



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 9

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, today is one of the greatest, if not indeed the greatest anniversaries in all Newfoundland's history. On this date in 1949 a few of us gathered together in Government House, we saw the late Sir Albert Walsh sworn in as Governor and we saw him swear in the Hon. Joseph R. Smallwood as Premier. Those there also saw the swearing in of nine Cabinet Ministers: Mr. Gordon Winter, the late Mr. William Keough, the late Mr. Forsey, the hon. Sam Hefferton, the hon. Charles H. Ballam, the late Michael J. Sinnott, the late Harmon W. Quinton and Dr. Pottle and myself. The ten of us were sworn in on that day as members of the first Provincial Cabinet of Newfoundland.

This was a fateful day in Newfoundland's history. For some years before, the future of Newfoundland had been under consideration and the time had come for a decision to be made. Joseph Smallwood, as he was at that time, had organized a campaign for Confederation. Almost single handedly, he directed that campaign. He had mapped it out first. He organized it. He carried it through until late in 1948 there was a plebiscite, a second plebiscite which decided in favour of Confederation.

The first day of April, the first Government was formed and a few minutes prior to midnight on March 31st., Newfoundland regained its status as Britain's oldest colony and youngest Dominion. On the next day, the ten of us were sworn in. Four of ten have since passed to their reward. That was a fateful day for Newfoundland. Newfoundland, by the vote of its people, had elected to become a Province of Canada and the majority of the people had voted for that. It was a unique occasion for the people of a country, to vote for its future status. Two and twenty years ago that happened. It is surprising how many ministers have been sworn in since that day. I have a list here of four foolscap pages. Some of them are

Mr. Curtis.

sitting on the Opposition. Some of them are otherwise dead. A few are still living. Our relationship with the Federal Government and with our provinces, our fellow provinces, has been extraordinarily good. The years that have passed have been happy ones for us. We have seen some wonderful changes in Newfoundland. We have seen roads built through practically the entire country. Where justified, we have seen paved roads. You would not recognize Newfoundland today as we knew it before 1949. Just to mention a few of the items: Apart from the roads, what have we got? We have the Family Allowances which were a Godsend to our people. We have the Old Age Pensions and before Confederation pitiful small and painfully few. We have Mothers' Allowances, now for the mothers of children attending school. We have improved Military Pensions. We have Unemployment Insurance. We have an improved Workmen's Compensation Act and when you realize, Mr. Speaker that before Confederation the maximum amount payable for Workmen's Compensation, in the case of death, was \$3,000. We have had development of our resources. We have educational establishments of which we are proud. We have schools that are second to none. We have a first-class University, making it unnecessary now for Newfoundland people to go abroad to get an education and to get a college degree. We have hospitals of which we are proud. We have a medicare programme, which is a Godsend to our people. These are only a few, Mr. Speaker, of the great things that have come to Newfoundland, as a result of Confederation.

I think it is only fitting that today, on the anniversary of that occasion, that we should stop for a moment and salute Newfoundland as the youngest and newest Province of Canada. It would be improper. It would be insane not to couple with that salute, a salute also to Premier Joseph R. Smallwood, to whom I say must go the credit for engineering

Mr. Curtis.

Confederation, for bringing it about. He is truly one of the Fathers of Confederation. Laugh, as you like. You can joke about it, but Premier Smallwood deserves the entire credit for bringing Newfoundland into its present state of prosperity. Newfoundland is more prosperous now. Those of us that went to the hustings in 1949 saw people with flour sacks for clothing, with rain coats in the middle of summer. I know, I saw them in my own district, and thank God the next time I went back, the people were without those.. They had new shoes on their feet. They had life, such as they had never known or dreamt of it before.

I salute, on behalf of Newfoundland, Premier Smallwood, and would take advantage of this happy occasion to pay this tribute to him. Thank you!

MR. A. J. MURPHY: (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would wish also to take advantage of this great anniversary day of Newfoundland's joining with the great Dominion of Canada in the great combination of nations,

MR. MURPHY: under British democracy. On an occasion like this I am rather loath to introduce any tinge of politics Sir, but I am afraid that the hon. minister on the other side could not refrain from a few snide and, in my opinion, nasty remarks on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, who can give the lie to the fact that the great majority of our people today are enjoying a far great measure of prosperity, of the things that rightfully belong to the twentieth century. We have heard, time and time again, that most of us now have indoor plumbing, that we have paved roads, that we have modern schools, that we have fine hospitals. These Mr. Speaker, no one would dare disagree with. Since 1949, this Province has been the beneficiary of many great benefits, as a member of the Canadian Union.

I would like also to pay tribute to the hon. Premier for being, as the hon. minister so aptly put it, for being the one who engineered us into Confederation. I would like, Sir, on this twenty-second occasion, I would like very much to say that this Province has enjoyed to the full the benefits that did come from Ottawa. Down through the years this Government has at all times placed first the welfare of our people. I would like to say that, but I am afraid Mr. Speaker, I must be honest. I must say that, with a deep sense of regret and sorrow, that I personally and many thousands of our citizens, must look on the other side of the picture, where so many thousands of our Newfoundland people are not enjoying the benefits that so rightfully belong to them.

Mr. Speaker, in this hon. House, today, we have representatives of what I might call the real Newfoundlanders; that is, the great number of fishermen from all over this Province, whom I fear in many respects have not enjoyed fully the benefits that should rightfully be theirs. Mr. Speaker, there are many areas of our Province still back in the dark ages, as far as many of the modern comforts are concerned. There are still many people who have to go to great hardships, over roads that in many cases are not fit to drive over, and are still enjoying benefits of second class citizens.

It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, at this time to go fully into this, this should be a very joyous occasion. But, on behalf of the party I 602

have the great honour to represent, who because in the early days there was a group of people, who in their opinion felt that Confederation should not be discussed, only by a sovereign body, an elected body, by the people of this Province, to go to Ottawa to discuss the terms of union; we inherited the term of being "anti-confederate."

I hope by now, Mr. Speaker, that this myth, this false accusation has been done away with. I will go on record now, Sir, to say that we on this side of the House are just as proud, and just as happy to enjoy Canadian citizenship as any member on the other side, notwithstanding anything we hear to the contrary. I may, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, just say that during these past three years we, of the P.C. Party, have been the only party to celebrate this great anniversary.

A little plug for our affairs tomorrow night, in many areas of this Province we will be holding dances, and so on and so forth, to celebrate this great anniversary. In St. John's we have two, the price of the tickets are \$3.50 each and I would urge the hon. members on the other side, the great confederates, to join us in celebrating, this great twenty-second anniversary. Thank you very much!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we too would be remiss if we did not associate ourselves with the expression of deep sentiment or propaganda that is being expressed on this anniversary - the twenty-second anniversary of Confederation.

We realize and are the first to say that the Premier deserves credit for his activities in bringing about Confederation, twenty-two years ago. We have no hesitation in expressing that feeling. There is just this to be said though, I think, Mr. Speaker, that what we need to be concerned about, in this Province today, is where this Province is in 1971. What is our condition today? What is our economic position today? What is the state of our fishery today? How many unemployed do we have today? What are our prospects for this year and next year and the next ten years? Those are the things, I feel, we need to discuss on the twenty-second anniversary of Confederation. Not the progress that has been made since Confederation, we can all see that. It has not only happened in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, it does not take a constitutional change

to bring about progress.

In the last twenty-two years there has been progress brought about in every country in the world. It is just amazing the changes you see everywhere you travel. I remember being in Spain in 1956, quite a backward country compared even to Newfoundland in physical resources and wealth, but when you travel there, ten years later or fifteen years later, look at the marvelous changes you see in Spain. Look at the changes you see in the United Kingdom. Look at the changes in Germany. Look at the changes in Japan. Look at the changes in Hong Kong. Look at the changes any where throughout the world, in the last twenty-two years there have been tremendous changes and advancement.

They have hospitals, they have had changes, in paved roads, they have had changes, in water and sewage. Newfoundland is not alone. One would sometimes think, Mr. Speaker, that this Province and this Province alone changed in the last twenty-two years, all because of Confederation. That is just not the case. A lot of these changes would have come about, Mr. Speaker, Confederation or not, for Confederation itself would have come about. I do not like to see these occasions, Mr. Speaker, used improperly.

We are all glad to note, and it is noted every year, that it is another anniversary of Confederation. There has not been that great a change in our fishery since 1949, and there are some fifty odd gentlemen in the gallery now I would like to welcome. I believe they are fishermen from around the Province, who hope that after twenty-two years they are going to see some fundamental change now in the fishery of Newfoundland, so that the fishermen themselves can participate in setting the prices of their product, and in bargaining for themselves, collectively, through a union of their own, freely chosen by themselves, unsupported by Government. That will be a change that will be well worthwhile, Mr. Speaker, and it will not be brought about because of Confederation.

Those changes, many of them can only be brought about by Government, and Government has to adopt certain policies and be willing to bring them about.

So we join the hon. Minister of Justice, in agreeing with him that it is the twenty-second year anniversary of Confederation. It is certainly worth mentioning, but we have a lot more to do, Mr. Speaker. We have to think, not just of the last twenty-two years, but of the next fifty. There are issues that we are going to decide this year, in this Province, that are going to decide what the next twenty-two years will be like.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentlemen who have alluded to this great anniversary in our history. I expressed my warm thanks for the kindly references that have been made to me, and to the part that I was privileged to play in bringing about this very great event in our Newfoundland history.

There are people in the gallery today who are not Canadians, and certainly not Newfoundlanders, they are citizens of the great United States. They will perhaps, more than most of us, be interested to hear that Newfoundland is the oldest settled part of the Western Hemisphere. That the City of St. John's is the oldest town in the Western Hemisphere, that it has been here continuously, not continually, but continuously, unbroken, for a longer period than has any other settlement of White men of European civilization on this side of the Atlantic Ocean. We are a very old, very historic part of the New World.

And in the time that we have been here some great events have occurred. I would number them as ten, and I would put the Discovery of Newfoundland by John Cabot, in 1497, and the beginning of the settlement of Newfoundland in that year, as the first great historic event in our Island story. And then I would say that the second was the taking of formal possession, in the name of the Crown, by Sir Humphrey Gilbert, in 1583. And I would say that the appointment of the first Governor of Newfoundland, in 1727, would be the third great historic event in our history. And I would say that the events of 1805 or 1806, and I frankly confess that, I forget for the moment which of the two years it was, would be the fourth great event, namely; conceding the right to live here. Because it had been unlawful before that to live in Newfoundland, it was contrary to the Laws of England. The right to live here, the right to enclose land, to put a fence around your piece of land and the right to put a chimney in your home, would be the fifth great event in our history. I would say that the sixth great event would be the building of the first road. The road from St. John's to Portugal Cove in, I think, 1824. I would say that the reform, the institution of the Reformed Supreme Court, the present Supreme Court of Newfoundland, in 1826. And I would 666

MR. SMALLWOOD: say that the appointment of the institution of Representative Government, in 1832, would be the eighth great event in our history, as was the institution of full Responsible Government in 1855. The ninth great event in our Island's story, and certainly in 1949, the coming of Union with Canada, Federal Union. Our entry into the Family of Canadian Provinces, bringing the number of provinces from nine to ten. Our becoming Canadians, our becoming part and parcel of this great and lovely land of Canada, would be the tenth and greatest, by far, the greatest single event in our nearly 500 years of history.

But, Sir, the coming of Confederation, twenty-two years ago, just before the stroke of midnight, yesterday, though the greatest event in our history, was not the last great event. Other great things have come since then. It would take too long merely to read a list of the great things that have happened in Newfoundland in the last twenty-two years. We have had tremendous events in Newfoundland, since we became a Province. We have built the first road across this Island, costing the best part of \$200 million, and running for a distance of nearly 600 miles and paved from end to end. We have built a great university, which of the sixty universities in Canada, is the tenth largest, with 6,000 students, with twice as many of a teaching staff today, as there were students the day I first became Premier. We have built a thousand new schools. One thousand new schools built throughout our Province. We have built over twenty new hospitals. We have built over 6,000 miles of roads on this Island and in Labrador. We have built twenty-seven great new, modern, new fish plants, employing 8,000 persons and buying fish for cash from many thousands of our fishermen. We have created over 200 new municipalities in these twenty-two years. We have built many public libraries. We have provided a great deal of rural electrification. We have put in a great many water and sewer systems. We have provided hockey and skating rinks. We have provided Arts and Culture Centres. And in that same period, Mr. Speaker, we have built Newfoundland's first oil refinery at Holyrood, and are now building one of the largest oil refineries in the

MR. SMALLWOOD: whole of the Canadian Nation to produce, at the beginning, as a start, 100,000 barrels a day. We have begun the production of a great new paper mill, Beginning with a production of 1000 tons a day, at Stephenville. And we have in prospect still another great new paper mill at Come-by-Chance. We have had the greatest mining development in these twenty-two years of any Canadian Province. In twenty-two years we have gone from mineral production of \$25 million a year to \$350 million a year. No province of Canada can come anywhere near that rate of increase, in that period. We have been instrumental in creating the great Labrador City and the great mining development surrounding Labrador City. And as well, the great City of Wabush, in Labrador, and the great mining development surrounding that City as well. In Bay D'Espoir we have launched a great development of hydro-electric power and on it we have spent so far something of the order of \$400 million, and we are now close to 1 million horsepower of electricity in that vast development. We have brought about the development of the World's mightiest, the World's biggest power development, at the Upper Churchill, to drain 6 million and 7 million horsepower, costing one thousand million dollars, employing four, five and six thousand men to build, for the last five or six years. And we are about to build, on the Lower Churchill, another vast power development, that will cost another \$500 millions to build and will employ another four or five thousand men, for the next four, or five years. And in Lake Melville, using the power to be developed at the Lower Churchill, we are, I believe, soon to have the mightiest industrial enterprise of its kind in the whole Nation of Canada, and I refer to the BRINCO Project to build a great uranium enrichment plant, using the cold clean water of the Churchill River and the power of the Lower Churchill, at a cost of one thousand million dollars.

And, Mr. Speaker, if these things were not enough to inspire confidence in Newfoundland, if all these mighty developments of the last two decades were not enough to inspire all Newfoundlanders and others with the great prospects of this Province, I point you to the enormous possibilities that lie just off the coastline, the shoreline of this Island and the shoreline

MR. SMALLWOOD: of Labrador.

We have with us here today, visiting us this afternoon, to be entertained by us tonight, all members of this House, on both sides of the House, a mighty corporation representative, the President of a titantically big corporation, AMICO, who are now in the act of towing \$14 million or \$15 million oil drilling rigs to be stationed one hundred miles southeast of Cape Race. We are, I believe, I verily believe - these gentlemen have given me the honour to lunch with me today, in the Private Dining Room, and I verily believe that Newfoundland is at the very edge of a vast, of a vast development of oil and natural gas, lying just of the shoreline of this Island and just of the shoreline of Labrador.

So, while we cannot credit Confederation with the presence of the oil offshore or inshore, though we cannot credit Confederation with the presence of the great potential hydro-electric power of Labrador, though we cannot praise Confederation because there is great mineral wealth in Labrador, we can praise Confederation, I hold, because under it, due to the advantages of Confederation, due to the great riches that have been brought here, due to the greater strength of our people, the greater optimism, the greater confidence of our people, and above all due to the greatly increased confidence that the outside world has in Newfoundland, due to these things Confederation is to be thanked for most of the progress of the last twenty-two years.

I, myself, never ceased to Thank God that I was led, and I have never doubted that I was led, (not by the Devil) I was led, to launch and lead the movement for Confederation with Canada. I doubted not, I have never doubted that I did right and I was inspired to do it. That I was inspired to launch and lead a movement, which conferred the greatest blessings upon the people of Newfoundland that they have ever known. Ever known, in nearly five hundred years of history. I never ceased to Thank my Maker for giving me life, for giving me energy, for giving me some ability, at any rate, and above all, above all, for giving me courage, the kind of courage that never takes 'no' for an answer, that never is daunted by any kind of Opposition, the courage, the strength and the determination to pursue great ends, not small ends, not piffling, trifling, picayune ends but great ends, great aims and great ambitions. If I am proud, personally proud of anything, it is a pride I have in the fortune, my good fortune, in inspiring the people of Newfoundland to look ever for better and ever for more, to aspire, in this Province, to the highest possibilities that are within our reach or can be brought within our reach.

In the gallery there is a visitor today, who was at my side in the National

Convention. He was at my side in the great campaign: To win the people, to win them for Confederation, in the great referendum campaigns, two of them. He was at my side in the first Cabinet, A few days after the Cabinet was sworn in by the new Lieutenant Governor of the Province, he joined with me, as a member of the Cabinet. He served side by side with me, loyally and efficiently, for a great many years, until his retirement four or five years ago, and I am so happy and proud that Charles Ballam is still around. I know why he is here today. I know why, today, the first day of this session he has put in an appearance. He is an old Confederate, that is why. His heart is here. I welcome him. I welcome all Newfoundlanders, wherever they are, who fought for Confederation. To those who fought against it, let me say that they too, they too today, all Newfoundlanders today, except the occasional crank, the occasional crackpot, the occasional fool. We have our just and proper share of crackpots, cranks and fools in this Province, our proper and our due share. We have not been neglected by the Almighty. He gave us our proper share of fools in Newfoundland. Except for those fools all Newfoundlanders, whatever they did, whatever they did in the two great battles on Confederation, today all Newfoundland joyfully, gratefully and proudly hail the coming of Confederation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a ministerial statement. It may be of some interest to hon. members on both sides of the House to learn that excellent progress has already been made on instituting the improvement in our Provincial Social Assistance Programme announced at the Development Conference on February 3, past. I am pleased to report, Sir, that food rates for recipients of short-term assistance, including unemployed employables and persons who are ill for periods not exceeding six months, these rates, as of midnight last night, Sir, the anniversary of this Province's entry into Confederation, have been raised to parity with those of recipients of long term assistance. These are people including needy mother as well as

persons who are ill for six months or longer. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the expense in implementing these programmes is shared equally by the Provincial and Federal Treasury, under the present terms of the Canada Assistance Plan.

Effective also, on this first day of the twenty-second year of the Canadian Province, Mr. Speaker, these unemployed employables will be allowed earnings that will not interfere with their Social Assistance Allowances, on the basis of \$25 per month, single persons, and families consisting of not more than five persons, with an additional five dollars for each member of the family, in excess of five persons up to a maximum of \$50 per month. We look forward Sir, to this measure as having a salutatory effect on the morale of our unemployed citizens. It removes Mr. Speaker, the old unreasonable morale eroding structure that kept many in enforced idleness or forced them to work in secret, as though work itself, Sir, was something unclean.

May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members on either side of the House, that if they would observe closely in their own electoral districts the working out in practise of these new measures, so that we as a House may be able to evaluate them as indicators of directions which we should follow in future programmes of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation.

As a footnote to these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I might also point out that we have already announced adoption of new tariffs covering the funeral expenses of indigents, that will help improve the conditions under which the last rites are afforded to our citizens.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I refer to the inception of another set of programmes designed to make easier the lives of a group to whom we all owe a great deal of respect. We hear a great deal these days, Sir, about the generation gap. The gap between the under twenty-fives and I suppose the over twenty-fives. There is another generation gap of which we are all not generally conscious, Mr. Speaker, because those who are not on the far side of that gap do not lead marches on the Confederation Building, destroy computer centres or puff pot at rock festivals.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the gap which has developed with the fading of family ties between us, in our vigorous active middle years, and those who survive as what we term nowadays "senior citizens." Put yourself in the position of the elderly, Mr. Speaker. As you go -

MR. CROSBIE: A point of order Mr. Speaker, a ministerial statement is supposed to be a statement of government policy. This is not a statement of government policy, this is a dissertation on generation gaps. If this time is to be used for ministerial statements, it should be ministerial statements of policy. We have the Address in Reply coming up, on which the minister can speak.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member does not like to hear this. This is good stuff, he does not like to hear it.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not like to hear bunk -

MR. NEARY: Now as we grow in wisdom and tolerance, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves also growing -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have risen on a point of order. Is it to be permitted or not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: He ignored you.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize it is the right of the hon. member to make a point of order but if we have to go into every phase and every line of a ministerial statement and see whether it contains anything other than just the bare, bald, outline of Government policy, there will not be very many statements given. The Minister, I hope, will not stray too far from the ministerial statement, but I know there is a certain latitude he has to be given, in order to clarify the policy which he is announcing.

MR. NEARY: Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. As I said, "Put yourself in the position of the elderly, Sir." As you grow in wisdom and tolerance you find yourself also growing in loneliness as the busy workaday world rushes by you and your own contemporaries depart one by one, like autumn leaves falling from the tree of life. Mr. Speaker, as promised in the Development Conference, and I know the hon. members on the opposite side do not like to hear this, Mr. Speaker, but as promised at the Development Conference, Mr. Speaker, we have plans to make easier the autumn years of that generation to whom we owe the gift of life itself.

I will not, Sir, retell the details of that programme of benefits for senior citizens, May I merely report to you and the House, Mr. Speaker, progress, over the past eight weeks, on its main focal points for action? Effective today, Mr. Speaker, this Confederation Anniversary Day, in the year of Our Lord, 1971, the Federal and Provincial Treasuries will share equally in providing an extra allowance, up to \$40.00 monthly, for special needs, to a person in receipt of old age security and guaranteed income supplement, whose spouse has not yet reached the age of pension entitlement.

