



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 7

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is a pleasure for me to welcome to the galleries today from the Whitbourne School for Boys at Whitbourne, fifteen Grade VIII, IX and X students with their teachers Mr. E. Nicholl and Mr. H. Cross, and from Hermitage, the John Watkin's High School, sixteen Grade XI students with their teachers Mr. Wesley Harris and Mr. Gus Jones. On behalf of all the honourable members, I certainly welcome you to the galleries and trust that your visit here is most interesting.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present a petition on behalf of just about every adult resident of the Community of Francois in my district. The prayer of the petition relates to the coastal boat service and the quality of it. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that it is a matter for CNR, but I think it is a matter in which this House ought to have an interest.

I will not read the petition. It is quite a lengthy one in terms of the heading and it does outline some of the problems which the people in Francois are having with the present coastal boat schedule and also with other matters related to the coastal boat service itself.

As I indicated in the House a few days ago, I have made representation to the Canadian Transport Commission with a view to having the coastal boat service on the south coast in particular fully investigated. It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to support this petition and to request that it be placed on the table of the House and also to request that government might lend its support to our efforts to have the Canadian Transport Commission investigate this service with a view to improving what is now a completely inadequate and a deplorable service.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the honourable

the Minister of Finance. I want to ask the minister if the government contemplates a full investigation under the Public Enquiries Act of the amount of \$4,355 that was used to charter a jet flight to promote a particular company's aircraft in this province and whether any member of the government or any public servant benefited financially or otherwise from this needless expenditure as outlined in the Auditor-General's report.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

That question is out of order. It is very argumentative.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the minister care to comment on the report of the Auditor-General concerning \$4,355 spent to charter an aircraft? Would the minister care to comment on that?

HON. H.R.V. EARLE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, the question for any comment should rightly be directly to the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications. I have no comment.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Transportation and Communication - he is not in his seat, Sir. It is the Minister of Finance, Sir, who should answer the question. I am dissatisfied with the minister's answer, Sir, and this afternoon at five-thirty I wish to debate the matter during the late show.

HON. E. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, I have a question, if I might, for the House Leader. I wonder if he could indicate when the government will move to appoint - I am not so much concerned at this point with the Standing Committees as authorized by the rules--but the Committee on Public Accounts.

HON. J.C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Presently, by leave. No, Mr. Speaker. There will be a motion brought before the House tomorrow or Monday to appoint various committees including the Committee on Public Accounts.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism. I wonder could the minister tell us who the national advertising company was that was awarded a contract last year, or awarded an advance on a contract of something over \$20,000

as reported in the Auditor-General's report.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order in connection with these questions which arise from the Auditor-General's report. Either notice of these questions should be given, because most of them deal with quite complicated points, or they should be left to the Committee on Public Accounts which will be set up and the Auditor-General's report will be referred to it, and they can ask for any explanations that they need.

MR. THOMS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the minister is trying to shut up the opposition because this is quite an important subject here. There are literally millions of dollars that were spent that should not have been spent or were not accounted for or were misused. I think the question, Sir, is relevant. I think that the minister should be given an opportunity to answer this question.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, first of all, Sir, the question of notice is a matter for Your Honour to decide on the general rules of the House, but I would submit that the Minister of Finance, that report was dated, I believe, the fifteenth day of January which means it has been in the hands of the minister and doubtless, of his colleagues for seven or eight weeks. So they have adequate notice of the points raised in it. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Public Accounts Committee, the intention of the government to honour the rules of the House and to set up a Public Accounts Committee does not mean that the matters cannot be raised here in question period if they are otherwise in order. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, any matter would be headed off simply by setting up a committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The points raised are well taken. I shall permit this question, it could very well be placed on the Order Paper. However, if the honourable minister wishes to reply to it, he may.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the kind of detailed information the honourable gentleman might want, but I can tell him the company is McConnell Advertising. He is absolutely wrong in his comment of millions of dollars. There is no waste of millions of dollars. In fact, there is not a waste of one single, solitary cent. I acknowledge the opportunity and appreciate the opportunity very much to comment on any statement made by the Auditor General with regards to my department and, in fact, whether he asks questions or not, those points will be dealt with in detail.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications who now I see is in his seat. Would the minister care to indicate to the House what the amount of \$1,650 on page thirty-one of the Auditor General's report, paid to the Newfoundland Liquor Commission, what this money was for, and then later another \$400 paid to the Newfoundland Liquor Commission? Would the minister indicate what this was used for?

MR. SPEAKER: That question could be placed on the Order Paper. It is not one that requires an urgent answer, but again if the minister wishes

to reply to it, he may.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short statement on that. I was away yesterday, not because the Auditor General's report came in but I had a prior commitment. There were almost about 3,000 people who used the government aircraft last year and that works out to about half a drink apiece. These people were businessmen, premiers, members of the opposition even, who travel on the airplane. We do not begrudge a half a drink to anybody who travels on the airplane. If the opposition wish to make political hay out of this point, they certainly may. We do not think there is anything in there.

However, it is my intention to make a complete statement on the items contained in the Auditor General's report in respect to the Department of Transportation and Communications. Officials of the department are now preparing the replies and as soon as I have that, which I hope will be in the next, let us say, by the end of next week, it could be tomorrow, it could be early next week, but as soon as it is prepared, I intend to make a complete statement on all the items contained in respect to the Department of Transportation and Communications in the Auditor General's report. I would hope that honourable members would await that report. It should be here hopefully by the end of next week.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister might also be ready to appear before the committee to try to explain -

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

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Sir. I thank him for his answer. Would the minister be prepared also to table the logs of the aircraft, the list of all those who have gone aloft, say, in the last year on government aircraft?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I made the simple statement that in all matters referred to in the Auditor General's report in respect to the Department of Transportation and Communications, I will make a statement. Whether or not that will be contained, and it has been government policy not to do so, unless, of course,

you want to go back long before January 18, 1972, then I will make my statement at the appropriate time. May I ask honourable members to trust my discretion when I make that statement?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see the Minister of Rural Development has decided to honour us with his presence temporarily. I have a question for him. Would the minister indicate to the House how many jobs which were created under the Rural Development Authority Programme, how many of those jobs thus created have ceased to exist because of the layoffs in the sawmill industry over the past few months?

MR. SPEAKER: That question is one which probably could require a rather lengthy answer. It could certainly be placed on the Order Paper.

HON. J. REID: Order Paper, yes.

MR. SIMMONS: Would the minister undertake to get the answer for me?

MR. REID: Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Hon. Minister of Rural Development. Would the minister indicate to the House what steps have been taken to correct the severe weaknesses in terms of administrative and accounting control which the Auditor-General discovered in the Rural Development Authorities operation? What steps have been taken to improve this?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, that is not a proper question. It is argumentative. It makes assumptions. It is not a proper question.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I will rephrase the question. As a preamble I refer to the Auditor-General's Report page 27, and I quote "My audit of the Rural Development Authorities -"

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If the honourable Member for Hermitage wishes to ask a question he should not preface it by preambles.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Rural Development what steps are being taken to correct the accounting and administrative weaknesses which exist in his department?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That question is argumentative as well, and it is out of order.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask a question of the gentleman for Trinity South. It was nice of him to drop around. Is he yet in a position to reply to a letter which I wrote him last Fall asking for a list of the persons to whom the Rural Development Authority have made loans in the period as of a current date?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Rural Development.

HON. J. G. REID (MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT): Mr. Speaker, I am going to add that the Leader of the Opposition asked this question because last year, when we presented the names of all the people who got loans throughout Rural Development, last year there was quite a controversy because a lot of our people did not want to see their names smeared all over Newfoundland because they came in here and got loans from our department. Now I am certainly quite willing

to give a list of all the loans that went out, and what they went for in various communities in every district. We had several people who made applications for loans in our department, who paid up some of the loans as quick as possible because they did not want their names smeared all over Newfoundland, and they would like to keep it fairly private. In the meantime we had other people who reneged on their loans, and we have not heard from these people since. Some of these people were very good reliable people but they would rather not have the general public know their business.

Now if we in Rural Development must give the names of all of the people, by all means we will give it. But I would rather for the opposition be the people to be blamed for us giving these names all over the Island. Thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the minister answer my question please?

MR. REID: Well that is the reason why.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the minister then. I cannot debate his desire to keep secret these lists. But I wonder then if he would undertake - is the minister then saying he will not make available to the opposition, and thus to the public - we will not take them on any confidential basis - we either get them publicly or not at all, Mr. Speaker. Is he saying that he will not make them available to us?

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that. I will make it available if I have to. I will certainly make it available to him. By all means we will certainly give all of the loans, and if I have to name the names, or give him all the names we will certainly do it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. The minister keeps saying 'if'. I cannot make him do it. Maybe the Premier can. That I do not know. Or maybe the Premier cannot. All I want is a straight answer to the question. Will the minister make these names public or will he not? If he will, then how quickly? I wrote

him five months ago on it. He cannot claim not to have notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. Leader of the Opposition was indulging in a speech rather than a question.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not finished - let him answer it Steve.

MR. CROSBIE: Sir, on a point of order. No minister has to answer any question. Now the honourable gentleman has asked a question, a supplementary, and a supplementary. The minister does not want to answer any further and that is -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Minister of Rural Development. Sir, is he aware, in view of his refusal to answer the question, is he aware of the fact that yesterday the Premier undertook in this House to make those names available to the opposition?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No answer, eh?

MR. REID: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am answering that. That is the Premier's prerogative.

MR. ROBERTS: A further question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister going to carry out the undertaking given in this House yesterday by the Premier?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not in order.

MR. ROBERTS: What do you mean it is not in order?

MR. CROSBIE: That is not a proper question.

MR. ROBERTS: I am asking a question. It is a perfectly proper question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not a proper question, Mr. Speaker, to ask whether the minister is going to carry out the Premier's undertaking.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, is the minister going to carry out the - the Premier yesterday, in response to a question -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is again attempting to make a speech.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, all I am asking is - the Premier yesterday in the House, Your Honour allowed a question, and the Premier answered it - is the minister going to carry out the undertaking made by the Premier?

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I was not present yesterday but in the meantime, if I am asked, I will.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I now ask him for the second time in the last five minutes -

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker -

MR. ROBERTS: - and last fifteen months.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: What are you hiding, Jim?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

This whole matter has become a debate, and I recognize another honourable member, if he has a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of Social Services for giving me a list of the distribution points yesterday on this free food that is going to be distributed. I noticed on the list that nowhere in Labrador was this food going to be distributed. Could the minister tell us if Labrador is going to be left out of this programme altogether, left out in the cold as usual? Will there be any of this free food get into Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Social Services.

HON. A. J. MURPHY (Minister of Social Services): Mr. Speaker, I brought this list over to the gentleman yesterday. I went down and got a copy. I said, "Look, Labrador is a question mark because of transportation at this present moment." He was fully aware of that, you know, and the reason he asks this now is because the Member for Labrador South is here. I do not know what arrangements have been made quite frankly, but how do we get it into Labrador? This is the problem at the present time, and I informed the member of that yesterday. Still he takes advantage, Sir. You know, you no longer can treat anybody there as a gentleman any more. I told him just what the story was. Now he gets up and tries to embarrass me before the Member for Labrador South or any resident of Labrador, and I told him quite frankly that I did not know what the transportation facilities or opportunities would be. It is insinuated now that we do not want to look after the people of Labrador again. It is entirely beyond our circumstances. It is going to Great Northern Peninsula and perhaps every part of Newfoundland. Now I do not know if the honourable member himself has made any representation. I only got one copy of the list that I gave to the member yesterday.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Sir, would the minister think it more advisable to shut off the bar aboard the government aircraft and put some of this -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - and put some of this food -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - aboard it to bring down -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

That question is certainly out of order, -

MR. MURPHY: It would be more advisable to shut off the Hon. Member for Bell Island, to tell you the truth.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

This question is out of order, and I recognize the Hon. Member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I wish to direct to the Hon. Minister of Health. It concerns the fund provided for the native people, by the Federal-Provincial Agreement, of \$4.5 million. I would like the minister to state whether or not it is a fact that a sizeable portion of this fund, something in the order of \$1 million, I have been told, has been earmarked for the use of the International Grenfell Association?

DR. G. ROWE (Minister of Health): I am not sure of the exact amount, Mr. Speaker, but I will undertake to discuss it and give the information to the honourable member.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you going to undertake to give the information to the House?

DR. ROWE: I will undertake to give it to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to put a very -

MR. ROBERTS: Do not try to hide anything Gus.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: If we can get Ank to keep quiet for a minute, Sir, I will put a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir. Would the minister care to inform the House whether or not there is an agreement between the Newfoundland Power Commission and the Newfoundland Light and Power Company that is not due to expire until 1977, about two and one-half years time?

HON. L. BARRY (Minister of Mines and Energy): That question should be put on the Order Paper. I will check into that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for the minister. Would the minister care to indicate to the House if it is legal for the Newfoundland Power Commission to bypass the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities, when they are asking for an increase in their rates?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker no minister of the crown, can be asked to give a legal opinion on questions like this. Only the law officer of the crown can give legal opinions.

MR. SPEAKER: That question is out of order in asking a legal opinion.

