have happened if any action had been taken on the urging of the Opposition, on the passenger service across this Province, without giving lip service to it, if an determined effort had been made by the Government on the other side, I say, that the Federal Government, or the Transportation Commission would have recognized that the people of this Province particularly the hundreds of railway people had someone looking after their rights. The Opposition cannot do it, we can only raise these points, and I think it is a pure outright disregard, because if Opposition raises anything, because they raised a question, because they put forward a suggestion, wipe it out, no matter who assents.

47

On the first day, of the Opening of the House here, on Monday actually, on the Order Paper there was a question addressed with reference to the appointment of a certain member of this House as Parliamentary Assistant, we were not worried about getting after any individual, Mr. Speaker, we just wanted to get the records straight in this House. On the other side of the House today, I doubt if there is twenty percent of the thirty odd members that have not some other form of remuneration besides a sessional pay, I maybe a little out. They tell me, we have eighteen Cabinet Ministers -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: How many?

AN HON. MEMBER: Ten percent.

MR. MURPHY: Ten percent, I stand to be corrected. We have on that side of the House, and this is very interesting today, when I saw this and I am speaking now of the complete disregard of the Liberal Government, not only now, but over the years of doing what they decide without just regards for the rights of other people.

Let us look at this famous Power Commission here. We have here a former member who did not run the last election, he was appointed to the Power Commission. We have an hon. member who sits in this House, who is a commissioner, we have another cabinet minister, who resigned, and I will say resigned - as far as I understand he never resigned, he might have been asked to resign or forced to resign, but not through his own volition. He is also on it, and I understand another member of the House whose picture is not here, and I fail to see the picture of my hon. friend from Labrador West. I think that is rank discrimination, He should have had his picture in this. But in this there are four either active members of this House or retired members who are stowed away not at the expense of the Liberal Party, but at the expense of the people of this Province.

A few short months ago, I raised a question about a young man, a very, very, personal friend of mind, and as I say it is not the individual I am getting at, it is the practice of this Government of using the people's money to reward their faithful followers. The Premier gave a dramatic speech, no doubt about it was tremendous. I enjoy it, every time I hear it, about jobs, and the great emotion, and I think the Preimer does get emotionally right away when this thing comes up. But when he is talking about jobs, when there is other jobs in the Civil Service, for heaven sake give everybody a chance to get a job in the Civil Service.

I could have tried last summer in a group that I am interested in. Three *4/1*

or four thousand young people, and I am not bragging, but I have given forty years of my life to the Youth Movement of this Province. We had five different leagues consisting of 400 or 500 young people. I go down staffs to the Physical Fitness Department for some help. What is the grant? Two thousand dollars to travel 200 or 300 kids all over this - \$2,000. If I had that \$7200 that is being paid to this young gentleman into a job that in my opinion there is no need for, I could have looked after 5,000 young people in this Province. This is what breaks my heart.

AN HON. MEMBER: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question? Are

The Opposition aware that on the average in the time that that young man had been in that job which was not created for him. Is the hon. the Leader of Opposition aware that as many as forty enquiries a day from the public, which previously could not be handled - there was no official to handle them - are being received in that Department? And that they are being well looked after - that the people are being helped and being satisfied as a result of the creation of this post which was created many months ago. Does he know that?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I have taken the information of the hon. member and I thank him for it. We have reached the stage in the Civil Service of this Province where men who have given fifteen, twenty, twenty-five years are getting considerably less than \$7000.00 a year, could not meet a person at the counter and say, "What are you looking for?" God help us! What a state the Civil Service must be in when we have to get the Liberal organizers. I do not know if the Liberal association gives special courses.

That is the first step of becoming a top-rate Civil Servant - is to join the Liberal Party. Perhaps it is. I do not know, but when the hon. the minister stands up and says to me that forty people are being served now that could never be served before. I do not think he expects us to swallow that.

Come on! Come on! God help us! I am fifty-six. I do not know what is going on in the world.

This Government - if we had ten percent of the money that this Government has squandered over the past twenty years, a lot of people in this Province would be working. That is what they would, be working!

Some of the people who are not devoted Liberals might get a job. Only yesterday we asked a question - an answer to a question we have a building over here, Philip Place? The Power Commission who occupy premises at Fort Pepperell with not one cent of rate, are paying \$140,000.00 a year to a building over here and yesterday we were told - another Department? Workmens' Compensation? - paying \$73,000.00 a year? - and we have the Board of Liquor Control over there. We do not know how much they are paying.

We have a federal post-office. Who owns the building? And what guarantee did the Government give these people? That they be paid off in three years from now?

Imagine! \$140,000.00 a year rent and we with buildings at Fort Peppereil that did not cost the people of this Province, not one red cent. Is that good Government? What would anybody - I would ask any member on the other side - the road the hon. member referred to the other day, in Hermitage - could you use \$140,000.00 for your people down there?

SOME HON. MEMBER: Three times.

MR. MURPHY: Three times. Right? Well, all right in three years we would do your bit of road in Hermitage, but you, the hon. the member, and everybody else will vote that they have the utmost confidence in this Government. The utmost - and still they say, "Look, I wish I had the money they have squandered on Philip Place". Does this make sense?

How many in all our districts - how many hundreds of our constituents would we like to see working in jobs, instead of everything being passed-over in a huge bundle to favourites of this Government?

If I am telling lies, just stop me. Just stop me. I am not telling lies. This is an actual fact. If one were to go back over the twenty years that this Government has been in power, it would frighten you actually to death.

I asked a question in this hon. House last year and I may say here the question was phoned to me to ask, "What happened on the eighth floor of the Confederation Building?" What went on there:- some operation. We put the question on the order bill. There were three contractors. Three outstanding in their devotion to the hon. Premier to keep him in power - outstanding to the Liberal party to keep him in power.

\$720,000.00 operation - and they tell me they do not call tenders on small jobs. God help us! How big can you get! How big can you get! No wonder I had to mention and compare it to the American Report. The same things apply.

The hon. Minister of Welfare took the - exception to my remarks.- I am not trying to destroy Newfoundland. God help us, no! I am trying to restore Newfoundland to a place in the sun, and if people in Newfoundland to a decent livelihood and fair play.

In 1935 - I have a few notes somewhere, I will find them - out of a

(44)

population of 280,000 people, we had sixteen percent of our people living on Social Assistance - whatever it ^{was} called in these days - the dôle or the whack or whatever they wanted to call it.- In 1968, the end of March, with all the benefits we had, with the Family Allowance, the Old Age Pension, Workmens' Compensation - out of 510,000 people, eighteen percent will receive in some form of Government assistance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is as wrong as anything the hon. gentleman ever said.

MR. MURPHY: If I am wrong, I will take it back. This research has been done for me. I will take it back.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Wrong. Utterly wrong. You know who is wrong - the Opposition, Sir. They are never right.

SOME HON. MEMBER: The hon. gentleman should learn the new Maths.

MR. MURPHY: Maths, yes. Absolutely. There is a brain for you, now.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Let the hon. minister give the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please; Order! Visitors visit the House as a privilege, but they are not supposed, not permitted, to exercise their views or their opinions or reaction by laughter or movement or by applause. They must remain silent when they are in the gallery.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you; Mr. Speaker. Let me see. Where are we? Percentages was it? In 1935 there were 46,900 people on Social Assistance.- 289,588.

SOME HON. MEMBER: How many were eligible?

MR. MURPHY: Compared to the number on assistance in 1935 of 46,900 out of a total population of 289,588, that made a percentage of 16,000 of the population.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, we would he like the latest figures.

MR. MURPHY: I think the Premier has spoken on this particular subject.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no. I do not want to speak. Would he like to have the latest figures?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, may I continue please? If there are any figures to be given, I will receive them after my speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order.

MR. MURPHY: Anybody can get up and criticize me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not criticize. I just want to ask him if he would like to ask --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. When the Premier speaks, the hon. members should resume their seats and the speaker should not have to raise his voice and try and make himself heard over other hon. members.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize if I did get a little bit worked up. I have been used to the old competition, you know, when someone is after you, go back, like that -

Do we want to repeat these?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman like to have the latest official figures as of January this year.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, I would love to have them. I would like to have mine. These are March 1968.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, but this is now - January - last month.

MR. MURPHY: I would love to have them. Would you pass them over so that--

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right. 6825 -

MR. SPEAKER: Order. --- for the hon. the Premier to interrupt the hon. the member's speech ---

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not interrupting the speaker. I asked him ---

MR. SPEAKER: But, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition indicated that he did not wish the hon. the Premier to read the information to him.

MR. MURPHY: Now, I mean, I will get the figures from the Department of Welfare report. I know the hon. minister is very co-operative and I will say this for him that any figures we want we can always get them. I mean, I am not objecting to these facts. I am just trying, Mr. Speaker, with all the hundreds and hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars have flowed into this Province since 1949 and what we hear about the schools and the roads and the this and the that and the other things. Here is where we stand according to my figures as at the end of March 1968 as compared to 1935 and anybody lived during 1935, 33,34 - we know this was really a tough time to live in for a lot of people and I have to repeat it again now, because in case we have not got the figures down.

In 1935 we had a population in this Province of 289,588 persons. The total on assistance - the number receiving social assistance at that time - was 46,900 were on assistance out of 289,000. In 1968 of 87,059 out of a population of 500,000 - sixteen percent in 1935 and seventeen percent in 1968. That is the percentage.

And that is not withstanding, with all the benefits that flowed in here, since Confederation. Now, remember you have Unemployment Insurance, you have got Old Age Pension, you have got the Family Allowance and you have got many other forms of federal Social Assistance.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Unemployment Insurance?

MR. MURPHY: Unemployment Insurance, yes. So, it just goes to show what actually has been done by this Government the past twenty years. Yes, Mr. Minister.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. member not aware that well over fifty percent of the total he just gave is 87,059.- is well over fifty percent of these people - are considered to be unemployable, unfit for work, widows, orphans, and so on, the blind the deaf. Is the hon. gentleman aware of that?

MR. MURPHY: Oh yes, I am, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of that, but that, you know, I think in proportion and I do not think that the minister is insinuating that since 1949 our people have become more lax, have become disabled and unable to work. I feel that in 1935 perhaps the ratio might have been higher, due to various forms of not getting the right diet.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, that is a fact.

MR. MURPHY: So it does not have that effect. It compounds the offence, I think, here at this time. But, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the reasons why I am sitting on this side of the House. Now I am not presumptuous enough to say I could be sitting on that side, but I had the chance to run for election and be elected to that side. Now inside me, it is my makeup, I guess, I feel and I felt in 1956, when I was asked to run by certain ministers on that side, that at that time then this Government was not the type of government that this little Province required to get it back to a place where we could stand as proud, if you like, responsible citizens of the great Dominion of Canada. We started off, and I have often said this in the House, during the Confederation battles when I listened to the Premier and I said to myself - here is the man, this is what Newfoundland needs to bring us even, if you like, with the rest of Canada - although I did not know exactly what Canada was like at that time. Because anybody who is in any type of business knows that Canada, as far as Newfoundland is concerned, you hardly considered Canada as a market for our products - and I think any business man here will know that. We got five per cent - you know. But we had hoped that our standard of living would be raised, we had hoped

47

that with this honest to God, hard-fighting Newfoundlander we were going places. And I think this was in the Premier's mind in 1949. But I think it is like the Gospel, where the sower went out to sow his seed, some fell on rocky ground and did not grow at all, some fell on other ground and started to grow but was choked. I think that is what happened to this little Province. We were all dedicated to make Newfoundland a great place but then we got into the big business deals where \$100 meant nothing

dollars meant nothing. You know, we were lighting our cigarettes with one hundred dollar bills - in the millions and the millions and the millions, that is all we could hear. We were thinking of culture centres - culture centres not recreation fields, not providing something for the fishermen.

"Burn your boats!" This was it. "Come ashore!"

Mr. Speaker, for seven years, I said, I have sat in this House. I have sat here and I have sat here, I have been abused, I have been called intellectually bankrupt because we dared, we dared to disagree with certain policies that this Government were putting into force.

Here we have today, on this side of the house, perhaps four of the most brilliant, outstanding Cabinet ministers that this Government has had since 1949. You may smile - all right, it is nice to abuse these gentlemen now. My hon. friend from St John's West, you know he did not get the leadership, so to heck with you! My friend here from Fortune, who I think is a very honest man - I criticized these gentlemen, now, / criticized them as much as I criticized anybody over there, but I say now - "I admire you gentlemen!" And I am not excluding the other two hon. gentlemen who are on this side of the House. And I only hope that within the near future they will combine with the Conservative Party, the Official Opposition in this House, who for twenty years have been abused, laughed at, ridiculed.

Us take over the Government? Us? I think you gentlemen can understand now, to a great extent, just what we had to contend with in this House of Assembly. I think they realize - you can come up with the most constructive thing in this world and the vote will be - I heard the hon. the Premier, on his favourite program this morning, "And they are going to bring in an unconfidence motion - how silly! How utterly silly and stupid! Ten of them to beat thirty of us!"

Heavens Almighty, does every member in this House come in with his mind firmly fixed - "I am going to vote, no matter what the boys on the other side" - Do not tell me that that is the state that I would have to come to if I wanted to be known as a member of government

MR E.M. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman voted with the Government on many occasions

MR MURPHY: Is it true I voted with the Government and lauded the Government because the confidence motions are the motions that are made on this side because we feel that we have no confidence in the Government, because they are not doing what we feel -

453

MR ROBERTS: Perhaps we have no confidence in the Opposition.

MR MURPHY: Well, that is absolutely apparent because if we made a motion today (and I am almost sure this must sound foolish) "It is raining like the dickens outside, it is blowing" - it would be twenty-one to one that the sun was shining out there.

MR H.V. R EARLE: It is blowing from the other side, raining out of doors.

MR MURPHY: Right! And Thanks be to God! we do get a few minutes during the session to blow our horn.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to give a few examples of why I must support this motion as put forward by the hon. member for Humber East and I am just trying to reconcile in my mind that statement of the Premier's this morning, where he can say that we have thirty - "We have thirty to their ten."

We will vote against this motion. And I think to myself just what the feeling in all our minds are. We are all human. I think we all believe in certain things. I think we are all open and receptive to ideas as expressed by other people. If this motion is defeated, and I know if I were on that side this is what I would feel, if someone said to me that I had to vote, I do not think I would- quite honestly. But if every one on the other side of this House votes against this motion, they are saying, in effect, "we think that bringing the Power Commission into a building" - and I don't know what deal is made with this company - "I think it is a marvelous thing for the Power Commission to leave a building that is costing us nothing."

"Now it is a bit small for them. They have a tremendous staff - it is small, but I believe and I think it is a wonderful thing that this Government should pay \$140,000 in rent to Lundrigans." And I do not know who else is in it. And I would like to say here and I will be perfectly frank and I would like to ask for this answer at this time - it is the rumor going around that certain members of this Government are in this building, and I would like to have it denied emphatically so that I could do the same thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not know whether just to ignore that. "There are rumors going around" - will the Cabinet deny it, will the members of the Government

45

deny it? Now what should

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, is this a question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Just sit down

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, out of order, out of order

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down, sit down

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, out of order, I am not sitting down - I go by what the speaker says - you sit down for a change. I have a Point of Order
Mr. Speaker

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am on a Point of Order - there can be only one at a time.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the Premier did not rise on a Point of Order
I am not deaf and I did not hear it - this is just another game - sit down

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): The hon. the Premier interrupted the Leader of the Opposition - he could only do that on a Point of Order. Now will the hon. the Premier now state his Point of Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. gentleman not just say there is a rumor - will he make a charge.

MR. MURPHY: No, no definitely

MR. SMALLWOOD: No he will not, he will not make a charge so where does that leave us Mr. Speaker? Is this Parliamentary - is it in accordance with Parliamentary practice, and precedent and procedure for a Leader of an Opposition to say there is a rumor - he does not say who says it - he says there is a rumor, he is repeating a purely anonymous rumor - it is anonymous as far as this House is concerned.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a long Point of Order

MR. SMALLWOOD: So far as his speech is concerned it is anonymous - we do not know - he says merely there is a rumor, I suggest to your honour that this is highly improper. In the extreme it is highly improper - he ought either make a charge so that we can have it investigated, or not mention it - not talk about anonymous rumors

MR. HICKEY: Is this a Point of Order, or is he making a speech

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down, sit down, sit down, ignoramous sit down

MR. HICKEY: I have heard that before, I am not sitting down when the Premier says so

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, protect me

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): Order Please

MR. HICKEY: Is he making a Point of Order, or is he making a speech. Do not tell me to sit down, you do not run this House

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please,

MR. HICKEY: In twenty years here you should know that

MR. SPEAKER: The speaker can only listen to one Point of Order at a time

MR. HICKEY: That is right, and that is a long drawn out one - get to the point

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. the Premier please continue

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I may have to take the necessary Parliamentary steps to be protected against that - we do not have to tolerate that.

MR. HICKEY: I do not have to tolerate a lot of things you do

MR. SMALLWOOD: Very rarely in the history of this House has anyone stood in the House and by inference, by innuendo, by implication accuse the Government without accusing them. He is not making a charge - he is merely saying that there is a rumor going around, He does not say who is saying it. Mr. Speaker this is atrocious, this is intolerable and I ask your honour suppose we adjourn the House while your honour goes over the references. I do not think I - I will not make a motion but this is intolerable really. We cannot and We will not lie under this.

Now perhaps your honour would like to rise the House, and maybe call Mr. Speaker back - or your honour confer with Mr. Speaker - look up the references - look up Beauchesne, look up the references and see where we stand when a member of the House says there is a rumor - that some members of the House are criminals

MR. HICKEY: I did not say that

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes criminals, oh yes criminals Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: Order please

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a lie, it is an important matter

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, on the Point of Order, I was just reading in Beauchesne that all members are entitled to say what they please speaking in the house - so long as that they do not impune the honour of other hon. members. Now then to say in a general way that the Government is extravagant and this kind of thing, or that it is rumoured this, rumoured that - is not taken to impune the honour of the Government, but to say something which indicates that members of the Government are to use a local expression "crooked" that would be out of order.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I will say this - quite likely I did it, quite without malice to kill any of this thing and I withdraw it with all my heart I withdraw this remark of impuning to any member of the House - any

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

MR. MURPHY: But this rumour factory got to be killed somewhere. Rumours have to be killed somewhere.

Mr. Speaker, to carry on with this, and I think I have made it clear

MR. SMALLWOOD: Point of Order. This does not settle the matter your honour - it will be reported all over the radio and television tonight, and news-papers tomorrow, and all across Canada that the Leader of the Opposition announced to the House in a speech that there is a rumour that members of the Government are shareholders of a company that owns a building in which the Government are tenants. Now that is the rumour. Your honour has merely said that no member may impune the honour of other members of the House, that is all your honour has said - that does not get over the fact that the Leader of the Opposition has made this statement. Now I ask your honour what can the Government do - will the Leader of the Opposition make an accusation? If someone will make the accusation we can set up a select committee at once. I would move it - to call witnesses, examine books, examine accounts, bank accounts, everything concerning the building in question. But how can I do it when there is no charge? If the hon. gentleman will make a charge - not just say there is a rumour. That is the quintessence of McCarthyism - the very quintessence of it - it is the essence and the quintessence of McCarthyism.