This allowance, of course, Mr. Speaker, will be based on any extra source of income enjoyed by that spouse. Now how is that for news.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will book a bed for the hon. member at the Hoyles Home, if he would like me to.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may I also inform hon. members of the House that volunteer groups have already been formed to aid in the work of our Government institutions for the aged. I can arrange for one of the hon. gentleman to go on the Committee, if he wants me to. Now, Mr. Speaker, experience with these volunteer groups will form a basis for instituting in communities, throughout the whole Province, organized home visiting services for those senior citizens, who would prefer remaining in their own homes to institutional living.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. members are really getting frustrated. I also want to inform members of the House, Sir, that we are presently conducting research into the extent of need and best modes of implementation for a number of other programmes announced at the Development Conference in February. Among these, Mr. Speaker, are the plans for decentralization of homes for senior citizens, with a much smaller number of residents than in the past and located, Sir, in the communities giving relatives of the residents easy visiting access. Paralleling this, Mr. Speaker, is the gradual conversion of our present larger homes to centres for those requiring nursing care. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that a pilot project, in the provision of a day care centre for the elderly, is to be undertaken at the Hoyles Home here in St. John's and should be operative within the next couple of months.

May I say, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that a month ahead of my earlier expectations, the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare will be holding a conference with his counterparts from the Provinces. There, Sir, I have every hope we will be able to negotiate a new cost-sharing agreement that will take into consideration the varying ability of Provinces to pay their share, with additional aid for Provinces, like our own, with low average per capita income. I am most optimistic, Mr. Speaker, that out of

MR. NEARY:

this meeting will come very real extra financial benefits to this Province, through revision of the cost-sharing provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan. It is the absolute intention of this Government, Mr. Speaker, to pass on to the social assistance recipient every benefit possible from the extra dollar assistance thus made available.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Minister after his very long and involved statement. At the beginning of his statement, (the Minister does not want any questions I gather) at the beginning of his statement the Minister mentioned that the rates had been increased for short-term assistance, that is needy, sick persons -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is it in order for that question?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, it is in order. The Minister said that there had been an increase in the rates paid for the short-term assistance, that is needy, sick persons and temporary incapacitated persons. Would the Minister tell the House whether these are the rates that the Government reduced in 1969, as announced in the Budget Speech of 1969, when the Government said that there was tight money? Are these the same rates that are now being increased back again as the election approaches?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is that a question that requires an answer?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes.

MR. NEARY: I was not a member of the Government at the time, My hon. friend was and he knows more about that matter than I do.

MR. CROSBIE: Are these the rates, Mr. Speaker, that the Government reduced in 1969, in the Budget Speech, or not? Does the Minister not know that? He knows it very well, and now they are being increased.

PETITIONS:

MR. BARBOUR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition from the residents of the community of Cannings Cove. The prayer of the people's petition, from Cannings Cove, is that the road there now, which is in good condition, be changed a little so that the motoring public, the buses and the people who have to use the road, can do a little more easily and a little more conveniently, because the present road is kind of steep.

MR. BARBOUR:

Mr. Speaker, the people of Cannings Cove are not all labourers who work on farms, in the parks and in the forests, quite a number of them are fishermen, honest, hard-working fishermen and, in my opinion and I have always said this, Sir, nothing, nothing is too great for the fishermen of Newfoundland. That is why today I stand here, on this the 22nd anniversary of Confederation and say that I intend to support the fishermen of Newfoundland as long as I am a member in the Liberal party and sit as a member of this hon. House of Assembly, and that is going to be for a long, long time yet.

Mr. Speaker, in presenting this petition I endorse it wholeheartedly, I ask that it be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion, petition received.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of a great number of residents of the district of St. Mary's with reference to the terrible condition of the Salmonier Line. I would appeal directly to the Minister of Highways, if some measures could be taken, not to pave it, not to upgrade it but to actually grade it so that it will become passible for the cars and trucks that have to pass over it.

So I would like to refer this to the Minister of Highways, that immediate action be taken because I have had telephone calls all day yesterday about the condition of the road.

On motion, petition received.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

MR. STARKES: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table regulations made under the Highways Traffic Act during the past year.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, question 341 on today's Order Paper, in the name of the hon. the member for Burin. The answer to this question has already been given.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the answer previously given was that it was Mr. Leo Stead replaced Mr. Groom.

Mr. Crosbie

Mr. Stead was a member of the committee before Mr. Groom resigned.

Is it Mr. O. L. Vardy that has replaced him? It could not be

Mr. Leo Stead. He was already on the committee.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Question no. 356.

MR. HICKMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Only part of that question was asked yesterday, in response to a question asked by another hon. member. Part (4) in particular, which asks: "Have there been any amendments or changes in the agreement referred to in (1) and if so the dates of such amendments or changes and lay on the table of the House the copy of all such amendments or changes?"

That was not ...

MR. SMALLWOOD: There have been none. So, there are none to table.

Question no. 356, in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West.

The answer to this question was tabled last year.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Have the Government got the report of the Phalen Royal Commission? The question is: "If the Government have it, will it table the report?" How can the question be answered? The report is not even tabled.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The report was tabled in this House last year.

Question no. 368..

MR. CROSBIE: That was not the Phalen Report.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Question no. 368, again in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West. There is nothing to be added. There is nothing to add to the information already known to the House. There has been no change. Question no. 369, in the name of the hon. the member...

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question - Question 368.

The question asked, whether any monies had been advanced by way of loan

Mr. Crosbie

or otherwise guaranteed for these monies or any company associated with them. If so, what is the amount, the terms and conditions..?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No need of reading it. I have it before me. The House has.

MR. CROSBIE: Well what is the answer then?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer is that there is no information in addition to the information that is already before the House. The answer to this is already well known to the House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, part (2) of that question which asks: "Has there been any default in connection with any of these loans and monies advanced to Newfoundland Pulp and Chemical Company Limited?" That question has not been answered.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Question no. 369..

MR. CROSBIE: Is the Premier going to answer the second part of the question? Has there been any default?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Question no. 369..

MR. CROSBIE: Obviously, there has been then.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Question no. 369 in the name of the same hon. gentleman. The answer to the first part is no. The answer to the second part is that the undertaking has been superseded. Question no. 370, in the name of the same hon. gentleman. The answer is no. There has been no reason to, because of the fact that there has been no cutting. Question no. 371 in the name of the same hon. gentleman. The answer to the first part is no. The answer to the second part is no. The answer to the third part is no. Question no. 372, in the name of the same hon. gentleman, This has already been answered. The answer to the third part is no.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The question was asked last year, a year ago, and the answer then was, no. This is now a year later. Has the agreement been amended since?

MR. SPEAKER: That is not the subject of a point of order, To begin with,

Mr. Speaker.

If the question is not answered satisfactorily, a supplementary question may be given or another question put on the Order Paper. The answer given in reply to a question, whether it was satisfactory or whether there is no answer or whether it is unsatisfactory, it should not be the subject...

MR. SMALLWOOD: Question no. 373, in the name of the same hon. gentleman. The answer is no. Question no. 374, in the name of the same hon. gentleman. The answer to the first part is no. The answer to the second part is: "The matter is still under negotiation." Question no. 375, in the name of the same hon. gentleman. This question was answered last year and there has been no change.

MR. CROSBIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, on Question no. 374. Part (2) of the question asks: "Has the electric reduction company agreed to pay a price greater than two and a half mills? If so what is the present price per kilowatt hour?" The Premier has not answered part (2) of the question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Question no. 376..

MR. CROSBIE: It is still not answered.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Question no. 376, in the name of the same hon. gentleman. The answer is yes. The amount is of the order of \$500,000 a year and it has been paid on various dates. The answer, to the second part, I have not got at the moment. I will get it. The answer to the third part is yes, the original agreement. The answer to the second part is yes.

MR. CROSBIE: What is the date of the agreement? That is the second part. What was the date of the said agreement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The second part asks the dates of the payments.

MR. CROSBIE: The second part of part (3)..

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said, various dates.

MR. CROSBIE: Part (3) of the question: If so, what was the date of the

Mr. Crosbie

said agreement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The agreement will be tabled. The date will then appear.

Question no. 380. The answer is that this has been done by this hotel, as it is frequently done by other hotels, so as to enable registered guests to play golf at the golf links.

MR. CROSBIE: A supplementary question on that question no. 380, Mr. Speaker. Hotel Buildings, Limited is not the operator of the hotel. The operator is Atlific Newfoundland, Limited. Why has not the Atlific Newfoundland, Limited paid the Balley Hally golf fees? Why should the public pay them? Why did Hotel Buildings, Limited, a Crown corporation pay them?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question no. 391 on today's Order Paper, asked by the hon. member for Bonavista North. Since April 1st., 1969, to date, the Workmen's Compensation Board of Newfoundland and Labrador has paid the following monies to the law firm of Williams and Cummings for services rendered. This will not be tabled. I am giving the answer orally, Mr. Speaker. The board has not engaged the services of any other lawyer or firm during this period. The amount paid to date is \$10,965.11. I will repeat the figures for the hon. gentleman. The amount paid to date \$10,965.11. The nature of the work, Mr. Speaker: Services rendered in collection of assessments and in court action involving third party claims, consultation with officials of board, redrafting regulations and amendments and opinions given the board on various other matters.

MR. Speaker, I also have the answer for Question no. 329, on today's Order Paper, asked by the hon. learned and inquisitive gentleman from St. John's West. The answer is, Mr. Speaker, that this question was answered in the House last year.

MR. HICKMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon.

Mr. Neary.

minister aware of the fact that this question was not answered in the House last year but that the House was advised that the lease was then being negotiated and vetted by the Department of Justice and that it would hopefully be ready for tabling before the House adjourned and if not, it would be tabled in this session? Is the hon. minister aware of that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister is aware of it. I can only repeat that this question was answered in the House last year.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister aware that there is no such lease tabled in this House for the members to read. If this is correct, will the minister then supply a copy of the lease, as the question requests? If the fact turns out to be that this lease is not tabled here in the House, will the minister supply a copy?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: No, you will not table a copy of the lease. That is what we want to know.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer Question no. 334 on today's Order Paper, tabled by the hon. member for St. John's East. The answer is zero.

MR. HICKMAN: Do you put the dollar sign in front of the zero?

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, answer to question No.173, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West, and I also table the answer to Question No. 273, asked by the hon. member for Burin, appearing on the Order Paper of March 29th.

MR. HICKMAN: What number was that?

MR. CROSBIE: Question No. 273.

MR. HICKMAN: Do you have extra copies?

MR. WINSOR: Yes.

Mr. Speaker, Question No. 309, appearing on the Order Paper of March 30th., asked by the hon. member for Gander. I am not in a position to answer that question at the moment, except to say this, that there is active negotiation going on with that company and I am virtually sure, we will have a statement, regarding the outcome, very shortly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WINSOR: Yes, of course. Part (2), I think, we are pretty sure that the plant at Catalina will continue this year the same as other years.

Mr. Speaker, I table the answer to Question No. 327, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West, appearing on the Order Paper of March 31st.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, in reply to Question No. 34 standing in the name of the hon. the member for Burin, on the Order Paper of March 25th., "What amounts of Newfoundland debentures and Exchequer Bonds are due for redemption in the fiscal year 1971-72, giving the due dates for each issue?" The answer \$10 million U.S. Due date, February 7, 1972. \$60 million Deutschemarks. June 25, 1971 and also \$60 million D.M., June 25, 1971.

(2) What sinking funds, if any, are applicable to each of these issues?

The answer is "nil."

(3) What arrangements have been made for the repayment of these issues?

Arrangements are being made to meet these commitments.

MR. EARLE: Would you permit a question, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister give the House the approximate dollar value, at the time, and rate of exchange on the Deutschemark?

MR. CALLAHAN: I am not aware of what the exchange rate is this day, Mr. Speaker, and therefore it is hazardous to guess.

MR. CALLAHAN: Question No. 189 -

MR. CROSBIE: Could the minister tell us approximately what \$60 millions Deutschemark is in dollars? Is it \$10 million, \$20 million? Approximately. We know he does not know the exchange rate today.

MR. CALLAHAN: That relates certainly to the exchange rate, Mr. Speaker, on that amount of money.

MR. CROSBIE: Will the minister take note, it is obviously the minister does not know how many Deutschemarks there are in a dollar. He cannot tell us, would he take note of the question and give it to us tomorrow?

MR. CALLAHAN: The minister knows, Mr. Speaker, what it has been. In recent days the minister is not prepared, to date, to guess what it might be.

MR. CROSBIE: Come, come now. The rate does not vary.

MR. CALLAHAN: And, I think, the rate is if it is available, does vary, Mr. Speaker, the rate is available to hon. gentlemen opposite, equally.

MR. CROSBIE: Just admit that you do not know.

MR. EARLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker:

MR. CALLAHAN: Question No. 189, Mr. Speaker, on the Order Paper.

MR. EARLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAHAN: How many supplementary questions are allowed?

MR. HICKMAN: Dozens.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, the question has been answered and I have no intention of giving further information on it.

MR. CROSBIE: That is a frank admission.

MR. EARLE: All right.....

MR. CALLAHAN: Question No. 189, in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. HICKMAN: What is the number?

MR. CALLAHAN: Question No. 189, on the Order Paper of March 26. How many trips did the hon. P.J. Lewis take during the calendar year 1970? According to the records of the Department of Finance, the hon. P.J. Lewis took no trips during the calendar year 1970.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, that is the answer then, no trips. Or just no trips as far as Finance is concerned.

MR. CALLAHAN: Question No. 78 -

MR. CROSBIE: Did Finance inquire from anyone else?

MR. CALLAHAN: Question No. 78, in the name of the hon. member for Burin, on the Order Paper of March 25. List the various debenture loans raised since 1 April, 1970, giving the interest rates, prices of issue, effective interest rate, currency of issue and due dates in each case? I have a table, Mr. Speaker, I will table this, but I am mindful of Your Honour's request that there be at least seven copies, so, if I may, I will hold this and have it copied and see that the copies are tabled this day.

MR. CROSBIE: Could the minister give us the total?

MR. CALLAHAN: I do not think it is totalled, Mr. Speaker. It is not totalled. Question No. 157, standing in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West, on the Order Paper of March 25. "As of March 31, 1970 what was the amount of any guarantee given by the Government in connection with the hotel known as the Halfway House, located in Carbonear, Newfoundland, indicating whether the guarantee was given in connection with a mortgage loan or bank loans or the type of loan involved together with the interest rate charged thereon?" The answer, Mr. Speaker, guarantee six and three-quarter percent, first mortgage sinking fund debentures. The outstanding balance, as of March 31, 1970, was \$309,508, since retired in full.

MR. CROSBIE: \$309,000 was it?

MR. CALLAHAN: \$309,508. In answer to part (2) Mr. Speaker, in connection with any guarantee given by the Government, having reference to loans to Halfway House, located at Carbonear. "Did the Halfway House fail to meet any payments on principal or interest with respect to such loans and was the Government called upon to pay any monies, and, if so, what amount of monies, in connection with their said guarantee?" The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that \$127,968.75 was paid by the Government. It has since been paid in full, together with interest. There is nothing outstanding.

MR. CALLAHAN: Part (3) of the same question. "What date did the Government purchase the property located in Carbonear, formerly used as a hotel, and known as the Halfway House, from whom did the Government purchase the property and what was the total purchase price of the property, indicating whether the full purchase price was paid in cash or by assumption of mortgage or in any other manner? What was the date of the purchase?" The Government as such, Mr. Speaker, did not purchase the property, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation did, on February 15, 1971, from the company, for the cash payment of \$930,000.

MR. CROSBIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell us why this Government agency paid \$930,000, when the Government had guaranteed a mortgage and could foreclose for \$350,000? Why was there \$580,000 extra paid for it?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the detail employed in that supplementary question really should be directed to my colleague, the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, because I think the answer is bound up with the nature of the future use of the building.

The answer to Question No. 201, standing in the name of the hon. the member for Burin, on the Order Paper of March 29. Did McNamara Industries, Limited pay to the Government, before the required date, the debt it owed to the Government? The answer is "yes." (2) If so, was this done at the request of the Government? And the answer is, "no." (3) If the answer (2) is yes, table all correspondences; of course, Mr. Speaker, does not arise.

MR. CALLAHAN: Question No. 269, (1) permission has been given. (2) the date is the first of June 1970. (3) the information in its entirety is contained in the Act No. 69, 1970. (4) the Government has not received a request for financial assistance and therefore (5), Mr. Speaker, does not arise.

Question No. 270. (1) Yes. (2) Nine applications, for a total of 45 acres, were received on January 16, 1967, One application for 35 acres, received on October 9, 1967. One application for one acre received on November 17, 1967. Seven applications, for a total of 105 acres, were received on April 21, 1970.

(3) None. Now, Mr. Speaker, I should explain that the first eleven applications, referred to in the second part of the answer, were approved and the applicants, in the normal course, as all applicants for Crown Lands, are notified to get surveys done. After no surveys were received, within a year the applications were deemed to be cancelled, as required by Section 15 (2) of the Crown Lands Act. The procedure is to notify the applicant of the date by which his survey must be received, to offer the opportunity for an extension of the time and, if the opportunity is not taken up, then it is deemed that the applicant is no longer interested. After the remaining seven applications, referred to in answer (2), were received, a department surveyor laid out the area applied for in seven lots. Mr. Speaker, this was unusual because normally the Government no longer do land surveys, but to try to help that situation, a departmental surveyor laid out the areas applied for in seven lots. The applicants then decided the land was unsatisfactory and selected a new site, but stipulated that one of the applicants was withdrawing his application. As of the present, the department has not been informed, by the group, which applicant has withdrawn and, therefore, does not know the names of the six applicants with whom it should deal. So that up to now, Mr. Speaker, we are a bit hamstrung in trying to handle this. We have recently had a fieldman go to the area again and my latest information is that the people themselves have not decided precisely what it is they wish to do. Until they do, we are not in a position to help.

MR.HICKMAN: Could I have a copy of that?

MR.CALLAHAN: Yes, I can get a copy of that for the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, I will have that one copied and tabled as well. It is a complicated situation which has gotten, I think, a bit beyond everyone's control and probably need to start again from scratch.

MR.DAWE: Mr. Speaker, in answer to question No. 203. and 266, these two questions are supplementary. The answer to the first part of the question of 203, yes, tenders were called. Contract has not been awarded and at the present time the consulting engineers are meeting with construction company to try if possible to reduce the cost. Supplementary to question No. 266, the estimated cost for the installation of the water and sewerage system at Red Harbour was \$169,000, The lowest bid that we have received when we had called tenders was \$232,000. Add to that engineering services and interim financing and we would come up with a figure approximately \$270,000. Mr. Speaker, this is the reason why this contract has not been awarded, but my officials and consulting engineers and the construction company are meeting with a view to seeing if we can arrive at some reasonable figure so this contract can be awarded.

Question No. 360, tabled.

MR.ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 263, I have only three copies of this statistical information and, actually, it is all contained in our annual reports, in one form or another. I am sorry I have only the three copies. I believe His Honour suggested we bring seven copies. I would be glad, if anymore are needed, I will table these three and if more are needed, I will be glad to bring along any number that are needed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR.MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, before we come to Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to - unfortunately he is not in the House now - the Minister of Fisheries, or perhaps someone on the other side could answer

April 1 1971 Tape 166 page 3.

or give an answer as to the makeup of this committee to investigate and study the seal fishery. I wonder, if the Newfoundland Government was consulted on this and, I do not want to make a speech, but there are five Canadians on it and a Norwegian, I wonder if Newfoundland fought for any representation on this committee to investigate the seal fishery. Were we consulted on that Mr. Minister? Established by the

Mr. Murphy.

Federal Government, Mr. Davis.

MR. WINSOR: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. It is strictly a Federal task force appointed by the Department of Fisheries, the Federal Department of Fisheries. We were not asked to be represented.

MR. MURPHY: A supplementary question. Has our Department of Fisheries made representations for some representation on this? It affects our Province solely.

MR. WINSOR: I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that that is really necessary. The Federal Department in Ottawa realizes the importance of this task force to the seal fishery and Newfoundland certainly is in the forefront of the sealing industry. We have from time to time made strong representation to the Department of Fisheries regarding the seal fishery. This may be the outcome. We have not been asked to appoint anyone to the task force.

MR. MURPHY: And we are quite satisfied not being represented on this?

MR. WINSOR: Well one is never satisfied. When it is anything pertaining to an industry pertaining to Newfoundland.

MR. MURPHY: Well, let us show it now rather than four years time, when the thing is being abolished.

MR. CROSBIE: A supplementary question...

MR. WINSOR: Well I do not think it will be abolished, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: A supplementary question on that point. Is it the fact that are our Government have not complained to Ottawa at the lack of Newfoundland representation on this committee? Is that a fact.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a fact.

MR. CROSBIE: That is a fact. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier, in connection with the wharf facilities at Come-by-Chance? Have the Government of Canada ever requested or the Department of Public Works

Mr. Crosbie.

of Canada ever requested, or the Minister of Public Works of Canada requested the Government of Newfoundland to guarantee repayment to the Federal Government of the cost of the wharf at Come-by-Chance, as reported by Mr. Laing, Arthur Laing, the Minister of Public Works in the House of Commons.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have nothing to add to what I have already said.

MR. CROSBIE: Does the Premier know that Mr. Laing is reported in Hansard as saying that a request to that effect had been made. Although the Premier has denied the fact in this House. Surely, it requires more explanation than this. There is some kind of equivocation here.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to Orders of the Day, I have a question to ask the hon. Minister of Highways. He is not in the House but possibly, like the Minister of Fisheries, he may be within sound of my voice. So, I will ask the hon. minister the following questions. What is cost of obtaining replacement stickers for the licence plates for cars, trucks, motorcycles - the replacement stickers of these stickers which are now put on these vehicles? Perhaps the Minister of Finance can answer it.

MR. HICKMAN: Before we proceed to Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Highways, I suspect, is behind the curtain. I wonder if he would ...

MR. MURPHY : Not the iron curtain.