MR. NEARY: Perhaps I will rephrase my question, Sir. Could the minister inform the House whether or not the Newfoundland Power Commission are exempt from making application to the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities when they are looking for an increase in rates?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it was only last Thursday that I made my last statement in the House

before all present, including the honourable Member for Bell Island, pointing out that the existing law is and has been for many years, many, many years, that the public utility, the Power Commission as it was and now the Power Corporation and eventually we hope this legislation is passed by this honourable House, the Newfoundland Hydro Corporation, that these corporations as the law now stands are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Board.

I also pointed out, Mr. Speaker, at that time, last Thursday, that it is government's policy and intention, when sufficient time has elapsed and I talk in terms of six months to a year, to permit the corporation, the reorganization to take place that it is government's intention and belief that the corporation should appear before, not necessarily the Public Utilities Board, it may be that we will go the route as I have pointed out they have done in Ontario, where they have a Provincial Energy Board, Mr. Speaker, where the public utility, the Crown Corporation must appear, or must justify rate increases and where there is an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, for public hearing, for public briefs to be presented and for the information to be obtained from the public utility, the same way, Mr. Speaker, as now applies with respect to a private utility. So I think that that should answer the honourable member's question.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister care to indicate to the House whether or not his government will be making any representation before the Board of Commissioners of public utilities in this matter of the rate increase, will there be any protests or objections, official protests from the government.

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

MR. BARRY: The honourable member is throwing out the occasional hook there to see if he can get a bite. Mr. Speaker, I have received no indication from any department of government that it believes there

should be representation made to the Public Utilities Board. As minister responsible for the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Corporation, which I understand has some involvement in the present rate hearings, or at least in the events leading up to the rate hearings, it would not be appropriate for the Department of Mines and Energy to make representation. As minister responsible for the Power Corporation I do of course take responsibility for the policy of that corporation.

But to answer the member's question directly, no, I have no such intention at the present time, it may be if it becomes necessary that this will change, at the present time I have no intention of making any representation to the Public Utilities Board. I do not know if there is any other information the honourable member would like.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary to the minister, Sir; would the minister care to tell the House then whether or not the Power Commission asked approval of the minister or any member of the government, for permission to go ahead with this rate increase and if so was such approval granted? Did the minister have to hold prior consultations with the Newfoundland Power Commission before they asked for this increase?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Power Corporation is not going ahead with any rate increase that I am aware of.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware, Sir, that the Newfoundland Power Commission have asked the Newfoundland Light and Power Company to cancel the contract that does not expire until 1977 and to increase their rates. I think it is by something like fifteen per cent. Is the minister aware of that?

MR. BARRY: To increase the contract. The contract of the Newfoundland Light and Power.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Therefore, Light and Power want increased rates.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, that is correct. The Power Corporation

has informed Newfoundland Light and Power and there have been discussions and I understand, I have not been involved in the negotiation, this is a Crown Corporation which has the responsibility to carry out this function but the Crown Corporation, I understand, has met with Newfoundland Light and Power, has carried out negotiations and I believe both the Power Corporation and Newfoundland Light and Power have reached agreement as to the form of the new contract.

MR. BARRY:

can inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that the Power Corporation informed Newfoundland Light and Power that in order for it to be able to meet the commitments, the capital commitments that would be required to supply Newfoundland Light and Power with what they have indicated they would need in the way of energy, following the expiration of the existing contract, that certain funds would be necessary to the corporation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, cutting through all the superficial or peripheral questions of the honourable member for Bell Island, if I might just say, Mr. Speaker, the issue here is the Power Corporation deciding whether it would keep rates to Newfoundland Light and Power the way they were or whether they would request - it is a request, Mr. Speaker, which Newfoundland Light and Power has agreed to subject to the approval of the Public Utilities Board - whether they would request an increase in the rate paid under the power contract. As far as the people of Newfoundland are concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is simply a question of whether the money to the Power Corporation would be paid by way of an increased subsidy to the corporation. Every year there is an amount paid from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the Power Corporation to meet the deficit of the Power Corporation. It is simply a question of whether this money comes out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, out of the taxpayers' dollars or whether it is paid by the actual consumer of the energy, Mr. Speaker. That is the issue that is involved here.

That is why my personal belief is that the consumer of the power should pay the cost of providing the service and that it is desirable, where that is possible, to correct any anomalies in the system to ensure that instead of the taxpayer, from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, all taxpayers subsidizing a Crown Corporation, that the actual person benefiting from the service supplied be the one to pay the cost. That is what is at stake here, Mr. Speaker, in the questions the honourable member is asking.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in all these negotiations, would the minister

indicate to the House whether or not the government have considered or are considering or will nationalize Newfoundland Light and Power, take over the distribution of power in this province.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we will nationalize Newfoundland and Labrador Power Corporation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact, Sir, that the schools are closing down in Rose Blanche and the people do not have any water in their homes and they do not seem to have a member down there to speak of -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Sir, care to indicate to the House what is being done about a water system for Rose Blanche?

HON. B. PECKFORD (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago the Provincial Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing undertook a preliminary survey into the possibility of installing a water and sewer system into the Community or the Town of Rose Blanche. After that preliminary study was done and submitted to the department, the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion and the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, Mr. Danson's department right now, agreed that they would begin negotiations towards putting in an experimental water and sewerage system into Rose Blanche. These discussions have continued for some time between CMHC and DREE.

In recent meetings in Ottawa, I mentioned and asked about how the negotiations were going on that. I was informed, as were individuals in the Intergovernmental Affairs Division of this government, they were informed that a number of meetings were taking place in February to try to finalize the deal, if you wish. Subsequent to that, I had written both ministers concerned in Ottawa asking for some definitive action on the Rose Blanche situation.

The business of installing a water and sewer system is, in the first instance, a provincial matter, but the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, the federal cabinet minister there representing

March 6, 1975

Tape 202

IB-3

Newfoundland, initiated action on his own in his department to have an experimental system done, a different kind of system. So, that is where it stands right now. I have written both ministers to indicate just exactly where it stands so that we will be kept informed all the way along the line.

Now, if in fact we get information - I wish we would soon get it - that they are not going to do anything, well then we will have the responsibility to try to help the people of Rose Blanche.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: No, at the moment, a week and a half or two weeks ago,

MR. PECKFORD:

No, at the moment, a week and a-half or two weeks ago, the regional administrator for the department was in Rose Blanche and met with the council to discuss the water situation. Yesterday, I requested, I instructed one of our engineers to go to Rose Blanche because the school is about to be closed, if not already closed this morning, to investigate what alternative sources of water could be found to alleviate the temporary situation that now exists. I am waiting for that report and I hope to have it this evening or early tomorrow morning. Then, with that report from the engineer, we will try as a provincial department, being the first responsible for it, to alleviate the temporary water shortage that exists there. But the long term solution to the problem is, if CMHC and DREE would soon indicate to the Provincial Government just what they are going to do with Rose Blanche, are they going to go ahead or if they are not, so that we can get on and do our part in the bargain.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister, Sir, responsible for dumps, the honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs, would inform the House if he has managed to straighten out the furor between his department and the residents of Spaniard's Bay, the controversy over a dump over there in the Conception Bay community?

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

HON. W.G. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, we undertook a consultant study last fall on the Conception Bay Central Area. The report was submitted to us around October. There is an alternate site, the one presently being used in Spaniard's Bay. It has to be developed and we are working on that now.

MR. SPEAKER: The thirty minutes for the question period have expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Tourism, a bill, "An Act Respecting Public Libraries And Boards To Operate Them," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Member for Twillingate, a bill, "An Act To Regulate Political Party Financing And Election Contributions And Expenses",

read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion (2) adjourned yesterday with the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Motion (2), yes, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity yesterday - could I find out how much time I have left by the way, approximately - fifteen.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: No, not on Private Members' Day.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity yesterday of outlining the main reasons why government believes it is important that this resolution be passed by this honourable House and forwarded to the Secretary of State for External Affairs in the Federal Government. The two main reasons are: first, we want to see the Federal Government take a more aggressive stance than we have seen them take so far with respect to, first of all, extending Canadian jurisdiction with respect to fisheries out to the edge of the Continental Margin, not just out two hundred miles. There are valuable fish stocks, valuable spawning grounds outside two hundred miles. In some cases it is necessary to go out in excess of four hundred miles, I submit, Mr. Speaker, in order to protect the fish stocks the way they should be protected. Also, Mr. Speaker, we believe they should be more aggressive in maintaining the rights which we believe Canada now has and which we believe within Canada the Province has the right to, with respect to the minerals of the seabed, again out to the edge of the Continental Margin.

The second reason, Mr. Speaker, in addition to forcing them to take a more aggressive stance, that we want to see this resolution passed, is to impress upon the Federal Government the fact that there are provincial rights involved here and if these

provincial rights are in any way going to be modified because of any international treaties entered into by the Department of External Affairs, then we have something at stake. The provincial government have a right, Mr. Speaker, to be approached by the federal government prior to any such decisions being made.

Now we have been consulted, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the position Canada is taking at the Law of the Sea Conference. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have had an effect on having Canada modify its position with respect to fisheries particularly because they are now putting forth at the conference the position that we recommended with respect to fisheries, that is, to go for control of fisheries out to the edge of the Continental Margin. They are putting this forward instead of the species approach that they had originally where they treated different species of fish differently.

Mr. Speaker, we had at the last Law of the Sea Conference a Mr. Rupert Prince as a member of the Canadian delegation, and this year, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Prince has now moved into another capacity with government. This year, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cabot Martin, from the Department of Mines and Energy, will be attending as the province's representative on the Canadian Law of the Sea delegation.

Now there is a limit, Mr. Speaker, and we are aware of this, as to how far provincial representatives are going to get involved in the conference. The actual negotiations and bargaining and so on will be carried out by the people on the staff of the Department of External Affairs and by federal government officials. But, Mr. Speaker, we have made it clear to the federal government, and Mr. Martin has been briefed to this effect, that we want to know as soon as it becomes apparent that rights with respect either to the minerals of the seabed or with respect to Canadian Fisheries jurisdiction, we want to be informed, this government wants to be informed and we will be making representation and strong representation to the federal government if it appears that in any way provincial interests are likely to be jeopardized.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs intends to be present at the conference at some stage, probably near the end of the conference since I understand this is the most effective time to make representation. Mr. Speaker, I hope myself to be present during the course of the conference because, Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out yesterday, there are fantastic stakes being played for here, fantastic stakes in terms of Newfoundland's future.

I gave you a few of the statistics, Mr. Speaker, when I tabled this map which shows that just beyond the 200 miles alone, you are talking with respect to the sea floor, the minerals of the sea floor, you are talking about an area of 210,000 sq. miles, an area larger than the combined territory of the island and Labrador, Mr. Speaker, which is approximately 150,000 odd square miles, half as much again, Mr. Speaker, as large as our onshore territory.

Now this is not a small area, Mr. Speaker. We now have fisheries resources being exploited there. Unfortunately they are being over-exploited. They are being ruined, Mr. Speaker, by the over-exploitation. We had just the beginnings of oil and gas developments over this area, Mr. Speaker. In years to come we will see other activities. We will see deep sea mining, Mr. Speaker, activities which are now being carried out in other parts of the world this very day.

As a matter of fact, in addition to the Howard Hughes Corporation which has received a fair amount of publicity, I believe he calls it the Summa Corporation which has developed machinery and technology to permit it to mine the deep ocean floor, we have a number of other companies, Deep Sea Ventures Limited for example, Mr. Speaker, has actually gone out and filed a claim, filed a claim in one area of the Pacific Ocean and has submitted this to the federal government, the United States Federal Government and requested the United States to defend its claims. This is out

in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, hundreds of miles from the nearest landfall, Mr. Speaker. They have filed a claim to the deep sea floor, and they have said to the United States Government, as citizens of the United States we demand that you protect our claim, and ensure that we have the right to exploit the minerals of the seabed.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the chaos, the chaos if it is permitted for private individuals, private companies to go off our shores or the shores of any coastal state and start doing what they bloody well want to do, Mr. Speaker? There have to be controls. We have to avoid the dangers of pollution, Mr. Speaker. We have to avoid potential interference with fishing operations, for national defence purposes, for many other reasons, Mr. Speaker. It is imperative that Canada obtain and maintain jurisdiction out to the edge of the Continental Margin. If they settle for 200 miles, Mr. Speaker, they will, as I have said, be giving up an area larger than the existing landmass of Newfoundland and Labrador. They will be giving up in excess of 210,000 square miles.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am underestimating, I am just looking at the quantity of the Continental rise beyond 200 miles. I forgot about the Continental Slope and the Shelf - in excess of 300,000 square miles, Mr. Speaker, more than double the size of Newfoundland and Labrador. So there is a lot at stake here, Mr. Speaker.

Now at the present time - well it might be asked why am I so concerned about Canada's lack of aggressiveness? Well I read yesterday, Mr. Speaker, a statement by Mr. MacEachen which indicates that all he can see, or all that he is emphasizing is out 200 miles. That is not the position, by the way, that his delegation has put to the Law of the Sea Conference. They have up to now been pushing for the limits of the Continental Margin. But what I am afraid of, Mr. Speaker, is that this is an indication that they are not really going to get hard-nosed in their negotiations, that they are not really going to take a firm hard stand to ensure that Canadian jurisdiction continues

out to the edge of the Continental Margin.