Now your honour what can the Government do to protect itself against this foul, infamous and false rumour? What can we do?

MR. SPEAKER: As I see it - it is not that I know of anything dishonourable for a member of the House or a member of the Government to have shares in a company that is dealing with the Government.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has said that members of the House and members of the Government have shares in a company that is doing business with the Government. That is not to my mind unpleasant.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I was on the general state of our Province. The hon Premier referred, and I think we are all aware of the statement of Mr. Jay Parker

42

MR. MURPHY: Hon. the Premier referred and I think we all are aware of the statement of Mr. Jay Parker with reference to Newfoundland's over-population and the lack of the necessary jobs to provide employment - in other words we just cannot support them economically. He has said that perhaps 180,000 Newfoundlanders should be moved out. I disagree wholeheartedly with it.

The Premier yesterday said the answer to it is provide jobs - I think everybody agrees with that. But in my opinion, and in the opinion of a great many other people, the answer to it - the whole question is - if the hon. gentleman wants to have a meeting Sir, it is very difficult for me to try and concentrate on a few thoughts.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: You have a caucus room in there, the same as the hon. gentleman for St. John's West had to prove his innocence last year eh? What was wrong with that? Can only one person insinuate or anything else in this House?

MR. CALLAHAN: On a point of order Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman now asks the House Mr. Speaker, whether it is not all right to insinuate. I suggest Mr. Speaker, that will happen - I am making the point of order. My point of order is that the integrity of hon. members on this side has been impuned, and that it will further impuned when the press begin to repeat the suggestion made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition as a suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): The Speaker gave his decision on that, and the Hon. Minister is out of order.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I will continue and I hope I will be able to continue until I finish without any interruptions by any experts or anything else - There is no MacCarthyism in me. If the Premier's reputation is as clean as mine is for being hon. he is an hon. man, an hon. man. Do not impute MacCarthyism to me or anything else. I will not take it.

Mr. Speaker, I think the great majority of people in this Province know what the answer to curing a lot of our problems are, and it is not through Come-by-Chance or anything else - these are a part of it. But I think the general feeling throughout this Province today is that this Government that has been in for twenty years, wasting, squandering our money on foolish things that are not at all contributing to the welfare of this Province. It is time for them to step out. It is time for them to step out. And I believe that the people

458

of this Province feel this way. And anybody who has travelled to this Province in recent months I think know the feeling of the people. You can stay in power by weight in numbers - if you have thirty to ten there is no trouble to stay in power. But I say this now, and I ask the hon. members of this House, everyone of them, and I will not bring up a matter of conscience again because I was criticized for it - to say to yourselves - the people I represent, two, three, five, ten, fifteen thousand - how do they feel about this?

Here is a House of Assembly and as I said earlier and got off it because I was interrupted - a question we put on the Order Paper about a certain appointment in this House. And I am not trying to poke my finger at any individuals - just a system that prevails in this House. We have a Parliamentary Assistant Mr. Speaker. \$6,500 a year - the Premier could not understand the question eh? Whether it was full time or part time. He told us it was just when the House was in session. \$6,500 a year - the most important outside of a Cabinet post in this House Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker himself gets \$5,500 a year. Here we have the Premier's Parliamentary assistant. I know he must have very onerous duties. We have Ministers without portfolio. We have members of the Power Commission. Who over there is not getting something else? Mr. Speaker, these are only some of the things that I am trying to prove these few thousands of dollars, how we could use them to other advantages.

And I quoted one instance that is very dear to my heart - and that is recreation for our younger people. For growing up, they have no playing areas. I challenge anybody that travels through this Province for me - and where are they growing up - and I have said this a thousand times before, and I will say it a thousand times again. In the jukebox joints, and then into their own houses - it would frighten you to death to see our young people, sixteen seventeen, eighteen - I have read it in the papers - being arrested for being drunk in charge of a car. What do we do with them? Now we have the drugs, that is the next thing. God forbid! Unless this Government wakes up and realizes that fifty percent of our population is under the age of twenty-one. A few years time we are going to have a lot of problems on our hands, unless we start to look after it. These are things we should be spending our money on - instead of foolish lavish Elizabeth Towers, Arts and Culture Centers. They are beautiful, beautiful for one point one percent of the people of this Province. I say

it is more practical to spend it on playing facilities for the kids, and I would like to put it before the public and see what they say about it. Not in every case no.

Sure you have thousands of people, and I have thousands and thousands and thousands of young people - and any member of this House can tell me what playing facilities they have in their area. I travelled seventy-five percent of the Province for three weeks last year on this one thing. Do not let us try to gild the lily. I am not against culture as such. People want to go to plays and everything else, let them go to them.

But if I have young people, fifty or sixty or seventy or eighty or a hundred in my district with no place to kick a football or throw a ball - I say forget the Arts and Culture Center. Keep the children occupied in recreation

Questions in this House? It reminded last year we asked about the Arts and Culture Centers. What were the costs? What were they costing? Nothing. In the Estimates we were asked to vote \$2,000,000 to Lundrigans for a progress payment - and still we get these off-hand answers. These are things - all right we out-number the Opposition three to one, but for God's sake, remember you are representing the people of the Province. You are not representing the Liberal Party. You represent people the same as we do. Men, women and children are depending on you people over there, to spend their money to the best advantage for this Province.

How many millions of dollars, hundreds of thousands of dollars to be wasted - you could pave roads that today ~~are~~ painful to drive over them. No one wants dirt roads, we know that. Everybody is demanding paved roads: We finished the drive in 1965 eh? We erected a great monument to Mr. Pearson just outside of Grand Falls. How much did we spend on the Trans Canada Highway since 1965? Why? We had the road to Norris Arm eh? Fifteen miles to the cut-off. Would not the hon. member for White Bay South like to finish the rest of the road to Baie Verte with this money?

It was available for that road. Not even the ten percent we spent? I would not care if got a hundred yards. Let us benefit someone. Let us benefit someone. Wait until total bill comes in for all this up-grading of the Trans-Canada. But why in 1965 - Yes, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the reasons why I feel that it is time to come to grips with our problem in this Province. A very serious

problem. We are not against Come-by-Chance, we supported the principle of the Bill or anything else, we supported these things that ~~was~~ good for our people. But for heaven's sake, do not let us try to carry the people along with dreams of fifteen to seventeen thousand jobs this year. How many times have we heard it? Since 1950 - 51 - 52 - great announcements.

Just one last item Mr. Speaker, before I sit down. And that is - and it has been brought up today with reference to questions. Where the Premier is on every morning on V.O.C.M. at ten fifteen, representing the Province, not the Liberal Party - the Premier, conversation with the Premier. And I would like to go on record Mr. Speaker, with reference to this House of Assembly and the reputation that we hope this House holds. And that is some of the drivel, this venom if you like, that is thrown out over that program every morning.

The other morning I was listening coming in in my car, and the hon. member for Humber East name was mentioned. Well such a tirade of abuse - people listening would think he had just got out for a half day from the Mental Asylum. He should be psychoanalyzed. He was nuts, he was crazy, he was ignorant. He knew nothing. A lawyer, a distinguished lawyer who comes here in this House - sent here by the people of Humber East - God help us Almighty, what do you do about it? Are we going to put up with this?

Now Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to go on record as supporting this motion, and to ask members of this hon. House to support this motion, and let us get a bit of responsibility back into Responsible Government. Thank you very much.

HON. STEPHEN NEARY (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a word on the amendment. I am sure Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman who just took his seat did not intend to mislead the House in the figures that he quoted on able-bodied relief in 1935 as compared to 1968 - that he called the wack that we now know as short-term social assistance, or assistance available to people who are employable, as to those who are not employable.

In 1935 he said that 46,900 people received able-bodied relief, or the wack. Today Mr. Speaker, as of the end of January 1970, 42,707 people were in the category that my hon. friend mentioned. 42,707 - and we now have double the population Mr. Speaker, so we have less people receiving able-bodied relief, or what the hon. gentleman referred to as wack today, as we did in 1935.

401

The other forms of assistance were not available in 1935. Assistance to widows and orphans - This is exactly the point Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's figure was misleading, and that is why I wanted to set the record straight. And actually it amounts to just a little over eight percent of the population of the Province on able-bodied, or what the hon. gentleman referred to as wack.

We have a more sophisticated name for it - we call it short-term social assistance. But actually it is eight percent of the population.

462

462

MR. EARLE: At that time, if his memory goes back to the records, was it not the case that all cases of able-bodied and sick relief as they called it in those days blocked together? In other words this figure which the hon. Leader of the Opposition has given includes all types of relief because that is how it was done in those days and he is accurately comparing it with the total today, I believe.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the difference?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is what was misleading about the hon. members - and I am sure he did not do it deliberately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: It is correct.

MR. NEARY: It is not correct. There was no assistance available at that time for widows, orphans and deaf children, blind children and this sort of thing. There was another statement, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman made on opening day that probably needs to be clarified, when he talked about the amount of money that is now being spent on short-term social assistance, which is able-bodied relief or wack or what the gentleman wants to call it. But what he failed to mention, Mr. Speaker, was that there have been substantial increases in the rates and especially with the coming into effect of the Canada Assistance Plan. This really is the reason for the substantial increases in the amount that is now....

The hon. Premier reminds me that in 1933 that over 100,000 Newfoundlanders were on what the hon. gentleman called wack or dole and that was over, I think, fifty percent. It was nearly forty percent of the population at the rate of six cents a day so I am sure that the hon. gentleman did not wish to mislead the House on these figures. Just to repeat what I already said, Mr. Speaker, today eight percent or a little more than eight percent Sir, slightly more than eight percent of the population are receiving social assistance or what is commonly known as able-bodied relief.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman also congratulated our former colleagues who moved over to the other side of the House and he invited him to come into the Opposition ranks. Now, Mr. Speaker they do not have very far to move. They are only about two feet apart, but I would like to ...

763

MR. SMALLWOOD: But the other way, they are not a part at all.

MR. NEARY: What I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, was that really they were right-wing Liberals, and I think that a right-wing Liberal is probably a left-wing P. C., and Mr. Speaker, although the hon. gentleman may have felt that they took a big step, I do not think it will be considered as a giant step for mankind.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the hon. House that we are now approaching the end of our fourth day of this sitting and to date, Mr. Speaker, nothing has been accomplished to meet any of the needs and the wants of the people at large and the taxpayers in particular in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to those who are obstructing progress examine their consciences. Mr. Speaker, do they not owe the people who have elected them to enact legislation to improve things in this Province some obligation to get on with the business of this House? Mr. Speaker, may I appeal to gentleman among those seated at the Speaker's right for a return to productive constructive work in this House? Unless, Mr. Speaker, the House itself degenerate completely into a laughing stock among the citizens of this Province who must be seething inwardly in the last four days of the unfortunate wasting of time of the taxpayers money.

MR. MALOENY: Mr. Speaker, after the high velocity of the exchanges across the floor of this House in the past several days, I would like to assure all hon. members that I have no arranged it with your Honour that a low key speaker come on at this time, but for all hon. members who can take a low key speaker, be my guest and to those who enjoy other fair well the only thing I can say is that this is not your day.

I would like to speak against the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and in particular to direct my remarks to the policies of this Government which I am very proud to be a part - policies which I feel have been followed in the fishing industry which see the 1970 year opening on a very bright note.

Mr. Speaker, 1970 has started out for us on a far brighter a note than has been the case for many a year. Action taken by this Government in 1968

116-41

and 1969 together with action taken by the Government of Canada have contributed greatly to the improvement in the fresh frozen and the salt fish industry of this Province. The market conditions for the former appear to be very good and the action taken by the Government of Canada in respect of the salt fish industry will bring a degree of stability to this segment of the fishing industry - the segment of the industry that has been marked by instability for centuries.

The development of the herring fishery, Mr. Speaker, is continuing around the Island, and in particular along the southwest coast, and I am encouraged to see the direction in which this is moving this year, and that is that the emphasis is more towards the utilization of herring for food. It has always seemed to me, Sir, that the use of this resource for no other purpose than for meal is to minimize the resource to say the least. In the year that has just closed or about to come to a close the fiscal year, I think the production of herring for food in Newfoundland will reach around 80,000 barrels, and I see this production increasing in 1970.

MR. MURPHY: Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. MALONEY: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: How drastic is this going to be on this over-catch of herring? Is that too serious an effect on our Province? I am just wondering.

MR. MALONEY: In reply to the question that the hon. Leader of the Opposition, there remains much research to be done. I would say there is a question mark on the extent of this resource. The scientists have not yet been able to say to what extent it can be fished. There appears at the moment to be no signs of overfishing. If the greater percentage of production at the moment is going into meal, if there were greater emphasis on herring for food, then I would say that this resource would be good for centuries, but there remains a great deal of research to be done and I have been pressing on behalf of the Government to see that more attention, more effort, more money is spent by the Government of Canada on this very valuable resource. I was able, Mr. Speaker, during the year to be able to bring to the Province

and to have them arrange meetings with packers in the Province a number of buyers from Europe. These men came from Sweden, from Denmark, from Norway and from Germany and I was able to arrange while they were here to have them taken around the Province and to be able to enter into production arrangements with these local packers, and this has lead to the present production schedule of perhaps eighty to one thousand barrels.

Over the past three or four years, Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the Federal Department of Fisheries, we have been looking at a resource that was hither to unknown or certainly if it were known, it was neglected and that is the shrimp resource. It has developed at one of the very promising areas along the coast which is in the upper part of the straits of Bell Isle to be more precise it is in the Port aux Choix area. The Government this year will be entering into a joint venture with the plant operators at Port aux Choix Fishery Products Ltd. and into ventures with fishermen in that area involving the chartering of boats and the whole purpose is to develop the catching and processing of shrimp. Our information from the market is that there is a very, very strong demand and our part in the project will be to see that this worthwhile industry gets off to a good start. Some members of the House and I believe the the hon. member for Gander and I believe the hon. member of Hermitage mentioned and questioned the Government on what their plans were, if any to do something about stocking or restocking the inland waters. I would like to make remarks on that now. Mr. Speaker, with your permission.

This matter has been on my mind for some time and it has been on the mind of the hon. the Premier for much longer. He has constantly urged me to look into this and last year I was able to arrange with the Department of Fisheries of the state of Michigan through the good offices of the American Consul here in St. John's to go to Michigan to see what they had done in that state in the development of a salmon fishery in Lake Michigan.

The development I might say to be as brief as I can has been successful beyond the wildest expectations of the people involved. It all started this way: when the St. Lawrence Seaway opened, the species of fish

known as alewives something like herring entered the seaway and reached the Great Lakes and surprisingly enough these fish made out so well in the Lakes and they expanded so rapidly that after a few years they became a menace and through disease or starvation great quantities, hundreds of thousands tons of these fish washed ashore on the shores of Lake Michigan. This meant the expenditure of many millions of dollars by the state in order to clean up the beaches of the lake, the shores of the Lake and it also caused a loss of many millions of dollars to home owners who had exclusive residences along the shores of Lake Michigan. There did not seem to be any way to overcome this dreadful problem caused by the overpopulation of these fish until somebody had the idea that perhaps the way out of this is to bring in what they call a predator a species that would enter the lake and live off the bait fish, the alewives and the coho salmon from the west coast was the specie that was selected.

Briefly this conclusion appeared to be quite correct and the salmon took this new environment exceptionally well.

so much so, Mr. Speaker, that it is now possible in Lake Michigan to harvest a large salmon fishery every year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MALONEY: That is commercial fishery as well as the fishery for the tourist industry. I am just coming to that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MALONEY: They are the pink flesh fish. Then they had to bring in elaborate programs of control in order to keep a proper balance between the salmon and the fish on which they fed. And this involved closed seasons and areas closed to fishing and that sort of thing. But, they have developed very good control and the thing now appears to be in good balance. But the tourist industry -

MR. A. WORNELL: Will the hon. Minister of Fisheries advise the House, if these coho salmon will spawn and thrive in fresh water with no outlet to the sea. Will they promote or grow to large size?

MR. MALONEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, they will. As a matter of fact, their growth in the lakes area is greater, they will grow larger in the lakes area than they have in their natural habitats in which they were taken in their original egg form. But the tourist industry in the state of Michigan, Mr. Speaker, if I may go on is growing in leaps and bounds because of this development, and the state provides a very sizable budget each year to see that this continues to develop.

Now the Department of Fisheries of Michigan made it possible for me to see this development, to meet all the people who are directly concerned in it, and I owed them a great debt, which I very sincerely acknowledge now, and also I wish to acknowledge again my debt ^{to} the U.S. Consul who made all the arrangements.

Now I had in mind and the Premier had in mind when we carried out this visit and survey to see if this approach might have some application in Newfoundland and we had in mind the water area created by the Bay D'Espoir Development. And of course, the much larger water area created by the Churchill Falls Development, but primarily it was the Bay D'Espoir Watershed Area. But, there is one thing that we have to remember and it is brought home very forcibly to me, and that was this, that the coastline of the Great Lakes - the 3000 miles, which is from here down to Chidley and back again, and perhaps half ways down again, I had no conception of the size of the water area in which this experiment was carried out. We think the Bay D'Espoir watershed area is appearing to be a very large area, but you could tuck Bay D'Espoir watershed area away in any corner of this

lake and hardly see it. This is one fact.

The big problem, however, the big problem in bringing a development of this kind to Newfoundland, particularly the coho salmon, and other species like it, and that is there has to be a species of fish to form a feed-base. There has to be introduced because there is not now a stock in these ponds to form a feed-base and we have no small base fish that would thrive, at least this is what scientists tell me, that it could be introduced into the lakes and brought in, this is the big problem. Yes, something along caplin or mud-herring or smelts or something like that, there maybe a possibility of smelt, I do not know. But I have kept up discussions with the Department of Fisheries of Ottawa, this matter is really not within the jurisdiction of the Province, but I have felt, and certainly the Government feels there responsibility to persue this sort of development to bring it to a head, and to do all possible, so I have continued discussions with the Federal Department of Fisheries Resource Development Branch. They have done as you know some work in Newfoundland on the introduction of the pink salmon, and there are plans to do something with the introduction of a trout species in Newfoundland. It is not developed too far at this time, but they are perhaps thinking about rainbow trout as a suitable fish for the Bay D'Espoir area.

So I thought I would report, Mr. Speaker, with your permission on this matter because it has been raised by hon. members of the House.

I would like to speak for a moment or two on the Labrador Fishery, because during the past year I have met with quite a number of people who are directly involved in the Labrador Fishery, we have had meetings, the Premier and I, the delegation, meetings from all parts of Newfoundland, and it is a matter of great concern, it continues to be a matter of great concern for 1970's. Now while the inshore fishery around the Province last year was considered to be fairly good, the situation along the Labrador Coast is the exact opposite. The voyage there can only be considered as a dismal failure. This applied to the livers, and it applies stationers, and it applies to the floaters. The fishery failed simply because the codfish did not come to the land during the time of the year when the fishery is carried on. This is a short season, starting from about early June and ending about mid-August. There has been years over the past century, when the Labrador Fishery failed in whole, or in part, but I do not think ever to such a degree as it did in the past year.