MR. HICKMAN: I wonder if he would now report to the House what action he has taken to prosecute the law-breakers who are constructing in the the erection at the intersection of the Come-by-Chance road on the Trans-Canada Highways, which he undertook to investigate two days ago and which is apparent for all to see?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister is not in the House. I think it is out of order to ask questions to the minister, when he is not present.

Address in Reply.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it seems a long time ago now since the Speech from the Throne was delivered, because many things have happened. The first impression with respect to the Speech from the Throne, the platform of the Government which contains the wishes and aspirations of the Government for the year, is that this can be indeed likened to a last will and testament, a last will and testament of this Government and, as with respect to a lot of wills, a lot of last wills and testaments made by people, if one waits for too long for it to be made and, when it is made or when it is finally made, it does not set forth with the virbancy and with the enthusiasm the firm intentions of a good, young type of Government. Indeed, there are many things in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, which are good. It is going to be left to another group of pepple to carry out the good things in the speech from the Throne, as well as many other things, itself.

Now at the particular time, shortly after the speech was given, there were a few notes that I made. The first was with reference to the Speech from the Throne, the fact that there are certain social reforms contained therein ,in the speech, with respect to the court. The first note that I put down is that I would like to have, the one that I certainly would like to have seen, legislative reforms provided for in the Speech from the Throne. Indeed, the events which have transpired since that time have made it patently more evident that there must be a complete and absolute revision of our concept of the operation of the legislature. Most important, Mr. Speaker, the most important thing for which any legislative organ exists is for the control of expenditure, the control of borrowing of people's money and the

Mr. Marshall;

assessment of taxes. This has been beaten out over a long, long period of time, through the institutions which we have now inherited. One likes to think of the British Parliamentary System as having evolved rather than revolved. It is true that there was much fighting to bring it about but certainly not as much bitterness as occurred south of the border, in the United States of America, in their revolution. It was over a longer period of time.

We can go back, Mr. Speaker, to the fourteenth century in England, when King Edward III called Parliament together for money needs to wage his wars. At that time, it slowly began to become engrained into our system of life that the ability to refuse supply, which lay in the ordinary man in the street - refuse supply to the King - gave him control of his own affairs. George III, another King of England, later, in the eighteenth century, the latter part of the eighteenth century, was to find out this as well, to his chagrin.

What do we have here now, Mr. Speaker? Your Honour what have we seen in the past few days? It is a very, very serious matter. I would view the events that have transpired in the past few days as an abysmal violation of the rights of the people to control their expenditure. We are faced with a Bill that related to one-quarter of the year's expenditure of this Government. The people on the other side of the House will look at the Bill and inform this House that we are only asking for something on account. Some of the sages inside the House and outside the walls of this House saw nothing wrong with it. I say, a pox on all their houses. The fact remains, Your Honour, that once money is granted, no House of Assembly, no responsible House of Assembly can renege from the expenditures that were made with this particular money. And this \$250,000 hopefully will be spent in a proper manner, an inadequate manner to further the interests

Mr. Marshall

of the people of this Province. It certainly need not be and certainly the people of the Province, and the minority on the other side, the ever growing minority on the other side, were denied their rights in a disastrous manner that has never, to my knowledge, been evident in modern times in any kind of democratic government. How can we, Mr. Speaker, get to this stage? The argument used on the other side, and, as I say, by some of the sages outside, who wish to justify events of the past few days, may well be that it is all immaterial anyway, because Supply has to go through and expenditures have to be made. But this is not the issue. The issue

MR. MARSHALL:

was and is that closure was made with respect to a money matter.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This is most highly improper. That debate is over. It may be referred to next session but not this. That matter is closed, the House decided on it, it cannot now be raised again. It can next session or every year for the next thousand years but not the remainder of this year.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, Previous debates are not to be referred to in the same session.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not referring to the debate that went on in previous days, I shall confine myself then to speaking in terms of generalizations. I should have liked the Speech from the Throne to have provided that this rule 50, this rule with respect to closure, should never apply to money matters, to money bills. Now I am talking, Your Honour, about the Speech from the Throne itself and I am rather disappointed, very, very disappointed to see that the rules of this House and the rules of Parliamentary Government were not looked into. The same thing applies, Mr. Speaker, of the rule or the law that lies before us now and has not been debated in this House, with respect to the borrowing of money by the Cabinet.

This is an outrageous law. It allows the Cabinet of this Province, in secret session, to borrow huge amounts of money. I have no doubt that when the delegation of the authority to borrow was given to the Cabinet of today, that it was thought that it would exercise it with restraint. Now what have we seen? We have seen great evidences of restraint with respect to this, Your Honour. This year approximately \$68. million dollars was borrowed, in addition to that which was estimated, and there is no justification for it whatsoever. The power has been abused and has been abused rather sadly. The reason for delegation of authority to Cabinet has come about, again as a result of our historical bequest from the British Government, from Britain. Under that, in the days way, way back when transportation was very hard, when the affairs of Government were becoming more complex,

MR. MARSHALL:

it became necessary to delegate authority to the Cabinet, it became necessary to delegate many, many things to the Cabinet, so that they could exercise their rights or they could carry on the Government of today without having to call the Legislature together, because it was too inconvenient to do.

As a matter of fact, way, way back in history, that was in 1539, there was a statute called the "Statute of Proclamations" which gave the King, with the advice of his council, the right to issue proclamations with respect to the carrying on of Government of the land. Now this was not abused, this was not abused by the people on the other side of the Atlantic, by our forefathers. It came to be only used for the purpose of carrying out administrative decisions but not for the purpose of carrying out policy or putting into effect policy and certainly it was never, ever contemplated in our existence that there should ^{be} borrowing of money by the Cabinet. It takes away the rights of the people of this Province or the right of any democratic people to be informed as to what borrowings are being brought about. One of the rationales for it was the fact that the financial houses required it. That is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, because the financial houses will not dictate to the peoples' House what they require.

As a matter of fact, in this day of advanced communication there is no need whatsoever of there being any delegation of authority to this Cabinet for the purpose of borrowing money. Surely to Heavens \$68. million dollars was enough excuse last year to have called this House, to reconvene this House together, to allow the people of this Province to have known that the money was being borrowed, because they are the people who have to pay it back. It is utterly and absolutely ridiculous, It is against all principles of our society. Then again, Mr. Speaker, we have the position in this House - another Legislative reform I should have liked to have seen, and I am rather surprised that it was not contained in the Speech from the Throne, was the provision of an adequate public accounts committee. This also is necessary to the proper operations of Government and informing the people of any democratic society to what use their money was actually put.

MR. MARSHALL:

Government provides a Budget for a year, there is no machinery in this House other than the asking of questions itself. You can inspect the accounts of the Auditor General but there certainly should be a public accounts committee in this Legislature. Way back, about 102 years ago, the first Public Accounts Committee was established by the British House of Parliament now, 102 years later, and at least one Government has gone burst in the duration, and we still have not had a public accounts committee.

Now I quote the British Parliamentary system of Government and I think that because this is the tradition upon which our institutions are based, and we do not quote them purely and simply because it is a matter of pride or tradition although that is a good reason in itself, but there is a rationale between all of this, there is a reason why we follow the British Parliamentary system. The reason is that in every Governmental system, in order for it to work properly, the people have to be informed, the people of the Province or the people of the nation or the people of the State, wherever you may be, have to know why money is being borrowed, on what it is being spent and afterwards the Government has to account why, the reason, and how it has been spent.

As I said before, Your Honour, one of the reasons, in this land today and throughout the nation and throughout North America, that we have the unrest that we have is because of the paternalistic attitude of Governments and the bureaucracy of the day. The young people, as a matter of fact everybody in the new generation, wants to know where our money is going (and this is not unreasonable) and for what purpose is it being spent. and the fact that it is not is the cause of suspicion, sometimes undue suspicion, but it leads to difficulties. I would suggest to this Government, and I do not expect this Government to see this point of view because this is a view that is different from the views of twenty, thirty or forty or fifty years with which this Government is obsessed, but I would suggest to this Government, if it wishes to leave a real legacy, in making its last will and testament to the people of this Province, it will update its

MR. MARSHALL:

rules and principles with respect to the carrying out of Government itself and with particular emphasis to the handling of money.

Do not forget that the way in which Government is being carried on, not informing people where the money is going, makes people discontent and it sows the seeds of violence and is one of the reasons why violence is sweeping the Western Hemisphere in this day and age. I would suggest that the hon. the Premier could well address himself to this particular point, because we will have more to worry about than Peeping Toms and a few people bugging telephones in the next few years, unless Government is prepared to come to grips with the matters that are before it, to tell the people what is being done with their money because, after all, we must not lose sight of the fact that it is their money, and then that is the first step to getting this Province on a firm foundation.

We are going through very, very difficult times right now, and I would suggest that, ^{is} one of the reasons why we had the situation with respect to the teachers' strike, for instance, and the policeman situation last year and the other labour turmoil that we have seen existing from time to time vis: the people who are employed by the Government and the Government itself. It is useless for this Government to turn around and say to a group of people, "We just do not have the money," The reason why it is useless is that this Government never tells the people where its money is going. It all sounds nice and easy to say that we must come back to this House of Assembly after we have borrowed money and say that it has been borrowed. It all sounds nice and easy as well for the theorist to sit back and say, "All right," when you vote a large amount of money, without full discussion and after things have been cut off, it is all very well for them to say that they have to come back to the Government, to the Legislature for its approval of the spending of the money." But things do not work out that way. A Government, the succeeding Government, the Government that succeeds this particular Government, regardless of the fact that it might regard many of the schemes, many of the reasons for the debts that are owing to be hare-brained, something that they would not do, ridiculous, not of benefit to

MR. MARSHALL:

the people, regardless of these considerations, any responsible Government has the right, not only the right but the duty and the obligation to honour the debts and obligations of the previous Government. There is nothing more important, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour, than legislative reform. There are other instances

MR. MARSHALL: of Legislative Reform that we should address ourselves to. First is the matter of the question period. One of the biggest reasons for the existence of the Legislature is that the Opposition and the Government can meet together for the Opposition to ask questions of the Government and the Government to supply answers and give an accounting of its stewardship of the people's affairs.

I find that last year, I know there is a rule in this House and I would have wished to see it in the Throne Speech, an indication that it was going to be changed or that the House was going to be asked to change its rules, to the effect that the Government need not answer any questions. This was demonstrated last year, when some twenty percent to twenty-five percent of the total of the questions were completely ignored and not answered. Then, again, we get some very smart tricks, What I would style the smart tricks in the answering of the questions.

The Premier was asked, for instance, the other day, with respect to the Petro-chemical Plants, could he, could he inform the House of the names of the three firms that were going to establish Petro-chemical industries? And he got up and he said, "yes," and sat down. Then on a supplementary question he was asked, would he? And he could get and he said, "no," Big joke. Absolutely marvelous. They hinge on the words, on words on the questions, to avoid them. And this is not the purpose for which this Legislature or any legislature exists. I say, Mr. Speaker that it is an object or manifestation of the fact that this Government have been in here too long.

We saw on the faces of so many of the members on the other side of the House recently, great smiles, great smiles when something is put over on the Opposition. A great joke. They will laugh on the other side of their faces one of these days, when things backfire, as a result of their inability to keep the care and control, of the affairs of the country, with which they are charged.

MR. MARSHALL: I think, Your Honour that the rules should be changed to require that this House should be asked to change its rules to require the questions to be answered. Now, perhaps, the office of the Speaker, should be strengthened, maybe to have the Speaker-

MR. CALLAHAN: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: This is the type of remark that I would expect from the hon. Acting Minister of Finance and it is also the type of attitude we see in the House, from time to time, and he is one of the great perpetrators of it.

But, anyway, Mr. Speaker, you cannot, obviously, we know the difficulty of getting the Speaker involved in any debates. But, certainly there should be some time limit for the answering of questions. Questions should be able to be tabled by members of the Opposition, when the Legislature is not sitting. Come in and table the questions and have answers tabled. You may turn around and say, "well, where is this done elsewhere?" There is nowhere I know it is done elsewhere, but that is no reason why we should not change it, because the big thing in all of our deliberations and consideration is the fact that there must be good faith shown in this House. There must be good faith. Perhaps, it would be unnecessary, perhaps it will be unnecessary to change the rules with the change of Government, because you will have a fresh group of people involved, who will be in good faith and after all, this is all the Opposition is asking. This is all that I am asking, is a demonstration of good faith on the part of the Government, towards the Opposition. But, certainly there should be some provisions where smart attitudes are not taken, with respect to questions that are asked. That there is sincerity on the part of people on the other side, The Cabinet Ministers, when they are asked questions to answer them. And to answer them in the manner that is obviously intended. You can play with words from one end of the day to the other. But, the point is we want the information. It is absolutely imperative that the Government give it, and if it is necessary to change the rules, so they should be changed. These are much necessary, I think,

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this type of reform, as the reform with respect to the courts and justices, obviously, as necessary as they may be.

There are other areas of reform that should have been taken into account in the Address and Reply or in the Speech from the Throne.

Now I make these suggestions, Your Honour, I might have written a letter, as the hon. member for St. John's West did, but knowing the way that the hon. the Premier has, the esteem in which the hon. the Premier holds the hon. member for St. John's West, and he, knowing that I was new at the game, I thought I better bring them up myself, because there is probably more chance of them getting attention.

One of the things I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am absolutely shocked about, that was not in the Speech from the Throne, is that there was not some provision in the speech to compensate the workers in this city, in the City of St. John's, who were adversely effected by the declaration of emergency, by the Municipal Council of St. John's on January 18 and 20, I believe, it was, January 18 to the 20, as a result of a very, very heavy storm. I am very, very, much surprised this Government, which says that it has done so much for the working man, did not address itself to this particular consideration.

There was, Mr. Speaker, there was, as we all know, a very heavy storm, which occurred on those days. We, also, know that the City Council declared a state of emergency for, I believe, it was the first time certainly in modern history, ordering people off of the streets. This state of emergency, and nobody is faulting the cause of the state of emergency in that particular situation, and this state of emergency was recognized by the fact that this Government brought into play the Department of Provincial Affairs and its Emergency Measures Organization, for part of the time, to assist in it.

But, at no time, at no time, has there been any effort made or any announcement of any effort made, either by the City of St. John's or by this Government, of efforts to compensate people who had their wages stopped, as a result of missing this employment. Now there were many of the employers

MR. MARSHALL: around this City, many of them pay their employees without the necessity of being required so to do. But some of them did not. The most notable company that did not pay them was the Canadian National Railway. This Government indicated its fear, trepidation, of the Canadian National Railway as it has in the past, is not going to talk to the Canadian National Railways or say anything to them or about them, despite the fact that they are the benefactors of a rail system, as a result of Confederation twenty-two years ago. It did absolutely nothing to compensate these works. There should have been measures taken, and the measures taken should be this: it is most necessary to formulize this declaration of emergency. I am sorry to see that the Speech from the Throne did not contain an Act requiring employers to pay workers in the City of St. John's for the period that they were not working during this state of emergency.

I am aware of several instances, people in the City attempted on that day to get to their places of employment, but were turned back by the constabulary or were turned back by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and were told to go back to their homes. Some of them were down at the C.N.R. The hon. the Minister of Economic Development knows this, as representing St. John's South, there are many people in his district were affected as well as people in my district and in the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and in St. John's East Extern, and they were turned back.

Now what are we going to do about that particular serious situation?

Look, a statement was made, I made a statement with respect to it and it died, as most minority deals die in this Province. There was nothing said about it. But, certainly there are measures, there are very, very definite measures, which can and must be taken. One thing that was said, and with great pomposity, with respect to the C.N.R. was; Oh! Ho! Well they had the same situation in the City of London, in the City of Ontario during the winter, and in the City of Moncton, in New Brunswick, this is what they

MR. MARSHALL: said. That is signed, but there is a marked distinction between the two. An organ of Government did not come out and declare a state of emergency. The people, if they could have crawled there on snowmobiles to their work to the C.N.R., could have had gotten there, but there were persons who attempted to get to their place of employment who could not get there, so we had to do something about it. I would like to have seen an Act, some type of Act or Acts, to compensate these people, to force the employers who, with bad faith, did not pay their employees, to force them to pay and, if they do not, to invoke the provisions, the same provisions as in the Minimum Wage Act; whereby an officer of the Department of Labour, if an employer is paying less than the Minimum Wage can go out and take the necessary steps to see that it is paid. It is collected by the Department of Labour for the employee. This is something that should be done in this particular case, An Act, or a measure should certainly be taken to help these people. But, I am not surprised, indeed, as I say, I am not surprised to see the Government taking no action, because of the fact, that it is apparently afraid of the C.N.R. - demonstrated back in the past. And, very sadly, I have to say that. I am rather sorry, as well, to see the Municipal Council of the City of St. John's not taking a much stronger position with respect to it.

Mr. Marshall.

Another measure has become quite evident over the past few days here in this House that should have been brought in, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne was some further definition with respect to the eligibility of persons to sit in this hon. House. Now I say this and make this suggestion, and I make this comment that, with all due deference to the Premier, I am not making this suggestion by way of poking fun at a person's age or the hon. the Minister of Justice for that matter or the hon. the senior member for Harbour Main. There are possibly others as well. But, certainly, when people approach the age of seventy years, Mr. Speaker, it is time, if they will not give up the reins, for them to be forced to give them up. I think in this case it would be a marked kindness for them too. I think it would be a marked, marked kindness for them too, before they are defeated in an election.

I should like to have seen it provided it here that the members of this House retire at the age of seventy. They do it in all other phases of activity. They do it in commercial practice. It is sixty-five in the Civil Service. It is sixty and sixty-five in other commercial areas. You got the judges who retire, certainly at age seventy-five. But they are considering a provision in the House of Commons now, Mr. Speaker, to have judges retire at seventy. That is perfectly proper. When they get to the age of - I am not talking about members of the House of Commons. They should have this rule too. Certainly members of the House of Commons should ..

MR. CALLAHAN: Why does he not retire himself?

MR. MARSHALL: Members of the House of Commons, MR. Speaker - I am talking about this particular House here, for what it is worth. I feel that members of the House of Commons should retire at age seventy. The House of Commons is

Mr. Marshall.

fortunate, because in the House of Parliament of Canada, consists the two Houses. It consists of the Senate and the House of Commons. Very, very often, before most people when they get to age sixty-five but certainly before they get to seventy, those that do not want to continue to hold on to the reins usually find themselves in the Senate. We do not have a senate. It was abolished back in the 1930's, in the Legislative Assembly. But certainly, there is no real reason why members of this House should be, by any means, subjected to any different rules than any other individual. At age seventy, I think, it becomes quite obvious that a person should retire. They have gone on long enough and certainly, if I may remark, it becomes patently evident from the performance on the other side..

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Chairman, a point of order..

MR. MARSHALL: Certainly, and lose men at age thirty-five, forty, if we can find Cabinet posts for them. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, there is another element as well. As I say, I mean that, I mean that in all sincerity that I feel, without any disrespect to the hon. gentlemen on the other side who happen to be septuagenarians, over seventy years old - I mean this with no disrespect whatsoever, but I do feel that time has come to consider retirement of individuals before they come to their seventieth birthday, certainly, if they come to their seventieth birthday within two years of the date of the issuance of the writ of election. There is another matter, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the eligibility of persons in this House, to which I should like to refer and which I should have liked to have seen included in the Speech from the Throne and that is with reference to persons on the City Council, persons in local government - there is no reason why a town councillor or a mayor for that matter should not be able to run, to offer themselves for election. Certainly once elected, there is no place for him. He cannot wear two hats. He should retire from the position as councillor or mayor or what

Mr. Marshall.

have you. He should retire from his position with respect to what he holds in the municipal council. There should be a provision in the Act, to the effect that once he assumes a seat in this Assembly, his other function, his other office, is by virtue of his assuming this seat deemed to be vacated.

This is most necessary, Mr. Speaker. It is most, most necessary. We have seen the result of this. We have seen this happen sadly in previous houses of this nature, when more than one-half, for instance, of the City of St. John's, either ran as candidates and a few of them were elected to this House. They continued to occupy the dual position. The local government has proceeded surely to such a stage nowadays, such a stage of independence and vitality that there is no rational whatsoever. There can be conflicts between a duty as a councillor and as a member of this House. Certainly, as I say, this particular situation should not pertain. I cannot help but think, I cannot help but think, Mr. Speaker, that there is not enough pressure brought to bear by community councils on the Government of today, by city councils. I would have to address myself to my own in St. John's. Why has not the City of St. John's been pressing this Government, very, very seriously for this report of the Fraser Commission, to which my hon. friend from St. John's West alluded and spoke about the other day? Why has it not been? It certainly should have been. The report was heralded as the most necessary thing, to increase and regularize the income of the City Council, of which we have not heard one whit nor one word from the City Council of St. John's. There should have been more statements made, in my opinion, and in the opinion of most people, of participation, of forcing the Government to act much more fully in the Mundy Pond and the urban redevelopment programmes. Again, we have the ignominious situation, Your Honour, where you have various levels of authority within the City itself. You have the Pippy Park Commission. You have the Wedge Wood Park Council. Out in the environs, you have the

Mr. Marshall.

Mount Pearl Council. You have the City of St. John's. All of these have to be regularized. I feel that with the councils being independent of the Legislature that we will have much more action in these areas.