Mr. Speaker, it is only in the last couple of years that we have seen our federal government take any interest in the oceans off our shores. We have one of the longest coastlines in the world. We have the second largest Continental Shelf in the world. The Canadian Government have showed very little interest in terms of getting involved in proper management of the fishing stocks, the fishery stocks off our coast. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, that is because of the pure economic facts of life. Maybe it is because that the value of the fishery in terms of the Canadian gross national product is approximately two per cent, or something less than two per cent, so that in pure economic terms it does not make any great impact nationally to our gross national product.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the social affect in a province such as ours, in terms of the number of people, Mr. Speaker, who are employed by this industry - what is it some 20,000 people dependent upon the inshore fishery alone?

AN HON. MEMBER: Nineteen thousand.

MR. BARRY: Nineteen thousand people in this province - 20,000.

Mr. Speaker, the fishery is crucial to our economy, not only to our economy, crucial to our very way of life. And although it may not mean that much in terms of the Canadian gross national product, Mr. Speaker, we think it is time that the Canadian Governemnt recognize the value of proper management of our ocean resources.

Now they are coming around to this way of thinking. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it has taken almost the destruction of the fishing industry to bring them to their senses. Also, Mr. Speaker, I suspect the other reason that all of a sudden we are hearing statements about new oceans policies emanating from Ottawa is because they see there may be a few dollars, a few more dollars involved in oil and gas. Mr. Speaket, we have seen then their attitude with respect to federal control of oil and gas on the Continental Shelf which we, of course, do not accept and will never accept. But because there is this great potential for

oil and gas, the great potential for additional revenue, all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, we see Canada starting to wake up and realize just what is at stake off our shores. We see the federal government paying a bit more attention to ocean policy. And we see internationally, because of the Law of the Sea Conference, all the countries of the world becoming aware of just how important the resources of the ocean are to the well-being of all our citizens.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the resolution, we believe, was important enough to have us set aside any political bickering. Initially we started off with the Leader of the Opposition having a resolution on the Order Paper, which we felt that we could not support because of a number of, what we felt, were shortcomings, but we got together, Mr. Speaker. We have a good combined resolution there. It is one that, I think, can be forcefully brought to the attention of the federal government, as I hope, a unanimous resolution of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of this House, both on the government side and those in opposition, to vote for this resolution. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of immediate short-term impact on our people that the importance of this resolution may not be readily seen. This may be why the eloquent language of the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, and the few short remarks that I had an opportunity to make yesterday, Mr. Speaker, why they were relegated below the comments of the Auditor General with respect to the \$1,600 worth of liquor that was charged up to the government airplane.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the impact of this resolution is more deserving. It should be brought, Mr. Speaker, to the attention of the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador just what is at stake here, what is at stake in terms of their future and their children's future. We can try in this House, Mr. Speaker, to do this, but unfortunately unless this is something that grasps the imagination of the media people we will talk to ourselves and to the few people who have an opportunity to visit in the galleries. But then the full impact, Mr. Speaker, is lost on the people of our province. We will keep trying, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the other members who will get involved in this debate will also contribute to making our people aware that discussions that will be held in Geneva, from March 10 to May 10, of this year, will have as great an impact, as great an effect on the future of our province as any decision probably that was made in this honourable House of Assembly, or as great an impact as any decision

made in the federal parliament. We have international law being created. We have possibly treaties about to be entered into which will determine the future of our province, not merely for months or years but for centuries to come, Mr. Speaker. We have fantastic potential resources at stake, hundreds of thousands of square miles of territory, Mr. Speaker, that just because it is covered by water our people have difficulty in becoming aware of what is involved. Mr. Speaker, I submit that if anybody dared come in and attempt to lop off a portion of the Burin Peninsula or a portion of the Great Northern Peninsula or, yea verily, a portion of Labrador, if somebody attempted to come in and say, well your boundaries have been there but we are going to change them, we are going to take away one square foot of territory, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province would rise up, and regardless of what government said or anybody else, they would say, no way. It will never happen.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have the possibility, and I hope it is only a vague possibility, but we have the possibility, Mr. Speaker, of losing, at this conference, some 300,000 square miles of potential resource-bearing territory. That is not something, Mr. Speaker, that we should permit happening without raising our voices. That is not something that we should not make the people of our province aware of. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the effect of this debate will be, not only to get a resolution proceeding to Ottawa to demand that they take the aggressive stance that we believe they should take, but also, Mr. Speaker, we hope that it will make the people of the province aware of what is at stake so that they also will put the pressure on the federal government, so that when the federal government come back to account to the people of Canada, following the Law of the Sea Conference, they know that they will have to justify any modification of our rights. Mr. Speaker, they will be put on notice by this resolution that we will not be satisfied with any modification of our claim with respect to the

seabed out to the edge of the continental margin, nor will we be satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with anything less than jurisdiction with respect to the fisheries also out to the edge of that margin. Because only in this way will our fishing stocks be protected and only in this way, Mr. Speaker, will our people get the full benefits of the resources of the seabed. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, so far we have had two speakers express their views on this most important resolution that we have before the House at the present time. So far, Sir, the discussion has been on a high plane, a high level, has been most interesting indeed. For the first time, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, in three years, both the opposition, both the members who sit on this side of the House, including my honourable friend from Labrador South, I presume, and the members who sit on the benches opposite us, Sir, we see eye to eye for the first time in three years on a matter of grave urgent public importance to the people of this province.

Now, Sir, this is a good thing. Sometimes I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this is not the way that we should be working all the time, although I realize, Sir, I am not that much of an idealist, and I realize, Sir, that on most occasions statements and accusations and policies and charges are developed along partisan political lines. Once in a while, Mr. Speaker, there comes the time in the history of every political party when they have to lay their political differences aside in the best interest of the people of the province. Now this indeed is a very, very rare occasion and one, Sir, which I personally welcome, and that is why I am so pleased to be able to support this resolution which was so ably moved by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, and then amended by my learned friend, the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Member for Placentia West.

It is a kind of a long resolution, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps a lot of the students, who are in the galleries today, and maybe some of the other spectators in the galleries today, listening to the debate, back and forth, they may not be completely familiar with what it is all about. And I can understand that, Sir, because you really have to get in on the beginning of debate to find out what it is all about. But these students, Sir, that we have from the District of Hermitage today, which is a fishing area of the province, Sir, certainly know what we are talking about, when we are discussing the 200 mile limit, the 200 mile fishing limit.

I would go as far as to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is hardly a man, woman or child in this province today because of all the publicity that the 200 mile limit has been getting over the past few years, who do not understand the importance of the 200 mile limit to the fishermen of this province. It is a matter of life and death, Sir, for the fishermen of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if honourable members are aware of it or not, but let me, Sir, inform the House of some statistics that I came across the other day on fish landings for the year 1974. Well, Sir, in case honourable members do not realize it, in 1974 fish landings were down substantially in value and in volume from 1973. If we had recorded the 1973 catch and sold it at the 1974 average prices, the total value, the returns to the fishermen would be \$14.4 million greater than the return realized for 1974. Fish landings, Mr. Speaker, for 1974, according to the Department of the Environment in the Canadian Government, were 514.8 million pounds, down, Mr. Speaker - just listen to this, Sir, here is the shocker - down 159.4 million pounds or a whopping twenty-four per cent, Sir, from 1973 catches. The value of fish landed was \$42 million, down \$5.3 million, or eleven per cent, Sir, from 1973.

Sir, that is enough to startle anybody, Mr. Speaker. What is the reason behind it? Some people may argue it is because we have a less number of people fishing, but, Sir, according to the figures that I have been given there are still about 20,000 inshore fishermen, either full-time or part-time, who earn a living or partly earn their living fishing inshore. Then we have the mid-water fishermen and then we have the deep-water fishermen, the trawlers and the druggers.

So, Mr. Speaker, technology has come to our fishery. We have more fish plants today than we have ever had before in our history, but according to last years figures, Sir, fish landings are down by 159.4 million pounds. Now, Sir, that would lead you immediately to ask the question, why are our fish landings down? There are just as many people trying to eke a livelihood from the sea. There are more

people working in the fish plants. We have the trawlers and the draggers. So, why, Mr. Speaker, are the fish landings down by twenty-four per cent? The obvious answer, Mr. Speaker, that pops in your mind is that the fish are just not there to be caught. They are just not there, Sir. We are overfishing off our shores. The poor, lonely fishermen of this province, Sir, have been preaching that for years and years, preaching it as long as I have been in public life.

First, Sir, we took the gigantic step of getting a three mile limit. A great thing, a major accomplishment, gigantic step forward, a three mile limit. Then we got the ~~twelve~~ mile limit. I cannot say the ~~twelve~~ mile limit is being enforced. We hear the member for Bonavista South once in a while bellyaching about the foreign draggers coming inside of our twelve mile limit, fishing, tearing up gear, destroying fishermen's gear. Once in a while we hear the "Burgeon Burp" tell us, Sir, that he can look out his window and see the foreign draggers and the foreign trawlers inside the twelve mile limit.

So, Sir, even though we declared the twelve mile limit, I would say to a large degree, that the problem with the twelve mile limit has been enforcement. But, Mr. Speaker, most fishermen, most people in the know, not the politicians or the businessmen, not the civil servants, Sir, the ordinary fishermen will tell you that the twelve mile limit today is just not good enough.

So, what we are talking about in this resolution, Sir, we are talking about two separate and distinct items. We are talking about one matter, the Government of Canada declaring a 200 mile fishing limit. That is a matter, Sir, that has to be decided within the Canadian constitution. It has to be decided within the boundaries of Canada. There are people who will argue that Canada should take a unilateral decision, that Canada should not fool around in negotiating with other countries at the Law of the Sea Conference, that Canada should go it alone. I have heard members of this honourable House make statements that not only

should the Government of Canada declare a 200 mile limit but, if necessary, bring in the battleships - gun-boat diplomacy. We have heard it from members of this honourable House and we have heard it from federal M.P.'s and ex-federal M.P.'s and we have heard it from Mr. Marshall, M.P., and we have heard it from Mr. Carter, and Mr. Lundrigan when he was in Ottawa.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether these people are serious or not when they talk about gun-boat diplomacy. Mr. Speaker, Canada now for the last several years, Sir, has been trying desperately, they have done everything humanly possible to try to persuade all the foreign countries that are fishing off our shore that if we do not bring in some conservation measures, that if we do not reduce the quotas of fish taken off our shores, that there soon will be no fish there to get. Canada, Sir, has been doing this now for the past several years. They did it, Sir, when we were the government on that honourable side of the House. They are doing it since the Tories took over the administration in 1972.

It is a motherhood item, Sir. It is something that we all agree on. It is something that we all want to see happen. We are becoming impatient, Mr. Speaker. Five years ago when you made these statements about gun-boat diplomacy, I for one, Sir, would tremble and shake in my shoes. Could you imagine, Mr. Speaker, Canada taking a unilateral decision to declare a 200 mile fishing limit and then building up a big air force and a big navy to try to enforce that 200 mile limit. What would happen, Sir? You would have a third world war start on the Grand Banks. All you need, Mr. Speaker, is to fire one shot.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am coming to that. Mr. Speaker, all you need is somebody to fire one shot and the next thing you would have the jets and the rockets going out on the Grand Banks, and the next thing you know poor, old Canada, little Newfoundland, would be right in the middle of a third world war. Sir, it could be that serious.

Mr. Speaker, that was five years ago. Today I too, Sir, along with the other members of this honourable House, am becoming impatient with the way the negotiations are going. I think,

Mr. Speaker, that it is time now that we showed a little muscle. We have been diplomatic long enough. We have gone on our hands and knees to these Law of the Sea Conferences long enough, begging and pleading and crying to try to get these countries to recognize the two hundred mile limit.

Mr. MacEachen, Sir, will be going off to the Law of the Sea Conference some time later on this month in Geneva. Mr. MacEachen, as far as I can understand, Sir, despite what the Minister of Mines and Energy read from that clipping he had from the Burin Post, I think it was, Mr. MacEachen is going off this time to Geneva angry and it would not surprise me one bit, Sir, and certainly our resolution to Mr. MacEachen at this time will not do any harm, it would not surprise me one bit, Sir, but he will inform - first of all, they will try again. They will try to diplomatically work out an arrangement because these countries claim they have historical and traditional rights for fishing off our shores. I believe, Sir, in the end, and I would be awfully disappointed if it did not happen, that Mr. MacEachen and the Government of Canada are also becoming impatient. Before they get to the end of that conference, Sir, I hope that they will at long last lay down the law and said to the Russians and the Portugese and the Spaniards and the French and all the other people who are fishing off our shores, "Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to declare unilaterally a two hundred mile fishing limit off our Coast." No beating around the bush, plain ordinary common sense, ordinary baby talk.

If you need a bunch of interpreters to tell the Russians and to tell the French and the Portugese and the Spaniards and whoever else is out here off our Coast, then hire the interpreters and say, "You tell Mr. Salazar, no, he is not there in Portugal now, well, "You tell your leaders, you tell your dictators, tell your leaders that Canada has been beating around the bush long enough trying to get you people to make up your minds. We are now at the end of our patience and we are going to declare a two hundred mile limit." We will enforce the two hundred mile limit, just like the Minister of Justice said that Iceland is enforcing their, what is it, fifth mile limit they have there, is it? -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They fired shots.