Now in trying to access the future of the inshore fishery along the Labrador. We cannot and I cannot honestly be unmindful of one very important situation which is relatively new insofar as the Labrador Fishery is concerned, and that is this fact, Mr. Speaker, that over the past four or five years there has been such a build up of activity on the Hamilton Bank by a fleet of foreign nations, and it is from this Bank that the Labrador gets its stock. That a great question mark has been raised in the minds of people who have been looking at the problem, as to what the prospects are for this year and the years to come. Last year, one country alone, one foreign country alone took a billion pounds of cod from the Hamilton Bank.

Now in case, Mr. Speaker, anyone raises the question of the twelve mile limit, let me say right now that the twelve mile limit is totally irrelevant here, the Hamilton Bank area is out in international waters beyond the twelve mile limit, where the Labrador stock is derived and limit other than those which would take in the continental shelf really had very little relevance.

So it would hardly seem to me to be likely that great quantities of fish such as I have mentioned can continue to be taken from the Hamilton Bank without having totally, totally serious disastrous effect on the inshore fishery or the Labrador.

The impression I get from the scientists is that this is the single big factor in the decline of the Labrador Fishery. I have to say this to say less would be less than honest, I have to say it as I see it, and as I am informed and this is the way it is - the owners of the floater fleet, these are Newfoundland base vessels have had several meetings with me, several meetings with the Premier in his office, I have been able to arrange a number of meetings between them and the officials of the Government of Canada, so that they can be fully informed, because it has to be realized that these men have a substantial investment in vessels, many of them new vessels. The Province has an investment in them in the way of subsidy and in the way of loans, the Federal for its part has a substantial investment in these vessels, and the coasting trade which provided an alternative a few years ago has difficulty. There may be one coastal vessel, one small wooden coastal vessel operating on the coast of Newfoundland this year. So, there is no really no other alternative. This presents these Labrador-skippers with very serious problems. One of the great costs of operating a Labrador vessel is the cost of insurance. And in many cases, I think, they have to pay as high as seven and a half percent, and this costs many thousand dollars. And the regulations

being bought in by the Canadian Steamship Inspection will become more rigid, they have added to the cost of operation, lifeboats, life jackets, various other considerations of fire protection, and the like all of which is added to the cost of operating a Labrador vessel.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. MALONEY: No that is the Hall Insurance.

One piece of practical assistance has been devised as a result of these meetings, and that is that we have been able to persuade the Government of Canada to include these vessels in an insurance scheme which they have had for years, but only covered small vessels. Now they have taken in the Labrador vessel last year up to a hundred feet and beginning April 1st. any Labrador type vessel in excess of one hundred feet, so all classes of Labrador floaters will be included. This will mean in the case of some Labrador skippers, perhaps the saving of \$3,000 to \$4,000. This could be the difference between staying home and continuing the voyage in 1970.

MR. T. A. HICKMAN: Will this insurance be available for the coasting trade generally in the Province? The wooden fleet? Or is it just restricted to the Labrador fleet?

MR. MALONEY: This insurance is known as the fishermen indemnity plan. There has never applied to vessels engaged in the coasting trade. It started off as a scheme to help the small boats from twenty feet up and it has got up to fifty, sixty-five feet, last year to hundred and now its opened ended and will take in the Labrador type of vessel. This is one thing that has been devised for the Labrador floater. Another thing we have been able to do, and I hope it is for work when we get at it, we have looked into the possibility of employing a number of these vessels, there are not too many around, perhaps fifteen or sixteen employing some of them in exploratory fishing. That is looking for other species of fish or looking for species of fish on new grounds, uncharted to both Governments. This was something that we have been doing

doing on a small scale in a number of years, and we hope to do this with a number of vessels in the coming season. This we hope can offer some encouragement to some of the Labrador floaters.

If we can develop a deversified fisheries then some of these vessels can be withdrawn and put into other segments.

I would like to touch on the fishing in the Straits of Belle Isle. The fishery which has given us over the past several years some concern - and with which we have been dealing as a Government - in my opinion very diligently and that is the interference with the fishery there by the trawlers of foreign nations. This interference lessened somewhat Mr. Speaker during 1969, but it does continue to be a bit of a problem in certain parts of Newfoundland. Now until these waters become exclusive fishing waters to Canada and this is outside the jurisdiction of this House - and all foreign fleets are kept out, we have found Mr. Speaker that the programs that we introduced the year before last and last year - and that was programs to replace gear lost by fishermen free of cost to the fishermen did not answer the problem. It was no solution. It appeared to be a solution at the time, it appeared to be a means of getting the fishermen very quickly back in the boats - but our conclusions now, after the experience of a couple of years, is that it is not an answer. The trawlers, in the knowledge that the Government was going to provide free gear paid less heed than

MR. MALONEY: Before to the plight of the inshore fishermen. So another answer had to be found - another answer has to be found. I am not sure that we have found one yet, but we have come up with a new approach to that very significant part of our inshore fishery - and that is to assist the fishermen towards other methods - the use of other methods and other types of fishing gear, so that the longliners that they own can operate side by side with druggers if that situation arises - and I refer to a new method of fishing call pier-seining.

The hon. member for St. Barbe South will I am sure be interested in this and the hon. member for St. Barbe North. This is the method which has proven very successful out of Prince Edward Island, and we started last fall in the straits to do some work - but really all we did was to get ready for this season. We will be ready to operate a number of longliners out of that area this year in pier-seining and this will remove some of the hazards of the past year - where they set a fixed piece of gear rather than tow a piece of gear as they will in this new method.

We will also be employing a number of longliners in that area for trapping, and we propose to do a good deal of work in scallop fishing - so all this will have the effect of taking away a number of vessels from this gill - netting and putting them to work in other types of fishery which will take the emphasis off this hazardous gill - netting.

Mr. Speaker,

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister permit a question please

MR. MALONEY: Yes Mr. Speaker

MR. COLLINS: I wonder would the hon. Minister of Fisheries agree that gill-nets possibly one of the greatest curses of the inshore fishery in Newfoundland now? The use of gill nets I should say.

MR. MALONEY: Well I think there is quite a difference in the two statements that the hon. gentleman just made Mr. Speaker, there can be - I think what he meant to say was in the use of the nets, and I would have to agree - perhaps a gill net as well as any other piece of fishing gear if it is misused and not properly used can become a nuisance, and perhaps bad for the fishery. I think this is the point he wished to make and I agree with it.

MR. MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, this new pier - seining - does the minister feel that this will be the answer to everything in the straits? Does he feel also that by recommending that the twelve mile limit be extended throughout the straits, does he not feel that this will be a lot more good for the fishermen

than even per-seining?

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Speaker, on that the question of limit and the question of fishing rights are beyond my - beyond our jurisdiction. I would agree that there is no doubt about the extension of the twelve mile limit - or the demarcation of the area as an exclusive area to the local boats would be a good thing, but we do not have that - in the absence of that we are endeavouring as a Government to introduce new methods of fishing there which would get over some of the problems which we have had during the last two or three years.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to our policies, and the criticisms that are leveled at us - it will be of interest to this House and to the people of the Province I am sure to know that the whaling industry has enjoyed a successful come-back in the last three years. This is something about which very little has been said - very little has been written but there are going ahead in Newfoundland and will be going ahead this year - two operations, one at Williams Port and the other at Dildo in Trinity Bay. These worked quite successfully last year - the quotas for Newfoundland and the quotas are arrived at after surveys have been made by the Federal Department concerned. The surveys would appear to be quite adequate to lead us to believe that the sticks are quite adequate to permit these two whaling operations to continue at good economic levels. The whale population is in fact, increasing quite significantly - not dramatically, but the quotas that are given to the two operators still permit a good expansion of the whale population.

This again is a development which will benefit many of our people. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should say something about the situation that was very much in the news and this concerns the plant at - of Atlantic Fish Processers at Marystown. Something over a year ago Sir, the fresh frozen industry - fresh frozen fish industry of this Province as in all of Canada, and indeed, in any country where frozen fish was produced was in a desperate situation. Now the reasons why this was so irrelevant is the point I am going to make - but in this Province apart from the very few companies, and I believe there were perhaps not more than two - the frozen fish operators had without exception to come to the Government of Newfoundland for assistance to keep their plants open. There were many instances where these plants were so imperiled that a close down was only a matter of a month or two months away. The fact Mr. Speaker, is well known to the House - to the people of Newfoundland that 47
two of the large companies - the great international companies Birdseye and

Ross did indeed close down. The livelihood of several thousand plant workers was in jeopardy, and outlets for the catch of a great many of our inshore fishermen were in danger of being closed out.

Now my colleagues in the Government including two former colleagues who now sit across the House, are very familiar with this situation - and they know the lengthy meetings with which were occasioned by this serious situation. They also know, of the extent of the assistance by way of loans and guarantees that had to be made by the Government. These loans and guarantees are a matter of public record, because they appeared in the loan and guarantee Act in the House as is required by law.

One company in particular, Atlantic Fish Processors, in May of 1969 sought a revision of their repayment schedule to the Government because their forecast, their projections of the returns from the market convinced them that they would be able to - that they would not be able to meet their payment schedule. Now I took a different view, and I so advised my colleagues in the Government. Their view was a pessimistic view - I took a different view and I so advised my colleagues. A number of meetings were held with the company the result of these meetings was that a survey on terms of reference laid down by the Government - and to which the company agreed was undertaken. In October the firm Kates, Peet and Marwick completed their report, handed it to the Government and discussions were reopened with the company.

MR. EARLE: I wonder would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. MALONEY: Yes Mr. Speaker.

MR. EARLE: This agreement with the Atlantic Fish Processors, I just cannot recall when was that drawn up - at what time was that originally drafted - do you remember?

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe it was in 1967 - perhaps - the date skips me for the moment, but I believe that it was in 1967. It was a statutory agreement, tabled in the House.

But this report Mr. Speaker, made by the firm of Kates, Peet, Marwick in collaboration with the company I am very happy to say - very happy, confirmed the views of the Government and I am happier to say confirmed this to the company as well. Now I have no doubt in my mind Mr. Speaker, that the people who worked at the plant in Marystown were concerned during the time this survey was being carried out. Of course they were concerned, their livelihood was involved and they were wondering - but as soon as we had the report and our views were confirmed the people of Marystown were reassured - they were reassured by the

Premier publicly in Marystown in late October at a public meeting, and they were reassured by me that the report had been received - it was a favourable report - and that the companies operations would be carrying on.

I must say Mr. Speaker, in the case of all loans and guarantees and agreements concerned therewith to the fishing industry, the Government are in possession of information regarding the financial position of these companies, and all information which maybe - which certainly can be considered of a confidential nature regarding their operations, as may be required by the minister. This is customary and is the case in the case of every loan and guarantee. This kind of information is sought not only when agreements are being made for loans and guarantees, but is also asked for and I might say readily given any time during the currency of agreements. I would like to put it on record that any information requested from companies is made readily and cheerfully available to the Government. There is a complete understanding of this situation by the companies and results in information being available to us at any time.

Now in the same manner Mr. Speaker, we have dealings, the Government, with several thousand

manner, Mr. Speaker, we have dealings - the Government - with several thousand fishermen in this Province. Several thousand fishermen borrow from the Government for boats, for equipment for fishing and we are required to gather from these fishermen, confidential information. We ask them about their assets. We ask them about their cash holdings, their bank accounts. We are required to do that. This is good business practice and I believe it is perhaps required by statutes. But, anyway, it is given to us very readily - information, private information, confidential information, by thousands of fishermen.

A one newspaper editor challenged me not so long ago, as the Minister of Fisheries, saying that if I expected to retain the confidence of the fishing industry in the fishermen of the Province, that I should publish the report referred to in the case of the Marystown plant.

I say, Mr. Speaker, it is precisely for that very reason, and that is, I repeat, that I wish to hold the confidence of the fishermen and the fishing industry of this Province that I regard statements, reports, and information given to me by these people as privileged - confidential.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude --

MR. HICKMAN: I wonder if the minister will permit a question before we get off this fishery.

In view of the encouraging improvement in the frozen fish industry, does he see any possibility of the re-opening of the Ross plant and negotiations going on.

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Speaker, I can only say to that, that we as a Government are continuing to look for people who are interested in establishing here. I know that the Pratt Brothers are constantly looking for someone to reopen that operation. I believe one of the difficulties in getting that plant reopened is perhaps the difficulty in getting trawler fleets at this present time. I think if that were overcome, then I believe, there would be operators appear on the scene for that operation.

MR. HICKMAN: A restoration of the bounty or subsidy on steel draggers might solve that problem. The cost is getting almost beyond the reach of any operator today.

SOME HON. MEMBER: And the Government of Canada.

MR. MALONEY: The Government of Canada. Yes, on that I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this would lead - that a number of operators in Newfoundland who presently have a way back in their ARDA book - ideas for trawlers, new trawlers - they would certainly start rebuilding, start building and certainly an operator who had some interest in the Ross Steers plant with an increase in the subsidy and taking the freeze off the subsidy would certainly increase the interest and the possibilities of opening this plant.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is purely with the intention of trying to find the answers. Is there any merit in - this would work two ways, as I see it - in the Marystown shipyard trying to come up with some scheme of rental purchase with a view to overcome two problems: one providing additional draggers to the local fleet, and secondly, reactivating that plant.

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Speaker, on that I am very happy to be able to say, now, that the survey involving what the hon. member, I think has in mind, is presently underway. Presently underway - that is as much as I can say about it. The survey has just started. We had had some meetings with a commission set up by the Government of Canada to look into this whole question of vessel subsidy. They are now meeting and, as I say, the survey is started with this view in mind.

Mr. Speaker, we are to close and say that, speaking against this amendment, in my opinion, we are entering 1970 with excellent prospects in our mining industry, the markets appear to be very strong. The markets for our forest industry with the exception of one incident which came to our attention today, appear to be good and the prospects of the fishing industry, as I just outlined, appear to me to be very bright indeed.

I am realizing, of course, that we are dependent as a Province on world markets and these are very often - not very often - almost often, things over which we have no control. The prospects of our Province, to me look very bright indeed for 1970.

APPLAUSE

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. the minister one question? And I ask this, I hope, for the sake of this House, that the answer is, "No". For his sake, maybe I hope the answer is, "Yes".

Is this the hon. the minister's farewell speech to this House?

SOME HON. MEMBER: You are darn right, it is not.

MR. SAUNDERS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to oppose the amendment. It is to imagine - it is a vote of non-confidence in our Government. I have been giving a lot of thought lately, here, since last Monday, not of crossing the floor, oh no, not coming over there, but of listening to all the votes of non-confidence and the Government of this side of the House. But, I have not heard any suggestion when they asked for an amendment to the Speech from the Throne of how to create jobs.

All I have heard is an amendment that they had no confidence in the Government.

SOME HON. MEMBER: All wind and no rain.

MR. SAUNDERS: I know there has been a lot of hot air around but today, if —

They are not going to ultimate. It is no good. I have not got a vote down and you are not going to stop me that way. But, it is their place. I know it is the Opposition's place to come across. I have not got a loud voice. I am not a meek one. I cannot get up here and read and say what I have got to say but I can keep on going and keep on going, but, I am disappointed over the past six years that I have been here that I have not heard a suggestion anywhere from the opposition how to create one job.

Maybe on an election promise you are going to say how to create jobs. I heard that the last election and the federal election - how to create jobs, but there is not one of them ever created - not one. They were even going to build bridges - they did not do it, because they had no authority to do it. If that is the kind of promises you are going to make on Provincial stuff - that is what you have done.

Now, I know what I am talking about, and I want to stay off that. I do not want to get into anything that is going to be controversial - do not want to, because I have been at this twenty years in elections that I can --

twenty years in elections and I can fight my own battles. Mr. Speaker, there are some things that I have confidence in and plenty, and maybe we will get from the Opposition some suggestions, or maybe a question of how it can be done - and who will start it, and I will give them some thought - and I will say to them now, what I am going to say, invest some of your money to Newfoundlanders. I learned that when you get up to speak, the easiest way to speak, is just look at one person and keep a smile on his face and you can get along.

I do not think the hon. member from Burin was going to turn around for the scowl there - I have always kept a smile there anyway. Now in the Speech from the Throne I heard one thing - I will take one thing first. The herring industry.

They are going to produce 80,000 barrels of herring in this Province this year - from 15,000 to 80,000 barrels of herring. That sounds great maybe to every member in this Chamber - 80,000 barrels of herring. To me it sounds more than 80,000 barrels of herring. I am one of three people today in the Island of Newfoundland - I am the youngest - a master cooper, my first trade.

80,000 barrels of herring means 80,000 barrels. I have not heard one question from the Opposition - where are the barrels coming from? I will tell you where the barrels are coming from and what they are costing. They are coming from Norway, Holland, Nova Scotia - there are a few from Newfoundland. I will admit there is one percent getting manufactured. I have asked a number of persons who are packing herring today, who cannot get one barrel - cannot get one, because they are not available.

You cannot get one of softwood or hardwood, because the softwood is in so much demand, that they are coming in from Nova Scotia - hardwood - they are coming in softwood. Now that 2,000,000 and a half of lumber that can be cut on crown land within the three or four or five mile limit - the machinery for that in Newfoundland is outdated, is gone, no good. It is not even manufactured fast enough. The machine that a few years ago would saw 3,000 staves a day which was a good machine - you can buy one today that can cut 36,000 staves an hour. You can get a heading maching that can do the same thing. All this most modern machinery - I have the catalogues of it, for an outlay of about \$30,000. You can get the whole plant ready.

Now we have in this country today the lumber - it does not take tradesmen anymore. We have the machinery right in here - Donovans to make the hoops - because they have been made. I had them in my hands - the hoops - the same cords, or cheaper even than we can bring them in from the Mainland.

Now there is \$400,000 labour in that one little industry, if we as Newfoundlanders were our own worst enemies. If we in Newfoundland would say today - someone, I do not care who it is, would say, we are going to start a little industry. The Government will help - I am just throwing out a challenge. I have not got the money. I had to give up the cooperage business, because cardboard cartons came in. I had the largest cooperage in the country. I had to give it up, it just sent out - faded - died - through no fault of this Government - through no fault of anyone. It just died. But today there is an opening for someone with an initiative and money. Not too much - yes, would say to the hon. member from St. Barbe South - maybe he has enough to start it. Sure why not start in Bay of Islands, up in Curling - I was up there when I travelled the length of Curling in every little cove. I bought three pieces of machinery up there.

I brought it out to Carbonear - used it. It was old machinery, but I made it do. It was only a couple of days ago I gave away a piece of machinery - outdated - I gave it to a man down in Bay of Islands - to make him a barrel - this machine would make him a barrel, but not for me because it was not fast enough. Today you cannot get a man that can keep their arm going all day sawing - it has to be automatic.

MR. MYRDEN: You can get it in Bay of Islands.