Then again, another reform that I should have liked to have seen. The Speech from the Throne brought in various reforms. It certainly is a change, as I have already spoken about the other day, in the Civil Service Commission. Since I am not allowed to refer to what I spoke about the other day, I repeat some of what I said, so that I will be sure it will be on the record. The appointment of Civil Servants, Mr. Speaker, should be widened. The report that has come in - the Report of the Civil Service Commission shows most of the positions, virtually all of the positions to be in the lower grades of the Civil Service itself. I feel that the scope of the Civil Service Commission ought to be expanded and expanded greatly. Before you do that, Mr. Speaker, I would also suggest that the Civil Service Commission itself, its membership should be changed. I have already mentioned the fact that we have two Civil Service Commissioners. Now, one of whom is a defeated Liberal candidate. The other was a worker in the Liberal election. This is not good. Of all places to have this - of all places to allow this - of all places to allow political patronage, Mr. Speaker. Surely, the Civil Service Commission is not the place for it.

Now the late Mr. John Courage has passed away, and there is no longer a chairman. The Government will

obviously had to address itself to the appointment of a Chairman. Now, I suggest, is the time for this Government to change the personnel on the Civil Service Commission and give it the proper type of powers as were suggested in the Royal Commission on Economic Prospects. To give it the proper type of powers-so that we can have a vibrant civil service, an independent civil service and certainly there must be provisions in the Act itself to provide that the civil service, both promotion and appointment of the civil service shall be by merit and solely by the way of merit, that proper examinations be set up. Because, after all, Government in this Province consists of two organs the Federal Government and the Provincial Government. The Federal Government has a relatively good civil service commission and a good strong Civil Service. The people of this Province can expect no less from the other organ which has jurisdiction over them.

Another measure that I should like to have seen, Mr. Speaker, is a proper Bill or proper Act, measures taken to really provide for the proper type of purchasing by Government. Now I have to say that the hon. the Minister of Supply at least has documented the type of programme or the manner which the Department of Supply operates. But this is really, Mr. Speaker, not purchased by public tender. I have heard over the past few days references in this House, the purchasing by tender, and I inquire really, what do you mean by tender? The tender as I understand it, in the Department and Services, is the fact that the Minister of Supply asks for three, writes a letter to three people on the tender list, from time to time, this is the way it is done in certain cases. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is the mode of procedure that is adopted in this particular documentary, a summary of purchasing procedures of the Department of Supply merely sets forth the machinery that is bought into effect in a

lot of other Provinces such as Nova Scotia. In the case of emergencies, where public tenders cannot become -public tenders in the nature of advertising for the - and inviting public tenders for the item that is wished to be purchased. You may talk about the cost, certainly you would not call a tender for amounts of fifty dollars, I know that. But all matters over, all items, all purchases over, say \$1000 anyway, ought to have the benefit of public tender, and public tender as such is advertising in the paper.

Another instance Mr. Speaker, which I would like to refer. Another type of reform that I would have expected this reform Government to have brought in, is some amendment to the Public Enquiries Act of this Province. It is to me and to most people a matter of some sadness that a public enquiry was held recently into the affairs of the Town of Bay Roberts and that public enquiry was not a public enquiry but was conducted in private. The public were not invited. Nobody knows what went on. Nobody knew what went on. Not being a slave to what they do in other Provinces, as most of the items of the Government, the Government brings up in this nature and the nature of reform. But I was interested in how they actually handled these in the other Provinces of Canada, and I looked up the various Acts, or as many as I could get my hands on in the library, that were available, or I had available. I found that with one exception all of the Acts are entitled to Public Enquiries Act. This adjective "Public" has been utilized and generally must obviously mean that the enquiry is going to be held in public. That it is going to be public and open, for people to see how it is being conducted, why it is being conducted and the manner in which it is being conducted. It comes right back again, Mr. Speaker, to my original remarks, that the people cannot be treated in a paternalistic fashion. The people are not children. The people on the other side of the House, the Government, are not superior

beings, and I feel that the Government should use the words of the present Minister of Transport of the Federal Government; "tell it as it is." This enquiry should have been held in public and there should be a provision made with respect to it. The Act of England, the Act presently in vogue in England, and I forget the actual name, "Departmental Enquiries Act" provides, specifically, that an enquiry of the nature of this particular enquiry must be held in public, unless in the opinion of the commissioner or commissioners a matter of security of the state is involved. That qualification does not apply here in Newfoundland, matters of treason and security of the state are matters for the Federal Government. There is absolutely no reason why public enquiries are not public enquiries.

Again, again, I have to point out, with respect to this public enquiry, my disappointment, over the fact that the Mayor of the City of St. John's was appointed as the Commissioner. This may not be a very popular thing to say, but the Mayor of the City of St. John's is also a former member of St. John's West. The public enquiry was undoubtedly called, because, regrettably, the Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs was, at the time of the matters upon which the Auditor General reported, also Mayor of the Town of Bay Roberts. So, I do not feel, I do not feel that a former political colleague should investigate, make a public enquiry into affairs that could affect, hopefully not adversely but certainly could affect the Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

We come to the reform of the Judicature Act, Mr. Speaker, I would agree, certainly, with the Speech From the Throne, with respect to placing women on juries. But I think that women want exactly the same rights as men with respect to these matters, that, women should not be given the option, should not be treated any differently than anyone else and, why should they be given the option of opting out of juries when men are not? Also I think that Bill

should have been expanded. I come back to the Civil Service Commission again, or the Civil Service, to include civil servants. The fact of the matter remains is that that particular section of the Judicature Act to which the Speech From the Throne refers was drafted away back in the year 1900, when there were certain businesses and functions of people that were thought to be very, very indispensable to the society of the day. For instance, you had telegraph operators exempted. Certainly, apart from the fact that the Judicature Act is to be revamped and given much more scope than the Speech From the Throne envisages, it also must be brought to the attention that Civil Servants ought to be able to serve on these juries as well, and certainly goes to show the reason for a Law Reform Committee.

Back to the Reforms that are actually in the Speech From the Throne, There is one point, and we all agree with the reforms that are there only they do not go far enough, as the Government never goes far enough with respect to rights of people. They go too far when it comes to spending money, they are very generous with that. They are not too generous when it comes to giving people their proper rights and seeing that important rights are looked after. One that I am very glad to see is Legal Aid, is this Government addressing itself to legal aid. However, I again reiterate the fact, that the appointment of a person employed by the Government in the nature, becomes in the nature of a public defender of one person employed by the Government. He becomes in the nature of the public defender, and I would ask the Government to look very, very closely before they make provisions of this particular nature.

MR. MARSHALL: The Speech Mr. Speaker, also goes into the fisheries and heaven knows we welcome the items which are going to be carried out with respect to the fisheries. We endorse every single one of them, and wish it were going much further. I am afraid it is rather empty from this particular Government. It is rather empty from this Government, which has advised in the past that people could burn their boats. Then they gave the appearance that they were ashamed of the fishermen.

We were going to create, in this great Province of ours, a Chicago, a Toronto, you name it, Tokyo, lately I gather Tokyo, probably a Romania too, probably a little bit of Moscow in it as well, but in any event it became patently evident, from the record of this Government it becomes patently evident the fact that this Government was for awhile and still is afraid or ashamed of the fishery. It has done many things, I know, but it has not come down to brass tacks. It has come down to steel tacks, it has come down to steel tacks. It recovered a bit from its embarrassment in 1966 Mr. Speaker, it recovered a bit then when it promised that we would have all boats built of steel over a certain tonnage. Now, did you ever hear anything quite as ridiculous as that? All boats were to be built of steel.

Electronic and suction pump devices would be used to catch the fish. Did anyone ever see anything as ridiculous as that?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Russians are using them now.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes the Russians are, but we are not. It is too bad we do not have a few suction pumps to take up some of the members on the other side of the House as well, we would be much further ahead in the fishery than we are at the present time.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: What year was that, 1966?

MR. MARSHALL: There has been a lack, a general overall lack, Your Honour, of concentration on the natural resources of this Province, and particularly with respect to the fisheries. You say, and I know, that there has been a lot of work done, there has been a lot of money expended. But, typical of this Government, it will give the money without seeing that it is applied in a

proper, sane, and sensible direction.

Long range development programmes are needed. The first thing we must do with the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, the first thing that we must do, is insure the plant which we have. I do not mean boats with wooden bottoms or steel bottoms or suction pumps and so on, but I mean that we must really make an effort to see that we control the fishing areas out off the coast. When I say we, I mean the Federal Government. Obviously the Federal Government has jurisdiction with respect to this.

As usual, in its appointments of boards and committees, in its days of the last bunker, like in the days of the bunker - the last bunker in the fall of the Third Reich, committees are going all over the place, not for the purpose of involving people, but in an attempt to absolve itself from its responsibilities. As usual, the Government wants to make the Federal Government the whipping boy. Now this Government has never really - it is up to this Government, it is up to the Department of Fisheries and the minister of Fisheries of this Government to see that these things are carried out, and to go to the Federal Government and insist that they take more positive steps to extend control over, not just the twelve mile limit.....

MR. STRICKLAND: Yes, like John Deifenbaker did.

MR. MARSHALL: Which is excellent, but control over the whole of the continental shelf. This Government does not do that, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you why. It is obvious, we all rejoice in Confederation.....

MR. CROSBIE: All of us.

MR. BARBOUR: Get assistance now, get it written down on paper for you to say it.

MR. MARSHALL: When the hon. member for Bonavista South was out on the boom docks, I was pretty well a boy in my cradle, when confederation came, but I certainly lived to rejoice in it, and to rejoice that we still have the Premier after this period of time. Any, the unfortunate part about it.....

MR. BARBOUR: Are you the shadow of the Minister of Fisheries?

MR. MARSHALL: The unfortunate part about it.....

MR. BARBOUR: Will the time never come, and she never will.

MR. MARSHALL: The unfortunate part about it, Mr. Speaker, is that this Government has never really, even after twenty-two years, understood what Confederation is all about. We have heard time and time again about "Uncle Ottawa," We have heard about the insinuations that Ottawa is a bottomless pit.

MR. BARBOUR: Sure lawyers retire at seventy.

MR. MARSHALL: We have heard all sorts of things. The hon. the Premier.....

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: I say Mr. Speaker, that this Government, because of its relationship with the Federal Government, because of its attitude of going to Ottawa like a beggar on horseback, has never really realized what Confederation is all about. I doubt whether too many people on the other side of the House, in the Cabinet, even know the difference between section 91 and section 92 of the British North America Act. They do not realize that in 1949, when we joined the great Dominion of Canada, we did not give up, we did not throw everything over on top of the Federal Government, and sit back here and expect that they were going to send down money so that we could spend it. This is the impression that we get. Consequently, the same relationship as an uncle or a nephew, and the same relationship as father and son, after all, the hon. the Premier always referred to the Prime Minister as 'Pierre' which always means father Trudeau. A father and son relationship all the way through.

Instead of the Minister of Fisheries and other ministers of this Crown going up to Ottawa and making sure that we have gotten our rights, they are satisfied to take their few dollars and go on, consequently, we get situations occurring. Up in Labrador, where, because of the white paper of Mr. Benson there are certain developments in Labrador which are not taking place. Expansions to the mines up there.....

MR. CALLAHAN: That is not so.

MR. MARSHALL: That is so, they have been delayed.

MR. CALLAHAN: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: What do we hear from the other side of the House? What have we heard from the Government through the Minister of - what public pronouncements do we make? The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that we must obtain

a plant, a plant that we must work. I would like to see something definite. Some definite action taken by this Government in fisheries, such as for instance, requesting the Federal Government to convene an international conference here with respect to the rights in the North Atlantic. There is no other way, right here we are in the middle of the North Atlantic. There is no other way that the situation here in this Province cannot be - the fishery situation cannot be brought more forcibly to the attention of other countries.

We all know that there are difficulties, Mr. Speaker, we all know that there are difficulties involved in enforcing the twelve mile limit properly, because of these conventions and treaties. But this Government has not shown that it is doing anything with respect to it.

I would also like to see the Fisheries Department appoint the Fisheries Corporation, Development Corporation that was referred to in the report of the Royal Commission on Economic prospects. There is nothing by the way, Mr. Speaker, more essential to our well being - to the economic development of this Province than the fisheries. This is why we must dwell and spend an awful lot of attention on it. We cannot be ashamed of it. We cannot go out and abandon the inshore fishery as we have abandoned it. We must take positive steps and one of these positive steps is to insure that the Government is properly informed, and to insure that the fishery is developed in a proper manner which is surely to develop this Fishery Corporation and I am going to quote Mr. Speaker if I may, page 198 and 199 of this report that is already before this House, so it can be brought again to the attention of the Government. "If the Newfoundland industry is to grow in an orderly fashion, and on a sound basis, and if it is to become self-supporting in the future, long term coordinated planning by experts must be undertaken."

MR. MARSHALL: Then it goes on, in order to co-ordinate development it is suggested that the development of the Newfoundland fishing industry should be placed in the hands of one powerful independent Fisheries Development Corporation, charged with making the fisheries self-supporting within ten years," 1966, within ten years, and nothing has been done on it yet. "And power to initiate and effect fishery development programmes, to manage the overall development of the industry; and to participate in the business activity should this be necessary to the fulfillment of its plans. Provision of adequate training facilities for workers and management should also be the concern of the corporation." The Government has done something with respect to that, but certainly there is need for involvement in the fisheries of this Province. There is need for involvement of the much maligned merchant. There is need for involvement of the fishermen themselves, through the unions. Most of all, there is need for involvement of this Provincial Government. And you cannot make the Federal Government the whipping boys for the problems with the fisheries, you must do something with respect to it. Not only just in fisheries, but in all other fields of endeavour in Government, there are many overlapping jurisdictions, Mr. Speaker, not only the Department of Fisheries. There are many areas in the Department of Economic Development where the forces of the Federal Government can be brought to bear, and the resources of the Federal Government can be brought to bear.

I must say that. I am glad to see, I do not know whether he is in harness yet, but I am glad to see that a step had been made in that direction with the appointment of Mr. Carr Ure, but I do not know whether he is there yet.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Ure.

MR. MARSHALL: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: But, in any event, it should not be allowed, Your Honour, this should not just rest with a civil servant. Heaven knows the Cabinet is big enough as it is now, I am not advocating any expansion of the Cabinet, much to the disappointment of the few remaining backbenchers that are there.

MR. MARSHALL: I am not advocating any expansion, it was heartening to see that there were only ten in 1949. Now it has grown to practically half the House, which is another instance of being against or a policy that is against accepted, unwritten parliamentary rules.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Certainly would welcome it.

MR. CROSBIE: Did the hon. member say that, the increase in the Cabinet is almost half the number of people of the House, might be caused by inflation or would there be other reasons?

MR. MURPHY: Tight money.

MR. CROSBIE: It did not go down with tight money, does the hon. member think it went up with inflation?

MR. MARSHALL: I think it relates to control. I think the situation is that it all relates to control and keeping the young bloods in line.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, there should be an additional, now at the same time, a complete reorganization of the Cabinet, in addition to turning those out, but there should be a reorganization of Cabinet function. And one of the most necessary posts in the Cabinet is a Minister for Federal and Provincial Relationships, to ensure that we have all of these programmes properly co-ordinated, to ensure that the voice of Newfoundland, to ensure that the Provincial voice of Newfoundland is heard in Ottawa. It has not been heard until 1968, when we had the great election, when we had the great results, but in addition to that, this Government seems content to sit back and not represent itself to the Federal Government as an organ of, a fellow, one of the eleven governments in Canada. And there should be as I say, a Minister of Federal/Provincial Relationships, to ensure that all and each and everyone of these programmes are co-ordinated together.

Now I could go on ad infinitum about who should be cut out, but we will leave that until this time next year, when another person gets an opportunity to do it.

MR. MURPHY: External Affairs.

MR. MARSHALL: External Affairs, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition refers to. But, you know this is a real reason for this particular minister. We have certain heads of Government that we have to look after. And we are superior with respect to these particular heads, property and civil rights, education etc., We have the same powers and rights we had prior to 1949. Confederation meant we gave rights to Ottawa, other rights which we had, to Ottawa. But, as between ourselves and the Federal Government, we are a separate Government and a separate entity, and this Department of Federal and Provincial Relationship should be there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the Division of Forestry, the Speech from the Throne mentions the forests, the development of the Forest Corporation is an excellent idea and a good move, if it is done, and if it is done properly and if the experts that are used in it are listened to, if it is not just a purpose of using it as a whipping boy, as they have used so many of the other organs of delegations of various powers to various groups. You cannot absolve yourself from responsibility of the forest programme of this Province. You cannot do it.

I would like to read, this is a recommendation - the Royal Commission requires negotiations with pulp and paper companies or request it. Has this been done? How far has it gone? These are questions that must be answered. We must have complete utilization of our forest resources, as was shown in the Royal Commission. We must get much more satisfaction from the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, Mr. Speaker, than we have in the past, certainly in this brief session itself.

The question was asked, Question No. 24 on the Order Paper. The question asked was - "how many cords of pulp wood were cut by Javelin Forest Products, Limited, at Lake Melville, during 1970?" And the answer was, up to December 31, 1970, 75,343 cords. And then subsequently, what is the amount assessed? \$42,156. What is the amount paid? \$1,892.00. And why is not the rest of it paid? And he comes up with some, what I consider to be

MR. MARSHALL: a ridiculous reply, to the effect that there is a dispute in jurisdiction, or there is a dispute between the Federal and Provincial Governments. Utter and complete rubbish. The fact of the matter is that, this is just another take it easy time with Mr. John C. Doyle, who gets the benefit of the Javelin Industry.

MR. MURPHY: He got two and a-half million cords of wood.

MR. MARSHALL: He got, and yes, he got two and a-half million according, to the prospectus of his file. It is a ridiculous situation, and it should not pertain. We see up there in Labrador, in the Happy Valley area, that much wood has been taken, and I believe, it has been exported and at the end of it, and this is the wood to which we refer, I presume, in this question No. 24.

MR. ROBERTS: It is going to Stephenville when the mill is opened.

MR. MARSHALL: Right, it was going to Stephenville, but, I say, Mr. Speaker, that not one cord of wood in this Province should go outside the Province, and it should be utilized here and processed here. This is the only way that we are going to get into the twentieth century, is to learn to process our raw materials. And it is fine, I know there is employment provided up in Happy Valley right now, with respect to the cutting of the wood. We know that. But, the fact of the matter is, if there were not Mr. John C. Doyle, he would be told to wait until the Linerboard Mill was up, or until some other mill was up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member -

MR. MARSHALL: After hearing the hon. minister.....

MR. CALLAHAN: (First part inaudible) I just want to ask him if he is aware of two facts. Is he aware, in the first instance, that there is in the law, as the law now exists, a requirement for the export of pulpwood from this Province? It must be exported to a minimum quantity, by law. Is he aware of that? Secondly, is he aware that there are around this Province at least fourteen communities that traditionally, and right now, today, depend absolutely for their livelihood and for employment and for their economies upon that export of pulpwood, is he aware of that? Is he further aware that without that export, as required by law and otherwise arranged, these communities would be completely flat?

MR. MARSHALL: I am also aware Mr. Speaker, who has made the laws here in Newfoundland over the past twenty-one years.

MR. CALLAHAN: Does he know who made that law?

MR. MARSHALL: I am also....

MR. CALLAHAN: Is he aware that law was made in 1938?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. the minister is not going to force me to have to answer his questions.....

MR. CALLAHAN: Come off it now, CAREFUL NOW.

MR. MARSHALL: To the news media, the same as he did at noon today.

MR. CALLAHAN: Come off it now.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the hon. member permit another question, while we are on the laws? Is the hon. member aware that under the Revenue and Audit Act that if anyone is indebted to the Crown, that the Crown cannot give or the Government cannot give, or lend money to that person? And that \$2.5 million was loaned or granted or guaranteed to Mr. Doyle, for his operation in Happy Valley, when monies were owing on royalties?

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. member is too smart a lawyer not to know the answer to that.

MR. MARSHALL: I thank the hon. member from Burin, I am not.....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: I am not as fully aware as the hon. the member for Burin was with respect to the situation, but certainly, from all we have heard, and

all we have seen, I am not the least bit surprised as to what concessions have been given by this Government to John C. Doyle, et al, esquire, because they love to give concessions.

The hon. the Minister of Mines, could well address himself to the fact, that, if this Government had adopted a policy of manufacturing our natural resources, processing them to the farthest degree possible, over the past twenty-one years, there would be many more than twenty; thirty or forty people, communities, dependent upon the forestry resources of this area.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. member is showing his ignorance, just showing his ignorance.

MR. MARSHALL: The fact that it has not, the hon. the member for Hermitage for instance can attest to the fact that the people down at St. Alban's - the problems that the people in St. Alban's are having with respect to even procuring wood, because of the concessions that have been given to the pulp and paper company. The hon. the member for Hermitage can also attest to the fact that probably the best craftsmen in Newfoundland are down in the St. Alban's area, at the head of Bay D'Espoir. All you have to do is visit the splendid Roman Catholic Church down there and see the wood work that has been performed by the people of that area.

Yet, the talents of these people, Mr. Speaker, the talents of these people are not able to be used. Why are they not able to be used? Because, this Government, this Government, has refused consistently to adopt positive programmes and policies for the utilization of our forestry products, as well as all of our natural resources. How many more people - look at the rate of unemployment we have, the shocking rate of unemployment that we have in this country at the present time. It is depressing, it is terrible the number of people that are unemployed.

MR. CALLAHAN: He does not know what it is all about.

MR. MARSHALL: There would be considerably more, there would be considerably more - I know what it is all about, having gone through the district of St. John's East very, very recently. I know full well what it is about, and I can sorrow with these people with much more feeling than the callous individuals

on the other side of this House.

MR. NEARY: - on welfare these days?

MR. CROSBIE: Any Ministers of Welfare on welfare these days?