MR. NEARY: They fired shots. It is about time, Mr. Speaker, that we had a little intestinal fortitude. I do not think for one minute now, today, that we will start a third world war on the Grand Banks. Put up the signs, put up the signs, "Two hundred miles, trespassers will be prosecuted, beware!"

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not shy. I would not go as far to say that, Sir. Beware, beware, Steve is watching you, beware. Keep outside of our two hundred mile limit. Sir, I think that we can do a selling job to these other countries because, Mr. Speaker, they must realize by now too that if they keep sending over these big factory ships, beautiful big boats - they come over here for six months at a time. They do not even have to go back to refuel. They are refueled right in the North Atlantic. They have both men and women on board these Russian factory ships. They have smaller ships bringing the processed fish back to Russia. - They must realize, Mr. Speaker, that fish is getting scarce off our coasts and it soon will not be feasible for them to send over their ships. So we have to start in, Sir, if our fishery is going to survive, not die. I would like to be a little bit optimistic about this. We have to, we have to for our own protection and for the protection of people in other countries of the world, declare a two hundred mile limit for no other reason than to conserve our fish stocks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having done that, once we do that, Sir, then we have to make sure that we are ready in Newfoundland to get out off our shores and catch the fish that we hope then will be there. It may take a few years for the stocks to come back. That means, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to have to, if you will excuse the word, Sir, dirty word, we are going to have to restructure our fishery, restructure our fishery, Sir. We have got to, Mr. Speaker, if we are sincere about the two hundred mile limit. I think we hope, that all of us here in this House hope that we will get the two hundred mile limit at the Law of the Sea Conference

that is coming up in Geneva. We all hope that we will hear good news from the other fishing nations of the world.

Once we get that, Mr. Speaker, we have to be able to show the Government of Canada, we, in this Province, that we are quite capable to go out there and catch the fish. You know, Mr. Speaker, a lot of our moaning and groaning and a lot of our bellyaching, some of it, Sir, has been unjustified because here we are with the world's richest sea right on our doorstep, loaded down with fish for years and we did not have the foresight, did not have the initiative to go out and catch the fish, even when we had the opportunity to do so. We could not compete with the Russians. They have to come thousands and thousands of miles off our shores to catch fish. Ah! We have to use our imagination, Sir, and we have to get the boats and the gear and the technique to go out and compete with these people and catch the fish and say to the Government of Canada, "You give us the two hundred mile limit and by God we will produce a fishery programme in this Province second to none and we will catch the fish and we will help you increase your gross national product." It is only two per cent now, Sir, fish. We will drive it up to twenty or twenty-five per cent. We will help to take care of the hunger in the third world countries. We will help to supply protein to a protein hungry world.

Give us the two hundred mile limit and we will catch the fish. But, Sir, we cannot sit back on our oars. We have to develop the programme now. Unfortunately, Sir, unfortunately, I can see no indication at all that there is any move at this moment to restructure our inshore fishery. Right now we are passing through a very difficult period, doom and gloom. The trawlermen are on strike. Everybody thinks it is the end of the world. You would not know but it was the first strike that we have ever had in Newfoundland. The trawlermen are striking to change a system and I think they are right. I think eventually, Sir, that they will win their point. All this, Mr. Speaker, all this will be completely irrelevant, all this will be useless, Sir, will be futile, unless the fish are there to be caught.

The only way that that can be done, Sir, is for the Government of Canada to declare a 200 mile fishing limit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the other matter, about our offshore gas and minerals. Mr. Speaker, this is another motherhood item. The Premier has tried to play, over the last year or so, a little politics with it. Every time he gets on the television, with his Colgate smile, he is poking fun at the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition never takes a stand, he says, on offshore gas and oil, and mineral rights. He never takes a stand on the 200 mile limit.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yesterday, Sir, we heard the Leader of the Opposition tell the House and tell the people of this province the Liberal policy.

MR. PECKFORD: The first time for over a year.

MR. ROBERTS: A first time for a year? Mr. Speaker, does the honourable Member for Green Bay think that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has to jump every time the Premier goes on television and says, well what is your stand? And he starts whining and groaning and moaning and weeping -

AN HON. MEMBER: And gnashing his teeth.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, he has a real Colgate smile when he is on television. He should be advertising toothpaste.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: After the introduction of this resolution by the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, let there be no doubt in anybody's mind where the Liberal Party, where the Leader of the Opposition stands on these two great issues, these two important issues to the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, it would not make any difference what government were in power. It would not really make any difference, Sir, if it were a Liberal Government, or a P.C. Government, or an N.D.P. government. Whatever government are in power, Sir, are going to try and get the

best deal they can for Newfoundland when it comes to offshore resources. Why, that is a motherhood issue, Sir.

Maybe we think, Mr. Speaker, that the Tory Administration are dragging their heels, they are too slow. I get impatient myself, I say, my God, why have they not got this settled? What happens if we discover gas down off Labrador, or oil off Labrador? What happens, Sir? Who is going to get the revenue? Right now we do not know. They are down there drilling with two permits, one from the Provincial Government and one from the Government of Canada. But that is an argument that has been going on now, Sir, I would say, for the last twelve years anyway. It is about time that too was settled, Sir. It is about time that the province got off its behind and used a little muscle with the Government of Canada to settle up this question of the jurisdiction of offshore mineral resources.

Mr. Speaker, I worked with a mining company myself for twenty-one years. Sometimes I worked down in the mine, I did not actually dig out the ore, but I put in a fair amount of time underground. And that was a submarine mine, Sir,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: It was a submarine mine. It ran, Mr. Speaker, if you took the main slope of No. 3 mine, and the Forsythe slope that ran off the main level, put the two of them in a straight line you could go, I would say, about four and a-half miles straight out under Conception Bay.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is what it is, Sir. It is a great place to store oil if we can ever get anybody interested in using it for storing oil. So, Mr. Speaker, here we were, we have a precedent. Here is a submarine mine, here you have a resource out under the ocean stretching out, I would say, six or seven or eight miles out under the seabed. No argument about that, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. DOODY: It is within our territorial limits.

MR. NEARY: It is within our territorial limits. Well, Sir, I think that all -

AN HON. MEMBER: In Conception Bay.

MR. NEARY: That is right in Conception Bay. There was never any argument about it. There was no constitutional arguments. It was just taken for granted that it belonged to the poor old Province of Newfoundland. Just the same, Sir, as we believe on this side of the House that all our resources off our coast belong to the people of this province. Sir, our hearts are beating together on this. There is no argument. The honourable members and the Hon. Premier cannot go out and make an election issue out of that. We have completely neutralized them, disarmed them, because all they are doing, Sir, is continuing on a policy that we started several years ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yes! Yes! Yes!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes! Yes! Yes!

MR. HICKMAN: Remember Mr. Smallwood's statement at the time that Mr. Trudeau said they would, (Inaudible) remember that? in 1968 (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Justice is going back into the past. They like to live in the past over there, Sir. Reaching back into the past. He is going back too far. He should go back to the last two or three years of the Liberal Administration. After the minister bailed out, then we started to get a little common sense on this side of the House. When the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance, when they left us and bailed out, and went across the floor of the House, Then Sir, we started to get a little intestinal fortitude, and those of us who went into the cabinet after these honourable gentlemen left

could see where the weakness was, Sir. They were wishy-washy. The Minister of Justice, who was suppose to be our spokesman in Ottawa on these matters, was wishy-washy and was incapable. He could not make up his mind.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The Hon. the Premier was nearly bonkers. He was frustrated nearly out of his mind, the Premier of the day, because he could not get the Minister of Justice to give him a legal ruling on anything. The man was incapable.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The man was incapable of making a decision. And, Sir, any work that was done in connection with the constitutional matters that are before us, our offshore resources, the ownership was done by Vince McCarthy, Sir, and Mr. Greene down in that department. At one stage, Sir, you may recall, I am not sure who it was but we went off and asked the advice of a constitutional lawyer who was an expert in these matter, in Canada. But this all happened after the honourable crowd left. And how would do they know anything about it? They did not have the courage themselves, Sir, to show a little muscle, to show a little determination. But, Sir, I can tell the Hon. the Premier right now that the policy of the much maligned now former Liberal Administration - poor old Mr. Smallwood, I do not think that we will ever forget him in this House. He keeps cropping up -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The minister who just got flicked out of the cabinet has been talking about him. Mr. Smallwood felt very strongly about this matter, Sir. He felt very strongly and so did his ministers and so did his backbenchers, that the Government of Newfoundland should get the best deal possible for its people. We have not changed. There has been no change. The Hon. the Premier can poke all the fun he wants at the Leader of the Opposition, but the Leader of the Opposition is not going to jump every time the Premier cracks the whip. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition will outline the Liberal policy carefully, calmly, coolly in language that people can

understand, intelligently, impartially. And so, Sir, it must come as a great shock, and a great surprise, and a great disappointment to the Hon. the Premier to know that this will not be a major issue in the next provincial election,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: on the offshore, Sir, because we are in complete agreement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: Our hearts are beating in unison -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Sir, the Hon. the Premier was not listening to me. That is a carry-over, a carry-over of the policy of the former administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not be so foolish.

MR. NEARY: It is. After the trio got flicked out, the Liberals over on the Tory side now got flicked out.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

We said it, Sir, back in 1969, 1970, 1971 -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Can we bring what?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, no issue. The Premier has no issue in this connection. The issue is with the Government of Canada, not with the opposition or not with the people of Newfoundland.

MR. CROSBIE: Do not be apologetic.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not being apologetic, Sir. Mr. Speaker, the 200 mile fishing limit is an emotional issue. That could be developed into a pretty good emotional issue if George McLean only knew how to do it, but the offshore resources is an non-emotional issue and the Premier will never win or lose an election on that kind of an issue. No, Sir, that is not the one to run on. If I were leading a party in this province at the present time, I know the issues that I would run on.

So, here we are, Sir, in this honourable House today, March 6, 1975 A.D., together. Our hearts are beating as one, no difference. Motherhood stuff, we are all for it. The Leader of the Opposition introduced a resolution, supported and amended by the government side of the House, Sir, and I think this is the way it should be because, Mr. Speaker, you might recall the "Evening Telegram", Mr. Wick Collins thinks we are all a bunch of actors up here. None of us are sincere. None of us are trying to get anything done.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, in some respects he is right. There are times when I watch the Minister of Fisheries, Sir, I swear that all he has got to do is paint his face and put on his polka dot suit with his little pointed hat and he would certainly make a great entertainer down at the Santa Claus Parade at Christmas time.

Mr. Speaker, there are times when I feel that maybe we should move the whole circus over to the stage of the Arts and Culture Center, because sometimes, Sir, it comes through as being phony. It is all a big act. It is all a big joke. Nothing is being done. Fortunately, Sir, now with this resolution, something constructive at long last is

being done. If we do nothing else in this session of the House, Sir, but pass this one resolution, I would say that we have justified this session of the House of Assembly.

Let me remind members, Sir, about the resolve of this resolution once more, just to point out to the spectators who may not have been here to hear the original resolution being read, what it is all about. "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED by the House of Assembly in legislative session convened as follows:

- that this Honourable House insists that at the forthcoming Law of the Sea Conference the Federal Government seek to extend Canada's jurisdiction over fisheries to the limit of the continental margin and that it maintain Canada's existing rights and jurisdiction over the minerals of the seabed and subsoil thereof to the limit of the continental margin and not merely out to a limit of 200 miles;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House declares that Canada should by proclamation take such jurisdiction in the event that the Law of the Sea Conference which will convene at Geneva in the month of March, 1975 does not so constitute and declare an international regime by December 31, 1975."

Mr. Speaker, I would say to that, "Hear! Hear!". They have now, Sir, to the end of this year, all the countries that come over here and catch our fish have until the end of this year to make up their minds whether they are going to voluntarily recognize our 200 mile limit or take a chance on getting a rocket right up the stern of one of their ships out here on the Grand Banks. It is a good thing, Sir. It is a very historic occasion in this honourable House. It is the kind of thing that I would like to see going on. It is the kind of debate that I like to participate in in this honourable House, hard-nosed debating, maybe once in a while getting in the odd little lick at the government, Sir. That is allowed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for having the foresight and for having the initiative and for having the courage to introduce this resolution in the House of Assembly. It

started off on opening day, Mr. Speaker - I am well aware of what happened - it started off as being one-upmanship. That is what I think they call it in the business world. I do not know what you would call it in politics, one-upmanship. The Leader of the Opposition came in and introduced a motion on opening day not knowing, not realizing that a few moments after the Minister of Mines and Energy got up and introduced almost an identical resolution.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the day has been saved by both sides using a little sense and sitting down together, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition with the Minister of Mines and Energy, sitting down over here in the Leader's office calmly and collectively merging the two resolutions.

MR. DOODY: Any firelight or background music?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, there was no romantic music in the background. There was no clanking of glasses. It was done, Sir, if Your Honour will recall, when we took a recess yesterday for ten minutes, I think it was. Both gentlemen got together. I want to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition, Sir. Now, mind you, he may have been pushed and shoved and provoked and motivated by some of his colleagues. May have been, Mr. Speaker. I have no doubt but he was. One thing we have on this side of the House, Sir, are regular caucus meetings. Everybody knows what is going on.