MR. SAUNDERS: No you cannot get it in Bay of Islands - Little Bay Island I am sorry. This man can get a man maybe to go into the woods and cut enough saw for a hundred barrels. That is not what I mean today. I mean someone to start an industry to come up and create some employment - cut the logs we have - we have birch, we have witchhazel, we have spruce, we have fir and juniper. We have all that in this country that is small - you only need a four inch log - four to five inch log, and you have the whole thing. That is all you need. I have watched them in Nova Scotia do it.

MR. MYRDEN: Will the hon. member permit a question? On Fisheries again. As I understand it, there is only one great school of herring left in North America,

and it happens to be around Newfoundland. How long does the Minister feel that we will be able to take herring from the sea and packing at eighty thousand barrels a year?

MR. SAUNDERS: I do not know if the hon. member was in the House when the hon. member for Burin asked that question. How long did he expect the herring to last? And according - I think the Minister of Fisheries said, that according to his understanding, it is indefinite. Am I right in answering that question Hon. Minister?

HON. AIDEN MALONEY (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, my opinion on that is, (and it is not my opinion, I am not qualified - I have to depend upon the experts in the Research Department in the Federal Department of Fisheries) and that is that if the stocks were to be utilized for food purposes - It is indefinite.

MR. MYRDEN: Sometimes it is used for other food purposes, such as meal. We have fish meal plants in this country -

MR. MALONEY: Yes Mr. Speaker, I think I said that

I think I said a great deal of research needs to be done even on that. But the opinion is while the limited amount of research has been done, is that perhaps we better take it easy at the present level until more is done and I think that is the intention to, sort of mark time.

MR.SAUNDERS: Mr. Speaker, that is the understanding that I had when I was listening to the Minister of Fisheries. I was not talking on fish meal, hoping that we will discover herring on the north east coast. It is not impossible we have plenty of herring on the north east coast, they do not move into one circle all the time.

SOME NON. MEMBER: Lots in Trinity Bay.

MR.SAUNDERS: There are plenty of them. Like, that is one, plenty of barrels gone over there.

MR.EARLE: Mr. Speaker, as an experienced cooper I wonder if he knows whether these barrels can be produced in Newfoundland to competitive prices to the imported article?

MR.SAUNDERS: I will answer that question Mr. Speaker. I am not on my feet without having the facts and I have gone into it thoroughly, that we can manufacture the barrel pay a decent wage. We cannot manufacture them by hand as the old coopers, we have not got them, in the island of Newfoundland today like I had to do when I learned, with the blood running out of my knuckles all day long and the cracks in my fingers. I was twelve or fifteen years old making them. We can order the machinery it is about \$30,000 I have checked into it with this company. Thirty thousand dollars worth of machinery we could bring it in this country, and we can manufacture barrels in competition with anyone. And make not the minimum wage but you can pay your men a decent wage, as any factory worker I would say clear of the paper mills or the mining that is paying high top wages, we can manufacture those barrels today. I discussed this with another cooper, one of the most experienced men I suppose in the island of Newfoundland. Still in the cooperage business. I have discussed it with him and spent hours and hours, and the last time I was there I had the speaker, Mr. Speaker, I took you with me and we discussed this we have gone into it. and it can be done Sir, Mr. Speaker it can be done, we can manufacture that barrel in Newfoundland and we can create four to five hundred thousand dollars worth of labour. Right here in our own little Province.

MR.HICKMAN: Would the Head of Bay D'Espoir be a good place for that, quite close to the herring?

MR. SAUNDERS: Any place, There is a problem that I looked into also Mr. Speaker. That the freight the C.N.R freight from Conception Bay up to the area where the herring is, is caught today, is even more expensive than the bringing the same barrel over from the other side. I can bring that barrel over from Holland land it , up there for half the price they tell me, as we would, it cost us to send it from here just up there.

MR. HICKMAN: Terrible indictment to the C.N.R.

MR. SAUNDERS: That is because the C.N.R has a said right on a barrel. But if we may be went look for a preferential rate of an empty barrel going in we could may be do something with it. Now that is something that I would through out to any Newfoundlander today, say that we can be self sufficient in one thing and before I am finished I will, that is my point, ~~to show~~ I am not losing confidence I am opposing this motion on those grounds that it is not the government it is ourselves both the Opposition , the government, everyone that we are not wondering, and looking and saying what is the matter with us, do we expect the Government to create every job in the island of Newfoundland today. Is that what is the matter? Why do not someone with all the money, what is the good of it in the bank if you are getting 8½% , yes, I was told one time, look, it is better instead of putting out your money on credit, it is better to put it in the bank. It is costing a hundred thousand dollars, it is better to put it in the bank, and get your 6 or 8%. You got no worries. But are we all going to be that kind of people, that we are going to invest money , and just let it lie and set down on our fannies and wait to get money. Is that what we are going to make Newfoundland? God Help Us. We have got enough millionaires here now. Let someone come out and say it, and I will invest in Newfoundland. We have got them. We got plenty of young people today who have not got a copper, but they have got it all invested, and I would say, there are not paupers, but I know they can not take a trip to the mainland only on credit, and wait for the airline, may be they got the next month to pay the airline, but they are given 600 jobs. That is right, buy now and pay later, they are not looking to the Government to hand them out stuff all the time, So we need more people , the Government has got it there, there it is, you have no confidence, the Government is there to offer every one everything. Look, you create something, we will do our share you do yours. All we hear is no confidence, there is no confidence, But what do you expect the worst thing that can happen is a Government industry run by the Government. We can not have it.

H.S.H

SOME HON. MEMBER: That has been proven.

MR. SAUNDERS: It has been proven sure it has. It can not happen. We can not run a business. Let the individual, let the individual run that business and make a dollar for himself. That is what we need. I know, I know where it is going to hit the day.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Should get some encouragement in the type of business, you are speaking of though, \$130 million here, you know.

MR. SAUNDERS: Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about the \$130 million, if the \$130 million I will show you what it cost as I go through. I will show you what it cost per job in some of the little things the Government has done. I will show you I have the figures here, what it cost, what it cost an ordinary individual, what it cost for him to create a job. I have not been on my feet without I am ready. I have my figures. I have discussed it with people, what it cost to get jobs. You think it is all just a matter of the Government providing jobs. But before I am finished I am going to prove that it is our own fault Mr. Speaker,

It now being 6:00 I now leave the Chair. The House recessed until 8:00 p.m.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 9

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we continue with the debate on the amendment, I have some remarks to make in connection with a Point of Privilege raised by the hon. member for St. John's West this afternoon.

I have spent some considerable time since the point was raised in finding as many of the authorities as I possibly could to enable me to give a ruling, and I will follow in this instance the same course that I read in similar, well not entirely similar but situations somewhat analogous to what we have before us right now and the method of disposing of it used in the House of Commons at Ottawa.

First of all, may I say this. If you will refer to page ninety-five of Beauschene the last paragraph you will find these words: as a motion taken at the time for matters of privilege is thereby given precedence over the prearranged program of public business that the business of the House was interrupted in order to present his Point of Privilege. The Speaker requires to be satisfied both that there is a prima facie case that a breach of privilege has been committed and also that the matter is being raised at the earliest opportunity. The second part of that, of course, we do not have to deal with, because it was raised at the earliest opportunity. The Speaker has to satisfy himself that there is a prima facie case of the breach of privilege and the method followed in Ottawa is that the parties be heard in order to assist the Speaker in making his decision. He does not know the facts. He has not heard the case from both sides and in order to make my decision as to whether there is a prima facie case or not, then it is necessary for me as laid down by precedent in Ottawa to hear both parties that is the hon. member for St. John's West and the hon. the Premier in bringing explanatory statements which cannot be termed a debate. Then the decision will be made. If there is a prima facie case, I think there might be, then the matter will be dealt with further in steps that I will outline after I have heard both parties briefly and without debating state their case and defenses.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, my submission is that there has been a breach of the

privileges of the House by the hon. the Premier in this connection and that on the Order Paper of yesterday there was placed a Question no. 71 by myself concerning the project at Come-by-Chance and part (4) of that question asked - Has the Government approved the appointment of an independent person by Newfoundland Refining Company Limited to furnish to the Government an opinion confirming the feasibility of the oil refinery project at Come-by-Chance in accordance with the agreement made on the 23th day of January, 1968 between the Government and Newfoundland Refining Company Limited and if so what is the name of that person? Part (5) of the question went on to say that if the answer to part (4) was yes, then has the Government received an opinion from such independent person confirming the feasibility of the oil refinery project at Come-by-Chance? The hon. the Premier answered the question by stating that this question as well the subject that was to come up for debate that day - he was going to deal with in the same way that there were certain negotiations underway, that information would be tabled later. It was not in the public interest to answer that question at this time or words to that effect.

In the subsequent debate that information was not given. We debated the issue for six or eight hours yesterday the Come-by-Chance Project. On radio station V. O. C. M. this morning at 10:15 a.m. or thereabouts the hon. the Premier, I was listening, as one has to if one is in public life in this Province and opposed to the Premier in anyway. I was listening, when the hon. the Premier stated in reply to a question from the news reporter of that station that a company called Universal Oil Company or a name such as that of Chicago...

AN HON. MEMBER: Universal Oil Products.

MR. CROSBIE: Universal Oil Products of Chicago had carried out a feasibility study on the oil refinery project at Come-by-Chance. He went on to say how they were once wholly owned by Standard Oil Company and what a wonderful company they were and that this feasibility report had been received. He went on further to say that they had found the project to be feasible. In other words, Mr. Speaker,

the information requested by a member of this House yesterday by a question properly tabled in the House and refused to be given to this House and to the public through this House on grounds that it was against the public interest to do so and the next morning at 10:15, it was given to a radio station and broadcasted to the people of Newfoundland. My submission is, Mr. Speaker, that this an attitude of contempt to this hon. House and the members thereof, that this showed disrespect of and disrespect for the dignity and authority of this House by contemptuously refusing to give this information at the sitting of the House yesterday, when it was requested and, therefore, this is a prima facie breach of the privileges of this House and not just any one member of it and I cite that there are many examples in the Parliament of Canada where ministers have been chastised for making statements outside the House, when the House was sitting of government policy and business and information.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore have given you or moved that this House censure the hon. the Premier for his disrespect of the dignity of the House by his refusal on Wednesday, February 25th to provide the information requested in part (4) of Question 71 and his subsequent disclosure of the information requested by the radio station V. O. C. N. on Thursday morning, February 26th and requests an apology therefore. That is my submission, Mr. Speaker, and I submit that there is a prima facie case of a breach of the privileges that go back hundreds of years of this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, there has in fact been no breach of the privileges of this House in the least. The Government have not yet appointed or approved the appointment of the person that is to be appointed. It has not happened yet. What has happened is that the Shaheen people themselves retained the services of a very famous company, U. O. P., Universal Oil Products whose head office is in Chicago to make a feasibility study of the project, the proposed oil refinery at Come-by-Chance. Universal Oil Products made that study and it is in the possession of the Shaheen people. The verifying of that, the confirming of it, the vetting of it, appraising it, measuring it is yet to be done and this will be done by some eminent person, some person eminent in the oil industry and it will be done in behalf of the Government. It will be done to

serve the Newfoundland Government and it will consist largely of a measurement, of an appraisal of the U. O. P. report, because we do not think it would be practical to begin all over again from scratch and have a feasibility - an independent, a complete, complete from scratch, from beginning to end, a complete feasibility study made after one has already been made by the Shaheen people and made for them by the finest company there is in the world so far as we know for making that kind of an appraisal, for making that kind of a feasibility study.

When I was asked in the House to give the name or to say whether we had appointed or brought about the appointment or approved the appointment of a person to make the confirming study which is in effect what it is, I either said no, we were not tabling the information now, but I certainly did not name any one for a very good reason, because no one has been named. When the hon. gentleman heard me on V. O. C. N. this morning answer a simple question that was asked by the interviewer - had a feasibility study been made? I said, "of course. It certainly has and made by a very famous firm namely, U. D. P." I told that it had been the great research department of Standard Oil who owned it, who formed it, who built it and owned it and operated it and then subsequently sold it and it became a private company and it developed into what is perhaps the most authoritative and highly reputed firm in the world in making studies of oil projects. I think it is not only refining of oil but the use of oil products that may be made in oil refineries and I think also with crude oil in oil wells. It is a very famous firm but it was not made for the Newfoundland Government. We have not as yet appointed any one because the U. O. P. has not yet come to the Cabinet and one of the things that we have insisted with Mr. Shaheen, one of the number of things that he must produce is his report and it will be tabled in the Cabinet and I think I remarked here last night probably in this House but only when we are sure that its production will not reveal the trade secrets of that company to their rivals. No breach has been committed whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if I might reply before you make your ruling. The

tape of the radio station V. O. C. M. would be interesting for your Honour to have before he makes his decision to see what exactly was said and I must point out again, Mr. Speaker, that in reply to this six part question yesterday concerning the Come-by-Chance Project and another question that it was stated not to be in the public interest to give any information on feasibility reports during the whole course of the debate - no information was given on this subject and this morning on radio station V. O. C. M. at 10:15 a.m. the information was given about feasibility reports and I draw your Honour's attention to the Act no. 86 of 1968 which states:- it is a Government Newfoundland Refining Co. Ltd. Agreement Act with the agreement attached thereto, clause(5) (1) of that agreement states: "prior to the commitment of the Government to issue the bonds referred to in paragraph (a) of this Clause 5, refining shall furnish to the Government an opinion of an independent person approved by the Government confirming the feasibility of the project."

Now the Universal Oil Products Company of Chicago could very well be this independent person, if the Government approves them. If Universal Oil Products is not, how can any company prepare a proper feasibility study within the next few days that would be tabled in this House as has been promised to be done - all documents would be before this House, everything is ready to go, everything is go. The only thing holding up the project was \$12 million for a wharf. How could that be if these are not the independent people that were going to have done this feasibility study.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Government have not yet approved any one to make the independent study. No we have not yet. The appointment of U. O. P. was done unilaterally without the Government's request or initially even the Government's knowledge. U. O. P. feasibility was done at the request of Mr. Shaheen and not the request of the Government. He did not seek our permission. We did not give our permission. He did not inform us. We did not know until after U. O. P. had nearly finished their work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since then the U. O. P. report has been submitted

490

to the Government of Canada and the Government of Canada through some of its very highest officials, officials, not members of the Government, very high officials of the Government have examined the U. O. P. report, but even that we do not except as the Newfoundland Government's measurement of that report. We will have our own independent survey made of that report and it will be made by some one admittedly and undeniable, competent to give us an acceptable appraisal of the U. O. P. report and it will be that some one that we will appoint or we will cause to be appointed. There seems to be no breach.

MR SPEAKER: I thank hon. members for their help in explaining and stating their cases clearly. It appears to be now that this question has resolved itself into a matter of difference of opinion between two hon. members. I have to take the statements of each one of them as being accurate and correct. There is a difference of opinion as to what did happen. I have to accept any hon. members statement that it is a fact. The facts differ and , therefore, I say it now has resolved itself into a difference of opinion between two individuals as a question of fact. Therefore, I have to say that there is no prima facie case of a breach of privilege.

We adjourn the debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lost again.

491

MR. W. SAUNDERS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not mind, I can keep a smile on their faces anyway. When I finished at 6 O'Clock I spoke on jobs, industry, some way to create work for Newfoundlanders. I throw out one suggestion, I hope the hon. members listened. I will gladly help them at anytime. Some of those that have money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on speaking on this motion of non-confidence, I am wondering, if is the same thing as I noticed on the Order Paper a question about Koch Shoes in Harbour Grace. What are they doing? How many hon. members here in the House has a pair of Koch Shoes on? How many are supporting local industry. There are as good as you can buy from the Mainland. There is nothing to matter with them. We got to go to Ontario and keep them going up there -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SAUNDERS: They are good. I wear them. There is nothing to matter with them, they are a good price. We got our own job, but we are not going to support a local industry. We are going to let that industry stay idle, rather than go and buy one pair of shoes. If they could sell one pair off ^{shoes} ~~shoes~~ to every individual in Newfoundland that plant would be going the whole year around. No, we say, "close it, let us go to Ontario to buy our shoes, let us go to Quebec and buy our shoes."

Is there an hon. member here with a pair of Koch shoes on?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SAUNDERS: I have had them on for years, Sir, and I have said it here before, Mr. Speaker, that is one thing - something else, now we have a full gallery tonight, Newfoundlanders -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SAUNDERS: Sure it is because it is a Government sponsored industry. You are asking what the Government is doing with their money? You have no confidence in them, they started an industry, and you will not patronize it. So how do you expect this Government or anyone else to do anything? You have no confidence in them, because they setup a shoe factory. Well, what are we going to do? You got no confidence in the Government, because they do not create jobs. They cannot create jobs for everyone, but there is fifty jobs that they have created, and we will not even patronize it. We are all to blame. We, Newfoundlanders are the blame for that. Not you personally, or anyone else, Mr. Speaker, but we Newfoundlanders are to blame.

492

Now another thing we have no confidence in the Government because they setup a birch plant.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Where?

MR. SAUNDERS: Just outside of here.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SAUNDERS: Well, sir, I do not mind ~~where~~ the birch comes from, it does not matter, the birch plant is out here at ~~Danovans~~. It is setup by the help of this Government. How many people go and say, I want birch finish, the best finish you can get. Do not worry, you go and look, I have made birch furniture, lots have been made and it is good.

MR. H. EARLE: Have you got any idea how much these shoes should sell for a pair in order for us to get our money back; that we have invested in that plant?

MR. SAUNDERS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has asked a question? I could not answer that question, I am not a director of Koch Shoes. I do not know their cost, I know their selling price. And the opposition has said plenty of times and they have voted for this Government to spend money to create labour, yet they never paid back a cent for what we put in there, and they created fifty jobs for year around. It will be fifty people working, paying taxes. Then our money will come back through both Federal and Provincial taxes. We could get it back, that is what a lot of the companies are doing everywhere. And this is something I would say that the Minister, the Old Department of Welfare, is here

AN HON. MEMBER: Social Assistance and Rehabilitation.

MR. SAUNDERS: It is Social Assistance and Rehabilitation now - But, I wonder if he would put all the money he has to pay out for shoes, for the Island of Newfoundland, I wonder if he would say, or if the Opposition would ask, the Government to direct to the Minister concerned to specify all things being equal, to buy Newfoundland products. That is what Quebec does, Quebec do not even do that, Quebec says "you buy Quebec products, providing they are not over fifteen percent higher. Quebec says that - the Government of Quebec says that.

AN HON. MEMBER: To who?

MR. SAUNDERS: To any department of Government..

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD: (PREMIER): If I may assist my hon. friend, about three or four months after Confederation came, the Government of Canada having passed an order that for I think the first year of Confederation, any purchases that Government made in Newfoundland would be made from Newfoundland factories and so on, provided the price was not more than ten percent above the price they could get the same goods

for on the Mainland - and they kept that going for a year. They have done that. The Newfoundland Government passed an order which is still the Law of this Land. The Newfoundland Government have no choice. Every department of this government, ever since Confederation had no choice but to buy what ever good it buys, bed clothing, boots and shoes, anything that is made in Newfoundland. In anything that it buys, if it is made in Newfoundland it must buy the Newfoundland made goods provided it does not cost over fifteen per cent more than if it came in from the Mainland. That is the Law for this Government right now. We do that in Newfoundland right now. My hon friend, the Minister of Welfare (to use his old title) is not permitted to buy footwear except locally made, provided the locally made costs no more than fifteen per cent above the Mainland price. In all the institutions, the Penitentiary or whatever, this is the case. The minister of a department must buy Newfoundland made products, if they do not cost over fifteen per cent over the imports.