MR. MARSHALL: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, this, Your Honour, this is an indication again of what these, we benefited, sure, we benefited from Confederation. We are all delighted it came about, but we have also suffered badly because we have had a Government that has been unable to operate properly within the nation of Canada itself. A Government that goes on like beggar on horseback, to Ottawa, asking for handouts, and sits back and gets the handouts and takes no interest nor initiative whatsoever in the direction of, not only the affairs of the Province as they are administered by the Government itself, but see that we get our just deserts from Ottawa itself.

Mr. Speaker, bearing all this in mind, the abject lack of planning of this Government, its lack of initiative, its failure.....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: I will be singing in a moment. Its complete failure

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: You are going to hear it again and again just for a little while longer. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the lack of planning, its failure to take initiative, and its failure to look after the welfare of the people of this Province, with the result that employment is at a shocking, crushing level in this Province, I move, seconded by the member for Gander, that the Address and Reply to the Speech from the Throne be amended to provide that; this House lacks confidence in the Government by reason of failure by the Government to provide for the well-being of its citizens and to provide sound planning, direction, initiative in developing the natural resources and manpower of the Province.

I understand Mr. Speaker, that having given this motion that I am allowed to immediately speak on it.

HON. L.R. CURTIS (President of the Council): Mr. Speaker, is a motion to amend the Governor's speech in order?

MR. SPEAKER: I have not received a copy of the motion as yet. I have it

now.

MR. MARSHALL: I might say Mr. Speaker, that it is the exact same terminology as was used last year in the motion for non-confidence.

MR. SPEAKER: The wording of - I know the intent and the intent is correct and is in order, but, I would prefer that, if the motion is going to be put - it states here the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, be amended to provide. We should have it put in a little different manner - the words: "after that" or "the following be added thereto" or words of that nature. It could be - the motion itself is not out of order, but it could be more properly phrased in another manner, which does not put the motion out of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Would Your Honour permit me to speak to the motion now and attend to the technicalities

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's East is now, he is talking to the motion on the Address and Reply. He has now, if he concludes his speech with a motion, but all of it now, he can continue because he still has the floor, up to this particular time. The custom is to make your motion and continue. If he wishes to continue with his speech, it is all in the one speech.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I shall be consuming more time than my allotted time so, if I may change the motion then, I move, seconded by the hon. the member for Gander, that the following words be added to the Address // Reply to the Speech from the Throne, namely, "that this House lacks confidence in the Government, by reason of failure of the Government to provide for the well being of its citizens, to provide sound planning, direction and initiative in development of the natural resources and manpower of the Province."

MR. MARSHALL: I will speak then with Your Honour's permission to the Motion itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we welcome the industries to the City of St. John's, that are put there, from the Speech from the Throne, We welcome them, we certainly do. We are told there are two now, that there are two of these trawlers, fishing boats, vessels that are going to be built now, and four are going to be built on the mainland. We have got to take it on assurance from these people that they will be replaced by four later. We will accept it, I know. We will accept it. We will be in the same situation, as we have accepted an indication from the officials of Newfoundland Refining Company, the deep sea trawlers could probably be built in Marystown. We find that they are not.

Another instance, Mr. Speaker, of complete lack of planning of this Government, complete and absolute lack of planning, something for which it will be faulted for the rest of its days, is the \$15 million extra that it has to guarantee with respect to the Linerboard project. In a group of individuals, this Government, this Cabinet, in any group of individuals, seriously, sit down before this House of Assembly and appear before the public of this Province and say that it has adopted good planning methods, that it is properly directing the affairs of this Province, when we find that \$15 million extra has to be guaranteed. Look at the paternalism. The House is not informed of this, behind closed doors again, \$15 million extra and we find, how do we find it? From this prospectus, A.E. Ames and Company, with respect to the \$25 million extra that is being borrowed.

This is a disgrace, Mr. Speaker. We all hope and fervently hope the linerboard mill will come into existence properly. That it will provide the jobs and this Province will not have to lend, to pay on any guarantees of monies that it makes. The very fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour, that in any guarantee there is always a possibility of a default, otherwise the guarantee would not be asked for. A guarantee is given with a very, very serious contemplation of all of the circumstances involved, after feasibility studies have been taken. A full investigation of the

MR. MARSHALL: project. A full investigation of the people involved. What do we see here? Fifteen million dollars extra, as if it were fifteen cents or fifteen coppers. And this House, and members of this House, having to be informed through a prospectus issued by the Government, and the Government felt that it was obliged to give the information. Was obliged had to give the information to the financiers of New York, to the people with the money, people who are supporting this Province in lending money, but did not, funny enough, feel that it had to inform the people of this Province beforehand, before it gave us \$15 million guarantee. What an indictment? What planning? What direction?

I wonder how was this extra \$15 million decided? Was it perhaps decided by a telephone call? Did someone ring an official of the Government perhaps, and say we need \$15 million extra? Okay, fine, we will put our John Henry on it, maybe, and it could possibly be, although we fervently hope not, to the detriment of generations yet to come. These observations may not be valid. If this Government were not condemned, time and time again, by independent people, by experts, for lack of planning, direction, of this economy, and by the Federal Government. The attitude of the Federal Government is obvious with respect to this Government. It is a ridiculous situation.

We come, Mr. Speaker, talking about planning and direction, yet the Government, I know, will talk about the Federal/Provincial Corporation. Great. It is marvelous. It is a great situation. Glad to see it happen. Sorry it did not occur at the instigation of the Provincial Government though. We all listened with interest when the hon. Jean Marchand appeared for the Development Conference. We all heard, with our own ears, those of us who could hear, and still hear about the Federal Ministers recounting a conversation he had, I am not sure whether it was the Minister of Economic Development or the Premier or whether they were one and the same at that time, but it must have had been the Premier. He said to them, he was reported to have said, when they were talking over the items, "there will be Government programme." That was to come up in this Development Conference. We heard 726

MR. MARSHALL: with our own ears, he said, "why not have a corporation, a Federal/Provincial Corporation." Then he recounted the fact that the Government says, "yes, it is a grand idea, we will do it."

Well, I hope that this Government is giving it more thought than that, much, much more thought than that. I hope they have not agreed to put this particular committee or corporation together purely and simply for the purpose of satisfying Ottawa. Purely and simply for the purpose of Ottawa further directing our affairs. Concept of Confederation does not require that. We have the right of the expenditure of money for education. We will determine that here, Ottawa will not, it never will or it never should. We will determine the state of our economic programmes. We will say where they are going to be located. Ottawa will not. Let us just hope that this is not on Ottawa's part, a requirement so that they can further control the expenditures of this Government. Now I will grant you that the expenditures of this Government have to be controlled. But, it is the people of this Province who will control the expenditures and not Ottawa. We are told that in a great statement, the Minister of - What is he Manpower?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: Federal Government to make, he suggests on the phone that this corporation be established. He gave the obvious appearance that no more thought was given to this Development Corporation than that. It was immediately; "yes, Sir, we will have it." It sounds good. Probably a few more jobs, a few more dollars from Ottawa. The Government has had the good sense to appoint a very capable Chairman.. That is the first step forward. This Chairman cannot operate, cannot operate properly, unless he is given the instruments with which to operate. We all know that. We all know what this Government does to the people of the nature of this particular Chairman, who undoubtedly will come, when you will call a spade a spade, when he calls a spade, a spade and it is not liked, let

MR. MARSHALL: us hope that he is not out of the door. What about the other members? When are the other members of this committee, this corporation that is so - and it is beneficial to Newfoundland - where are they? Where are they? Why are they not appoint now? How can this committee properly function? There is no Federal/Provincial Development Corporation with proper terms of reference where we spend the money. Where we determine our own faith in the future, is long over due. And, why? Why have we not the other members - why is this corporation not operational at this present time? It cannot be operational with one man. There has got to be a staff. There has got to be other people on the corporation with them. There has been no announcement. The Government is inept with its delay. I am just wondering - I wonder with respect to this corporation.

Mr. Merchand is styled as one of the three wisemen. And, I hope, I certainly hope, that, his wisdom is not such that, he is attempting to control the affairs of this Province. I hope the situation is not so that the Federal Government sees it necessary to attempt to control the affairs of this Province, through this corporation. The fellow who pays the piper usually calls the tune. That is so. The Confederation is a partnership. And I suspect that, we, long since, have gone past the stage where we are really masters of our own affairs.

Mr. Marshall.

It is a good idea, this corporation. Let it come into being, let it not be interfered with, as soon as possible. The fact that it is a creature, the way in which it was brought about by the hon. John Marchand, the way it was brought about certainly indicates the lack of initiative and direction of this Government in the affairs of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we then come on. I have many matters. Do I continue on now? I continue. With respect to education, we welcome very much a vocational school for the handicapped and the increased aid to libraries. But as I said before, the most, regardless - I know he said it with a great deal of pride. There certainly is reason to be proud of it. I come back again to the student/teacher ratio. There is certainly reason for the Minister of Education and the Government to be proud of the measures it has taken with respect to education. But there is much more needed than that. The emphasis, the planning, the direction has to be harnessed and driven by this particular Government itself. The Government must drive the horse. One of the biggest problems that we have, regardless of the student/pupil ratio, and I say it again, is the lack of proper facilities in the elementary and secondary school areas. If you are a parent of young children, you would quickly realize that. I do not know whether this Government has gotten so bogged down in its own affairs and with certain respect has gotten concerned with various matters of its own making. It really got the imagination and the drive and the initiative to bring the educational system to the farther step that it must be, so that we can realize the true promise of Confederation. Nothing that this Government, this present group of people on the other side of the House, can do, can ever retrieve the good-will of the teachers of this Province, after the disgraceful exhibition that went on recently. It was brought about by lack of planning, lack of direction, lack of any kind of initiative. You would think that the intelligentsia of the teaching profession

Mr. Marshall.

is going to accept too much more from this particular Government of the day! Who suffers? No, not the Government! No, not the Government! Although, perhaps, there are members on the other side of the House who need to go back to elementary and secondary school. The people who suffer from this are the children of this Province. They suffer very, very badly. Why is it? Why is it that the Government has to take - is it frantic? Is it panicing because it has gotten us in such a financial situation that it cannot meet the reasonable, ordinary needs of this Province, it has to try and beat people over the head? This is great planning. Children off from school. The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of the lack of planning, direction and initiative of this Government that all segments of our society have lost faith in its present administration. No good! They may come with all good will to any group and say to them; we have not got the money. But how, in the name of Heavens, can one reasonably expect any one to believe them, after what they have done?

MR. SPEAKER: I call it 6 p.m. and I do leave the Chair until 8 p.m.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 10

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumed at 8:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed further, I must offer my apologies to the House for not getting here a little bit earlier or at eight o'clock, I was unavoidably detained, I got caught up and I just could not make it physically. It was without any intent to hang up the proceedings of the House. I had planned to be back here at eight o'clock, regardless of who came. It so happened that I could not make it.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, on that point. We were in this House at eight o'clock when the House, when the House was called, when we arose at six o'clock. There were only five members in this House at 8:15 P.M. The Deputy Speaker, was in the House. We asked him to take the Chair. He said he was waiting for the Speaker. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is not at all just nor right. I will say this; I think this was arranged this afternoon, that this House would not be opened until 8:30 p.m., although, when we arose, we arose until eight o'clock, and that is the point I want to make.

I would say now, Sir, if we are going to follow the rules, the Parliamentary rules, this House should now adjourn.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with that point of order, our Standing Orders, rule (2) and rule (4). Rule (2) states, "That the time for the meeting of the House is at 3:00 p.m. in the afternoon of each sitting day, and if there be not a quorum present by 3:15 of the clock, Mr. Speaker shall adjourn the House until the usual hour of the next sitting day."

Rule (4), subsection (c) says, "The only occasion when the Speaker takes the initiative in this matter is at three o'clock or at eight o'clock, after the intermission. If he does not see a quorum, he refrains from calling the members to order and asks the clerk to count the House. If there are not fourteen members present he declares, without question put, that the House stands adjourned until the next sitting day. This procedure must be duly recorded in the journal."

Mr. Speaker, the same rules are in effect in the House of Commons of Canada, Beauchesne, Page 48, and it is our submission, Mr. Speaker, that this House should now be adjourned. The Speaker was not here at 8:00 P.M., he was not

here at 8:15 p.m. to do as the rules direct. The Speaker is now here, there was no quorum in this House until eight twenty-eight, and our submission is therefore, Mr. Speaker, that you should now adjourn the House till three o'clock tomorrow afternoon, in accordance with the rules, the Standing Orders of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: As I pointed out before, it was my intention to be back in this House at eight o'clock, regardless of who else came back. I was unavoidably detained and I just could not make it. I could not possibly make it back here. The Deputy Speaker was here, the Clerk was here, the Sergeant-at-Arms was here. A simple matter of a motion, to adjourn until tomorrow at three o'clock, is in order, I do not know whether any members would want to do that, but if they so do, the motion is acceptable.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of a motion, this is a question of the rules of the House, the Standing Orders of the House being enforced by the officials of the House, who were elected for the purpose of enforcing them. No motion could be made, nor could it be called to the Speaker's attention at 8:00 p.m. or 8:15 p.m. that there was no quorum, since the Speaker was not here, nor the Deputy Speaker. We are now asking, without any motion at all, that the Standing Orders and rules of the House be enforced by the Speaker, who is now here, because there was not a quorum from 8:00 p.m. to 8:28 p.m., not to make a motion for the adjournment of the House, when we know that a majority of the members in the House are going to vote against it.

What we want enforced by the officials of the House, who were elected to the important duty of enforcing, is the rules of the House. We therefore request that Your Honour declare the House now adjourned until three o'clock tomorrow afternoon, in accordance with those rules.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot declare the House adjourned until three o'clock tomorrow afternoon, for the simple reason, if we want to follow exactly - I do not know but there was a quorum present, or whether there was not a quorum present during my unavoidable absence.

MR. CROSBIE: The Clerk was here, the Law Clerk and the Clerk of the House were here and can confirm, Your Honour, that there was no quorum here at eight o'clock, no quorum at 8:15 p.m. and no one quorum until just several

minutes ago. The officials of the House were here, apart from us altogether, who can confirm that fact.

HON. J.R.SMALLWOOD (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I request that the House go on with its business.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker,

MR. CROSBIE: I move that the House do now adjourn, in accordance with the rules of the House, until three o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at three of the clock. Those in favour of the motion please say "aye," contrary "nay,"

MR. SPEAKER: Let the House divide. Call in the members.

Those in favour please rise:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition; Mr. Marshall, Mr. Collins; Mr. Earle; Mr. Hickman; Mr. Crosbie.

Those against the motion please rise:

The hon. the Premier; the hon. the President of the Council; the hon. Mr. Lewis; the hon. the Minister of Highways; Mr. Noel; Mr. Smallwood; the hon. the Minister of Labrador Affairs; Mr. Hodder; Mr. Strickland; the hon. the Minister of Education and Youth; the hon. the Minister of Public Works; the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs; the hon. the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation; Mr. Barbour; the hon. Mr. Hill; Mr. Moores; Mr. Saunders; Mr. Wornell.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move the following Resolution, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition. That this House regrets the failure of the Speaker and Deputy Speaker to enforce the Standing Orders and rules of this House fairly and impartially. I have a copy here of the Resolution.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before the aborted adjournment at six o'clock this afternoon, I was speaking about the lack of planning of this Government, the lack of concern for the well being of its citizens, and its inability to provide direction and initiative for development in this Province.

Speaking on the subject of education, we talked about the situation with respect to the teachers, and the regrettable fact, the regrettable, probable fact that this present Government will never be able itself to repair the damage that has been done. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, the truth is that many segments of our society as the result of this lack of planning, lack of initiative on the Government's part. Its cavalier attitude, its paternalistic type of practice of Government, have lost

faith in the Government and refuse to believe and accept the statements that it has made. On the education area, it is not hard, it is really not hard to see how the public could lose faith, when the Hon. the Minister of Education became backed in a corner after the Development Conference and was forced to recant on the position with respect to school assessments. That's a bad situation, and it is ridiculous. If there were proper planning in Education, Mr. Speaker, we would have more specialist teachers in this Province. There is a real need for this, and a real integration, and proper type of apprenticeship programme. I would suggest that certainly there should be a relationship between this new development corporation and the vocational schools themselves, in order to provide, and attempt to provide, an adequate apprenticeship programme, correlation of the education of the Province with the commercial sector of the Province is absolutely essential.

One area where he really see a great deal of lack of planning is in the field of Health. We now see in the Speech From the Throne that there is going to be a joint University Hospital and General Hospital to serve the needs of the Province. The question that immediately occurs is, who is going to control the Hospital? We all remember the recommendation XI, of the Brain Report, this report incidentally was going to be implemented in its entirety by the Government of the day, this present Government in its manifesto of 1966. But a recommendation in Volume 1 of the Report says, "I recommend that this New University Hospital should be managed by a governing body appointed by the Minister, after consultation with the appropriate authorities and bodies and that the financing of the Hospital should be the responsibility of the Minister." Subsequently, the Dean of Medicine at Memorial University, Dr. Ian Rusted, went to England and talked with Lord Brain, with respect to this one specific recommendation, and the result was Volume 11, of the Report of the Royal Commission on Health. In this, Lord Brain, in effect, changed his mind and went into the historical difference between health, education and control of

health education on this side of the Atlantic and in the European sector of our society. He came up with the conclusion, changed his mind with respect to this recommendation XI, and said, "that it is the University itself which must control the University Hospital."

Now this is an instance, we are told that there is going to be a General Hospital and a University Hospital combined; and there must needs be, right now a proper revelation as to who is going to be in control of this. Is it going to be the Government of the Province; because if it is going to be the Government of the Province that is not necessarily acceptable to the University Authorities. But, by the same token, it certainly is not acceptable to the general public of the Province that the affairs of the General Hospital, serving the chief hospital of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, should be controlled by the people at the University. The horns of a dilemma the Government may be in with respect to this and they should clarify their position and clarify it soon. But it certainly is evidence of its lack of direction, the words, the necessary planning and initiative in the field of health services as in many others, that there is in this Speech From the Throne containing the Government programme, statements made, there is going to be a new hospital with which we would all be delighted, but certainly there should be an explanation as to which body is going to control it. Obviously it has to be the Government of the Day, but this is not going to be acceptable to the University authorities.

When we are talking about this New Hospital, it is also the fact that the Government has spent a large amount of money on the General Hospital itself in recent years. What is going to happen to this facility? Are we going to get the full use of the money that we spent or is the Government going to be prepared to write it off, forget about it, as it is so prone to do with respect to other situations?

Now, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour will also note that in the Speech From the Throne there is a provision here to the effect that the Government has decided to introduce a new Dental Care Plan to be provided without charge to all children in our Province under the age of thirteen. Now, here we come again with planning and direction. Marvellous programme. Denti-Care or almost Denti-Care, but, we also are drawn, have to draw the attention to the Report of the Royal Commission on Health, to Volume 3, to the Appendix in the back, which contains a table, setting forth the requirements in Health Services for the years 1966-1981. This table, I might state, was not prepared by the Commissioner nor by the person, who wrote this Appendix, Alan Peacock, for him but really is a table provided by the Department of Health of this Government itself.

It says, with respect to dentists: "In 1966 we will require fifty. In 1971 we will require sixty-eight. In 1981 we will require 116. We have all heard the statements made by the Minister of Health last year, to the effect that the old dental programme was not working adequately because they did not have enough dentists. We now have within the Province somewhere in the vicinity of between fifty and fifty-seven dentists. I think certainly four or five of those are not practising, but, in any event, we are far, far, below the projected requirements of the Department of Health, as supplied to the Brain Commission: "In 1966 there were supposed to be fifty, 1971 sixty-eight, in effect we have very few more than we did in 1966 and we are going to put on this programme. It is marvellous to put on this programme. We certainly hope it works out, and it works out all right. But it is doubtful that it can be brought about, not be, purely and simply because of the lack of planning and direction of this Government itself, in the provision of the dentists. They cannot meet their own requirements at the time.

I have also to note the remarks made by the Minister of Health, in the Interim Supply debate, when he was referring to Legal Aid. He mentioned at

would
the time, that we, very much like to be able to institute a type of Legal Aid services that were suggested, but there was not enough lawyers around to do it. The same situation applies with respect to the dentists, I fear. This programme has to be in effect, it is a good programme, but the Government may be prevented from doing it because of its own lack of planning. It may well recognize this, and it may be just another bit of political puffery, like the type that we saw in that manifesto of 1966.

Then, we go, to the overall; disappointed, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the lack of planning, very, very disappointed with respect to the reference to the Mental Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases. We know, that there have been a certain number of escapes, from the Justice Ward of that institution, over the past few years. It has been somewhat alarming that the numbers have come out. We also have had pictures painted, by the Minister of Health, admitting that the facilities were hopelessly inadequate and that they were going to do something about it, by building an addition on to the Hospital For Mental and Nervous Diseases.

This is the same group of people who said, in 1966, that they were going to implement all of the provisions of the Brain Report, the Royal Commission on Health, and to put an adjunct on to the Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases, for this purpose, is directly contrary to the recommendation of Lord Brain. I want to read that recommendation.

"The Justice Ward was built in 1855, for the detention of criminals who are mentally ill. As there is no segregation of patients, it offers little security, and as it is at present administered, it a potential danger. There is no place where the inmates can exercise nor is diversional therapy provided. Even with treatment, no male patient is ever moved from the Justice Ward into the wards of the mental hospital. The conditions in this ward are bad and should no longer be tolerated."

April 1 1971 Tape 178 page 5.

"A mental hospital," and I am going to ask Your Honour to note these words, "A mental hospital", says Lord Brain, this great authority on Health, "is not designed, nor are its staff trained, to provide the kind of security necessary for the housing of dangerous criminals."

Mr. Marshall.