So, he may have been prodded a little bit, but, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition certainly yesterday made it clear what the - he took the initiative and made it clear - what the Liberal Policy is on our offshore resources and on the 200 mile limit. Sir, I would be very remiss in my duties indeed if I did not also extend congratulations to the Minister of Mines and Energy for amending the resolution, for allowing his resolution to be incorporated in this resolution which stands on the Order Paper in the name of the Leader of the Opposition. That, Mr. Speaker, the minister is to be congratulated for. He put party politics aside, Sir, and agreed that both resolutions should be combined and placed on the Order Paper in the name of the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, that was

a big sacrifice. There is no question about that because after all, Sir -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Penny ante.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The honourable member has two minutes.

MR. NEARY: Two minutes, Sir. Thank you very much.

MR. BARRY: Just have a lash at the CN now. Let us see, where is Newfoundland there.

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland? Penny ante - oh, this has to do with the railways. We will talk about that later.

Mr. Speaker, the sooner we can get this resolution dispatched to Mr. MacEachen and the Government of Canada, I would say the better because we will want an opportunity to sit down with the group that will be going to Geneva to look at this resolution. They will say, "Well, now, that is not just politics. That came from all sides, all members of the House of Assembly in Newfoundland. They must be pretty sincere and pretty serious and pretty worried about these matters there in Newfoundland." Then Mr. MacEachen, let us pray, Sir, let us hope and pray that Mr. MacEachen will go over to that Law of the Sea Conference and show a little muscle and bring home the bacon, Sir, for Newfoundland.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would be indeed remiss of my representation in a fishing district like Bonavista South if I did not have a few words to say on this very important resolution. I think I am going to say things this afternoon that may be a bit controversial because I am not going to agree with some of the other speakers. I fully agree with the resolution. I think it is a good gesture on the part of this legislature and we are going to vote for it, I think, unanimously and get it off to Ottawa.

What I am going to say is that I am wondering what it will mean because I have a number of reservations about going to this upcoming Law of the Sea Conference in Geneva, part two of the third conference, the Law of the Sea Conference.

I am a bit pessimistic, maybe I should say more than pessimistic, because I am not at all convinced the Law of the Sea Conference is going to achieve anything at all.

I have been sitting back the last couple of days and looking over the minutes of the meetings of the last two Law of the Sea Conferences, the one held in New York in 1973 and the one held in Caracas, the first part of number III, in Caracas in 1974. I think that what has been taking place at these Law of the Sea Conferences is some international diplomacy, some political international niceties, the best you can find, but with little achievement.

Mr. Speaker, that is the very reason today that we see in the USA, our neighbouring country, we see a bill that is being now passed by the US Senate, not yet passed by the Congress, but passed by the US Senate, declaring an exclusive fishing zone, extending 200 miles out from the Coast of the USA. Now if the USA had any confidence in the Law of the Sea Conference, it being a major participant in the last conference, the last two conferences, if it had any confidence at all as a country, why would that country now in this crucial stage of international negotiations, why would that country suddenly declare or attempt to declare a 200 mile fishing zone. Because surely you must recognize that it would have a detrimental effect on the upcoming negotiations, because if one country decides to go it alone and because there is so much at stake that each country is only watching the other, or each nation watching the other very closely as to what they are doing.

This bill now before the US Congress is, in my view, going to have a very detrimental effect on the upcoming Law of the Sea Conference. But maybe it is not only because of the impatience of the US as a nation, of the US fishermen, and God only knows this country and in our little Province of Newfoundland, the impatience! The patience of the fishermen are worn out.

They watch it daily when they see foreign fishing ships come in and reap the stocks off the coast, day after day, week after week, month after month. The fish stocks in 1974 are down fifty per cent, the fish catches rather, down fifty per cent from 1973. Sure their patience are wearing out. Why would they not?

But is it just only because of the patience wearing out that the USA is taking this action? No. I would say it is because they have no confidence that there will be anything achieved at the upcoming Geneva Conference, that they saw what happened in the last conference.

For example in 1973, in New York, all the nations, I think then there was 132 nations, all these nations could not even agree on the procedure to use at that conference. They could not even come to an agreement as to what kind of procedure they would use. For example, rules of procedure, it took the Caracas meeting, the Law of the Sea Conference, it took that conference one week, one full week where we saw 148 nations, I think it was 2,000 delegates, where they could not even come to an agreement as to what they would set down as rules of procedure, on the third Law of the Sea Conference.

That is the reason why Norway for example, Norway back in late Fall of 1974, issued a statement of intent to declare in 1975 a trawler-free zone to protect the domestic fishing industry. Now there are two countries that took part in the Law of the Sea Conference and obviously had no confidence. Because I am confident that these two actions, of two individual nations, two individual countries, will have serious repercussions on the negotiations that will take place in the Geneva Conference.

Now, Mr. Speaker, even if these 148 nations would get together in Geneva in this month, the end of this month, even if they hopefully come to some agreement, I am convinced it is going to take at least years, possibly two, maybe three years to even set down that

agreement in an actual finalized written agreement, because of the complex international law. It will take at least two or three years. But I am not convinced, as I said at the beginning of my few words on this debate, that The International Law of the Sea Conference is going to achieve anything at all, let alone come to an agreement.

That is one reason why I am pessimistic about this resolution going to Ottawa. I know it will go to Ottawa, passed by this House of Assembly, I am confident of that, but the other major reason, Mr. Speaker, is because I have got no confidence at all in this Country of Canada, this Government of Canada, as a negotiator. The reason why I say that is because I watched Canada, and we all have as a province, we have watched Canada as a negotiator in going to those ICNAF meetings. Nobody can convince me as a politician that Canada has any powers as a negotiator when we go to these international, North Atlantic Fisheries Commission, go to these meetings, ICNAF meetings, and we see the quotas for example in 1974, just back to the Fall of 1974, here we see the Russians and the other foreign fishing ships coming in within nine miles of our coast, even less than that, and during the past two years, fishing extensively the caplin species.

Last year in 1974 when Canada went to the ICNAF meetings they came back and guess what happened? Instead of having the quotas for the caplin species reduced in 1974, I mean 1975, this year, they were increased, increased, but to which country? The Russians. They were increased by 10,000 tons in 1975 over 1974. That is one prime example of Canada as a negotiating power at these meetings. We are dealing with the great nations, and the small nations, all combined.

In 1974, for example, the total quota for the cod along the east coast of the fisheries, from the Grand Banks up along the east coast to the Hamilton Banks, the total quota for the cod was 600,000 tons. Do you know that our Country of Canada only got ten per cent of that quota?

Ten per cent! The reason why, according to the ICNAF meetings and the minutes of these meetings, the reason why? That is all she asked for! That is all Canada asked for!

Of course, then it revolves around some of the officials and the echelons of the Civil Service in Ottawa I have been talking to says, "Well, look what is the point of asking for a bigger quota if we have not got the capabilities to go ahead in catching our fish?" A good point, but again on the other side, what have the federal government done to increase our fishing catching capabilities? I would say very little.

1974 was the first year that we saw any reduction at all, any reduction in the amount of fish to be caught in any species, 1974. 1973 it was increased. 1972 it was increased. 1971 it was increased. All increased every year on the quotas for the fish species.

In the meantime, Canada saw that these species were being over-fished. It was obvious to all of us in the Country of Canada if they lived particularly in the eastern part of our country. We all saw what was happening. The catches were going down each year. It was obvious to anybody with common sense that the stocks were being depleted and over-fished. But in 1973 we saw an increase in practically all the species. In 1972 we saw an increase, in 1971, up through the years.

The first year we got a break at all was in 1974 when we did see a minor increase in some of the species of our fish being caught along the east coast. That to me

is a prime example of what this country can do, what this government in Ottawa can do, as a negotiating power at this international conferences, in particular the ICNAF meetings and now the Law of the Sea.

The reason why also, Mr. Speaker, I am not convinced that we are going to achieve anything is because so far the Government of Canada has not indicated, I am sure, to all members of this House of Assembly and to this province, that they are genuinely determined to go out and get that 200 mile limit at the next meetings or to get the control of the Continental Shelf, whichever is greatest, 200 miles of the Continental Shelf, the edge of it. Because if they were so determined to get control of the fishing zone, and the resources along our shore, why have they not taken some kind of action to make sure that after we get that 200 mile limit that we are going to have some means of management, some means of control and some means of surveillance. What have they done? All we have got today, Mr. Speaker, with regards to surveillance measures are nineteen patrol ships, nineteen fishing patrol vessels, what you call patrol vessels—the others are smaller vessels—nineteen large ones are all we have. There has been no attempt for the past two years to increase that number of vessels. There was only one new vessel built in 1974, one new fishing patrol vessel. Sure we saw in 1974, in the Fall, when we saw the great political public relations job by the federal government, when they came down and they announced the big announcement that they were going to use, I think, twelve or fourteen, I think it was fourteen, destroyers. We are going to have them listed as patrol boats, and we are going to use these fourteen destroyers along the east coast, we are going to keep all the foreigners out, and down they came with one boat, the Annapolis. The destroyer Annapolis came down with two fishery officers aboard. That was in October. They checked on, or supposedly checked on, a fleet of thirty vessels, Russian fishing ships. What have we heard since? We have not seen of nor heard of any destroyers along this coast.

Mr. Speaker, I am willing to say today that we are not going to hear tell of many more. It was simply a P.R. job, a farce, a surveillance farce. That is what it was. There was no genuine attempt

to carry out surveillance measures nor to improve them. Because if there were, we would have those destroyers along our coast right now. We would have them there in the month of December, when we saw the Russians had over-fished their quota for caplin. The minister is now in Ottawa. The minister has now agreed with some of the statements that I have been advocating back and forth to him in telegrams and letters that the Russians were over-fishing their quotas in the months of November and December. He has now agreed that they did overfish their quota, because he found out at the last ICNAF meetings. Why were not these destroyers that were now commissioned as patrol boats, why were they not out there in November and December doing the job they should have been doing? If they are going to be patrol vessels, use them accordingly, not to have nineteen patrol vessels tied up to the wharf most of the time along the east coast and the northeast coast of Newfoundland, and tied up because of one reason, one little reason. They are tied up on the weekends, they are tied up in the evenings, simply because the federal government will not permit these vessels to be manned by double crews, number one; and number two, will not permit the men to be paid overtime. Now is that a genuine attempt on the part of the federal government to show the other countries that we mean business, we are going to get control of the 200 mile zone limit, we are going to have surveillance measures, we are going to have control, we are going to manage the Shelf? No, it is not, Mr. Speaker.

I would say that that kind of attitude towards controlling our Continental Shelf and the fisheries along the Shelf, to me, is a poor example. It is a very weak portrayal of the federal government. That is the reason why I have no confidence when they go to the upcoming Law of the Sea Conference, because they have not, to use the bayman's language, got the guts to stand up. They are afraid of political repercussions, international repercussions. You have to be nice to the other countries.

When one minister in Ottawa, who is no longer in that position, when he was Minister of External Affairs, he practically said so, He did not want to create any waves at these meetings. He did not want to cause any political repercussions. In the meantime we see the livelihood of 18,000 or 19,000 Newfoundlanders being raped by the foreign countries. Sure, it is a great resolution, Mr. Speaker, it is a great resolution. I would say it is one of the most important to be brought before the House, because it affects so many Newfoundlanders, in their livelihood and their future. I would say, indeed, it affects the whole economy of this country. What it will do, and what it will mean by the government taking it to the ICNAF meeting, I am afraid it will mean very little.

Again, there has been some action taken, very little. For example, I noticed that an Atlantic International Fisheries Office has been set up now in Halifax, just recently in fact, in January. They have started. That is the first step they have taken. They have talked about the Law of the Sea Conference. They have talked about the 200 mile limit for the past three years, four years, back before my involvement in politics, but the only action they have taken to date - no, they have taken two actions; they have established the Atlantic International Fisheries Office in Halifax, number one, which is going to develop Atlantic surveillance programmes, they have established that; and also, Mr. Speaker, they have done one other thing, it is very interesting. A few days ago I happened to notice that there was a contract awarded to a Newfoundland company, it was Newfoundland Air Transport. That is a very important step. They awarded a contract to Newfoundland Air Services for an air carrier to carry out surveillance measures along the coast this year, 1975. It is a good beginning, not enough naturally, it is a very small beginning, but it is a good start in the right direction. They have now got Atlantic International Fisheries Office in Halifax, and they are looking at the engaging of aircraft from private companies to use as surveillance air carriers. I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, established in Canada right now, before the Law of the Sea Conference, before we go there, so it will give

us some kind of power behind saying the question of what is your country doing to make sure you are going to manage and control all this territory when you get it, the 200 mile of the Continental Shelf, I would like to see established immediately an Atlantic fisheries management group, and that group or commission would be for to control and monitor fishing activities all along the east coast of Canada.

Now that kind of commission could right now, this month, if set up, could immediately start setting up management procedures in the expectation of getting control of the 200 mile limit or the Continental Shelf, whichever is greater.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I could just interrupt the honourable member for a couple of minutes. By our rules, I am to inform the House, supposedly, by five o'clock today what questions will be debated at five thirty. There are three today. The order of them will be, first, a question by the Hon. Member for Bell Island to the Premier, with regard to unemployment; and secondly, the Hon. Member for St. Barbe North, a question to be debated, the Hon. Minister of Education; and thirdly -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: - a question re the white paper, I think it is, asked a few days ago; and thirdly, the Hon. Member for Bell Island with a question to the Minister of Finance. These are the questions, and that is the order in which they will be debated at five thirty.