MR SAUNDERS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. the Premier for clarifying that situation. But it leads up to something else that I had to say; where he explained that the Government buy Newfoundland made products. What about all the money that the Government have to back up hospitals and everything, schools and no matter what the money is going into; can we say that you must give preference to Newfoundland products to keep a Newfoundlander working?

MR SMALLWOOD: If my hon. friend will allow me again - if the Government give money to the churches for their schools (because the Government do not own any schools, we do not run any - the churches do and we give them the money). We cannot tell them they must - maybe we can but we never have. Maybe we are a little scared to tell the churches that in spending this money you must give preference to Newfoundland products. I have asked them. I have gone to the Heads of Churches. I do know this much - the Roman Catholic Church, under the very kindly inspiration of the Archbishop, has seen to it that all Roman Catholic Schools have Newfoundland flooring (birch flooring or mahogany flooring or whatever flooring they can get in at the Birch Plant) Newfoundland plaster board, Newfoundland this, Newfoundland that, wherever they can do it that is done in all the Roman Catholic Schools. We have not been quite so successful in schools of the other churches.

MR SAUNDERS: Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for us to get the other churches - We got to keep Newfoundlanders working, we got to send their children to school and we got to help pay for it. So, why cannot we give them a decent living? That is one of the things we are lacking in. "Patronize home industry" - we have plenty of

home industries, we have paint, we have two paint factories here. I wonder how many Newfoundlanders, when they when they go to the store - when they look on the shelves - I am sure our paint is as good as any that can come from the Mainland. Cannot we make it possible that we can get two or three other people working in that plant by using local products. You will be surprised at the Mainland paint that is coming in here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hate to interrupt my hon. friend, I know he welcomes it, I would not do it otherwise. If he were on the other side, I would do it, whether they welcomed it or not. I have never known them yet to welcome it. But my hon. friend probably does and he will not mind yielding. Where there are two paint factories, and I have gone especially and particularly to Churchill Falls Power Corporation and all the contractors and demanded that they buy Newfoundland paint, and they have done so. And the paint factories here are extremely grateful, at least I know one of them is that got a large order. Extremely grateful for the order that is consumed in this Province at Churchill Falls. And they got a pretty good order - and other products that are made in Newfoundland are going to Churchill Falls through the intervention of this Government.

MR. SAUNDERS: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. the Premier again, I am getting information that is good for the people of Newfoundland. I still got confidence, but I wonder if the Newfoundland people are doing the same thing. The Premier is interested - he is going to ask the people to do it. Why do we not tell the people? Anything that this Government has to invest money in we want them to buy Newfoundland products. And you would be surprised - we will get it.

I checked another thing - we have a little factory, I do not know if you would call it a factory or what - here in St. John's, it has been sold lately but it has been an old established firm - Chaulker and Company. They are the only ones in Newfoundland manufacturing bacon and hams, fat pork, riblets etc.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman does not know what thin ice he is skating on now.

MR. SAUNDERS: I know what thin ice I am skating on now Sir, right Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER: There is not much Chaulker left in Chaulker and Company

MR. SAUNDERS: I would not be surprised, but I still say

MR. SPEAKER: Order please

MR. SAUNDERS: Mr. Speaker, I will still say it is a local industry, and we should patronize it. And if the Government is buying local products, they should buy our hams and bacons. Not as some contractors do - I am not certain

405

but I know there is some Government money going to a certain institution -
and as far as I can understand the furniture is coming in from the Mainland.
But I am sure if the hon. members will examine what is here you cannot beat
it down - it is as good as any furniture you can ever look at - there it is
locally made - competitive price - that factory is down to a skelton crew
that made that - why?

496

Why? Why? I would like to ask the contractors, the ones who are building those big buildings - why they are going on the mainland when we can keep a factory going in Newfoundland? Why? They have to come to the Government for money. The Government has to subsidize some of it. Here we are - we have furniture that can be equal to anything in this Province or anything in the dominion of Canada. Still, we cannot support home industry. No, oh no, we have got to go up on the mainland because it is - I do not know what is the matter, but it seems like it is better. It is not better. It is not as good. That factory that made this? Saunders and Howell at Carbonear - part of it.

Mr. Speaker, patronizing the home industry. I am glad I have got a full gallery tonight because some of them are going to hear it. They can listen, but they cannot speak and they cannot answer me back.

But, what I had for my supper tonight and I have had two or three times - I have had herring, Lunenburg, fish sticks from Lunenburg, smoked fish from Lunenburg - is this what we are going to patronize home industry, to create jobs?

SOME HON. MEMBER: I had rabbits from the West Coast.

MR. SAUNDERS: I am glad you did. This is something the Government is trying to promote. The Government is willing. They put money into it, but how can you expect, how can you expect - we have a man sitting here tonight who has tried his best just to promote it, sell it. Why will we not buy it? This is good? No, no, because there is a little better wrapping, maybe there is more money up there. Maybe the firm - I know the firm - I was there in Lunenburg and watched the firm. Maybe they have been longer there. They have made that a more attractive package, but there are still worms in the fish coming back from Lunenburg. It has been discovered last week - worms in the fish. We can fight them here in Newfoundland.

But, why is it we will not buy it. Oh, no, because it is Newfoundland. It is not good enough. We have got to go on the mainland, and then we are wondering what is the matter with Newfoundland, when we cannot create jobs. We are our own worst enemies. We want patronizing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I notice there is a new Department of Supply or a reorganization of the Department of Supply set up, which I am glad of, and they will look after, I am sure, under the leadership they have, that they will be looking into these things to make sure that what we purchase that it will be local products and maybe, in 1970, some of the things that we are bringing in from other provinces will be employing more men here to work.

I am, Mr. Speaker, speaking ^{to} this motion again, noncompetence, that the Government is not creating jobs. I may range - wide range a little bit, but so have the other members.

In the program of the fishery - the longliners which I see in this year - we have an act where there is going to be a bounty paid up to seventy-five feet. The longliner can be seventy-five feet which will give them a better boat, longer range which they have been asking for the last two or three years. They can stay awhile, come in, - right now, the last fine day we had, in my district, we had boats coming in with as high as 25,000 lbs. of fish. Now that was part of this Government, but it is also part of local industry.

The local industry, I would like to explain this, after the Government both Federal and Provincial, and the owner of that boat has supplied everything, the boat is there sitting by the wharf, ready to go, but not a thing to go fishing with. Someone has to have the initiative to say that I will advance that person \$8000.00 on credit. There are not too many Newfoundlanders today will say, I will give them \$8000.00 on credit and do not know if he is going to catch a fish. We have some of them. We have them in our district. We have them in the Carbonear district. We have them in the Harbour Grace district. We have them someplace around the Island, where we have fifty longliners over there. Now multiply that by \$8000.00 and you will see what an investment the people over there are putting in after they have the help from this Government and the Federal Government.

We have no confidence right here so we are told.

Now, I did hear from the Opposition how much it is going to cost to create jobs. Just one year after the Government has spent \$2000.00 to create one job. The Federal Government has spent \$2000.00 to create one job. Someone else on my district had to spend another \$2000.00 to create

the same job. Should it cost that much money to get four men in a longliner fishing? You have to sacrifice a lot.

Now, then, the Federal Government's share is over the years, the Provincial Government's share is over the years, but the man who has to supply that longliner - it is every year. Last year, I know one instance where a man for a firm supplying one boat - \$15,000.00 for to borrow that boat and when they landed the catch, they had 200 quintals of fish. They never expected to get it back. That is just a gamble. They did not come to the Government. They did not come in underneath and ask the Government to pay back.

Is the Government creating jobs? No confidence in the Government creating jobs. No, I am not talking about if there are men here able to handle how many jobs we are going to have at Come-by-Chance, but in the district that I have the honour to represent, the Government has helped to create this summer, providing, Lord willing, we are going to have the fish. We have never been a complete failure.

We are going to have 500 jobs - 500 jobs in our district supplied this year through the fishery. Now, take the 500 jobs - then they are saying there is no work. There was a scarcity last summer, we could not get men enough to go to work in the fish plant. This summer, we are even going to be worse. We are going to have to go up Trinity Bay. Well, it is a good thing because in Trinity Bay or half-ways up in Trinity Bay, they are going to be looking for men, too.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Yes, that is right. Haines' will have 200 there.

MR. SAUNDERS: Haines' is going to have the men up there, so we are - the labour force. That brings me - the hon. member from Trinity South has just said something. This is something else that torments me. I cannot help that I am a Newfoundlander.

During the Christmas season, I did trouble to go over to Janes'. I bought three cases of crabmeat, came in here and I distributed it to people who had never had crabmeat before. Everyone of them would come back and say, "What a delicious article"! Now, if the Newfoundlanders that are going to serve a lunch, will buy a tin of crabmeat instead of going out to the West Coast and buy it.

It is already in the supermarkets. They have not got this big advertising campaign. They are not one of the big seafood firms that they can advertise, so I will try advertising and ask you to go buy a tin. Ask your neighbour to buy a tin and if we buy three or four tins, you are going to keep someone else working - one or two more people. You are going to buy—maybe the next one you buy will be out in British Columbia. It is not as good but if maybe ~~you will not look at the~~ labels but I ask you the next time you go into that store, look up the label. See that it comes from C. Janes and Son in Hants Hr.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And while the hon. gentleman is at it, give a little boost at Bonavista, for making it at Bonavista, too.

MR. SAUNDERS: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping the member for Bonavista would correct because I would - I thought I would get a rise there. I know they ~~are~~ making it in Bonavista.

MR. BARBOUR: We ~~employ~~ Sir, eighteen ladies, because these are the people who have to handle the Queen crabmeat. —Here at Bonavista we put it up in five lb. packages. Now, we are experimenting on the tins - in cans. It is going to be a great success. Next year we hope to have 150 ladies there.

MR. SAUNDERS: Mr. Speaker, speaking as the Government in support of the Government on this I will have to say where we have created another little bit of work, that is done - I would like to thank the Minister of Mines, and Resources for.

During the last few years, I have been tormenting him to get roads in - excess roads further in our area where there are quite - a berry-picking area, but there has got - you have got to get in there. People will no longer take two buckets and walk ten miles. They want a pick-up or a car to be able to pick the berries and they have these new mechanical outfits to pick them.

So, this year, after a period of, say, three or four years, we have got roads in, we have had them about a year - we get them in so that they can get their pickups in over them, and this year does not seem much.

But, there are 4000 barrels of partridgeberries picked. Multiply that by \$35.00 in your spare time - by help from the Government. I am confident so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And they would be people of middle age and older.

500

MR. SAUNDERS: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Premier, I will give him one instance of a family - the man had one leg. He had a crutch, but he had his children, went in - he never applied to the Minister of -- I am sorry but I call him the Minister of Welfare. I am so used to calling him that that until I get used to his new portfolio -- Instead of applying to him for clothing, he looked at me and he said, "We can buy our clothing for school", We can buy everything. We are outfitted. We picked \$500.00 worth of berries. Now I got a credit and you cannot earn a living - this Government is not helping. This Government is helping with everything.

In another instance - I will not the name the person - but a doctor, in the district last summer,--

SOME HON. MEMBER: The hon. member is giving the Government credit for a good crop of berries.

MR. SAUNDERS: Mr. Speaker, I am not giving the Government credit for a good crop of berries. No! I am giving the credit - the Government credit for burning the ground and for making the ^{road} accessible to get in there. What I had harped on - what I had asked for - they could not have got. They could not have got half that money, unless this Government had gone in and done something.

This is what I am giving them credit for. This is why I have confidence. And I have confidence, that this summer, that I will get something else done - to maybe to increase that \$400,000.00 to \$500,000.00 - it is another \$100,000.00, and in a small district like what I represent, every dollar counts.

What I was going to say - we supply --

I was going to say we supply bounty and gill nets. That is something else, we do not do anything. But one person, one doctor last summer in my district had before he went in his clinic in the morning - landed 2,500 pound of salmon. It cannot be done, because the Government through the Minister of Fisheries has seen fit even to go to Japan and bring in their gill nets - it could be handled easy with a small outboard motor - but we would never have it I am sure - we would still have the old squid jigger even - if someone with a foresight, like our Premier did not turn around and jump the gun and say, look let us see what is better than our great grandfathers had, let us see if we cannot improve something. Well there is an instance. If that man had to take the old fashioned, uptodate, he could no more do it than I could.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many things this Government is helping with. Down in the district that I represent we do not have everything. We need so many things, but the money does not grow on trees. We cannot pay the sick. We cannot give the crippled children, we cannot give the orphans, we cannot give to everyone, and still have money - to throw away - you know like some people think it is there like a shovel, you can shovel it out. We cannot expect that.

But the Federal Government with the support of the Minister of Fisheries and this Government here. We have a new breakwater built at Old Perlican, that is going to be a great help there. We have a new wharf built at Bay de Verde with the pressure from here. We have no confidence in them, but I have confidence, because when I come to him - I have already come to the Minister of Fisheries this year, and I have great confidence that he is going to work hard to get what I want for my district this year.

I am sure Mr. Speaker, that instead of saying no confidence in this Government - I wonder if the hon. members of the Opposition will say - we have no confidence in ourselves, we are not doing enough. Thank you.

MR. ROWE (W.N.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on the amendment, in the vote of no confidence in the Government - and to give some reasons in my opinion are valid reasons for supporting the present administration. But before I do so Sir, I would like to refer to something which was mentioned here today by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. A statement which he made concerning and by innuendo implicating every member of this Government, every Cabinet

Minister. And before saying what I have to say on that subject I want the hon. member to know Sir that I bear him no malice whatsoever. It is not him, it is the statement - the statement which he made, which causes me to become a little anxious about the honour and integrity of this hon. House.

I wish to deprecate and utterly denounce Sir, the statement made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, concerning the rumour he says which states that members of this Cabinet, this Government are shareholders of Prince Philip Place, or Philip Place, the building down the road in any event, because I feel that making such a statement as that, the hon. gentleman has impuned the honour of every member of the Government, and has imputed to every member of the Government by innuendo, disreputable conduct in carrying out their duties - their official duties on behalf of Newfoundland.

And it makes no difference Sir in my estimation, that he says that, he does not say it, it is only a rumour he is reporting to the House. As a matter of fact, it is worse in my estimation to couch a statement in those terms. As your Honour knows being a lawyer, the law of slander does not allow a man to escape from the penalties of law, and damages given as law, by saying, by allowing that man to say, "well I do not say it, it is only a rumour that I have heard and repeated it". Because the law fully realizes that more as much as at least, and probably more damage can be done to a person's reputation and integrity in the eyes of the public by stating that it is a rumour going around. And therefore, not being able to pinpoint exactly where the allegation comes from.

What if some maniac were to approach the hon. gentleman and say, I hear that a member of the Government is involved in such and such ^{is} reputable conduct. Is it proper for him to come in this House and say he has heard that the hon. member, or the hon. minister is involved in that type of conduct. What about if I, Sir, as a member of this House, were to come in and say quite falsely, that the hon. gentleman himself was the head of a baseball association.

I have heard that he has never submitted an audited report concerning the operations of that association. You would deny it. You are able to deny it - who can deny it here when no one is named and it comes from nobody. What about if ex-members of the Cabinet, if I were to say about them, that they for example, quite falsely, were giving business to business associates when they were members of this Cabinet, and I have that, that is what they were doing - I do not know, but I have heard. Would it be proper for me to do so? I do not

think so Sir. I am naturally concerned about the honour of myself and this hon. House and in the Government, and the honour of all the colleagues with whom I am associated. But I am more concerned about the honour of this House itself, and the dignity of this House itself in the eyes of the public.

Surely the hon. member, the hon. Leader of the Opposition must realize that by making such remarks and making such imputations, it is bound to bring a reply from members of this side of the House, perhaps at the same low level. Perhaps there will be a recriminatory remark hurled back at him at some later date. And this can only ^{add} to the bitterness and the acrimony which has been going on in this House for the past three or four days. And it can only destroy I submit your Honour, the dignity and respect of this House, in the eyes of the public.

And does the hon. the Leader of the Opposition think that by making such a remark he himself can escape from the impression which will be left in the eyes of the public that all politicians are just a bunch of crooks - dirty politics - politicians are scoundrels. I would submit Sir that by making such remarks concerning hon. members of this House, he will live to regret it himself, because it does nothing but lower the dignity and the honour and the integrity of every member of this House, and I wish to disassociate myself from any of that type of remark - any type of bitterness or acrimony or manifestation of frustration which we have seen going on in the House recently. And I will not say anything more about it Sir, except I will not be associated with that type of remark.

To continue with my original purpose of standing here tonight to support, to give reasons why the Government should be supported. I would like to inform the House that I had been for several long months, involved in preparation for the Government, of a white paper of proposals and information concerning the economic and social development of Newfoundland and Labrador in the '70's. And I hope before very long that I will be in a position to table such a white paper on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

In the meantime Sir I would like to give some indications of my own feelings and the feelings of the Government on developments ^{both} social and economic in this Province. Though we in the Province of Newfoundland and

504

Labrador have been passing through a period of very rapid change - we must always possess a clear and unmistakable awareness, that the world around us, particularly the western world around us, has also been passing through perhaps even more revolutionary changes. Relatively recently, technological forces have taken a major jump into the electronic age, and related to this technology, major contemporary economic trends such as those of automation have emerged, and have to be taken care of as best we can.

Even the basic framework Mr. Speaker, of the Capitalist System as we know it, has been altered, and is altering profoundly - owing to the deep depressions and less serious recessions and alternate bouts of inflation that have regularly plagued Capitalist economies in the past. The Capitalist System has been transformed and is being transformed from its classical pattern.

In its place is emerging I would say a more rational system, more capable of generating sustained continuous and orderly growth. New theories of economic management involving long terms social policies have led to smoother growth as well.

And this new experience of prolonged periods of sustained development, has tended to overcome traditional modes of resistance and thought regarding government intervention in the operation of any economic system, and economic planning perspectives - the whole aspect of economic planning, which have developed throughout the world represent a major political force towards new approaches in this decade of the 70's.

The emergence of what the Canadian born economist J. H. Galbraith has labelled the "affluent society" has produced staggering new social forces as well. And these complexities as if they were not enough were compounded by the sophisticated media of communication which bring the world into our homes and alter the nature of social values and generate a far wider range that is strongly felt human needs. And a sudden revolution in my recent lifetime, and I am not very old, a sudden revolution of expectations that has put incredible new strain on the body politics of Newfoundland and Canada and North America.