Normally, it is the responsibility of the legal authorities. It is much easier to provide adequate mental treatment for criminals retained in prison than to provide prison restrictions in a mental hospital. I recommend, therefore, that the necessary accommodation for mentally ill criminals shall be provided in prison and the prison authorities shall be responsible for their security. Medical and nursing treatment should be provided, in situ by the Department of Health. In the face of that recommendation - in the face of that recommendation, after giving us a manifesto, to the effect that every recommendation contained in the Brain Report is going to be implemented, the hon. the Minister of Health announces that he is going to put an adjunct on to the Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases, after Lord Brain says that this is not the proper way to cure it or care for such unfortunate people. There must be in this Province proper planning and a new approach to mental health and to the needs of mental patients. There are various kinds. There also should be proper quarters, separate quarters for other types of patients. I cannot but look in hopeless horror at the description, as contained in the Brain Report, about the justice ward at the Mental Hospital, in 1966, to know that it took the escape of a dangerous prisoner, this year, before anything was done about it. When something is to be done, what happens? Tear up the Brain Report. This man did not know what he was talking about. Whatever money we paid him was wasted. He will be paternalistic with the people over in England because we have been paternalistic with all of Newfoundland as well. We will ignore it. Generations in Newfoundland are yet to come, and will suffer because of it, as they will suffer for the many, many other lacks with this particular administration.

On the Department of Health itself we have a situation where there will be no pharmacists trained in this Province for quite a period of time. There is room now for twenty or thirty jobs, qualified drugists in the Province. There is absolutely no training facilities available at this present

Mr. Marshall.

moment. Why? The Government may well turn around and say the pharmaceutical association should have taken care of it. That is great! They will turn around and say, like they turn around and say the churches should build the schools, like they will turn around and say the General Hospital, the directors of the General Hospital are responsible for the hospital. The Government cannot absolve itself from its responsibility, particularly in such vital and essential services as these.

I would also point out and talk about the lack of planning and the lack of initiative. The present Minister of Health was asked a question, with respect to the Auditor General's Report, a little while ago, the day after it was tabled in this House. He has the unmitigated effrontery, the unmitigated effrontery to say that he had not read it. It is unfortunate that he could not be here tonight. I would wish he could, and many more almost did not get here. But he did not know about this, about a \$530,277 enquiry by the Auditor General of this Province. Number fifty-nine, on page fifty-seven says: Payments cancelled and postponed hospital projects, 1969-70, \$250,000. In 1970-71, \$240,577 - chicken feed to this Government. On 21 February, 1970, the Department of Health received a construction company's claim of \$530,277. It was said to be owing for services rendered on institutions of the Government of Newfoundland, in connection with several planned hospital construction projects which had either been cancelled or postponed. It was one-half million dollars for projects that had been postponed. The Minister of Health - the Auditor General goes on to point out how he received letters from the Minister of Health and the Minister of Health was asked this question the day after the report was tabled. He said that he had not read the Auditor General's Report. That is the type, Your Honour, that is the type of treatment we are getting. That is the type of reaction that we are getting from this Government. It is very, very indicative of its

Mr. Marshall.

lack of planning and its lack of proper initiative that it has been taking.

In the field of economic development, we have a real gem. The first thing that we must do; we want to supply the proper impetus to this economy, is to have a Department of Economic Development, to have one. Do not have all of the decisions made by one single individual. The next thing we see in the Throne Speech - we would hope and fervently hope that the BRINCO proposal for Labrador will come to fruition for the enrichment of uranium there.

There is the hon. member for St. John's West, who speaks sense so many times. He said (we all agree whole heartedly) to make sure that this power is used for Newfoundland. Now I note that late as January 12, 1971, Brinco was reliably reported, that the power development on the Lower Churchill, in order to bring about the power development of the Lower Churchill, integration into the Churchill Falls system is necessary. If this is so, it means that it is going to be exported to Quebec. I have the newspaper here from which I am going to quote, Your Honour and I can table it. It is from the "Globe and Mail", Tuesday, January 12th., 1971. It has an article entitled, "Newfoundland Enters A New Development Phase With Major Projects Blossoming At Last." Anyway an excerpt from this, with reference to the power section. It says as follows: "The British Newfoundland Corporation, developing the \$946 million Churchill Falls Project, has investigated a second hydro site in Labrador, Gull Island, on the Lower Churchill. It would cost \$500 million and could be a source of power for the Island of Newfoundland, if a means is found to successfully cross the nine miles Strait of Belle Isle. BRINCO would need assurance from Ottawa of an equitable tax environment before embarking on a second power project." That is the first thing it says. I would like to know what the Government's comment is with respect to that. Has it just sat back on its haunches or has it done anything about the

Mr. Marshall.

requirements of the proper tax haven or the proper tax atmosphere that BRINCO requires? They are representatives of the Province of Newfoundland. You cannot compromise the position. You have to represent Newfoundland's interest here. It goes on to say. " There are other important considerations." (Here we come to the meat of it) "Power from Labrador will be directed to southern markets. The economics it is serving Newfoundland, are questionable. " It goes on to say: "The company says the Lower Churchill site appears to be viable," (note the word, if. If, is a condition) "if" "if the project is integrated into the Churchill Falls system. This means power transmission through Quebec. Two other hydro-sites are available on the Island, although the Province has not written off the sub-sea power crossing from Labrador as possible. A decision on future production would have to be made within three years. The continuance of high interest rates would preclude further hydro-expansion by the Power Commission. Another thermo plant seems the likely compromise!"

I draw your particular attention, Your Honour and members of the House, to that provision: that the company says the Lower Churchill site appears to be viable, if the project is integrated into the Churchill Falls system. This means power transmission into Quebec. I say to this Government

MR. MARSHALL: to just make sure. Before you go off with any steam of pie in the eye, just make sure that BRINCO not only has this enrichment of uranium facility ready to go in Labrador before they are allowed to develop the Lower Churchill. Let us make sure that, hoping to entice this Government into the development of the Lower Churchill, they hold out the great ripe apples of this uranium enrichment plant and subsequently, after the development of the Lower Churchill has proceeded beyond the point of recall, will turn around and say, "we are sorry gentlemen, it cannot happen. It cannot occur. We have got all the capital investment here. We must feed it into the grid, into the Quebec hydro-grid, and it has got to go to the betterment and for the purposes of other provinces of Canada, and the United States of America." They already have enough of our power. And this power must be used in Newfoundland. And when I say Newfoundland, I do not necessarily mean the Island of Newfoundland. Your pie in the sky, grandy old scheme of transmitting electricity underneath the Straits of Belle Isle is not necessarily imperative.

There are two parts of this Province which this Government is so quick to forget, and certainly industry in Labrador is most, most necessary and this power on the Lower Churchill should be used in the Province and in Labrador itself, if at all possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons for this problem or this dilemma in which the Government finds itself right now, this dilemma owing the huge amounts of money it owes, results from this philosophy of develop or perish. We have heard it from time to time, "develop or perish," and it sounds good. It sounds catchy. The way it is practiced by this Government can mean develop and perish. Certainly everybody in this place, everybody in this House, anybody in Government will agree that in order to attract industry to a province, in a province like Newfoundland, that you have got to take risks. You have to take chances. But there are degrees of the chances you would take, and you do not become reckless. I am very surprised, when you look at the ministry of this Government and see it make up of so many people, who are in their middle age grew up in the depression years, who knew what the

MR. MARSHALL: depression was like. I do not know about it, except second hand. But, I would imagine that people who have grown up in the depression years would have been much, much more cautious than they are, particularly when they are dealing with other people's money.

What have we done? We have given, we give, give, give, time and time and time again, and our life-blood is being drained from us and used by other people in Canada and the United States, and the Power Development is one instance of it, and let us not see it, the rest of the power of this Province go out of Newfoundland.

I note when the hon. the member for St. John's North, was speaking with respect to the Speech from the Throne; opposed its adoption. He made mention of two facts, with which one has to take issue. He said, that anything the Government gave, it could take back, even the bog. The way she is going with some of these promoters and the way the Government is giving everything away, that maybe all we will get back is bog. But, then the most serious thing of all, and this reflects the attitude of Government, is that the hon. member for St. John's North had the audacity to get up in this House and say, "oh, unemployment is not too bad, our unemployment is fifteen percent now. But between the '50s and the '60s it was up much higher than that." If you adopt that kind of philosophy it is in effect saying, "do not scream, when you are hungry, just wait until you are starving."

MR. SPEAKER: (NOEL): In my comment on the present rate of unemployment; I read the rates, but I made no comment as to whether the present rate was good or bad.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, as I have recalled in checking Hansard that a comparison was made between the fifteen percent rate and the rate of twenty or thirty percent.

But, in any event, this particular philosophy of the Government, "develop or perish. which becomes "develop and perish," has resulted in

MR. MARSHALL: a whopping big debt of this Government. And depending upon how you do your accounting, it amounts, in any stretch of the imagination, which ever way you account for it, to the tune of \$1 billion; and that is not hay.

Coming back to planning again, the lack of planning, instances of the lack of planning. Marystown shipyards. Grand, grand instance of lack of planning. The deep trawlers, we see the first instances, the first reverberations, come by chance, when we see the deep sea trawlers which could have had been built here, should have been built here in this Province, being built over on the other side of the Atlantic. We were led to believe that this may come about here. In Stephenville again - I have already alluded to it. But, there is one great natural resource which is really untapped, and this is the Tourist Industry. This Government have not done enough, have certainly not done enough, by its own admission, with respect to the Tourist Industry.

I am going to quote what I consider to be a startling and depressing admission by this Government, which is contained, Mr. Speaker, in the prospectus with respect to the \$25 million additional loan for, to secure the debentures and for people to purchase debentures, on page twelve. One that has already been alluded to by my learned friends - tourism. It is to be borne in mind that these particular paragraphs which I am reading are really the words of the Government itself. Because, the Government have endorsed, and in fact, at the end it says the undersigned, the Deputy Minister of Finance in the Province of Newfoundland, has supplied, in his official capacity as Deputy Minister, duly authorized hereto by Order-in-Council by the Cabinet, the information relating to the Province set forth herein, except the information appearing under underwriting. So the Government then says on tourism: "Tourism presently contributes little to the economic of the Province, but the Tourist Development office of the Province has recently begun an active campaign to attract tourists," after twenty-two years. "The Province has vast areas of unspoiled scenery and presently maintains thirty-six provincial parks, as well as a number of historic sites. In addition, there is one national park at Terra Nova in

MR. MARSHALL: the eastern part of the Island, and the second is planned for Bonne Bay area on the west coast.

'There are facilities for outdoor sports and recreation. The Province anticipates that tourism will become an increasingly important industry in the future.' It should have been an important industry all the way through.

The hon. the Minister of Economic Development yesterday answered a question with respect to the Tourist Industry, that some firm on Mainland Canada has been involved, has been engaged to advance the cause of tourism in this Province. That is a good idea, provided they are doing their job. But, a little bit of imagination, and this is where the crunch comes in with this Government, they do not show the imagination. They do not see the initiative in tourism can develop this Province to heights unknown before. We have always known that we have places like L'Anse-au-Meadows and Castle Hill.

Now I was interested, but I was particularly interested today, to hear the hon. the Premier, I am not sure whether it was the second or the third great event. talk about the second or third great event in Newfoundland's history, and this was Sir Humphrey Gilbert's taking possession of Newfoundland as the first British Colony. And that occurred, Mr. Speaker, on August 3, I believe, of 1583. Now 1583, if you add 400 years to that, you come to 1983. Now that 1983 is twelve years away now, much too far for this Government ever to anticipate to live to or to continue, but this Government owes a duty to the Province to plan ahead that far. However, not being a Government to plan ahead -

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the hon. member permit a question on what we are now debating? I agree completely with a proportion of what the hon. gentleman has just said, aiming towards 1983, as a matter of fact, they have some information on this tourist division, which we met on the other day, looking ahead that far. There is another celebration coming up in about four years from now, I think, we will celebrate

MR. NOLAN : let me see, three years from now, we will celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of Confederation, and we are also planning something for that.

MR. MARSHALL: We like to hear about it, but, before you allow your Mainland experts to take over, perhaps, the hon. minister will allow me to inject a little bit of Newfoundland into the Government of today, in to this Government that is trying to create Ruhr Valleys and Chicagos all over the place everywhere.

MR. NOLAN: All the Government members are foreigners, I know.

MR. MARSHALL: A certain number of them - most of the electorate of the Province I think would wish that all of them were.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, in 1983, which is twelve years time, only twelve years away, we have this great 400 anniversary of the coming of John Cabot to Newfoundland, to St. John's.

MR. BARBOUR: Bonavista.

MR. MARSHALL: No, that was a mufti-guard. That was John Cabot.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, this could be the occasion of a great tourist promotion in the Province of Newfoundland, the 400 anniversary of the British taking possession of Newfoundland, as a colony of England. And it would attract many tourists to Newfoundland and have great and lasting advantages, but, only if certain steps are taken. I would suggest that the Vocational School or the Fisheries College, I am not sure which one makes the boats, but one of them makes the boats,

MR. MARSHALL:

make replicas of the ships, the "Delight," the "Golden Hind" and the "Squirrel." Have these ships equipped in contemporary fashion, with people on them, dressed in accordance with the day, taking tourists on trips outside the harbour of St. John's to other points around. Let us now turn our minds to gathering proper replicas and records of that particular time, so that we can have here in St. John's, and do not forget that it is August 3rd, August is the best time of the year for tourists to come to Newfoundland, and it is a marvelous way in which to build up the tourist development of this Province. You cannot do this unless you are prepared to take other steps and build the basic foundation. The basic foundation of our tourist industry, obviously, has to be the transportation to and from the mainland. I do not feel that this Government - this Government needs to take a hand with the Federal Government, seems to be afraid of the Canadian National Railways. We gave them a railway across the Province, every single other Province in Confederation had a railway built for them across their land, but we gave them one and the Federal Government takes away the passenger service.

The Federal Government should be prepared to provide adequate, much more adequate ferry service between here and the mainland ports, for the development of the tourist industry and Bell Island is one of them, certainly, but it should be prepared and you cannot do it, you cannot develop your tourist industry, this Province cannot develop, unless this Government is prepared to recognize what Confederation is all about, that it is a Government and not a follower of the Federal Government looking for handouts. We have to take a strong position with the Federal Government on this. This planning of this particular event, Sir Humphrey Gilbert 1983, should be begun and should be begun now, and it could be a very, very imaginative scheme.

Also with respect to the tourist industry there should be, provincial parks are fine, they are marvelous, but there should be, and this is the type of thing, I know, that your advisers and certainly they are good ideas, but this is the type of thing in a report on the mainland would be fraught with

MR. MARSHALL:

provincial parks and camping sites etc. Grand, we need them, we need more of them but there are also other things in Central Newfoundland, you have to plan for the whole of the island obviously. In Central Newfoundland, in Gander, in the Gander portion, there should be a much bigger type of museum, with respect to the aircraft industry of the island. Then you go to Grand Falls and in Grand Falls you could have, not a museum but a place of attraction that shows Indian relics, the Indian relics of lost Beothucks of the island. An ideal place in Central Newfoundland, a fisheries museum down on the South Coast, and I do not mean a museum as much as I mean a display case, to show people what Newfoundlanders do. But this is beyond the comprehension of this Government. This is not the type of thing that this Government would think about.

MR. ROWE: Would my hon. friend permit a question?

MR. MARSHALL: Certainly.

MR. ROWE: I understood him to say that there should be a museum at Grand Falls, which would display Indian relics and so on. My question is, has he been reading the papers or listening to the radio or the television? There is due to be opened at Grand Falls, in the public building there, around the 15th of May, a museum which will display Indian relics and display other things as well, and work has been going ahead on that project for the last twelve months. Does my hon. friend not know anything about that?

MR. MARSHALL: Marvelous, marvelous! Yes I am perfectly conversant with it, but that particular museum will be as dead as this Government this. Now let us face it, this particular museum will show certain little relics around etc. etc. but not necessarily a museum but statuettes of Indians etc. made. Laugh all you like, marvelous. Laugh, you have already laughed your way through a billion dollars in this Province, so we can stand you chaps laughing for a bit more. But I am not necessarily talking about museums as such, museums of a type, statues of Indians around, places like they have in little Prince Edward Island, which shows more imagination than this Government. This present Government, could show in a hundred years, parts for young people to go, to displaying the Indian artifacts and the history of this Province, not

MR. MARSHALL:

in an enclosed building, not dead, not dead as this Government is.

There are also, Mr. Speaker, and I want to advert to other particular instances of lack of initiative of this Government in connection with the motion before this House. One of the great things that is missing in our society is a lack of portable pension plans. You can talk about the Canada Pension Plan, and the Canada Pension Plan, I know, is a Godsend, but with the rising cost of living in this Province, with the rising cost of living it does not afford too much to the people who will be recipients of it. The actual fact is, the actual fact is that, particularly around my own district, there are a number of elderly people who are on fixed pensions and some of them not on pensions at all and the pensions are pathetic.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my hon. friend would permit a question relative to what he is now talking about? I do not know this for a fact but it certainly touches on what he said, that is I have heard, within recent weeks, of a well-known firm, who will go unnamed, whose employees, for years and years and years they were pensioned, with nothing written, and all of a sudden I hear their pensions are cut off. They have no guarantees, no nothing, they are just cut off like that. I think this is probably the thing he is attempting to get at.

MR. MARSHALL: Now this is the point, this is one of the points, Mr. Speaker. Now I have to say, and it is very easy to condemn, it is very easy to condemn the employers, but they have to provide for the present, the present working people as well, but it is a tragedy, it is a terrible tragedy. You go around places like the city of St. John's and the hon. Minister of Economic Development, when he was speaking the other day, mentioned about poverty and mentioned the fact that he knew about poverty and bad conditions. We will agree with me that still the worst kind of poverty you can have is urban poverty, is city poverty. Poverty is bad anyway but the bigger the place is the worst the affliction is on people. I have seen it, going around the city of St. John's, in the district of St. John's East, I feel that there are a number of elderly people and it is time to bring in legislation requiring, positively requiring, portable pension plans for people who are

MR. MARSHALL:

working. What I mean by portable pension plans, of course, is, if one transfers from job (a) to job (b), his pension goes with him. It is a ridiculous, a terrible indictment, a social indictment upon us that this particular situation can continue on, and it shows the lack again of planning and initiative by this Government.

Again, again I come to another lack of planning, a lack of initiative is the housing that is around. You talk about urban poor, you talk about it in the city of St. John's, you look at the housing that is around. I have gone and I have seen and the Minister of Social Service and Rehabilitation will agree with me that I have seen some of the houses in this town that are being rented today that are unfit for human habitation.

MR. NEARY: The hell hole of Newfoundland is right downtown St. John's.

MR. MARSHALL: It is a ridiculous situation. What is the Government going to do about it? What is the Government going to do about it? In the war, during the war years, the Government did something about housing, the commission of Government, that is, did something about housing when it brought in the Rent Restrictions Act and various other types of acts to cure the situation. It must needs be, if you are talking about the well-being and the health of the citizens of this community, I cannot concede how this Government could allow this situation to pertain.

Then again do we have to look, when we are looking at these elderly people of sixty-five - I do not know how one is going to do it but certainly there should be a programme encouraging people, employers, to accept employees, certainly up to the age of sixty-five. It is a very pathetic sight to go around and see that a condition of employment is; you must be under forty or you must be under forty-five, and it leaves the poor individuals concerned without any recourse whatsoever -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a violation of the Newfoundland Human Rights Code.

MR. MARSHALL: It is a violation of the rights. Why is the Government not seeing that this type of thing is enforced and enforced properly? If you really want to alleviate, as well, the position of the elderly person in society, you would give deep consideration to your liability for municipal

MR. MARSHALL:

property taxes. Now the situation here in St. John's is that they can go down to the City Council and they can get relieve from taxes if they can show need and this is not an enviable position. All the tenets of social welfare indicate that this is not a good position in which to cast,

MR. MARSHALL: It is not a good position in which to cast any individual. To require him to go down and make a means test. This is what it amounts to, before he gets relief. I feel the principle of taxation, of property taxation, evolved from years ago when ownership of property was equivalent with wealth and rightly so, that situation no longer pertains. There are many, many people in St. John's, living in very good but old houses, who are retired. They are on a fixed pension, the cost of living goes up, and yet they still have to go down and pay their full taxes. I think that provision should be made to alleviate these elderly people from the incidences of property tax, without forcing them to go down and fill out affidavits saying that they are needy.

This comes back to the planning and direction of this Government. This Government will never be able to give the proper planning and direction to the economy, or provide for the well-being, if it is prepared to use other organs as a scapegoat, be they municipal councils, boards of education, hospital boards or what have you. We must remember at all times that the Government has the direction and control of this economy, and if it feels that it has not that, it should resign.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we come on to another situation where there is a dismal lack of control by this Government. It is obvious that the prevention of ordinary pollution is beyond the means of the municipalities. They cannot do it. In my district, the district of St. John's East, you have places like Rennie's River, Quidi Vidi, that is adjacent to Long Pond, adjacent to the district and are polluted, and have been so for years and years and years. The City Council has been unable to cope with the problem.

Now, if the City Council is unable to cope with the problem, and for good reasons, it is obvious that the Government should take the responsibility, take the bull by the horns and cure this situation and prevent other like situations occurring in various municipalities. After all, it must be remembered that rivers and streams do not confine themselves or pay attention to municipal boundaries, they have a habit of running from one municipality to another. Another situation, on the planning and initiative of this Government that it has failed in, is in the overall situation of pollution itself.