The Hon. Member for Bonavista South may proceed.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, while we are having this interruption, I would like to ask the consent of the House for the Minister of Social Services to make a statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable minister have leave to make a statement? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the House very sincerely for giving me this opportunity to make this statement. It is a very important one, and something that has been very sentimental, if you like, or very sorrowful over the past few days so I would just like to make the statement now.

The Department of Social Services and the Newfoundland Conference of the United Church of Canada wish to clarify once and for all the joint decision taken on May 23, 1974, to close the home on Hamilton Avenue, as of March 31, 1975. This decision was taken only after a lengthy series of discussions between the board and the department dating back for several years. Two

concerns were uppermost in the minds of both parties when this decision was taken. The most important of these was the physical, social, emotional and spiritual well being of the children at present residing in the home. Secondly, the justification for continuing to operate the home in the light of changing needs in the field of child care.

On the first concern, both parties are satisfied that these children deserve the right to get settled permanently with parents of their own in normal family settings. To this end, arrangements have been made for eleven of the nineteen children to go for adoption, return to parents or relatives or go with top-notch foster parents. Both the church and the department feel that nobody would deny them this opportunity, not even those who have vested interests or those who have sentimental ties to the Home dating back to orphanage years. The remaining eight children, those who have been in the Home the longest, will remain together in a new group home operated by the United Church in close proximity to the present institution and they will continue to go to the same schools.

This group home will closely resemble a normal family setting operated by a husband and wife who will act as parents to the children. It will be remembered that the Home has been functioning in recent years as a receiving Home for the temporary care of children pending more permanent placement. However, this kind of facility is no longer required to the extent that it once was. In fact, it has not been needed for the temporary care of children since September, 1974, when the last child was placed there. Furthermore, this trend will continue.

In the circumstances, therefore, it seems only sensible to stop providing a service that is no longer needed and begin providing new services that are more responsive to current needs. To this end, the Church and the department will be strengthening its partnership in the field of child care by embarking upon new services almost immediately. Signed by myself, as Minister of Social Services and J.G. Burton, President of the Newfoundland Conference of the United Church of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it was most -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: What do you mean, by leave?

It was most unfortunate, Sir, that there had to be a breakdown in communications in this matter in the beginning because it came as a -

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. There was no breakdown at any time in communications, only the sinister things that were happening on the other side.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, because this is a highly emotional issue, Sir, I am glad now that relationships have been established with the United Church Conference, with the board.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Apologize to the minister.

MR. NEARY: Apologize to the minister for what?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The minister, Sir, seems incapable, seems to be incapable I believe, to communicate with anybody these days.

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

MR. NEARY: He has his whole department in furor, Sir. In this particular matter, it came as a terrific shock to the children, Sir, right out of a clear, blue sky when they discovered that the Home was going to be closed. I think they learned about it at a meeting, at a meeting that was held over there as a group. They were told that the Home was to be closed.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order. Now, this is introducing a debate, this business about a shock to the children when introduced to the matter. I mean this is completely improper. The honourable gentleman is entitled to ask for explanations or to make a few remarks, not to start a debate on a ministerial statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, if I might, Mr. Speaker. There is obviously a very thin line between making remarks and introducing a debate,

or introducing remarks and beginning a debate. It is a very thin line, but I submit that my colleague has not crossed over that line. He is making a few remarks, and he is making a few remarks which are germane and relevant to the statement made by the minister. He is not beginning a debate. We should love nothing better than to debate the minister's conduct but that is not in order and so we will not do it now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Member for Bell Island was straying somewhat from the content or reply to the ministerial statement. I feel that he was probably, because there is a very thin line, but getting getting into the realm of debate on the statement. He may continue.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it was most unfortunate and rather tragic that this situation was allowed to develop to the extent to which it did. My colleagues and I agreed before we came in the House today, Sir, that we would have nothing more to say about it because it was such an emotional issue involving children. We wanted to keep it removed from the realm of politics and that is why during the question period we did not ask any questions about it today, Sir. But I am glad now that the minister has made a statement and I hope that the matter will be put at rest, Sir, forever.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bonavista South.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to get back to the debate on the resolution. Mr. Speaker, how much more time do I have?

MR. SPEAKER: I will check for the honourable member. The honourable member has some twenty-five minutes left.

MR. MORGAN: Okay, Mr. Speaker. Today being the day we go into the late show, I guess I will be a bit briefer and give some other speaker a chance to have a few words to say.

The honourable member of the opposition, I think it was the member of the House for Bell Island, talked about election issues. If ever we wanted

an election issue, if the Premier wanted an election issue right now, I know what it would likely be. I would like to put it this way, that we would demand this Federal Government in Ottawa to take unilateral action and forget negotiations at the upcoming Law of the Sea Conference. Now, that might sound like a radical statement, but it is -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: We demand. We are not going to get it in my view at the upcoming Law of the Sea Conference.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

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

MR. MORGAN: That is what I would like to see as an issue and see where the opposition would stand there. Demand, Negotiations, in my view, have already failed. Canada cannot even negotiate properly to get ICNAF quotas set properly, let alone getting control of our Continental Shelf.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: That will be a good issue.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

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

MR. MORGAN: That will be the issue. That will be the issue. They wanted an issue. Of course, we are all keeping our fingers crossed that negotiations can be the possible way to settle this dispute with the nations and to prevent any further raping of our resources by the foreign countries. We are keeping our fingers crossed that the only means of doing it properly is by negotiation, an agreement by negotiation. We are all hoping for that, each and every one of us, but I have my doubts.

Surely, if we do not get it, if we do not get it at this Law of the Sea Conference, surely this country of Canada cannot wait, we cannot wait for the next Law of the Sea Conference. Action has got to be taken in 1975. We have got to get that control of the two hundred mile limit. Now, there will be an issue. We are going to get control of the Continental Shelf and the two hundred mile limit and we are going to get it by unilateral

action, get it in one way or another.

Mr. Speaker, hopefully the Federal Government will send some powerful negotiators to this Law of the Sea Conference and get some action. But, to dismay me further, just this morning I happened to learn from talking to my reliable sources in the Federal Government's Department of Secretary of State responsible for fisheries, only this morning I learned of this, to dismay me further with regards to the Federal Government's attitude towards our resources and our fisheries, I learned that they are going to spend, going to take part starting this spring in a multi-million six year programme, a multi-million dollar six year programme. To do what? Guess what, Mr. Speaker? They are going to study the reasons why our fish stocks are being depleted, why the fish stocks are declining! Going to study it, the Federal Government, your friends in Ottawa. They are going to embark this spring on a six year programme to study the reasons for the decline in our fish stocks, in particular the herring, the mackeral and the cod, in the specific area, for example, of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and along the East Coast of Canada. Is that not fantastic? Spend millions of dollars when here what they should be doing is spending millions of dollars in building new ships for ship patrols, fish ship patrol vessels, developing surveillance measures, that is what they should be doing, But no! We see studies and more studies. That is all we have seen from the Federal Government, and I am afraid that is all we are going to see.

Mr. Speaker, in closing this debate, when I travel down to Bonavista and talk to the fishermen in the fishing season and get aboard their trap skiffs and go out to the fishing grounds with them - I did this last summer, and I get aboard the longliners and go with them and they come back with a few pounds of fish - and they reminisce on the days when they used to come back with their trap skiffs loaded, when they come back with their longliners, only a few years ago, maybe ten years ago, first when they got in the longliner programme, but in particular, the trap skiff fishermen - there is an awful lot of them in Bonavista, inshore fishermen, and

I went out with them they would reminisce on the days when they could go out and bring back their trap skiff loaded in the morning and loaded in the afternoon, keep them going - That was not too many years ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: That was when I grew up myself on Flat Islands, Mr. Speaker, when my old man was a fisherman. I used to go fishing with the old man.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: There were no gill nets then. There were no longliners. We would go out with the handlines. And I still believe - of course, I will not get too involved in the fisheries because there is another motion on the Order Paper with regards to that - but then you went out years ago with handlines and you would work all day, you are up in the middle of the bay with handlines and load your boat with good old codfish, practically every day - that was back in 1955, 1956, 1957 .

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: I am betraying my age now.

But, Mr. Speaker, these days are gone now. Now they go out on the fishing grounds off Flat Islands where I was born and raised, now they go out there and they get a few meals of codfish. The reason why? We all know the reason why. It all has been taken off out on Saturday Ledge, and Stoney and these places, and all the fishing grounds -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker, But seriously it is a very sad thing because these fishermen recognize and realize the fact that there is no longer any fish stocks. The Labrador fishery is gone. Now all they can do is talk about the past.

So this motion really in essence could be, and hopefully it will be, the end to an era of frustrations and dismay of the fishermen along the Northeast Coast of our province. And that after we get the 200 mile limit in 1975, whether by agreement, or by unilateral action, whichever has to be taken, that in two or three years - I say it will

take two or three years for the stocks to rebuild along the fishing grounds. In two or three years time we can go back - and I can go back in Bonavista again and get aboard of a trap skiff and see a man coming in with a load of cod, a load in the morning, and a load in the afternoon. Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, we can see that day again.

I am sure we are all going to vote for this resolution, and we are all going to keep our fingers crossed that Canada will be quite forceful in their arguments and negotiations in the upcoming Law of the Sea Conference, and will come back - we will all give them three cheers if they say we have our 200 mile limit, or the Continental Shelf, whichever is the greater. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I realize that I only have a few minutes, and I know the anxiety of the honourable members to put this matter to a vote, as was indicated by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday. I am not certain but I believe the hope is that this may go to a vote this afternoon, because time is of the essence, Mr. Speaker, the conference opens on the Law of the Sea Conference on March 17.

My understanding is that resolutions that emanate from this House have to be transmitted by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor to the Governor-General, and then the resolution works its way down until it reaches the appropriate minister. I am certain that the Canadian delegation will be leaving a few days before the 17th. So my feeling is that if we do not get this resolution off today it is not likely to reach the appropriate ministers, in particular the Minister of External Affairs before National Defence - before they leave for Switzerland.

Mr. Speaker, firstly, I think, and I take this debate, and I welcome this debate in a very non-partisan sense. I must very, very briefly for about a quarter, of a minute respond to one statement made by the Hon. Member for Bell Island when he talked about the position of the Smallwood Administration. I think I should remind the

honourable gentleman that in 1967, or 1968, I think it was, Prime Minister Trudeau made a statement on offshore mineral resources wherein he indicated that the Government of Canada took the position that these offshore mineral resources belonged to, and came under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Government of Canada, and that whilst Canada was not prepared to share with the provinces in the management of that resource they were prepared to negotiate on a division of some of the earnings that might accrue from it.

I was rather naive in politics, and I was called as the then Minister of Justice and asked to comment on this. I said very definitively that this was totally unacceptable to the Government of Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Totally unacceptable to the Government of Newfoundland, this was late in the evening. I overlooked the fact that when a minister speaks he apparently is suppose to articulate the position of the government that he is a member of. And to my horror - the next morning there was a statement from the then Premier saying that obviously I was advancing a personal opinion because, in his opinion, it was a very generous act on the part of the Government of Canada. At least it taught me one lesson: never to make a ministerial statement again without first making sure that I was enunciating government policy.

Again as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition pointed out, in 1971, and/or 1972 - yes 1971 - some honourable gentleman who was then sitting in the opposition benches brought in a resolution not too far removed from this asking that the Canadian delegation who were then heading for a meeting with the Russians in Moscow, advise the Russian Government that unilateral action of some sort would be taken unless they were prepared to restrict their catching effort off our coast. That too was -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: I did not think it was voted down. My recollection is that the then Member for Trinity North, Mr. Uriah Strickland got

up and moved for a six months hoist, and his motion was carried by the government of the day. So it is not quite correct to say that there was a vote on it, but at least it was obvious at that time that position was not then acceptable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this administration, I say, and I do not say this in a partisan sense, have taken a very leading role in trying to give the Canadian Government and its delegation to the Law of the Sea Conference last year in Caracas a bit of backbone. We appointed, not too long after we assumed office, a committee of ministers, and also a Newfoundland team of experts to start working on what we thought should be the position advanced by the Government of Canada at the Caracas Conference. This team consisted of Dr. C. A. Barrett, President of the College of Fisheries, Mr. David Jeans, the Chief Environmental Engineer, Mr. Cabot Martin, who was the legal adviser to the Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Vincent McCarthy, Q.C., the Deputy Minister of Justice, and Mr. Rupert Prince. That committee and also the committee of ministers did a great deal of work not really knowing what the position was that would be adopted by the Government of Canada. We were rather apprehensive that Canada really did not have a position formulated, and indeed there were some very disturbing signs that the Canadian Government were not really that concerned over a matter that involved only from two to four per cent of the gross national product.

Our suspicions were confirmed at a federal-provincial meeting of consultants on the third Law of the Sea Conference which was held on September 26, 1973 in the Arts and Culture Centre at St. John's, when the leader of the federal team advised the meeting - and remember now this was only a few months before the conference was to get underway - that at that time September 26, 1973 that Canada had no formal position worked out as yet for the third Law of the Sea Conference. Now this was only a few months away.