All of these various institutional shifts as they have been called indicate - institutional developments rather, your Honour, indicate the very shifts are taking place between the various institutions in Canada. These forces are evident in such things among others as the concept of participatory democracy in the recent debates and talks about changing the Constitution, and

the strenuous efforts being made to decrease and get rid of regional disparity in this country. In Newfoundland the Government has also made strenuous attempts to meet these changes, and to channel rationally these social forces by the implementation of different social and and economic programs, together with and probably far more importantly, lengthy and protracted and strong demands and negotiations with the Government of Canada to hurry up with their job of reducing regional disparity, and regional unfairness.

But in such an environment of change which I have been describing your Honour, there is a great premium on the ability of the people of this Province, and on the economy of this Province, and on the Government of this Province, to respond in the right way to these opportunities and these challenges.

The economy of Newfoundland must expand at a growth rate not only to bring the population, our population, an increasing level of standard living, but also progressively and rapidly increase the disparity

506

Newfoundland must expand at a growth rate sufficient not only to bring the population, our population an increasing level^{of} standard of living but also progressively and rapidly decrease the disparity in the difference which exist between us and the rest of Canada, or otherwise we will not have a population in the Province.

This latter task I have mentioned is the major and the most difficult one. And it simply cannot be attained by a passive attitude on the part of industry or on the part of commerce or on the part of labour or on the part of Government. we are waiting these things to happen to us or for some fairy godmother to come along and do them for us. It requires as well, an exceedingly positive attitude on the part of all our people, towards the necessary adjustments which are taking place, and a positive and energetic approach and response to all these challenges.

The Government of Newfoundland in my opinion, has pursued these objectives aggressively in the past, and has committed itself, to the responsibility of working towards meeting these requirements. The Government of Canada again has finally accepted the general responsibility of endeavouring and trying to maintain high rates of growth and expansion of national income and employment and for the more equitable distribution the more fair distribution of that national income and activity and growth. It has finally assumed the responsibility of trying to insure that this growth takes place in ^{the} weaker regions of Canada as well as the stronger ones, and consequently in 1969 it established the department of Regional Economic Expansion, popularly known as DREE. To assist industries to become located in less developed areas like Newfoundland by providing direct incentives to industrial firms and by helping the appropriate provinces Newfoundland is one of them, to provide the necessary infrastructure, social capital or public services accompanying these developments and for general growth.

But, again Sir, I would submit, it must be fully realized that this Province can not simply coast on these increased federal efforts nor is it believed by myself or by the Government that the people of Newfoundland harbour any such wish. It is true, of course, that the Government of Newfoundland has long recognized that is totally incapable by itself of providing the scope of expansion in financial investment and activity that is required. And of course, as the Premier mentioned the other day we are accordingly pleased that what this Government has heard for almost decades has now become a new federal concept of providing assistance to help meet Newfoundland among other provinces meet Newfoundland's development and industrial requirements. But nevertheless it must

be stressed that in no way is the Government of Canada taking over completely such areas of responsibilities, but is merely providing a much needed and a much desired measure of assistance. And there can be no argument concerning the rectitude or rightness or the fairness of our receiving special assistance. It is at least Mr. Speaker, as warranted and as merited as external aid to underdeveloped countries outside the nation. And it is justified by the nature of our economy with its vulnerability with its lack of protection and defence to various forces outside of our control altogether. And this vulnerability is lack of protection. must be reduced, must be gotten rid of, so that we can become a self-reliant region, and a region which can stand on its own feet.

Yet the Government and people of this Province must continue to do their share and even expand much further the potential role which Government and electorate alike can play in assuring our continued and rapid economic development.

We have heard a lot all over the Province and in this House about the need for employment, the desperate need for employment and there can be no doubt looking at the situation as an observer, that there is a great need for employment. But I thought for a moment, Sir, that I would perhaps illustrate this need, this desperate need, by certain key basic data, basic information concerning our general situation taking the period from 1961 to 1967 for which reliable statistics are now available and projecting those statistics on into 1968 and 1969. And I look first at the most basic of all statistics namely, those of our population, those of our people, in terms of population and in terms of our labour force. In that period which I have mentioned 1961, - 67, -68 ; 69, our population rose from just over 450,000 nearly 460,000. In the 1961 census, too it is estimated about 515,000 in mid 1969. Newfoundland's population increased at a rate more than twice as high as the neighbouring Maritime Provinces, but not as fast as the national rate which was boasted of course, by immigration. Various estimates, depending on whether you are gloomy or optimistic can be made of our future population. Depending on the forecast of the rate of natural increase and of net migration which is the most important one, and the most desperate one,, The birthrate is declining but it is still relatively high, the net migration/^{rate} will depend largely if not completely on the rate of employment creation in this Province, which will determine how many of our emerging native labour force can expect to find adequate opportunity here they will not stay otherwise, and also of course how many will be attracted here. If new recent trends continue favourably we can expect a population of about

600,000 people in Newfoundland and Labrador by the end of this decade, by the end of the 70's. If on the other hand all developments are less favourable and I do not think that will be the case, we may expect a levelling off of population increase. We are therefore, Mr. Speaker, faced with the task of providing jobs for our expanding labour force. Our labour increased from about 113,000 in 1961 to about 147,000 in 1969. Even if our population does not expand beyond the present level we would still be faced with the necessity of generating a multitude of new jobs for three basic reasons. First, of course, there is the unemployed group of people in the Province, while in 1961 there were 23,000 unemployed in the Province, and while these numbers have been significantly reduced to about 14,000 in 1968, we are still faced with reducing the unemployment rate further as this rate of unemployment represents almost ten per cent in 1968 of the labour force compared with the national rate of just under five per cent in that year.

Accordingly, even with the present labour force which we have we need to generate about 7000 new jobs merely to reduce the unemployment rate to the more acceptable if not completely satisfactory national level of unemployment.

Secondly, Sir and just as importantly, we have a sizable sector of people in this Province of actually under employed people who have a terribly low earning power in their present work to permit a transfer of such eligible people into more productive employment will, it is estimated require an additional minimum of 10,000 jobs with our present population.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In addition to the seven.

MR. ROWE: In addition to the seven.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There will still be five per cent unemployed.

MR. ROWE: Thirdly, there is the major sector, a hidden sector not immediately obvious to all, of potentially under-employed and unemployed people in this Province. We have an extremely low participation rate in the labour force in Newfoundland and Labrador. Of the total labour force, old enough to take part in work, old enough to participate, only about 45.4 per cent, around 45 per cent did so in 1966 compared to almost 49 per cent in the Maritime Provinces and compared to even higher ratio in Canada as a whole, among males, among men this low participation rate is very pronounced for age categories over 45. But it is even more pronounced among women among the female population of the Province where only less than 23 per cent of women participated in 1966 compared to 28 per cent in the Maritime Provinces and about 33 per cent nationally.

The participation rate in this Province is lower among women than in the Maritime Provinces for each age group except, and this is where the danger lies, except for the youngest age group capable of working 15 to 19 years of age. There we are higher.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There we participate more.

MR. ROWE: There we participate more. And it is an indication of what we have to face in the immediate future.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That would be in shops, fish plants, secretaries and offices, female age grouping of what?

MR. ROWE: Fifteen to nineteen years of age.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have a high percentage, higher than other provinces, but lower in other age groups. Why would that be? They get married sooner here.

MR. ROWE: I am about to deal with it Your Honour, perhaps it will emerge as I continue on with my remarks. The decline of birthrate, answer partially at least the Premier's question, and the changing attitudes of women in this Province and there is no doubt about the changing attitudes of women in the Province, indicate that employment opportunities will have to be generated for those women wishing to participate in the Newfoundland labour force or they will leave the Province and this will in turn have a further adverse effect on our population. We must expect an increase of at least 10 per cent in the female participation rate over the next 10 years, making necessary the creation of about 15,000 additional jobs.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is the hon. minister saying we may expect this, or we ought to have it or is likely to have it, which is it?

MR. ROWE: What I am saying Your Honour is that, there will be this much of an increase in the female labour force expecting work and if there is no work here they will not remain here. They will go abroad, to do their nursing or their secretarial work.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why may we expect that, because higher grades of education as they pour out of the schools?

MR. ROWE: It is that, and is the declining birth rate which effects employment mothers with fewer children to look after, and as, again as I mentioned the changing attitudes in this Province concerning women working,

MR. SMALLWOOD: More than will want to go out and work, rather than stay home.

MR. ROWE: That is right. And this 15,000 additional jobs for the female labour force will be necessary even if the present size of the potential female labour

force were to remain the same. I am not taking into account Your Honour any increase in the labour force of women beyond the potential which we could have now if the ten per cent more wanted to work. Thus even, if the total population were to remain stationary, were not to increase we would for the three reasons I have given require new job creation of about 32,000 over the next decade or at least 3000 per year if we are going to stagger it over the decade. But Your Honour that is only half the story I have only referred to a labour force remaining at the present level in addition every 10,000 increase in our population means that about 6000 more people will be in the labour force age group, for whom there will have to be at least 3000 jobs available thus if the population rises to 600,000 by the end of this decade, there will be a need, there will need to be a further additional minimum of 30,000 jobs to support ^{it}/_{or} about another 3000 jobs per year.

Your Honour these are the key facts and the basic facts of our situation in this Province. We will have to generate 3000 jobs per year merely to meet the expectations of the present population and probably another 3000 jobs annually for the expected increase in population. Consequently we must, we have to, realistically set as our target the creation of up to 6000 new jobs per year, and it is this

and it is this basic fact of life in Newfoundland and Labrador which has determined the main line of our strategy to combat unemployment in the white paper which I referred to earlier and which will be tabled by the Government in the House shortly.

But your honour, again this only gives one part of the picture. Entirely aside from the need to create additional jobs - we are also confronted with the absolute necessity of increasing productivity and incomes for the existing jobs in this Province. Over the same period which I gave 1961 - 67 the gross national product of Canada rose by 65.6 percent. During that period Newfoundland's production of goods and services, the gross provincial product rose by about 62 percent - 61.9. So that our output per capita - per person probably kept pace with the national averages on a relative basis, it probably fell back on an absolute basis. But if we are to raise our incomes we must raise the productivity of our workers in this Province closer to the national level - and the necessity of raising our production per worker is corroborated and supported and sustained by the income measurements which we presently have.

During the same period again 61 - 67, Newfoundland's total personal income rose by 66.4 percent, 66 percent, slightly surpassing the national increase of 65.6 percent, about a percentage point above the national increase for the same period.

HON. J.R.SMALLWOOD (Premier): Would the hon. minister allow me to interrupt him. He argues that we must have a considerable increase in the productivity of our labour force in the coming ten years - does he mean by that - that in paper mills and mines and the fishing industry and factories the average producer, the average worker must in the next ten years be producing per man or per woman by means of not working personally harder necessarily, exerting themselves more physically, moving faster, but rather by means of automation, mechanization, improvement of management, apparatus and machinery - is that what the hon. minister means?

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Yes your honour, basically that is what I mean, but also efficiency in plants, and industries, and in manufacturing plants, general efficiency but also a need to grant or enable our working population to acquire more and better skills in these industries so that they can raise with an equal level of efficiency in the plant, they can also themselves have an equal output with someone say in Toronto, or anywhere in Ontario because of their own equal skills in that job. We were able Sir to close slightly the relative

gap between ourselves and the nation as a whole as our productivity relatively went up higher than the nation as a whole.

But it will be noted Sir, that the absolute gap between our per capita income, and the average per capita income, although we went up higher than the national rate on a relative basis, the absolute gap had actually increased from \$630.00 back in 1961 to almost \$890.00 in 1967. So the absolute gap - the absolute disparity continues to increase as time goes on. These figures your honour, well, ^{should} obviously impel us all to try to close the income gap faster. If we can force our productivity in this Province to rise faster than the national rate we might reasonably target our reducing, with federal help - that absolute gap I was talking about to a level of less than say \$500.00, or \$400.00 or \$300.00 per capita as a more acceptable price for the privilege of living in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador - and it's obvious advantages compared to the other parts of Canada.

As our incomes rise, this in turn could mean that we could reduce the relative gap to about fifteen percent or even less, and of course it gets less as the figures get higher. Thus, our minimum target with federal assistance becomes an effort to reduce our disparity in income levels by achieving at the very least, eighty-five percent of the national average income levels, certainly a more acceptable if not completely satisfactory and we should of course aim to go about that.

We envisage the Government of Canada helping us in this major effort to reduce our income gap to that point, but beyond that point your honour - I fear that we in Newfoundland and Labrador ought to expect - we might not want it but we ought to expect certain leveling off of enthusiasm on the part of the Government of Canada - the other Provincial Governments God knows, there is little enough enthusiasm now on their part - and the people of Canada generally as the competition for federal funds throughout this nations continues to increase. Therefore, we in this Province ourselves, should be prepared for the extra thrust - the extra thrust necessary to bridge the remainder of this gap. Again a major element in this push must be programmed as designed to increase efficiency and productivity - and again your honour in this white paper I referred to strategies are being laid out, and have been laid out to accomplish this purpose.

The third strategy which we have in mind among others, is designed to facilitate the necessary structural changes in public services which will take longer to be felt - and have a less defined effect compared with the other strategies I have mentioned - but this includes the provision of infra structure

and resource development programs which are absolutely necessary, if we are going to have good industrial development in this Province.

These three strategies which I have mentioned and which will be gone into later in this hon. House all involve major investments of Government capital Provincial and Federal - in industry, in utilities, in municipal servicing, in housing and in all the various range of municipal and institutional services. It may take an investment of many thousands of dollars for each new job created - but it can be seen Sir, that investment levels are a highly significant measure of the direction in which any economy is growing, and of how that economy is preparing itself for the future - and very significantly again Mr. Speaker, is the fact that such investments - a high level of investments have been made and are being made in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador from which we can expect with assurance a major pay-off during the years of this present decade.

An important measure of vitality of this Province which gives me at least confidence that we can expect to attain the objective which we are setting for ourselves, is the volume of new investments and expenditures or investment expenditures being made here on a per capita basis per person in this Province. In 1961, new investment expenditures were made totalling almost \$450.00 for each person in Canada, while in Newfoundland the rate was \$402.00 or ninety percent of the national rate. In 1968, investment expenditures had accelerated to over \$750.00 for each person in Canada - but in this Province the investment expenditures had attained a level of over \$800.00 - \$819.00 per capita by 1968, or more Mr. Speaker than eight percent higher than the national rate of investments per capita in this nation. And I submit Sir, that this favourable trend by this Province must be maintained almost at all costs.

Now Sir, there is one final matter I would like to deal with before I sit down, namely the development objectives - what are our objectives in this Province? What can we reasonably expect to attain in the next ten years and beyond in the Province of Newfoundland and in Labrador in all the circumstances? There is a great deal of literature and knowledge available on development, much of it related to specific experiences in particular areas and situations - we have had in our efforts, and the Government and the department - we have had to select what is most appropriate to our own situation - the Federal Government recognizes that our development situation is far different in many respects from that of other Provinces of Canada, and has shown a great deal of flexibility in adjusting it's DREE program to our specific and particular regional development needs.

514

The objectives which we set for ourselves, can be distilled into a relatively simple statement of what the Government wishes to carry out. The basic objective is not new - it is by creating job opportunities through industrial expansion to reduce unemployment and under - employment in the Province. The complications of course, and there are complications or we would not have arguments in this hon. House in the past few days - the complications grown out of the fact that change is an exceedingly complex and complicated matter involving a multitude - a multitude of economic and basic social factors. Many desired changes can be frustrated through inertia - lack of energy, lack of drive and desire to accomplish our objectives - through lack of communication, and this has happened in the past - I would submit between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and not, I would submit because of our fault.

Through lack of adequate knowledge of skills or through inadequacy in the administrative machinery for implementation, and in general - and in general, and most importantly through a lack of adequate concepts - ideas, bigness of concept and ideas of how to achieve these objectives - and of course the means of reaching these desired ends are often very complex. One of the prime requirements of this Government, and of the people of this Province is a realistic appraisal of what possible economic roles our regional economy can play effectively so that it can work itself into a condition where it can provide good incomes, in competition with other economies which may aspire to similar roles. That is our basic problem. We have had a traditional role as suppliers of fish products - pulp and paper and minerals - these are primary products which in some cases have yielded good incomes but which in general have not raised the Provincial economy above a relatively weak condition. We must continue to aspire to new roles your honour in fish production, in wood and mineral utilization, and to activities which will provide opportunities for using the higher levels of skills which our improved educational system is now producing and which will yield incidentally - higher incomes.

Apart from the utilization of raw materials presently available to us, we must continue unstintingly to inquire into and to study the possibility of any supplementary activities which can use other elements of our whole situation - such as our geographic location - our deep water ports potential - our access to other materials still untapped. We have been, in this Government your honour been approaching - we have been approaching and must continue to approach these possibilities imaginatively - yet, realistically. We must keep probing and

remain on the alert for any openings that may lead to the break-throughs which we are all anxiously and eagerly seeking.

In the first instance therefore, we must continue to play the role of an explorer of new possibilities with respect to what we already have, and what we might achieve. Moreover, we in this Province want economic well-being enough, not only to plan for it - that is easy enough to do - you can hire your consultants, but to work for it against almost overwhelming.....

for almost overwhelming odds at every turn. We in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, above all other Provinces cannot afford to be willing, merely to let things happen in the hope that somehow the problems will sort themselves out or disappear. Not only the Government, the elected members and the Civil Service but also the industrial community and the financial community must be willing to commit themselves to a larger conception of our role and our destiny in Canada. By this I do not mean and the Government does not mean to suggest that we should assume a task that is so unrealistically large that we cannot possibly achieve it. But we should work on a number of fronts as we have been doing to determine new possible roles in Canada, we should in the future as in the past as lead by the hon. the Premier of this Province, pursue these roles in magnetism and dauntlessly.

When the Newfoundland Government committed itself to this type of objective, the commitment was to realistic and disciplined as well as imaginative action and planning in order that fundamental changes can occur in our outlook and in our approach. The Government and people of Newfoundland must always make sure they they retain the initiative no matter what amounts of Federal money and financial assistance come into this Province, because we the residents of this Province are primarily concerned and we the residents of this Province must be always on guard against the possibility of encroachments on our constitutional sphere of influence and activity and responsibility. Working with the Federal Government, however, and its reservoir of skills and money, we should be able to develop the concepts and the attitudes and the incentives to establish a larger and more positive role for Newfoundland and Labrador in the economic sphere of Canada.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that a rational role for Newfoundland and Labrador involves the following examples of what I have been trying to announce. It involves a fully developed fisheries industry capable of competing favourably with foreign fleets for the resources which are after all adjacent to us, on the basis of a full range of products, on the basis of efficient catching, processing to the ultimate food forms with Newfoundland

being recognized as having a quality superiority in this field. A full marketing program which we hoped will be helped out by the Federal Government very soon and rapid transportation of products to markets which are fully serviced. The Government of Canada is helping us to move faster in those directions but obviously much still depends on us, both Government and the fishing industry alike.