Certainly, one of the problems in our wildlife, our outdoors, is the

abysmal presence of the unreturnable bottles that the soda pop people are putting out. The beer cans, and the coke cans etc. they are around the place, all over. And certainly consideration - if this Government is doing any planning for the future, if it wants to preserve our outdoor life and its various attractions, if it does not want it to develop into a giant rust heap it should take great care and attention with respect to this, to bring in legislation banning, banning, if necessary, the use of these tins and unreturnable bottles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another instance of the abysmal lack of planning shown in the Throne Speech, the Government's platform, is this lack of provision for proper drug treatment centres within the island itself, or within the Province. It is a big problem, it is a great problem. The hon. the Minister of Health mentioned it in a speech one time, but other individuals apparently have ideas with respect to it. It is a very, very touchy subject. Touchy subject or not, something which this sterile Government will have anything to do with, but it is a matter which they must consider and address themselves to very, very quickly.

We are told that there is a rising incidence of it, particularly in and around the area of Grand Falls. What is being done there? There should be active drug treatment centres for these individuals, where a young person can come to the centre for the purpose of treatment. One of the giant problems with respect to the treatment of drug addiction is the fact that it bears a criminal penalty. You get a young person who gets on to marijuana, and then he goes on to L.S.D. and what have you. He gets hooked, as they say. He gets hooked, very often because he does not know who to turn to. He does not want to turn to the parents, the teacher, because there are sanctions against it. If there is one thing for sure and for certain, there should be at least a haven for them to go to, where they can be treated and looked after without the fear, without any fear whatsoever of criminal prosecution.

You may say to me that this is without the ken of this Government and hold out your hands and absolve yourself of any blame with respect to the situation. I know that criminal law is a matter for the Federal Government, but certainly what I would like to know is, if this Province is prepared to take a

stand with the Federal Government, with respect to it, to have at least the Federal Government allowed. I think actually that the Provincial Government can do it by not - no it is a Federal complaint, but to have the Federal Government agree that these people who go to these centres for the purpose of treatment are not to be visited with criminal action.

In the field of labour relations we see another great instance of the lack of planning of this Government. Much has been said with respect to the labour relations in this Province and we are awaiting anxiously the Cohen Commission. There are one or two points that should be brought to the attention of the Government and which I think they should be prepared to act upon, particularly with the developments in the Labrador portion of the Province. The labour Relations Board of this Province meets at certain set times. It is staffed by very competent people. They cannot do everything and they do not have the direction from the Government. There is a difficulty, I understand, in the Labrador construction area, where unions applied for certification. There are small jobs, they are working with jobs as subcontractors. It may be four, six or eight weeks before the application is heard by the Labour Relations Board and, by that time, sometimes conveniently, sometimes not, the job may be finished, so there is no longer any point for certification.

If this Government was aware of what was going on in the rest of Canada, but I say, why should they, when they are not aware of what is going on in the Province? This is a problem which has been tackled by the Province of Ontario recently, and it was established that construction sections of the labour relations committee, ^{were} to look after this, to look after the speedy application for certification with unions, in the labour relations. Now there is nothing more important to this Province than its economic development, and something that has been overlooked by this Government is sound and proper labour relations. It is a social right, not only is it a social right, it is a necessity for the economic and social well being of this Province.

Unless this Government is prepared to address itself sincerely to the requirements of the labour movement in this Province, then it is another indictment, and another indication of its lack of planning.

MR. NEARY: I am wondering Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would be prepared to document a specific case and let me have it, so that I can just see exactly what it is he is talking about.

MR. MARSHALL: I certainly will. Now, we come to Labrador - Labrador itself and Labrador construction. We need, Mr. Speaker, to take a serious look at our relationship with the mainland of this Province. We do not like the appellation of the "Province of Newfoundland and Labrador." I am just wondering if the Government of this Province has dropped this particular designation of our Province when it entitles the Throne Speech the Province of Newfoundland, and throughout the Throne Speech refers to Newfoundland? If it does, it is a good thing. If it does it is an excellent thing, the division should never be there.

We have to direct ourselves to the integration of the Labrador portion of this Province with the Island of Newfoundland.

MR. MARSHALL: Something has gone wrong somewhere, and the only fault, since the overall direction of this Province has lain for the last twenty-two years with the gentlemen on the other side of the House, the only fault can lie with the Liberal Government as it is presently constituted.

It is a tragedy when you have an individual, a patriotic individual, like the member for Labrador West, who has sat in the Government and feels it necessary to get away from the Government. It is even more tragic that he thinks it is necessary to operate a special organ, a special party, to advance the ideas of the mainland part of the Province. Perhaps he will learn, or he will come to realize that there are people on the other side of the House who are with him and feel exactly the same way. We have to take a very, very close look at Labrador. We have to be prepared to establish a programme in order that the people from this Province, the young people in this Province, can settle in Labrador. The only way you are going to do that is with an adequate vocational training system integrated with the industry of Labrador. I wonder how much integration and planning and initiative the Government has taken in this area?

I do not know what it may have done, or what it may not have done, but I know what the results are. What about the Goose Bay portion of the Province? What about the airport in Goose Bay, what about it?

MR. WINSOR: What about it, yes, what about it?

MR. MARSHALL: Can the hon. the Minister for Labrador Affairs inform the House, at this time, what the situation is with respect to the Americans in Goose Bay? Can he? Will he?

MR. WINSOR: When I get the opportunity I will tell the hon. gentleman.

MR. MARSHALL: Or Air Canada for that matter. We see glaring examples. You can go all around, you can go all around this House, the Minister of Highways. You can look at the situation down in Labrador South, and foretell where they have a plow - what was it, a 1954 plow that broke down? That is marvellous planning. Look at the Minister of Municipal affairs. We see lack of housing,

MR. STARKES: Do not talk to me for heaven's sake.

MR. MARSHALL: We see lack of housing down at Fermeuse where jobs.....

MR. STARKES: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: Again the Minister of Labrador Affairs, for lack of integration of the island part with the mainland, and he as Minister of Fisheries for the almost death of the inshore fishery that has been allowed to be perpetrated in this Province.

MR. WINSOR: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question? Does the hon. gentleman think that a Minister of Fisheries can control the fishing in Labrador? For the last three years there has been no fish to catch there. We can do most anything, but we are not that superman you know. If the fish do not come, no man can catch them.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not expect the Minister of Fisheries to do that, but I do expect the Minister of Fisheries to rise in righteous indignation when this Government refuses or does not provide an adequate fishing programme for certain parts of Newfoundland.

MR. WINSOR: Such as what? Such as what?

MR. MARSHALL: When we look at the Department of Education we see the teachers' strike.

MR. WINSOR: Ah! you are flying around like a fly.

MR. MARSHALL: We look at the Department of Justice, this is a great instance of planning and initiative. The police situation last year, marvellous, absolutely marvellous. We could go on and on. We could look at the Department of Economic Development and its failure to use our natural resources. We can condemn the Department of mines for the concessions it has given to the few people, to the Doyles etc. Marvellous!

The Department of Health for its failings that I have gone over. Then we come to the Department of Community and Social Development, and we hear a great silence. Not much said about resettlement this year, boys, it is an election year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on now, you have missed a few departments.

MR. MARSHALL: I will deal with them all. This Opposition can only do so much. It can only do so much. One of the things that this Opposition can do, in its effort to put some impetus behind the Government, which it is going to do, is introduce certain Bills in the House. Already notice has been given of them, to bring about some of the social reforms to which I have addressed myself

today. It is to be remembered that we cannot, not yet, but before the year is up we will be in a position to introduce money Bills. But the Opposition cannot introduce a Bill respecting money. It is up to the Government itself. We are prepared, we are prepared in our programme, to take positive measures with respect to social reforms, I challenge this Government, which is always talking about the Opposition opposing, I challenge this Government to look at, in a fair and honest manner, these particular Bills that are essential to the social well-being of our communities, and to vote along with them.

Do not you oppose them simple because they are coming from the Opposition. Yes Mr. Speaker, it is a lack of planning. A grave, grave lack of planning. I am afraid that the overall, the general results of this lack of planning is where the Federal Liberals have failed to create a just society. I am afraid this particular society is turned into a rather sick society, a society you would tolerate, tolerate. The programme on radio station VOXM, any society that would tolerate that must be sick. Tolerate, and we hear the great sages of our country, we do it, they will rationalize their way through it. The effective abolition of Parliament which has occurred here.

This Government, through its lack of planning, particularly what it has evidenced in this House the past few days - this country has always been a peace loving country, but I just fear that this irresponsible Government, by what it has done in the past few days, has sowed for the future the seeds of possible riot and insurrection, and, by God, I hope that does not come to us.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if nobody is going to speak on the other side, or are you just putting the motion?

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): I will put this motion and then you can speak. That the following words be added to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Namely, "that this House lacks confidence in the Government by reason of failure of the Government to provide for the well-being of its citizens, and to provide sound planning, direction and initiative in developing the natural resources and manpower of the Province."

Those in favour of the motion.....

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I was giving a chance to the members on the other side to speak but, apparently, they do not wish to speak, so I would like to have

a few words on the motion.

Mr. Speaker, the motion is one of nonconfidence in the Government. As I certainly have no confidence in this Government, it is a duty and a pleasure to support the motion. The motion states that the House lacks confidence; by reason of its failure to provide for the well being of its citizens, and to provide sound planning, direction and initiative in developing the natural resources and manpower of the Province."

How true that is, Mr. Speaker, how true that is. Particularly for a Government that has been in for twenty-two years - in power for twenty-two years, and its great boast always is the great things that it has done for the people of this Province. When that record is examined, Mr. Speaker, when that record is looked at, what has been accomplished as compared to the resources that have been used to accomplish what has been accomplished, then the record is not as pretty as people who so often try to paint it believe. This is a Government, Mr. Speaker, that has spent, in the last twenty-two years, \$1 billion of money, borrowed, if you include direct and indirect debt of the Province. \$1 billion, borrowed, it has either spent itself or supervised the spending of, or allowed other people to spend. In addition to that billion dollars, Mr. Speaker, have had at least that much, if not more, or hundreds of millions more to spend, that it has raised in taxes and other sources of revenue. It has had additional hundreds of millions and perhaps as much as \$1 billion to spend in money that was provided for them by the Government of Canada. Yet, what have we to show for it, after this twenty-two years?

We have heard of the roads, and we have heard of the paved roads. We have heard of schools, we have heard of hospitals, yes, certainly there has been progress in those directions in the last twenty-two years. What kind of Government could be in office twenty-two years that would not build hospitals or pave roads or build schools, or homes for the aged or whatever? Every Government carries out those necessary kinds of services. Where are we economically twenty-two years after Confederation? Where are we, after twenty-two years of desperate attempts at economic development by the Government? Where is the progress there? It is difficult to see it. The hit or miss spectacular

method has not worked, Mr. Speaker. It has not worked, despite all talk and the blow about it for the last twenty-two years, it has not worked. You only have to look at the Province to see that it has not worked, and it is not working, and that there are different approaches needed.

We are a Province that, after twenty-two years, still has the highest unemployment rate in Canada. We still have today, unemployment of fifteen or sixteen percent - 23,000 unemployed. We have had a lot worse in the past. The member for St. John's North pointed that out in his speech on opening day. He gave certain percentages...

MR. CROSBIE: wages were even worse a few years ago. But fifteen percent and 23,000 people unemployed at this time, Mr. Speaker, is certainly bad enough. We are still in an economy that depends entirely on construction for anything approaching full employment, after twenty-two years.

The Fishery, Mr. Speaker, after all that has been attempted in the Fishery for the last twenty-two years, where is the Fishery today? We have at last got a Salt Fish Corporation that is setting about to do something about our salt fish problem. We are only now, the Government is only now taking some steps, following the initiative of the newly formed union, Fr. McGrath, Mr. Cashin, and those that form the new union, the Newfoundland Fishermen and Allied Workers Union, only now taking steps to arrange some method whereby the fishermen and the plant operators and other interested in the fishing industry of this country will meet every year to set prices. Only now are steps been taken to bring in legislation that will permit the fishermen of the Province to bargain collectively. This has taken a long time, and it was not initiated by the Government, Mr. Speaker.

I am happy to say I support it. I support the endeavours of the Newfoundland Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers Union. I believe that, the principles that they are trying to establish, to set out in their latest publication, union forum of March 1971, are good objectives that I will certainly support in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: That the fishermen of the Province shall have the right to recognized unions, to bargain collectively, that the processors of fish, for the establishment of minimum of prices for all species of fish, the fishermen of Newfoundland, will have the right to determine the union to represent them in the collective bargain process. That the procedures involve only fishermen. That there be a suitable definition of fishermen. That when certification is granted to an organization, to bargain on behalf of the fishermen, that all who sell fish under the terms of such an agreement, they are required to join the union. That the fish buyers be required to enter into such negotiations. Those are all objectives and principles that

MR. CROSBIE: I will support.

The House have selected a select committee, Mr. Speaker, to recommend to the House, I assume this is what it has been appointed for, how those principles are to be carried out, what machinery is to be used. There, may be some differences of opinion on what is the best way to do this, that is what the select committee is to recommend to us on it.

I am also happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not any late conversion on my part, to these views. I stated my views on this issue two years ago, and before that, in a booklet called "Building for the new Newfoundland."

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, always have been. There is a copy I can provide members. There are still a few left. They are going fast.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, I outlined my views, that a marketing agency should negotiate prices each year, with the fishermen. And in the event that minimum prices could not be agreed upon between the fishermen and the marketing agency or association the prices should be set by an independent appeal board or by the Department of Fisheries; that we have to institute marketing controls in the frozen fish industry here. Those principles, I believe in then, and I believe in now.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that will be done quickly in this session, when this select committee report is to - for this House to enact legislation that will permit all of this to be done. And after all, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing radically new in it. I know that this Government have had report after report on how the fisheries of Norway are organized, and how Iceland is organized, and how prices are set in Norway, and Iceland, by negotiation between the vessel owners, the fishermen and the fish company people, with arbitration by Government, if they cannot reach agreement on prices, that has all been known to this Government for many years.

MR. CROSBIE: As I say, Mr. Speaker, the one thing that should be done very quickly is to give this select committee time to meet and consider these problems, so that action can be taken within the next few weeks, as quickly as possible, so that, the new organization can be in effect this year, for this year's fish catch, if the select committee is late in reporting or this House is late in adopting their report or passing legislation, then it will be impossible for the new system of setting prices and collective bargaining for fishermen to operate this year.

It is going to be difficult, I would think, Mr. Speaker, for that committee to meet while the House is meeting. Perhaps, it will not be, perhaps they will be able to sit when the House is sitting. But, in any event, that should be kept in mind and the committee encouraged to start immediately, as I have no doubt, they will. And I would assume that they will want to have meetings, at least several meetings outside of St. John's, across the Province, to give people a chance to make representations to them.

The Resolution mentions, Mr. Speaker, the lack of planning, the lack of sound planning, direction and initiative. There is no planning, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the finances of this Government, no planning whatsoever. We have the living proof of that in the fact that, in the estimates presented to this House last year, and in the Budget Speech delivered at the end of April last year, by the hon. the Premier, there was forecast a deficit for the Government, of \$56 million. Yet, although, we have not been told this officially by the Government. We have no official word on it. And after the House have voted \$100 million in Interim Supply, without having the information, jammed through the House by the process of closure, by cutting off debate, with \$64 million, ten departments going through without one word of debate. What is today? Thursday. Tuesday night, without one word of debate, \$64 million for the Department of Health. The Department of Welfare, the Department of Fisheries, the Newfoundland Liquor Commission, all of those departments went through without a word of

MR. CROSBIE: debate. The Government have not yet told the House, Mr. Speaker, whether this statement is correct. It must be correct from their prospectus - prospectus of the Government on this bond issue of \$25 million. That is page 23. That the estimate, for the 1971 year, is a deficit of \$103,206,000. That is what the Government says in this prospectus.

It says, Mr. Speaker, according to the way that I read it, and I would like some member of the Government to point it out, if I am wrong. Yes, it says a current account deficit of \$11 million and a capital account deficit of \$92 million, that is, if the figures were prepared on a bases consistent with previous years, the figures would be like that.

The House will recall, Mr. Speaker, that two years ago the payment of interest and debt repayment was transferred from current account to capital account. But, if the same procedure had been used that was used every year up to two years ago, there would have had been a current account deficit this year of \$11 million and a capital account \$92 million. But under our new accounting system, the total deficit is \$103 million. There is \$97,000 surplus projected for current account and the rest is on capital account, under this new system.

But, in any event, the deficit is not \$52 million. It is not \$62 million. It is not \$72 million. It is not \$82 million. It is not \$92 million. It is not \$100 million. It is not \$101 million. Indeed, it is \$103,206,000 in a

Mr. Crosbie.

total budget of between \$300 and \$400 million. In other words, at the minimum it is a twenty-five per cent error. In actual fact, based on the estimates presented to us last year, it is a thirty-three and one-third per cent error based on the whole of the estimates, but is a much greater error than that. The Government forecasted a deficit of \$56 million and had a deficit of \$103 million, which may be even more when we finally get the out-turn for this year.

So, when this motion says that the Government have not provided sound planning, direction and initiative, that is so obviously true, Mr. Speaker. What Government would have the gall, other than this Government, to come before Parliament or the House of Assembly. Of course, the Government do not have the gall to do it. It has not even told us about it. So, perhaps the Government do not have the gall to do that. We have to learn it by sideways, by getting hold of prospectus. We are not given the information. Double the deficit that the Government forecast. That is what we had on the year ended yesterday. This is the first day of the new year. What a deficit we will have this year, Mr. Speaker. This is election year. The tight money is gone. Election year, anything goes. I will predict now that the budget will show, this year, the projected deficit for the present year of perhaps \$50 million or \$60 million or it might even show \$70 million or \$80 million. I will forecast it now. I would like the words recorded, Mr. Speaker, to look at next year. I forecast the deficit as at least twice what the Government will estimate, possibly, three times. Way in excess of \$103 million, because the Government will go all-out this year trying to bribe the electorate with their own money or with money being borrowed in the name of the electorate. It is an old familiar story. But I think that the people have caught on to it finally. Planning; Is it planning, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Crosbie.

when a government says in the sacred Budget Speech, given by the hon. the Premier, that the Government will borrow \$29.5 million in the bond market this year in debentures and, in fact, the Government borrow \$97.5 million? Is it, Mr. Speaker, good planning when, in reply to a question that was answered today by the Acting Minister of Finance, it turns out that the Government have to repay this year, in borrowing, \$120 million deutschemarks.

MR. HICKMAN: How many deutschemarks is a dollar? Four, is it?

MR. CROSBIE: Four. Some people call them deutschemarks. There are four or five deutschemarks to the dollar. That is \$120 million, divided by (some mathematician should tell me) five. How many times have I seen the Premier do that. And usually there are about ten on the other side ready to help him. Now, I am sputtering around dividing 5 into 120 and nobody will help me. Oh, \$24 million, thank you. That is \$24 million U. S. dollars to be repaid this year. The other item, was it \$10 million? That is \$34 million this year, which has to be repaid by the Government, Mr. Speaker, with no sinking funds to help out. In other words, have to borrow another \$34 million this year to repay that \$34 million. Is that planning, when a Government borrow like that without providing sinking funds? This year the Government have to borrow, not just what it needs to spend this year, but has to borrow an additional \$34 million to pay back what it borrowed five years ago, without providing any sinking funds for it. There was a question tabled here last year or an answer that shows, Mr. Speaker, that between April 1st., 1971 and two years from that date, this Government have to repay \$104 million worth of bonds, for itself and the Power Commission and have a total sinking fund of about \$3 million to do it. And \$93 million of it is debt incurred without provision for sinking fund payments. In the next two years the Government have to find and repay \$93 million, without any sinking fund. That is in addition to all the rest of the borrowing the Government

Mr. Crosbie.

are going to have to do. Is that sound planning of the resources of this Province or is it a wild, spendthrift approach to Government? I am not going to get mad at all. I am sorry. I am sorry for the Government that has been so careless in the past and which had such lack of planning that it has borrowed blindly on the bond markets, not caring about the fact that this money would have to be repaid, not providing any sinking fund so that it could be paid, so much a year for twenty years, and we would have the money available when the time came to redeem the bond.

The budget is going to be a jim-dandy. She is going to have twice as many pictures that budget this year than she had last year. By golly, we know how many pictures. There is the Budget Speech. There are the pictures, page after page of pictures: The Premier, Newfoundland courts, the Minister of Community and Social Development, the picture of a dollar, one of our efficient hospitals, Churchill Falls, the tunnel at Churchill Falls, the Janeway Hospital, our improving road system, (We have not come across the Minister of Welfare yet) residents of Wain, Labrador, salt fish industry, train from Labrador City and a Newfoundlander. That is the Budget Speech - we printed 3,000 copies of. No, 2,000 copies were printed and it cost \$3,000 to send this document, which is supposed to explain our finances, out to any interested investor. They must get a start when they see this. They must think they have "Life Magazine" in their hands, when they receive a copy of our budget. What a farce! No, I do not think it was printed in Japan. It is possible. It does not say here where it was printed. I imagine it was printed here in St. John's, although it might be up in Montreal. It does not say. There is a similar type Premier in B. C., who is also Minister of Finance. I do not doubt that theirs is twice as large and three times as many pictures. Well in between the Province of Newfoundland and the Province of British Columbia are all just these ordinary provinces, that in a budget speech explain to you what the finances of the provinces are. They do not try to bedazzle you with "Look Magazine" pictures. Anyway, I do not want to spend much time on finances tonight, Mr. Speaker, because members

Mr. Crosbie

opposite just will not learn. There is only one way to change that situation and that is to change the Government. There certainly has been no lessons learned by the members opposite, in the last twenty-two years, about finances.

MR. NEARY: Nobody is taking you seriously.