In the Spring of 1973 there was a Federal-Provincial Conference of First Ministers. At the insistence of the Premier of this province

March 6, 1975

Tape 214 (Afternoon)

PK - 5

we asked to have placed on the agenda the question of the Law of the Sea Conference, and the right of the provinces to have some input into Canada's position.

MR. HICKMAN: Indeed, we asked the right to attend this as official observers. That suggestion did not really receive any worth-while support. The Premier of Nova Scotia indicated that he thought that it might be a good idea. The Premier of British Columbia was more realistic and said some rather unkind things about the federal government, and we came away from there with not much more than an undertaking that there might be further consultation.

Then in the Summer of 1973, there was a Conference of Premiers at Charlottetown, where our Premier again put the Newfoundland position and asked for and received the unanimous support from all ten provinces - even those who could not care less about the Law of the Sea Conference - that Canada take a firm position and insist on the 200 mile limit or the edge of the Continental Shelf or margin or whatever is the greater.

Even after that - that was the Summer of 1973 - remember that in September 1973, the Government of Canada still had not worked out any position for the Caracas Conference. We subsequently submitted to the Government of Canada, Newfoundland's position vis-a-vis the federal government and the position we hoped the Government of Canada would take. That position paper has been tabled by the honourable the Minister of Mines and Energy.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in May of 1974, I was invited by the External Affairs National Defence Committee of the House of Commons, to appear before that Committee and to review with them Newfoundland's position paper, and to answer questions. I believe that it was the first time that any Provincial Minister, certainly from this Province, had been invited to participate in this kind of setting. I am not certain whether Newfoundland was the only government asked to appear before that committee, but I can assure this House, Mr. Speaker, that this province, this government, was indeed the only provincial government that did, in fact, appear.

The indication I received, and it was more of an impression because I did not put the question to the committee, was that no other government filed any formal position paper with the Government of Canada. I say all that, Mr. Speaker, simply as a background to indicate to this

House that there has been a tremendous amount of work on the part of the Government of Newfoundland and this team of specialists and advisers that we set up. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundland can take full marks for having persuaded the Government of Canada to take a position somewhat different from what it had intended to do.

I would like to have the time to deal with that which was briefly touched on by the honourable the Minister of Mines and Energy, the difference between what is known as the Economic Zone Theory and the Species Theory.

The Species Theory, in my opinion, was the approach and position that the Government of Canada was going to take. Under that theory any fishing nation can come along and say, "in our opinion, a particular species has a sustainable yield of X millions of tons per year, and we have a perfect right to fish for it." This is the cause, in my opinion, of most of our troubles at this time.

The Economic Zone Theory, which was the one that was put by the Government of Newfoundland to the Government of Canada, in effect, says that we have territorial rights out to the end of the Continental Margin. It is our property. It belongs to us. Anyone who fishes there must fish with our licence and we will decide what species will be caught in that area.

Several speaker who have gone ahead of me have mentioned the fact that Canada has not the fishing capacity right now to take all of the sustainable yield from our Continental Shelf and our fishing grounds off the shore. There was a suggestion by one honourable gentleman that maybe, or at least if we get that capacity, then we can sell to the nations who need protein this additional catch that we are going to land and process on the Eastern Canadian shore.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, if under the Economic Zone Theory or Doctrine, we control it and we know there is more caught out there than we have the capacity to land in any particular year, then the Canadian Nation can issue a licence, say to the Portugese, for X number of thousands of tons of fish per year, tell them where they are going to catch it, when they are going to catch it, and how much.

Mr. Speaker, for instance we know that the Spanish have little or no interest, the Spaniards in haddock. They go out now and any species that they haul on board if they are not interested in they throw it overboard. Whereas if you have a licensing system and you determine the species and where that species is most likely to be found, it will cut out, in my opinion, a tremendous amount of waste that we have seen accruing insofar as our fish production of our coasts are concerned.

The Canadian Government went along part way with that economic zone approach, but still wanted to talk about recognizing traditional fishing rights. The position we tried to put to them, and I certainly tried to put to them before the Committee of External Affairs, was that it is about time that Canada ceased behaving and attempting to be the good neighbor, the friendly, international citizen at the expense of her own subjects. It should be made abundantly clear that we are not prepared to compromise on this issue, that if unilateral action is necessary, then unilateral action will be taken. But make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Canada did not go that far at Caracas. It only went half way.

If any honourable gentleman wants to see double talk at its worst, or at its finest, they should read the verbatim of the press conference given in Caracas on August 28, 1974 by the honourable A.J. MacEachen accompanied by the Minister of Regional and Economic Development and the honourable Mr. R. Leblanc and ambassador J.A. Beasley where the press tried to tie them down on what unilateral action Canada would take. Mr. Speaker, I guess I am going to have to adjourn this debate now. If I get the opportunity to continue, I would simply want to read into the record - I would like to get it off, Mr. Speaker, but there is a late show coming at five-thirty. I can conclude in about three minutes but I am in the hands of the opposition. I can only continue here on in by leave. I believe the honourable gentleman for Twillingate wants to speak. So, Mr. Speaker, the best thing I can do is adjourn the debate in the hope that we conclude it early on tomorrow.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the House at its rising do adjourn until Friday, March 7 at 11:00 A.M. in the forenoon.

On motion that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday at 11:00 A.M, carried.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being five-thirty, I recognize the honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, never at any time in our history, Sir, has there been a higher number of Newfoundlanders unemployed. As of the end of January, 1975, Sir, an all-time record for unemployment in the whole history of this province was established when Statistics Canada reported 43,000 Newfoundlanders were out of work.

When I put a question to the honourable the Premier there a day or so ago, Sir, about this matter, the Premier gave me no specific plans, no indication at all that there was going to be any action on the part of the government to deal with this matter. Mr. Speaker, the January figure that I just quoted is 11,000 more than that of December, 1974. We were told at that time, if the House will remember, that unemployment would not rise above - we were told by the Premier, unemployment would not rise above that figure that was quoted in December. Yet in January we find out there are 11,000 more Newfoundlanders unemployed than in December.

Mr. Speaker, in January, 1972 when the Liberals left office there were 21,000 Newfoundlanders unemployed. So, Sir, in just three years of Tory Administration we have seen this figure more than doubled. Well, Sir, is it

any wonder that they say that Tory times are hard times? The heartbreaking part of it, Sir, according to the information provided by the Government of Canada's statistic agency, some 8,268 Newfoundlanders were forced to leave their native province between January 1973 and mid 1974 to earn a living for themselves and their families in other parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the government's programme for the session which opened last Wednesday should have outlined definite measures for dealing with this desperate unemployment situation. A joint federal-provincial programme to create work and to restore the desire to work of our people before their morale has sunk to an all time low, Sir, that work will become a dirty four letter word. Now why, Mr. Speaker? Why would the Newfoundland Government force us to listen to all the catalogue of uninteresting garbage that we heard in the Throne Speech last week, without any reference at all about, or any commitment by the government to do anything about one of our top problems in this province at the present time, namely unemployment.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is because the Premier and his colleagues have no real knowledge or sympathy or dedication or any commitment -

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is reading his speech, and that is not permitted in the House as is well known. The honourable gentleman is reading his speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame. Shame.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! Both honourable gentlemen have made their point. I thought maybe that the member for Bell Island was referring to his copious notes, however.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hope that I never see anybody else

reading his speech in this honourable House. But, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to honourable members of the House that the reason there was no reference in that Throne Speech is because the Premier and his millionaire buddies in the Cabinet are completely out of touch with reality, Sir. They have insulated themselves from the ordinary people of this province. And they are carried away, Sir, they are carried away with their wheeling and dealing, big financial deals and goings on in the international business world and on the national level and they do not have time, Sir, they do not have time to deal with the problems of the ordinary people of this province.

The only thing we can do, Mr. Speaker, the only thing we can do here in opposition, is keep using all the parliamentary techniques that we know how to use to try to force the government to recognize that we do have a desperate unemployment problem at the present time in this province. And we will keep bringing it up, Sir, the cost of living, unemployment. We will keep bringing it up at the late show. We will keep bringing it up in the Throne Speech, every opportunity that we get we will keep reminding that honourable crowd of millionaires, Sir, that there is -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Twenty seconds left.

MR. NEARY: That there is a desperate unemployment problem in this province and that something needs to be done about it immediately.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The honourable the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the Premier is on more important business than answering the honourable gentleman from Bell Island at the moment so he has asked me to do it. It is a typical performance by the Member for Bell Island. The Speech from the Throne outlined, I suppose, 100 plans in the attempt to overcome unemployment. The plan to develop the Lower Churchill being just one of them, the plans to continue our great housing construction programme. The honourable gentleman mentions the unemployment figures, Yes, they are bad, 43,000 people, an adjusted rate of sixteen per cent, but the labour force, Mr. Speaker,

went up from January of 1974 to January 1975 by 8,000 to 187,000 people. The number employed went up from 143,000 employed in January of 1974 to 144,000 employed in January of 1975, so the total number of people employed during the same periods went up 1,000.

The honourable gentleman twisted the figures, so he compared the end of January 1975 to the end of December 1973, not exactly cricket, to get a figure of 11,000, when in actual fact the total number of employed at the end of January 1975 is up 7,000 over the end of January 1974, not 11,000 - 7,000. So we can see what kind of arguments now we can reasonably expect from him.

He forgets to point out some of the other economic indices such as the fact that housing construction in this province was never higher, 122 starts in December 1974 compared to 84 in December of the previous year. The total for the year up 2,252 from January to December as compared to 2,100 and the number under construction up by 300, and the rest of it, all these other indices. The gross value of manufactured shipments up considerably the volume of iron ore up, the volume of pulp wood production up, all of those figures are conveniently forgotten.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the honourable gentleman talks about unemployment and talks about 1972 he should remember that the labour force in Newfoundland has gone up since 1972 by well in excess of 30,000 people.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have not doubled though.

MR. CROSBIE: Well

in excess of 30,000 people, and when we talk about unemployment, we have to look at the government that really controls the economic climate of Canada, and which really decides about unemployment, the Government of Canada, the Liberal Government of Canada, that has been in office now since 1967, and we can see the results of their efforts, when we look at these figures here. They control the Bank of Canada, they control the currency, they control bank credit, they control all the credit facilities of the country, they are the ones that have the lever to do something about unemployment, who we must principally look to. When we look at this little provincial government and see that it spends over \$200 million in capital works during the year in an effort to provide employment as well as provide facilities, we realize that the provincial government is making a fantastic effort to overcome unemployment.

There is another thing I want to say, Mr. Speaker. Let us just look at those figures realistically, now be realistic. How many of that sixteen per cent are actually unemployed and looking for work? How many of them? No more in my view than six or eight per cent, because the others now are on their winter unemployment. They are employed in seasonal industry, and they do not work during the wintertime if they are fishermen.

AN HON. MEMBER: No - inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Or there are carpenters who do not want to work. They are in the construction industry, and they do not want to work in the wintertime, because they work eight or nine months, and in the wintertime they have unemployment, and they do not want to accept unemployment if it is offered to them.

The actual rate of unemployment in Newfoundland is not sixteen per cent or anything like sixteen per cent. There are a great many people in Newfoundland, particularly in the construction industry, who are not wanting to accept jobs. You got the fishermen who

are off on seasonal unemployment insurance and the rest of it. So those figures do not represent 43,000 people actually looking for work. If there were 43,000 people in this province actually looking for work, wanting a job, to go to work, they would be rioting in the streets, and we would not have the kind of other figures that show how unrealistic that position is. You would not have retail sales up, as they are, tremendously over last year. You would not have pulp wood shipments up, iron ore shipments, manufacturing shipments up and the rest of it if we had sixteen per cent unemployment. The island would be in the doldrums, if there was really that figure of sixteen per cent unemployment. So our plans to overcome unemployment are there throughout the Speech from the Throne. They will be there in the Budget Speech. We are borrowing to our limit. We are taxing to our limit. We are spending to our limit to do what we can to create employment in Newfoundland, and it is up to the Government of Canada that controls unemployment insurance, that controls the banking system that controls the Bank of Canada and the currency and the rest of it, to take special measures to help overcome unemployment in Newfoundland and in the other provinces where the unemployment is very high.

So when the honourable gentleman gets up to try to bring this to our attention, to pretend that the Liberal predecessors, I suppose, could have done any better, he is not convincing. I am sorry, is the time up?

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Ten seconds.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, ten seconds.

So, in concluding, Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that I made the honourable gentleman lose his notes there, because he ended up very poorly. He should have stuck to his script.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): The Hon. Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: There goes that Yahoo already.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in 1973 the Throne Speech promised a white paper later on that particular year to outline further development plans in education and human resource development, and presumably this is why we had Dr. Leslie Harris appointed as a one-man commission to submit a report on education and human resource development. Now it is our understanding, Sir, that this report has been completed for some time, a year or more. My colleagues and I have been asking for the tabling or the making public of that particular report for over a year.

And the Minister of Education, Sir, has refused to table Dr. Leslie Harris' Report on Education, or has evaded answering the question altogether.