Secondly, Sir, a rational and sensible role for Newfoundland and Labrador involves: optimal and good and maximum management in utilization of our wood and our mineral resources and full development of the resources as I have mentioned for the fishing industry.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, a rational and sensible role for Newfoundland and Labrador to play is a fully developed array, a fully developed set of specialized industries which are based on marine transportation of bulk, raw materials or products. Our Island position, the Island of Newfoundland should not be regarded as a handicap or a cost-increasing factor but rather as a means for reducing costs in large scale assembly of raw materials for specialized production and this your ^{Honour} is the real meaning of the ERCO breakthrough in Long Harbour and of the Come-by-Chance and Stephenville developments and we have further such prime locations in this Province at Mortier Bay and Bay d'Espoir and Labrador, areas in Labrador and hopefully in Argentina.

Fourthly, your Honour apart from the value of our location for industry itself, for the industries I have just described there exists the possibility of marine transshipment between the Atlantic on the east and the Great Lake system on the west and between the northern waters and the Atlantic seaboard to the south. A cursory glance, the nearest glance at a map indicates immediately that Newfoundland is nothing but a gigantic wharf projecting out into the North West Atlantic ocean and we must continue to make every effort to develop this advantage.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A look at a globe is even more graphic.

MR. ROWE ^(W.N.) Fifthly, your Honour by way of example, there are a number of other specialized types of secondary manufacture which may be available to us. Some of these may be related to further specialized use of our raw materials, some to the availability of labour and some to the availability of power.

and these have to be proceeded with and looked into without any looking back or any niggardly approach to developing these potentials.

These your Honour are the fundamental objects to which our economy should continue to be oriented and which provide the basic answers to why we have acted as we have and why we want to act in the future, in certain ways. Within such an expanded framework of economic development, every Newfoundlander, every Newfoundlander man or woman should realistically hope and expect to find here an individual role for himself or herself without having to flock of to Toronto or Montreal.

These are the general long term objectives of this Government. Some of them may be realized in part within the coming decade, some in the decade after that, and some may not be realized in full until the last decade of this century. But they must be translated and they are being translated by this Government into more specific sets of goals within narrower time frames, such as five year periods, in order that we may be able to plan reasonable concrete achievements within specific time periods and this your Honour is what we are doing.

In the initial period of our planning and our developing of the seventies, the decade of the seventies, we must recognize the general credit stringencies and with that in mind do what we can within the financial resources immediately available to us. We must develop further the long term planning capability, and the administrative mechanism for implementing short term plans. That your Honour is what we are doing. We must concentrate on catching up on infrastructure essential to development, such as transportation, and on bolstering centres experiencing growth now or capable of growth in the future and that Mr. Speaker is what this Government is doing. We must facilitate the immediate development of resource-based industries, where the way is open for job creation and facilitate the preparation for longer term development in these sectors of minerals, fisheries and mining and that, Mr. Speaker, is what this Government is doing. We must develop further our basic information processing and our information retrieval capability with computers and what not and that, Mr. Speaker, is what this Government is doing.

519

The Department of Community and Social Development, which I have the honour to be the Minister of has accordingly established a framework for a set of development strategies which I have already referred to, which will enable us to move ahead on such fronts as are open to us at this time. With these strategies your Honour, I fully believe with complete confidence and assurance that we will have in the 1970's in Newfoundland a brilliant social and economic development program. Thank you.

MR. CROSBIE Mr. Speaker, on the earlier Point of Privilege, Mr. Speaker, something that has just come to my attention since your Honour gave his ruling on whether or not there had been a prima facie breach of privilege tonight. I had not noticed then, but it refreshed my memory, a report in the Evening Telegram of last night's debate. The hon. Minister of Health had reported to the House an independent feasibility study on the proposed oil refinery at Come-by-Chance..

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman is completely out of order. He is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking on a Point of Privilege now or is the hon. member reopening a matter that has already been closed.

MR. CROSBIE: There are two facts that have come to my attention.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not in order, because it is simply a matter of raising an issue on which a decision has already been given and if we go on with this - no ruling will stand for any length of time, if it can be raised and we have to go over the whole issue all over again. We have done that. If there is something that the hon. member has to raise, there is another way of doing things, but you cannot raise on a Point of Privilege now on an issue that has already been closed.

MR. CROSBIE: They are contradicting one another. Last night the minister said there was a study done.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question on the amendment?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Divide. Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Will all those in favour of the Amendment, please rise.

The Hon. The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickey, Mr. Collins, Mr. Earle, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Wells, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Myrden, Mr. Burgess.

Those against the Amendment, please rise.

The Hon. the Premier, The Hon. the President of the Council, The Hon. Mr. Lewis, The Hon. The Minister of Highways, The Hon. the Minister of Public Affairs and Housing, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Strickland, The Hon. the Minister of Public Works, The Hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, The Hon. the Minister of Community and Social Development, The Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, The Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, Mr. Canning, Mr. Barbour, The Hon. the Minister of Fisheries, The Hon. the Minister of Supply, Mr. Saunders, Mr. Mahoney, Mr. Wornell.
I declare the Amendment lost.

MR. T. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me offer my congratulations to the hon. gentleman who moved and seconded the Address and Reply to the Speech from the Throne. And while I did not necessarily agree with their impressions of this Speech there is no doubt in my mind that their sincerity with reference to that document was genuine and on a personal note. It was rather unfortunate that neither of these gentleman are here tonight. There are not too many people whom I have met in my travels than I have more respect for, and for whom I genuinely feel have made a massive contribution towards the welfare and progress of their country and Province. And whose contribution to validly in Parliament Proceedings leaves nothing to be desired. That is the two hon. gentlemen, former Minister of Health, and the former Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the various speeches in the Address and Reply we have been told of the merit and the shortcomings of this Government policy from both sides of the House. And since I am the only member sitting in this House who is not environmentally involved in the problems and workings of the Island part of the Province. There is not that much pregnant comment which I can make to the Speech from the Throne.

In the main it deals with the proposed direction of the Island part of the Province and with the exception of the reference to the possible expansion of the Iron Ore Complex at Labrador City and the possible harnessing of the Lower Churchill, it deals mainly with the Island part of the Province.

The reference in the Speech to the development of the Lower Churchill and the gigantic number of kilowatt hours to be produced are truly fantastic. The reference in this section of the speech and I quote, "such production would place Newfoundland among the greatest sources of hydro electric power in the world." It

521

gives the people of Newfoundland and Labrador great satisfaction indeed to know that the Churchill River and watershed is only one of several great potentials sources of hydro electric power in Labrador."

That quote, Mr. Speaker, that statement is precise to the point and highly accurate. Great satisfaction indeed. There is no doubt in my mind that the established of the great Iron Ore Complex of Labrador City and Wabush were a great source of satisfaction to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. There is no doubt in my mind that the establishment of the American Air Force Base and Canadian Air Base at Goose Bay were the great source of satisfaction to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. A great source of satisfaction indeed. There is no doubt in my mind that the establishment of the American facilities at Cartwright, which are now a Marconi Station were a great source of satisfaction, to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

But, unfortunately for these people, for those people who come from Labrador, the people who have gone from the Island to live in Labrador, and the people who have come from the rest of the world and reside in Labrador, that is all there is for them, because of the development in Labrador, great satisfaction. And they are supposed to be very grateful - great satisfaction indeed. The satisfaction takes the place of roads, ^{does} it takes the place of communication? Does it takes the place of civilization? Does it take the place of Government services and tax dollars go to pay for? I respectfully submit, Sir, it does not. Great satisfaction indeed. The proposed intention as announced in the Speech from the Throne, the proposed intention of the Iron Ore Company of Canada to expand their Iron Ore Complex at Labrador City, Mr. Speaker, I will say very little about this, because all it states is that there maybe an expansion. And in this regard a great deal depends on the Federal Government, and particularly our Federal Minister of Finance, Mr. Benson with his white paper on taxation, and it states in the Speech from the Throne that it would be tragic if the extension of this development were to be delayed or abandoned because of the intentions of the Federal Government in this field of taxation.

Now, since my background, Mr. Speaker, before being elected to this Hon. House ~~was~~ Labour. I will make reference to that part of the Speech, Mr. Speaker, which deals with Labour Legislation and the Minimum Wage Laws. The proposed intention of Government to repeal legislation which had certified the International Woodworkers of America, Mr. Speaker, while the principal is good, the principal of repealing this legislation is good, I submit Sir, that it is no more than a

sop to the Labour Movement. In that there are no I.W.A. Locals in this Province and neither are there likely to be any I.W.A. Locals in this Province in the near future, because their main source of membership would be the woods workers themselves and they are organized and there are agreements between unions that they do not trespass on each others jurisdiction. So the repeal of this legislation in effect, Sir, means nothing.

In my opinion it would be a far greater service to labour, if an appeal is being made to labour, to see stated Government policy to the effect of ensuring that other workers in this Province who are paid pitfully low wages, and who are forbidden to strike have established a method of seeing and ensuring that there are reasonable demands are met, and these demands to be ascertained by a third party and by that Mr. Speaker, I am referring to a conciliation procedure or an arbitration procedure. And when I talk about the workers and the essential services that are not allowed to strike, I am referring mainly, Mr. Speaker, to the police force, the firefighters and the hospital workers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will the hon. member permit a question? Are they subject to the conciliation proceedings?

MR. BURGESS: This is a fact - to answer the hon. gentleman's question, they are subject to the conciliation proceedings, but unfortunately when the recommendations are handed down by this Conciliation Board, they are never acted upon, and it seems that negotiations are always coming up just before Budget time. And they are always told to wait for the Budget, and this was the result of the strike in 1957. This is exactly the same set of conditions that we were faced with in 1967, when the strike did occur in the Grand Falls hospital.

Now I will talk about the firefighters. The firefighters of St. John's Mr. Speaker. I have some friends in the firefighters in St. John's, and I believe that they are very sensibly doing some lobbying now, in that they are approaching most members of the House with this brief. It is a submission on salaries, and fringe benefits and working conditions.

Their case have been taken up by the N.G.E.A. and as I have said Mr. Speaker, they are doing a lobby on their own to see if they can gain support from members of this hon. House for their cause. And in my discussions with them today, I did not go too deeply into the brief - this I will do, and I imagine some consideration will be given to these people when the Budget is handed down.

But some of the things that I did find out about our firefighters, about the firefighters here in St. John's - some of the conditions, some of the conditions which they stated to me, I just could hardly believe that these conditions existed, or could exist in a vitally essential service area. And some of the conditions very, very briefly Mr. Speaker, some of the conditions which they outlined to me, and which I am sure the public are not too, too aware of. Number one mainly being that when a man is first employed with the firefighters - in the first year he receives a salary per month of \$333.33 - and after eight years of service, his per annum wage goes up to \$5,290 per year.

Now I have been complaining all along that the members of the House of Assembly are lowly paid, but we do not do as dangerously a job, or as arduous a job, or as strenuous a job, as these people, and we get more. I did not think there were too many lesser paid than the backbenchers of the House of Assembly. I know I am going to have Ray Guy after me tomorrow, but that is beside the point. Now one thing that startles me about the firefighters Mr. Speaker,

is the fact that the firefighters are not covered by Workmen's Compensation. There you have a group of people who are performing the most dangerous service that you can possibly imagine, and they are liable to have an injury every day, and fatal injuries and severe injuries and they are not covered by the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Now I cannot see how any branch of government, or whoever administers to these people, cannot see how it can be possibly justified that these people not be covered by the Workmen's Compensation. In any industry - in most industries in the Province, there are a set of statutory holidays which have to be observed, and the purpose of a statutory holiday Mr. Speaker, as most of us know, is for the purpose of giving a man a day's rest without loss in take-home pay. But the firefighters for some reason do not receive any of the statutory holidays that government employees have, or that people working in industry through negotiations have established. They do not benefit, they have no statutory holiday.

And when automatically they are required to work on these holidays, they do not receive any remuneration in terms of overtime rates or anything else. They just do not have any statutory holidays. They work forty-nine and a half hours a week, and I believe there is an established forty-hour mandatory work week for government employees. But the firefighters work forty-nine and a half hours a week, and on top of that, they are required to stand by for another forty-nine and a half hours.

In other words they have to be available for call for another forty-nine and a half hours a week. And one thing Mr. Speaker, if they are called and do not answer that call and get to their station within a half an hour of being called, no matter what time of the day or night it is, they are subject to a fine if they do not get to that station.

If this gentleman on stand-by is acquired, if he wants to take his wife to the movies, to the theatre, he has to leave a number where he can be contacted, and in lots of cases their leisure hours are disturbed because of a necessary call. And they receive no remunerations for this stand-by work either.

They receive no overtime rates period - We all know how a fire engine has to hustle when it is called - if they have an accident when they are operating the vehicle on the way to a fire - if they have an accident they are subject to a twenty-five dollar fine. If one of them was picked up tonight 525

because and taken in and tested with the breathalyzer, and it was established that he was impaired, he would automatically lose his job.

Now these are points - these are conditions under which these people are working. And in the brief - the brief speaks for itself - at the start on the first page, when it says that the association feels that the general public are not really aware of the hazardness and strenuous aspects of the job of firefighter, nor the skills or initiative require in the performance of his work in the interest of people and property. They go to quote an editorial from the "Telegram" wherein it states that St. John's is still a highly inflammable city. Should a major fire get out of hand and start to jump streets, the fire department might be unable to keep ahead of it.

Once out of control it could wipe out most of the city. It is hoped that the fire department is not being denied the men or equipment to handle a major fire or a series of multiple fires. And I respectfully submit Sir under those set of conditions and those type of wages, how can you attract and retain competent people? And I am sure that the N.G.E.A. will do a competent job, but I told these people that I would mention it, if and when I would speak in the House and that is what I am doing today.

And I do not think that the public knows enough about it. And I do not think that the people who administer it do not know enough about it, otherwise those conditions would not exist.

There is just one more thing I would like to say in reference to the Speech Mr. Speaker, and that is relative to the Minimum Wage Laws. The Government feel and have stated so in this Speech and rightfully so, that the Minimum Wage Laws should apply to workers in the Fish Processing Industry. When we talk about priorities of governments in my opinion, in my estimation at least I feel that the minimum should be raised, and where equal work is provided, particularly in the fish plants that both men and women should receive the same remunerations for the same services given - and this is not a fact, this is not what is happening.

And the non-organized fish plants today are hiring women because they can get them cheaper, pay them the minimum wage, but they provide the same service, the same work, but the only difference being that they get paid less.

Now Mr. Speaker, as is to be expected of me, I wish to devote the

rest of my time in speaking about the problems and area closest to my heart, and that is of course Labrador.

Labrador the area of fantastically resourceful people and that part of the Province on which the rest relies to a fantastic degree. But you would never think it - those treatments which Labrador is receiving from this administration. You would never think it at all.

To recap slightly on what I said earlier, the main theme of what the hon. the Premier had to say yesterday was the importance of a Government in providing jobs for the people to whom they administered. We listened to him yesterday for two hours when in answer to a question from the Order Paper, when the question was skirted, he talked about jobs, and he talked about practically everything under the sun.

Now when you talk about jobs in Labrador there are two aspects to which this philosophy, this apparently single philosophy of this Government - jobs - and this philosophy means two entirely different things in Labrador. And when I say two entirely different things, I am referring to two immensely different areas of Labrador - I am talking about the affluent area of Labrador West, and I am talking about the very poor areas of Labrador North and Labrador South.

During most of the speeches Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier reflects on Newfoundland as it was twenty years ago when Newfoundland went into Confederation, and Newfoundland as it is today. He has a great tendency to compare, and to tell you how - to describe so well that you can practically feel it. You can relive it. He can describe the conditions as they were at the time of Confederation. And then he, quite fitfully so, he describes or compares conditions as we have them now, and sometimes I have to resist the impulse of getting down on my knees he is so persuasive, and thanking God that I am living here at this time in the history, and not twenty years ago.

I have to resist the impulse - that is how persuasive the hon. the Premier is -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? In addition to comparing Newfoundland now with twenty years ago. Does he know anyone in Newfoundland who has insisted as much as I have insisted, and talked

as much as I have talked, and acted as much as I have acted, to try to get Newfoundland brought up to the Canadian standard. Does he know anyone who has? Well am I living only in the past? No -

MR. BURGESS: If he will give me a chance to finish I will explain what I am after hon. Premier.

Well if the hon. the Premier Mr. Speaker, would like to relive the days of Confederation - we all like to remember and relive our triumphs - it is the natural instinct of man. If the hon. the Premier wants to relive Confederation, all he has to do is go to Coast of Labrador today. And as soon as he sets foot on the coast, I am sure that twenty years will drop off his life. Twenty years will drop off his life. There is no question in my mind.

Maybe most hon. members of this House Mr. Speaker, have seen references by myself or statements made by myself in the newspapers, and I can remember very vividly in Fox Harbour, a place called Fox Harbour in Labrador South - when I visited there to see if everything was as good as the hon. member for Labrador South had explained it was in this hon. House. When I went there to find out for myself if it really was as good as he had made it sound, and I met a

MR. T. BURGESS: ~~That~~ woman there who had been, and I must emphasize this - who had been an avid fan of the hon. the Premier. She had been his greatest supporter - and she read a poem to me Mr. Speaker, she read to me a poem which she herself had composed at the time of Confederation and it was very, exceptionally, complimentary to the Premier. I am sure he must have received a copy if not I will try to get it for the hon. the Premier. It was extremely complimentary to the Premier in what he was trying to do to bring Newfoundland into Confederation and to help to bring Newfoundland up to the - into the main stream of Canadian life - it dealt with the lack of jobs - it dealt with the hard times - the conditions that existed there, and she read this poem to me by the aid of kerosene lamp, because, there was no electricity. She read this poem to me, and that poem which was written twenty years ago Mr. Speaker, equally applies today - not one whit, not one thing has changed, despite - despite what the hon. the member for the district claims - the advances that have been made and the services that have been provided. They have not changed one whit from the time that poem was written.

You can go from Forteau in the south of Labrador up as far north as Nain, and you would meet conditions that I find very hard to describe in this hon. House. It is practically impossible to describe. In the context of Labrador being an integral part of this great, prosperous and in relation to the rest of the world, happy nation of Canada. Labrador being an integral part and if you have a hat Mr. Speaker, as soon as you get on the coast of Labrador you will have to turn that hat right around in order to compare with your thinking and your outlook as soon as you see the conditions that exist. I have tried my best during this past year to illustrate conditions as they are - the isolation and frustration on the coast of having no roads, the isolation and frustration of having little or no communications, telephone, radio, television or anything else - the frustration of having a mail service that could only be compared to the pony express in it's frequency. The frustration of having no air-service, no regular air-service at all - when you fly into those communities which I have to do in a small plane, every time you are leaving you have a line up of people wanting to know if you could carry them to the next settlement to Cartwright or Goose Bay because there is no regular into - on the coast of Labrador.

The boat service, it made me laugh, it made me chuckle. In December or November of 1969, when I heard the hon. the Minister of Labrador Affairs come on radio to inform the people - to tell them how grateful they should be because he had been instrumental in having C.N. run an additional boat up the 529

coast, due to the fact that mild weather existed and the boat could not navigate the waters, and he came on radio to tell the people how grateful they should be to him, because he had been instrumental in getting this one additional boat

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): I doubt that he did any such thing. I doubt it very much.

MR. BURGESS: That is a problem for the hon. the Premier, he doubts it - I know it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did the hon. gentleman hear him?

MR. BURGESS: The hon. gentleman heard him, and that is why the hon. gentleman is making the comment

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well he is not present in the Chamber, but we will check. I still do not believe it

AN HON. MEMBER: Check his office, see if he is there

MR. BURGESS: The hon. gentleman was in the Chamber the other night when he said with reference to the

MR. CROSBIE: Let us see if he is on the tenth floor

MR. BURGESS: The hon. gentleman was in the House the other night when reference was made to the Speech from the Throne when he confirmed the fact that the Iron Ore Company of Canada had confirmed the expansion.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying anything about the hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs or the hon. Minister without portfolio that I would not say if they were here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And what he said was that that the people should be grateful to him for what he had done - that is what he announced publicly?

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, one point I would like to make Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier - granted he does not have too much support on that side of the House - too many people who can do much talking, and he has to carry the ball - this is recognized, but one point I would like to make Mr. Speaker, is that I sat here in this chair yesterday and I listened to the hon. the Premier speech for two or two and one half hours, and I restrained myself from interrupting of any sort - any type because I feel that the hon. the Premier deserves this respect - he is the Premier of the Province - he should be allowed to speak uninterrupted, but I also feel Mr. Speaker, that any member of this House should be allowed uninterrupted. And I am sure the hon. the Speaker, is well aware of this and I am sure the hon. the Premier is more aware of it than anybody.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a rather delicate thing is it not - this statement about

how they should be grateful to him - rather delicate. I just wanted to keep drawing your attention to it

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. the Premier wish me to stop my speech until the hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs is brought to this Chamber and questioned about what he had to say in that radio speech - because if so I will stop speaking right now - and wait until he does arrive.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Brave man - stout hearted man, have him arrested and brought here - brought in

MR. BURGESS: There is only one piece of advice Mr. Speaker, I would give the hon. the Premier - and that is that he does not do his Christmas shopping early this year, because, by Christmas he will not have any friends left.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Say \$500.00 worth of shopping and then another \$500.00 worth of shopping for example? And another \$500.00, and another \$1000.00.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Shopping, buying, selling

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, am I going to be allowed to speak uninterruptedly Mr. Speaker.

In Labrador South, from Rigolet to Battle Harbour Mr. Speaker. Rigolet - I had occasion to call into Rigolet once again to see if conditions as explained in this House were as they had been stated, and in Rigolet where there is not too great a population - in Rigolet I spoke to the - in the centre of town they have a Komatik Trail Mr. Speaker, they do not have any roads, they have a Komatik Trail - and I saw various people working on this trail, trying to keep it open - keep it clean, and I asked who was paying for the - to keep this Komatik Trail open. One gentleman told me that from the Government they received \$399.00 per year to go for the maintenance of this Komatik Trail. \$399.00 per year. Now Your Honour, if this gentleman had told me \$400.00 I would say there is some system attached to it, I just do not know what kind of bureaucracy exists in that \$399.00 would be given for the maintenance of a trail in a community like this. \$399.00.

At that time the request was made in all of the communities which we visited - Paradise Point, Cartwright, Nain, Battle Harbour, Forteau, Port Hope Simpson - the request was in the main - the people wanted to know if it were possible for the Government to supply at least one piece of heavy equipment in each of these communities in order that it would make the job of keeping what trails or roads they had - what little roads they had open. Now this request has been made - I was told that it has been made of and on for years and years

and nobody has seen to their request.

Now I think it would make life in these communities so much more easier if even a small piece of mechanical equipment was given to these communities in order at least, to ensure that they have a track or a path through the centre of town.

And then we go to Goose Bay Mr. Speaker, which is the Capital of Labrador. I am not going to deal with it at any great length because, during the time I was speaking to the amendment I dealt with conditions as they are in Goose Bay, and conditions as they are presently in this formerly vital and prosperous community - by virtue of the American and Canadian Armed Forces influence I might add Mr. Speaker, and not by any great participation or involvement by the Provincial Government in that area.

We all know what happened there last year when the people were handed the biggest disappointment of their lives, when promises made were not kept. Now they have received another set of promises Mr. Speaker, which I sincerely hope are kept, but of which some indication will have to be seen before the next election. If not, and maybe even in any case, they will have to be carried out by another administration I do not know.

In Goose Bay itself, I was in there a week and a half ago and I imagine it comes under the Department of Municipal Affairs, but you cannot even, despite the very hard work by the newly elected council in Goose Bay, the very hard work - is the water system - even the water system in Goose Bay, you cannot have a drink, a glass of water without getting one eighth of an inch of mud in your glass - and that is in practically in every home in Happy Valley.

Now Mr. Speaker, the implications - the greatest implication which I received from the Speech from the Throne is that based on the current monetary situation in the country and the rest of the world for that matter, we are being asked to mark time - the Province is being asked to mark time, and not expect too much. The hon. member from Humber East in his address in reply the other day said that he was glad to see a reserved approach to the coming year instead of a massive borrowing spree which we have been witnessing for years past. Well now we are being asked to mark time, and everything seems to point or depend on the people of Newfoundland who have to depend on now in the main this new Federal Department that has been established known as DREE. The Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

The Department of Regional Economic Expansion. Now the purpose of this program as it was adequately outlined by the hon. Minister, Mr. Rowe, the purpose of this program is to encourage economic expansion in regions of Canada where the growth of employment and income has been lagging. In the interpretation section of this program notice was given, Mr. Speaker, of the formation of an Atlantic Development Council. Wherein it is described that by Atlantic Region is meant New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, P.E.I. and Newfoundland. And I notice, Mr. Speaker, it does not say Newfoundland and Labrador, Now there maybe an explanation for this. But, it states quite clearly that New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, P.E.I. and Newfoundland.

The function of this Council is to advise the minister and the departments of (a) plan programs, and proposals for fostering the economic expansion and social adjustment of the atlantic regions, and (b) the feasibility of particular programs and projects and the contribution of these plans and projects will make to the economic expansion and social adjustment of the atlantic region.

Now once again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know exactly what is meant by "atlantic region", because I can remember not so long ago, sometime last year when the Maritime Freight Rate Subsidy Act was handed down or passed in the House of Commons, Subsidy on Freight Rates in the Maritimes, in the Atlantic Provinces, Labrador was excluded. And I can see nothing in the Act, in the Bill as passed in the House of Commons wherein it stated that Labrador will benefit under the DREE Program, or this Atlantic Development Council. And if it is Mr. Speaker, why is it? Because by virtue of its physical and geographical location. I sincerely hope that we are not left out of this DREE Program.

Now Mr. Speaker also in the interpretation section of the Bill under special areas it states, and this is the section Mr. Speaker which I will be asking this Government to ensure that the strongest type of representation will be made to the Federal Department, and under special areas, it states: the Governor in Council may by order designate as a special area for the period set out in the order, any area in Canada that is determined to acquire by reason of sectional inadequacy of opportunity, both productive employment of the people of that area or of the region of which that area is a part, special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustments. That section or clause, Mr. Speaker, could have been drafted and tailored with the Coast of Labrador in mind. And as I have said, Mr. Speaker, by special demand that the strongest kind of representation by made by this Provincial Government to see that this section

does apply.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to Labrador West, the area in which I live, Labrador City. We have been told Mr. Speaker by the hon. the Premier, we were told the people of Labrador West were told prior to the Leadership Convention that efforts would be taken in negotiation or proposed negotiation would be undertaken with the Province of Quebec for the purpose of trying to establish a road link via Labrador City, Mount Wright, Gagnonville, Manicouagan, and the north shore of the St. Lawrence, and thereon to some point between =

Now the hon. the Premier told the people that he would undertake these negotiations and I sincerely hope that these negotiations are undertaken as soon as possible. The matter which I have brought to the public attention and this hon. House on so many occasions and that is in the area since Labrador, since we are living on the western extremity of the Province, and since we are serviced by one airlines from the Island of Newfoundland, the rate per air mile Mr. Speaker are really and truly exorbitant. Now I must say that the Eastern Provincial Airways is not the only airlines servicing the area, you have another airline Quebec Air servicing the area from Montreal to Wabush. And they are charging per air mile practically the same as Eastern Provincial Airways. And the rates which they are charging Mr. Speaker are approximately somewhere in the region of forty percent more per air mile than Air Canada charges in the rest of Canada. Forty percent Mr. Speaker is a lot of money per air mile.

What amazes me, granted we are told by these airlines that the cost of maintaining their northern stations are exorbitant, and this is why it is necessary to charge this additional fee or sum as it were. I do not see any airport, facility which they have provided so far in Labrador that will cost anything near as much as the amount of money which they approve by charging this additional forty percent per air mile. And even Air Canada, Mr. Speaker, when Air Canada carries freight from Montreal into Goose Bay-it charges ninety percent more per air line - ninety percent more per air line to carry freight into Goose Bay than it does elsewhere in Canada.

Now what I would like to know, and I am quite positive what all of the people in Labrador would like to know is where transport rates, where rate structure like this, it has to be sanctioned by some Government Body, granted it is a Federal Government Body. But, how can a Federal Government Body sanction a rate structure that is obviously discriminatory towards the people in a Federal region of Canada? It is hard to understand, Mr. Speaker, how this can

happen.

Mr. Speaker, if any hon. member of this House has occasion to walk into the air terminal in Wabush, you will see a sign on Quebec Air's Ticket Counter which states, "they are proud to announce the fact that if you travel from Sept Isles, which is across the boarder in Quebec to Montreal, that you can now travel for seventeen percent less than you could a year ago," Seventeen percent less, they have reduced their fare from Sept Isles to Montreal by seventeen percent, because of the fact that they are competing with Air Canada out of Sept Isles to Montreal. But, if you purchase your ticket in Wabush and you have to go of necessity, you have to go via Sept Isles, and on the same route to Montreal, you cannot avail of this reduction. Why? Because of the fact that they have a franchised and captive market in Labrador and therefore they can charge what they like. And this is exactly what they are doing. But, as I said, Mr. Speaker, what I cannot understand is how our rate structure like that can be sanctioned by any body of government?

The hon. the member from Humber East the other day made reference to the fact that in Corner Brook, he is consistently explaining conditions, the various of conditions that exist in Corner Brook as opposed to the Avalon Peninsula and St. John's. And he ~~was alluded to the fact that~~

made reference to the fact that even if you buy a bottle of liquor, in Corner Brook, you are charged ten cents more than the schedule issued by the Board of Liquor Control. You are charged ten cents more in Corner Brook.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform this hon. House that in Labrador, you are charged forty cents more for a bottle. Granted we live on the western extremity of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador - granted we live on this, but do we have to pay for it? Why should we be charged forty cents more per bottle, and why should we be charged extra per bottle of beer. And in this, Mr. Speaker, I am looking for every alcoholic's vote in the country.

Why should we be charged additional? Because by virtue of our geographical location. Particularly, Mr. Speaker, since most of the product itself - the liquor - is brought into St. John's. It is shipped into St. John's. Then it is shipped out of St. John's up to Labrador in ships from parts of Central Canada, from elsewhere in Canada and from elsewhere on this continent. It is shipped to St. John's and then up to Labrador. It could be shipped direct from the areas of Central Canada that do supply liquor. It could be shipped direct to Labrador without the necessity of coming around and maybe we would not have to pay this forty cents more per bottle.

But, no, this is just Labrador. It does not matter. You can get away with anything in there.

In the Newfoundland Bulletin, Mr. Speaker, a couple editions ago, I saw where it is stated that the Government of Newfoundland was running one of the biggest bus services. They were talking about school buses on the continent, in North America, and this is so. They said they were providing - they were subsidizing bus operations in almost every part of the Province. Almost, but not Labrador City or Wabush and why? Because the transportation section of the Education Act states that subsidy for transportation will not be provided wherein the school or the children reside less than one - in less than one miles radius of the school.

Now, Labrador City and Wabush are new towns. They are very, very orderly and tidy towns. They are new towns and there are not too many homes that are more outside of the one mile radius.

I did get in my car and I started from the school - the front doors of the school and I drove to one of the houses on the very extremity of the

town and it happened to be 1.6 and I informed the gentlemen in the Department of Education that I had driven 1.6 miles. I must admit I was splitting hairs - 1.6 miles, but he amazed me - he split hairs more. He said it was not as you drove. It was as the crow flew. And I told him that all we have is a bus service not a helicopter town, but there is no subsidy for the bus operation in Labrador City or Wabush, and I maintain, Mr. Speaker, granted under the provisions of the act as it presently exists, the act is clear in that it does not provide a subsidy wherein you live less than one mile from the school.

But, I would like to see that section of the act changed, Mr. Speaker, because based on the climatic conditions that exist in Labrador is highly necessary. You cannot allow your child to walk to school on the type and degree that the temperature that we get in Labrador.

Only three weeks ago, we went through a whole week when the temperature did not go above thirty below zero and it sometimes - on one occasion it went down to fifty below zero and we have lost people. We have lost two people since I have been there, who have frozen to death and you cannot - it is very difficult for some people who do not have transportation, who do not have their own privately owned automobiles - it is very difficult and very hard for them to let their children walk to school; children from the ages of five and up. It is very difficult for them to let them walk to school and have peace of mind.

And I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that some change based on the climatic conditions that exist in Labrador - some changes in that act should be made for Labrador. And, Mr. Speaker, during my tenure in this House I think every year that I have had anything to say at all I have brought up the fact, I have tried my best to be reasonable and understanding on some of the matters which I have brought to the attention of this Government, particularly with regard to roads. I know when you talk about roads-link, a land-link with the rest of Canada or a road across Labrador you are talking about hundreds of millions and you are talking about years and years of construction, this I understand. But I have made a request consistently, year after year, that in the interim period, until such time as some of the basic facilities that are provided to other Canadians, some of the facilities

that are provided and are taken for granted, until such time as these facilities are provided we should have concessions of some sort in order to make the people feel that they are in the main stream of things and that we are just not suspended in mid-air and forgotten about.

One of these things, Mr. Speaker, should be the exemption of gasoline, of tax on gasoline, because we all know that the purpose of a gasoline tax is for the purpose of building and maintaining roads and we do not have the roads. The Government have not been in a position to provide them, they have not provided them and I do not see why we should be subject to a gasoline tax which goes for building and maintaining roads. And particularly, Mr. Speaker, since the climate is what it is, there are a vast number of skidoos, which is one of the few means of transportation, of driving yourself more than three or four miles from your home, particularly with skidoos who are not allowed to use the roads anyway, there is no order which permits them to use a public highway or a road, I do not see why we should have to pay tax on the gasoline to operate a snowmobile.

-528-

With further reference once again when I was talking about the DREE programme I forgot to include ^{that} which I will now Mr. Speaker, And a radio statement made on Oct. 5th of last year by a one Mr. Andre Saumier, assistant deputy-minister of the new federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion. When Mr. Saumier told the delegate, told delegates to the community planning association of Canada here in St. John's that the likelihood of a boom in Labrador was a delusion, is a delusion, and I am quoting. He went on to tell delegates that if any one went to the people of Labrador and promised them munificent things that would transfer Labrador into a prosperous place they would be perpetuated and illusioned and the price would be borne by the people there. Now these are quotes Mr. Speaker, which I have said, from the deputy-minister of this new department. DREE, which acts further Mr. Speaker to reinforce my opinion that since practically everything in the Throne Speech revolves around, this new programme DREE.

It leads me to believe, and I sincerely hope that I am wrong Mr. Speaker, It leads me to believe that once again as in the maritime freight rates, subsidy act Labrador will be left out. I sincerely hope not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do not, I made reference to some other matters pertinent to the area of Labrador during my address to this House in the amendment to the Speech from the Throne, and I do not intend to further, to repeat myself to this House but I do say this Mr. Speaker, I say this in all sincerity, that, unless this Government, this administration or any government no matter what government it is that conditions and the feelings that presently exist in the minds of the people who reside in Labrador they have to be removed by closer, the establishment of closer ties with the island part of the Province. After all, in the main, the major percentage of the population the newly arrived population of Labrador they have come from the island section of the Province. They are people with close ties they have close ties relative wise, conscience wise, heart wise and every wise with the Province. And they should not, be, the general thing that happens after they have been there a year they tend to forget. They tend to forget that they are responsible to this House, this House which is established in the island part of the Province. Because the influence of this House and the influence of the Government is not there, it has not been injected into the environment in Labrador. And I would advise any administration no matter what administration it is that this feeling that presently exists in the minds of the people in Labrador has to be removed at all costs. Because it is a hateful thing to see when you address groups of people there and you mention the fact that something

will be brought to the attention of Government here and the reaction the spontaneous reaction you get from the people what is the use. And then we go to the, to a matter which I have also, one matter that have been brought up in this House even by the previous member for the three or four terms which he did sit in this House and that is the matter of communications particularly with reference to radio and television. Now I have been told quite often in this House and I am perfectly aware of the fact that television and radio comes under federal jurisdiction. But that does not mean that we should not have the strongest kind of representation on our behalf from the provincial authorities to the federal authorities to alleviate our problems in this matter, particularly the matter of television.

Now I heard yesterday as I sat in this House and I listened the other day to one of the hon. ministers who are connected with Labrador state when this satellite, this satellite ^{which} is going to be launched in 1972 to circle the equator it will make instantaneous it will make life easy as possible in Labrador. Now if my memory serves me correctly Mr. Speaker, four years ago we were told that that satellite was going to be launched in 1970 now it is 1972. And one in 1972 particularly with the austerity measures that we are being faced with in this country what is to stop them saying that it will not be launched until 1974. And in 1974 it could be 1976. And on top of that when they launch a satellite they also have to build receiving facilities. Receiving facilities to pick up the signal that will be transmitted from the satellite. Now what is going to happen even in the event that this satellite is launched in 1972? Then it is going to take two more years to build the facilities, so it still means that we are not going to get television reception until 1974 in any event.

In Gagnonville, the community over the border, in the Province of Quebec which is approximately 90 miles removed from Labrador City they have cable TV, they have television which is cabled into Gagnonville, which is 90 miles from Labrador City. Now, Labrador City we have a close circuit K₂ type of television centre. We have a facility there that goes on the air for four to six hours a day and this facility, this transmitter was established, erected, paid for and staffed by the Iron Ore Company of Canada, not the federal Government, not the Government. It was erected by the company it was established there by the company and operated by the company.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me, does he want to go on or does he want to go on again tomorrow whatever he wishes if he is not going to be an awful

lot longer it might be the pleasure of the House to stay until he finished, but if he is going to be any much more it might be sounder to adjourn until 3:00 p.m. tomorrow. What would the hon. gentleman like?

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I was threatened by the press today upstairs, they told me , that I was all kinds of things because I spoke after eleven last night, and with all due respects to the people who are sitting in this House and who have been listening to all kinds of diatribe and speeches for so long in sympathy to them, I will say that we finish at 11:00 p.m., and I will continue tomorrow and also in sympathy of my own throat. So, Mr. Speaker, the hour being almost 11.00 p.m., I am willing to adjourn the debate and continue tomorrow.

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 3:00 p.m.

541