Now, Sir, one only has to ask why is the minister refusing to table that particular report? Is he trying to hide something? Is there something in that report that is not consistent with the government's action? Actually if there is anything in the report that has to deal with action, that would be inconsistent with the government's action. The government have not acted on anything in the field of education since the minister has taken over.

Sir, in conversation with educators throughout this province I detect on their part, Sir, a feeling, a lack of confidence, a feeling of lack of leadership on the part of this government when it comes to matters and problems facing education in this province. Sir, this is a very serious indictment against the Minister of Education. Sir, the government have not tackled the major problems of education in this province. Presumably the Harris Report must have related to these problems.

Sir, I can list off very quickly about twenty-five things but I will not have time to mention them all. For instance, what does the Harris Report say about the polytechnical institute? That is the only thing mentioned in the Throne Speech this year, Sir, in education. Not a mention of the educational television system that was promised back in 1972. Not a mention, Sir, of the Offshore Manpower Needs Conference, that was promised back in 1972. Not a mention of a system of regional colleges that was promised. When this government before they took over, in their election campaign, promised increased student aid to the Memorial University students, instead they reduced it. There has been a drastic reduction in student enrollment at the university, Sir. There has been no articulation of philosophy as far as the future Memorial University is concerned by this government. There has been no statement as to what they are planning to do except for this brief mention of a polytechnical institute. No

statement of philosophy with respect to vocational schools and residences.

In spite of raging controversy in the field of financing education, Sir, there is no mention by this government where they stand on school assessments, and school taxation. Sir, they have not given the reasons why they are de-emphasizing DREE schools in this province when we still need schools, additional structures. Sir, the school bus transportation is still in a mess, although it is not a raging controversy as it was a number of years ago.

Sir, this government have failed utterly to deal with the many, many problems facing the field of education. In the Throne Speech they mention one single thing, a polytechnical institute, and I would submit the only reason that was mentioned, and it is badly needed, Sir, badly needed - but I would submit the only reason that was mentioned was the fact that the government knows full well that they are going to have to go to the federal government for the money, and if they are not successful in getting this polytechnical institute established they can turn around and do as they have been doing in every other case, blame it on the federal government.

Now, Sir, I submit that the minister should get up, stand on his own two feet, show some leadership in the field of education, and either table Dr. Leslie Harris' Report or give the reasons why he is not prepared to do so.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The Hon. Minister of Education.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, in my brief parliamentary career I have listened to a fair amount of nonsense, and I have listened to some common sense from the honourable gentleman who just sat down, but I am afraid this evening I really did not see very much there. I mean to listen to really all of this raging controversies, and all of this one, would not know that we were in the middle of the Spanish Civil War.

The honourable gentleman is awfully interested in white papers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Interested in white papers, and because, you know, something is not tabled, then obviously there is something to hide. I mean all of this real nonsense, and you hear so much talk about it.

Now the honourable gentleman says that there is nothing going on in education whatsoever, no progress being made, nothing of value. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. STAGG (SPEAKER): Order, please! Honourable

gentlemen, both to my left and right, are interrupting the speaker or the gentleman who has the floor and I ask that they observe the right -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Well, especially gentlemen to my left then.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, really, they were remarks unworthy of the honourable gentleman if we look back within the past three years of this administration and we look at some of the things which have been done in the area of education. We have a regional college which will be opening in September, the first time in the history of this Province that the provincial university will be in operation outside of St. John's with a full fledged programme, that will look after not only the first and second year students, but also students who later will be completing their studies at technical post secondary institutes and will also, as part of its mandate, bring a ray of social, economic needs to fulfill them. The polytechnic, which the honourable gentleman says is the only thing mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, one would think that that were a very minor undertaking. He did hasten to say that he agreed with it, no mention whatsoever of a teacher allocation programme introduced last year, which, when it is fully operative by September 1976, will bring an additional 850 teachers into the system, no mention. What would you rather have, white papers or an additional 850 teachers?

Now, also, when this administration came in of all the district vocational schools only one was being used for high school students, the one at Harbour Main. Now, there are twelve being used with a pre-vocational programme and the number of young men and young women who are using these vocational schools has gone from approximately 400, when the former administration left, to 4,000 today, of young men and young women using it. So, you would rather have purple papers or green papers or would you rather have things happening?

Now, also, of course, this government was the first one to bring in collective bargaining or the legislative frame work for collective bargaining for teachers. I am only sorry the time is so short, Sir. These are fairly major accomplishments. They are worth a few white papers or green papers or

any other kind of paper. But, not only these - extremely large and significant and very expensive areas, not only in these areas. Let me just mention two or three which are pretty small. They do not cost much, but which I think are of real value. For the first time in the history of this Province, we have a consultant, a person working with school boards, whose exclusive responsibility is assistant in the education department for native people and endeavouring to make the curriculum and the school process as relevant as possible. A small thing, it is only one person, but something of some value, I would think, after all the nonsense, not all the nonsense, but all of the so-called concern, whether it is so-called, it may well be very genuine, I so not know.

To the best of my knowledge, for the first time in the Province, we have classes for blind adults, being held in St. John's. That started about January. I visited classes myself last night. It is our hope, but we are not sure, it will depend upon availability of facilities and indeed of teachers, to investigate the possibility of having this in western and in central parts of the Province as well.

So there are quite a number of areas, Sir, and these -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, the Minister of Fisheries has reminded me of our text book policy where free text books were extended from four to six last year and where the Premier has already announced there will be a further development for grade seven and eight this year. So there are many many areas -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: One can take about white papers all one wishes and I said something about I was going to do a white paper, right. I said that a couple of years ago and I started to write it and I started to talk to people and I started to think about it and I said, you know, really what is one doing putting intellectual blinkers, either on myself or the department or the government that everything is going to be in a little formula so that I can give the honourable gentlemen a white paper. If he wants one, Sir, there is all kinds of papers around and we can have them any colour, but

this is a kind of rigidity, an intellectual blinkers that certainly in an area as changing as education, I would think is the last thing we need. Now, with respect to the report -

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! Order, please! The honourable member's time has expired.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order! Gentlemen, restrain yourselves.

The Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we were all surprised and shocked and startled when we read the Auditor General's report and saw some of the irregularities that were mentioned in that report. Today, Sir, I put a question to the Minister of Finance about one of these alleged irregularities in the use of the taxpayer's money -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, not the carpet, Sir. It was a matter of \$4,355, Sir, that was spent apparently to provide an aircraft sales representative with financial assistance to make a pitch to the government, to try to sell the government an aircraft. Now, Sir,

It may sound like a small amount of money but \$4,355, Mr. Speaker, is just about the total amount that the average inshore fisherman would earn in one year in this province. But it is not the amount -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: It is not the amount of money, Sir, that I am concerned about, it is the principle of the thing, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: What principle? What about the time Lundrigan charged for you a trip up to Avondale?

MR. NEARY: This money was spent to an un-named aircraft sales representative -

MR. ROBERTS: - to sell wrong in the future - right in the future. Is it?

MR. CROSBIE: Just ask about it?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: What happened before he used it to get into office?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! If the honourable gentleman will permit. This procedure of the question and answer period is restricted to those who have gone through the proper procedure, and other people who are intervening are completely out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I realize this is just a very small amount of money. It is not as much, for instance, as we have been lashing out to George McLean for making films and slide presentations and booklets and so on. The amount may be small, Sir, but the principle behind this particular waste is big. In my opinion, Sir, the administration, the Minister of Finance who was responsible for paying out this money, has no choice but to fully inform the people of this province what this ridiculous, unjustifiable amount of money was used for. And who was involved in spending this \$4,355 without any authorization? The people involved, Mr. Speaker, should be called before a proper tribunal.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: It should be the kind of tribunal, Sir, that you would

find out if there were any under the table deals, or any kickbacks, or any corruption, or did the money find its way into anybody's pockets through hanky-pankies, or connected

AN HON. MEMBER: Hanky who?

MR. NEARY: with this \$4,355 expenditures?

Anybody, Sir, involved, whether it is a minister of the Crown -

AN HON. MEMBER: No coaching now please!

MR. NEARY: or a high paid ranking government official, if they are found guilty, Sir, they should be charged with fraud, and abuse of public trust. Action should be laid against all those involved immediately, Sir, before it is necessary to have to resort to the complicated situations that we are having now in trying to get extradition proceedings against certain other gentlemen in this province who were accused of hanky-panky in charges of fraud, and breach of trust.

MR. EVANS: Probably it was a highjacking, did you take that angle?

MR. NEARY: Before the culprits are allowed to get away, Sir, there should be a thorough and complete investigation, and if necessary, charges laid against the individuals and the money recovered from this aircraft company. Steps should be taken at once, Mr. Speaker, to clear up this matter.

There are a number of other matters in the Auditor-General's Report that I cannot deal with. I have to deal with this one specifically, Sir, because -

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty seconds.

MR. NEARY: this one, Mr. Speaker, of all of the points that were fingered by the Auditor-General in his report concerning irregularities in the use of the taxpayers money, this one struck me as being the worst.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: I want to reply to this because I was the Minister of Finance at the time, not the honourable gentleman for Fortune Bay.

Now this has nothing to do, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Anybody can reply.

MR. CROSBIE: Anybody can reply.

MR. NEARY: No they cannot.

MR. ROBERTS: I think that is the point that I wish to raise.

I am not sure that -

MR. CROSBIE: That has been decided.

MR. ROBERTS: Was it decided? I am not aware that the point has ever been decided but, if so, - I am sorry, has it been decided, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Not as far as I know.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is why I rise on a point of order, and the Bully Boy shall not be heard to shout us down. My point of order is just that. If I can find the - Standing Order (36) is it?

MR. CROSBIE: What page is it?

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, (31)(h), Page 19 of the current version of the rules says that "The member raising the matter may speak for not more than five minutes." Then it says, "The minister "

MR. CROSBIE: What page?

MR. ROBERTS: Page 19, (31)(h). "The minister if he wishes to reply." Now there is no ruling in there, Sir, no reference in any way which can be, in my submission, taken to mean that a pinch hitter can be sent in if the Minister of Finance is incapable of replying as he obviously is, then his option is not to reply at all.

I think it is a very important question. Obviously, Sir, in Section (8) of that Standing Order (31) -

AN HON. MEMBER: Go on to the end before 6:00 o'clock -

MR. ROBERTS: No, I am willing to have the House sit well after 6:00, Mr. Speaker. But the point is with all -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir. The Speaker tells us that this matter has not been settled before, and therefore is now being raised for the first time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I hope somebody can speak in behalf of the Premier, the Premier cannot speak in his own behalf. But the point I am making is that the rule said that "The minister" and there is no provision for any substitute. And accordingly the point of order which I raise is that the only member on the other side who has the right to reply is the minister in respect of whom the dissatisfaction is registered with respect to the question.

Otherwise, Sir, it makes a mockery of the entire proceedings set forth in Section (31), and the provision under Section (31) that "If a member is not satisfied with the reply given by a minister then he may note it down." So we have it on this so-called late show.

So I rise on a point of order. I think it is an important question, and I think it should be decided with caution.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if I could respond to that. It is quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that there is no - "the minister who has to reply." Now if we look first at what happened in the whole situation here.

AN HON. MEMBER: (31)(g)

MR. CROSBIE: (31) (a) provides for oral question, and (31)(g) says "A member who is not satisfied with the response or has been told by the Speaker that his question is not urgent or not of public importance, he gives notice that he intends to raise the subject matter of his question on the adjournment of the House." That is all the honourable gentleman has to do, if he wants to raise that question in the House on Thursday. There is nothing in these rules that says that the only minister who can speak to that is the minister that the honourable directed his question to. The honourable gentleman can direct his question -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): I am prepared to speak on that at this time, if the honourable member permits me.

MR. CROSBIE: I would love to hear the arguments.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): I have to leave the Chair at 6:00 o'clock. My interpretation of the rule is that the honourable member who makes the request has the right to make his dispute as to the lack of an answer. And if a minister, or in some cases a parliamentary assistant is designated to reply, he may do so. Where the rules are silent on the matter I think it would be resolved in what would make common sense. It is also the Ottawa procedure as well.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, indeed while we respect your ruling, may we appeal your ruling? There is no argument on that but I feel your ruling is wrong, I think we should appeal it now. We have a problem.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): It now being 6:00 of the clock I do leave the Chair.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may - my understanding from the House Leader that he did not propose to sit tonight. We are not sitting tonight? Now I wonder if perhaps we could -

AN HON. MEMBER: The House is adjourned.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh the House is -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): I will entertain if there is some comment to be made on this.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know if they have adjourned - well why do we have to appeal now or if we are back at 8:00 and have it, is what I am saying. It is ridiculous not to have it now.

MR. CROSBIE: The position is quite clear. The notice was given and the House adjourns at 6:00 until tomorrow at 11:00 in the forenoon.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay we will start with the appeal tomorrow.

MR. CROSBIE: No, we can have the appeal now. If the House consents lets us have the appeal, and the reply.

MR. SPEAKER: We will have the appeal now.

MR. CROSBIE: If the period is being extended then we should have the appeal and have the reply. Is that much agreed to by the House?

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): That the Speaker's ruling be upheld.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: There is no consent then, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! It now being 6:00 o'clock I do leave the Chair until tomorrow, Friday, March 7, 1975 at 11:00 A.M.