MR. CROSBIE: Nobody is taking me seriously, hey? I am glad to hear the hon. minister say it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this management of resources. Well let us just take an example, lack of sound planning! Let us just look at the Come-by-Chance wharf, the famous wharf. This is the way the Government approach these problems. Do you think there is any planning or control of what is happening? No! The Come-by-Chance project started, the oil refinery, Mr. Speaker, in 1967. In 1967 it started. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that it is still not clear, under what circumstances the Federal Government are putting a wharf and related facilities at Come-by-Chance? That there is still confusion, after four years? We cannot get a clear statement from the hon. the Premier on just what the situation is. He is using words and semantics to obscure what the position is. Here is a clipping, Mr. Speaker. I wish I had a research assistant. August 20, 1970 - "Premier Smallwood told the "Telegram" today that he fully agrees with the statement by Public Works Minister Arthur Laing, when he says the Federal Government will build the \$16 million wharf, only when a joint complex is off the drawing boards and on the ground." Mr. Laing was quoted as saying: "there will have to be a substantial amount there of the company's capital, on the ground, before we build any wharf. We have built too many harbours like this that we cannot rent to a sea gull. We are going to see their capital on the ground before any wharf is built or else a new Public Work's Minister will build the wharf." That is what he said then and the Premier said that he agreed. I think I agree fully with that. I see nothing whatever wrong with it. It is not anything new. It has been the case from the beginning. Ottawa is not going to build the wharf until the agreements providing for the financing are signed.

Mr. Crosbie.

The Premier and the Minister of Public Works of Canada were heart-to-heart on the wharf situation. This was just a few months after they were a bit at odds, when the Premier called him, the minister, a stupid jackass.

the Minister of Public Works at Ottawa called by the Premier of the Province a stupid jackass. A new low in inter-governmental relations in Canada.

What is the situation the last few days? We have heard time after time in this House, the Premier saying that the Federal Government would build that wharf. Well now, there is some semantics going on. Mr. Laing says; in the House of Commons, Mr. Carter asked him the question: "Can the Minister inform the House whether it was the intention of the Canadian Government to request the guarantee from the Newfoundland Provincial Government to cover the amount in question?" Mr. Laing: "The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that we have made that request." The announcement is about the Newfoundland Government's docking facilities in Come by Chance.

In other words Mr. Laing says, "that the Government of Canada had requested the Government of Newfoundland to guarantee the amount to be expended on the wharf." The Premier says; "it is not so." I think I know what the reason is, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Laing, the Minister of Public Works of Canada, believes that the Crown Corporations that this Province owns, Provincial Building Company, Limited, and Provincial Refining Company, Limited, which are going to operate that oil refinery at Come by Chance, are Crown Corporations, they are owned by this Government, by the people of Newfoundland. He believes them to be Provincial Government. So he says the Province has been asked to guarantee the cost. The Premier says; "no", playing on the semantics of it, because the Premier can take the position, as a strict legal position, that the Crown Corporations are not the Government of this Province. That the Government of this Province is not legally liable for their debt. That is the legal position. But that is where the difference is. Perhaps the Government of Canada has not asked this Government of this Province to guarantee it. But it has asked and has required and has made it a condition that the Crown Corporations, owned by the Government, are to guarantee to the Government of Canada that the

sixteen or twenty million dollars spent on the wharf will be repaid over twenty-five years with annual installments. If there are not sufficient wharfage paid and user charges paid, these Crown Corporations will have to make up the difference. If the operation was not a success or has to close down, the Crown Corporations would have to continue to pay and that means the Province would have to continue to pay. Why, Mr. Speaker, the Province would not be legally liable, we agree, there would be no legal obligation. We agree the Province can allow a Crown Corporation to go bankrupt. It can allow it, and not be responsible for debts.

But, how would the Province borrow a nickel thereafter, if it did that? If the Province allowed the Crown Corporation, all of whose share were owned by the Government, if it allowed it to default and go bankrupt how would the Province then be able to borrow a dollar itself on the market thereafter? That is the question.

Now, we have put that point time after time to the House, Mr. Speaker. It is not just thirteen million dollars that the people of Newfoundland are lending to that refinery. We are behind the whole \$155 million, our credit, because we cannot allow one of our Crown Corporations to default. We have said that time after time and the Premier repudiated it time after time and said it was incorrect. Now, what do we find in this prospectus, Mr. Speaker? The prospectus of Hornblower & Weeks - Hemphill, Noyes, A.E. Aimes & Co. of March 1971, in connection with the \$25 million Bond Issue of the Government of Newfoundland, this prospectus which has to be approved by the Government which has to meet the requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission in the United States.

What does it say, it has a page and a-half on the oil refinery, pages 15 and 16. Here is what it says: "The Province has no legal responsibility with respect to the obligations of the Corporation which will build and own and operate the refinery other than as specifically set forth above." We agree that is the legal position. Then they go on, "nevertheless, such

Corporations are principally owned by the Province and it is possible to conceive of circumstances under which the Province might deem it desirable, voluntarily, to provide financial support for such corporations." That is what they say.

Now, it is weak wording. But it is quite an admission for this Province to allow a prospectus to go out, stating that there is even a possibility that the Province might provide financial support. It is possible to conceive of circumstances under which the Province might deem it desirable, voluntarily, to provide financial support for such Corporations. Certainly, it is. If they get in trouble or go insolvent, the Government will have to bail them out. It cannot happen, a Corporation owned by the Government, the shares of which are owned and held by the Government. It cannot have that go under. It cannot leave creditors unpaid in such a situation. So, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Lang said that this Province has been asked to guarantee repayment of the cost of that wharf, probably meaning the Provincial Crown Corporation, he is stating a correct fact.

The Premier is able to say, "no, they have not asked the Province," because the Province does not have to do it directly, because of its legal technicalities. But the Province is guaranteeing, because the Province could not allow our Crown Corporations to fail to meet their liabilities to the Federal Government.

Now all that is required to settle this issue of the wharf, that has been going on now for some weeks, is just for the Premier to explain it. The facts, give us the information, But no, day after day there is confusion about whether the Province has been asked or not asked or whether it will or it will not. Why? It is another \$20 million indirect liability that the Government of this Province is assuming. Well, that is the Government's decision, the Government is in power. They want to take on that responsibility or liability go ahead, for the Government must take responsibility for it. Do not try to weasel around and say that the Province has not asked to guarantee it. when

really the Province is guaranteeing it.

I suppose we will hear from the Premier eventually, and he will explain the whole matter, and we will discover we have been on LSD or something.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member, if you add the amount owed by the refinery to the \$766 million reported by the Auditor General and the \$120 million borrowed this year, what is the total amount the Province would owe?

MR. CROSBIE: About a billion and seventy-two million dollars.

MR. MARSHALL: A billion dollars -

MR. CROSBIE: A billion direct and indirect -

MR. MARSHALL: How many million is that?

MR. CROSBIE: Well, we would need the Premier for that, I think it is a hundred million, million, million, or one billion - I am not sure how many it is. It is one thousand million. My hon. colleague here, was very used to finances, says it is a thousand million. Not a thousand and one million. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the planning from another point of view. There is so much lack of planning direction, there is no end of initiative, an awful lack of planning direction. Let us look, just for a moment, at Sea Mining Corporation, Sea Mining, the magnesia plant at Aguathuna, how often did we have it explained about that magnesia plant? It was not magnesium, it was magnesia, and how you got it out of the sea water and processed it in this plant. When the plant was constructed and when it started to default, we did not hear much about it, the Government would not take the dose of milk of magnesia that it should have taken, after getting itself caught in this flopshow.

What is the situation? Question 166, answered today, there are two million eight hundred thousand dollars advanced by the people of this Province, by the Government, to Sea Mining. There are four hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars arrears of interest, up to December 31, 1970. The operation has defaulted. It has not operated, I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, it has not

operated this year at all. I do not think it operated last year at all. This was an enterprise, Mr. Speaker, that the Government investigated hardly at all. When Mr. Gormley came to this Province, with the suggestion for this plant, and wanting the financial assistance of our Government, the matter was hardly looked into at all as to its feasibility. I am not sure whether it was in 1966 or after, I believe it was in 1966, but in any case, whatever time it was, it was not investigated thoroughly or otherwise.



MR. CROSBIE: There were reports that the enterprise had attempted to get the New Brunswick Government interested in it, and to guarantee it.

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. gentleman is right in the Cabinet, and if I could - Cabinet secrets, I would really give them the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty-one years.

MR. CROSBIE: Right, in the Cabinet. I know where I can speak.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Watch out or I will let out a few Cabinet secrets. There were a number of them in the paper yesterday, Mr. Guy was describing the Cabinet meeting recently, at which bugging devices were very much in question.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Now there was a report that was turned down by the New Brunswick Government, but it was established here in Newfoundland (The Premier was Minister of Economic Development) in the usual way, without much information on it at all, and was in difficulty from the start. Now we find that it is said to be taken over by Lundrigans, Limited. I got a few clippings here on that too, if I can find them. If the hon. gentleman opposite would provide me with the research assistant, I shall make my speeches much more quickly. Here it is. Here is the contradictory kind of story you get. September 4, 1970, "Evening Telegram" - Sea Mining Corporation having financial woes. This article reports the plant was shut down since August 1, and it is a matter of money problems. "We are only a small company and it takes us a lot longer to raise capital than someone like Bowaters." It did not take them long to get \$208 million out of the Newfoundland Government, but that was gone then. "The company is trying to work out financial arrangements." They will have them completed very shortly. There was a kink up in the United States, if they could not purchase, and, therefore, could not fill an order. But, they hope to have it all within three or four weeks. Then October 12, 1970 "reported Lundrigans' buy magnesia plant." That Lundrigans had required all the shares of the three-point-two magnesia plant at Aquathuna, and the Provincial Government have agreed to guarantee another \$1 million for a major expansion to the facility. Who said?

MR. CROSBIE: Was it some minor Cabinet Minister, who would be rapped on the knuckles the next day for saying this? No! It was Premier Smallwood himself said it. This is what was stated in October, 1970. "The Province is going to guarantee another \$1 million for a major expansion to the facility." The Premier said; there was not anything in particular that causes problems to the original owners and their efforts to make the plant a going concern. It simply did not go well. It had some kind of sickness.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this enterprise is to be refloated, surely we should be told what it is going to cost. And surely, there should be tabled in this House a report by some business experts, some analysts, who will report why the plant did not succeed so far. Was it lack of capital? Is the process itself not working properly? Is it technical problems? Was it management problems? Surely, the people of Newfoundland or the members of this House should have something to go by. Well, what do we get? We get the pie in the sky. We hear that one of the most tremendous, and largest and most magnificent and most everything corporation in the world, in this field is probably going to take it over. And there will be a big announcement in three or four weeks. How sick we are of these big announcements. Let us have some facts.

Surely, a Government should give people occasionally some facts, not contradictory stories every time that a question is raised.

Planning - uh! The direction we are going in is down, unless we get a change of Government in this Province, Mr. Speaker. Initiative, yes, to rush in headlong every time a crack-pot scheme that is proposed. That is the initiative that we see the Government take. Now all members of the Government are not responsible for that, except under Parliamentary rules are all collectively responsible. There is one largely responsible for it.

Planning; that is sea mining, we do not know where we are in that, except - now, it is ^a tremendous thing now. This is terrific. The thing has failed. And it turns out to be magnificent, because it is going to be taken over by

MR. CROSBIE: the biggest and the most magnificent other company in the world and really be something ten times as big. My gosh!

And you can go through instances after instances of that. Mohawk Hockey Sticks, I will just mention one other, and I mention it for this reason that during the late lamented Leadership Campaign of 1969, when the Premier retired and then he announced that never again would he serve or would not serve if elected, and he was General Sherman, who ever it was, but he did run and during that campaign in September of 1969, lo! and behold! in a meeting at Stephenville, it was announced that there was going to be a Hockey Stick Factory at Stephenville. The hockey sticks were going to pour out of that factory. There are certain people in Newfoundland who pooh pooh it and said, this was crazy, one was Howie Meeker, I remember, a fellow who should know something about hockey sticks. When he had the audacity to question it publicly, whether that thing could be feasible or not, he was called everything under the sun.

There is going to be a hockey stick factory. Well, there is not a hockey stick factory, and the Government have finally admitted that there is never going to be a hockey stick factory. The Mohawk Hockey Stick project just did not go ahead. Why announce these projects before they are even looked into? Why not wait until the Government have got an agreement reached with the promoters and know its finance, and know that it is going ahead, before making the announcement. The reason, why not, is a circus, a political atmosphere that always has to be created around this Government, particularly when there is an election on.

We will hear of more hockey sticks, light bulbs,

MR. MURPHY: Blue lines.

MR. CROSBIE: Of which?

MR. MURPHY: Blue lines.

MR. CROSBIE: Blue lines.

MR. MURPHY: That is what is on the ice.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, yes, blue lines. Red lines. We will hear of more enterprises this year, they are going to crop up in every district that you can shake a hockey stick at. And that is called planning and initiative!

MR. HICKMAN: Do not forget that mushroom plant.

MR. CROSBIE: I could, so many points, I only have - when did I start? I only have an hour and a-half, unless, with the indulgence of the House I can go for twenty-four hours.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, I will switch from industry.

MR. COLLINS: You should have switched to baseball bats for the seal fishery.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. member just make - no I am going to switch. I would sooner switch than fight. Yes, I am going to transfer my attention now to health for a moment.

How I regret that the Minister of Health is not in the House here tonight. How I regret. But, he imposed censure on the House, and he has disappeared ever since. I think, he has ^{an} attack of conscience. The Minister of Health has not been in the House since the infamous censure was imposed on us last Tuesday night.

MR. MURPHY: He has not crossed over.

MR. CROSBIE: Censure. Closure. I am censuring the closure, you are closing the censure. He has not been in the House since then. He has had an attack of conscience, or else he has got the flu. Most likely the flu.

Just let us look at planning and health. The Resolution decries the lack of sound planning, direction and initiative. What is the latest development in the planning field in health? Plebiscitis! Plebiscitis! There is going to be a plebiscite to decide where a regional hospital should go in Conception Bay North. If that is not the lou-lou of all lou-lous, I am absolutely beat.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, a Government that will have a plebiscite to decide where a regional hospital should be built. The very Government that promised every voter in Carbonear district in 1966 that, they are going to

April 1st. 1971

Tape 187

PK - 5

MR. CROSBIE: have the regional hospital in Carbonear. The very Government led by the man who turned the sod, and I assisted him in my own small way by removing some limb from his shoulder as he did it, at the end of September 1967, turned the sod in Carbonear for that regional hospital. That Government, whose policy is deemed to have a regional hospital in Carbonear since 1966,

MR. CROSBIE:

I reaffirmed, when I was Minister of Health in 1967 and 1968 and participated in the ceremony, now says that the right thing and the proper thing and the wise thing and the Governmental thing and the thing that all Governments with any sense should do is hold a plebiscite to decide where the hospital should go. What utter tripe. The Minister of Health says he has a White Paper, He answered a question the other day and he said he was tabling a White Paper. I would say it is going to be called a Yellow Paper, it must be getting yellow with age. All last year he was going to table that White Paper and at least it is going to be tattletale grey by the time we get it.

What is a White Paper for? It is a paper that sets forth the planning of the Government, I mean Governmental White Papers. In this Province we all know what they are worth. We know where the Bulletin goes and we know -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order!

MR. CROSBIE: The White Paper of a Government sets out the Government's planning proposals. A White Paper on health will surely set out the Government's planning for health, where hospitals should go, yet the Premier, on March 22nd, before a television audience, that is what amazes me, said before the television audience that a plebiscite, the Government is going to have a plebiscite in Conception Bay North to decide whether that hospital should go in Bay Roberts, Harbour Grace or Carbonear or perhaps even somewhere else. The Premier announced it was government policy that there would be a plebiscite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier tried to argue, on March 22nd, that when the promise to Carbonear was made for a hospital, there was no planning for regional hospitals and he tried to pretend that this planning for regional hospitals came with the Brain report and that, therefore, Government thinking had to be revised about these regional hospitals. This is all one hundred per-cent inaccurate, I will not say untrue, yes untrue in the sense it is certainly not fact. The Brain Royal Commission on health filed its report in January 1966, that is when the report was filed. In that report it recommended a small hospital for Bay Roberts, as

MR. CROSBIE:

the hon. member for Port de Grave no doubt knows, nothing extensive just a small one and so on, for emergencies. It had nothing to say about a regional hospital at Carbonear. That report changed nothing.

The concept of regional hospitals in Newfoundland has been a concept of the Government for at least eight to ten years. The concept of a regional hospital for Conception Bay North, at Carbonear, has been in the Government's planning for at least six years. The report of Llewelyn Davies, the English firm of architects, who were asked to examine the health facilities of the Avalon Peninsula and the city of St. John's, when I was Minister of Health, their report agreed with the concept of a regional hospital at Carbonear, having 130 beds. They never recommended that it should not be Carbonear, that Carbonear was not the right site for it. Why then all this nonsense about where the hospital is going? The answer is politics. The member for Port de Grave is angry because Port de Grave is nowhere near getting its hospital it was promised and the member for Port de Grave does not want to see Carbonear have their hospital. He says if there is one in Harbour Grace, we will compromise and agree on Harbour Grace, then neither of us will get a hospital, Harbour Grace will have it.

Now all the citizens of Harbour Grace are stirred up and feel that they should have the hospital, naturally, and the Government, instead of quashing that nonsense and saying the regional hospital is going to go where everybody agrees it should go, and either that Bay Roberts is going to get their hospital too or that medical planning and thinking are changed and it is no longer required there or whatever. Instead of facing up to the problem it is trying to waffle around so it will not lose a district or two or three in an election. Well, the result will probably be to lose all three, but I am certainly not a political genius. As the Premier says, I do not know anything about politics. The Premier is a great expert, well perhaps he is right that this political move is going to result in saving all three seats, but I cannot see it. But even if it does, it is not right. How can a Government surrender its powers of decision and planning and say that the people of an area will decide by plebiscite where they should have a

MR. CROSBIE:

hospital? If you do that for one hospital you must do it in Twillingate. Why should there be one in Twillingate and not on New World Island, without a plebiscite? Why should there be an extension to Western Memorial in Corner Brook and not in Stephenville, a new hospital in Stephenville or a new one up in Bonne Bay? There should be a plebiscite on the West Coast. Why should the Government say we are going to put a new general hospital on the Memorial University campus in St. John's, without letting us all have a vote on it? Perhaps we will want it out on the Logy Bay Road or perhaps someone will want it out in the Goulds or someone want it in Bay Bulls.

AN HON. MEMBER: In Hogan's Pond.

MR. CROSBIE: No, we do not want it in Hogan's Pond. We want a rest home there. The Government cannot have a plebiscite of one area and use that as a principal to decide its planning and not have it in other areas. Is the Government now, when it decides to build a home for the aged or when it decides to pave a road or when it decides anything, going to ask people to decide this by plebiscite? To state it, is to show how crazy the concept is. I hope that the Government will drop this nonsensical idea of having a plebiscite and get some guts and say, "It is our decision, backed by the medical advice and the advice of experts in the health field, and so on... that the hospital go either a, b or c, the regional hospital, for those reasons." Presumably Carbonear, now perhaps medical thinking has changed, perhaps the thinking of hospital experts have changed, if so the Government should come out and say so, but this crazy waffling around, trying to pretend that Carbonear is now no longer the logical site because of some new concept in regional hospitals is utter nonsense.

How can the Minister of Health put in a White Paper on health planning when he does not know when his White Paper, whether and when it is going to be riddled by a plebiscite? What will he say in his White Paper about the Carbonear hospital? Put a little asterisk and down at the bottom. "This piece of planning will be decided by plebiscite in the following districts: Port de Grave, Harbour Grace, Carbonear, Bay de Verde

MR. CROSBIE:

Trinity South."

AN HON. MEMBER: Harbour Main,

MR. CROSBIE: Will they include Harbour Main, I wonder? So when this resolution decries the failure of the Government to provide for the well-being of its citizens and to provide sound planning, direction and initiative in developing the natural resources and manpower of the Province, how true. There was another incident two years ago, the same kind of despicable tactic was used by the Government, Isle aux Morts. When they had that herring plant in Isle aux Morts and I was down there, that foul stinking plant in the middle of that community, belching out smoke and stink, right in the middle of all the houses where the people were living. I was in the school teachers' house there, he could not see his way in or out of the house when that was going on, that public nuisance. It was up to the Government to make a decision, if that was a public health menace and a nuisance, to close the plant until they got the machinery in to change that. What did the Government do? It said we will leave this to the people of Isle aux Morts to decide. Now the poor people of Isle aux Morts were in a bind, Mr. Speaker, because a lot of them worked in the plant and people came from outside to work in the plant and did not want to lose their jobs and money for the few weeks the plant would be closed.

So how would a vote go? How could you say that you let the people of the community vote in circumstances like that when there were twenty or thirty or fifty people, their houses and their property, living in misery with the stench, to say that now the people of the community will vote on it? That is not the responsibility of a Government. The responsibility of a Government is to govern, to make decisions, popular or unpopular, not to say we are going to turn it over to the people to decide whether this public nuisance will be closed or not, when a lot of the poor devils had to work in the plant and were not going to vote themselves out of a pay check, no matter how miserable some of their neighbours might be. What a way to govern the affairs of the country, and now the Carbonear hospital, suggested by the Premier, is going to be treated the same way.

MR. CROSBIE:

There are others, there are just so many examples, there are just so many one might get accused of being negative, of being negative. Mr. Speaker, It is hard to be positive when you are surrounded by this kind of thing, this kind of improper planning, this kind of political approach. You have, to

Mr. Crosbie.

You got to criticize it. What else should you do? That is what you are here for, to call things as you see them. That is not to say that the Government do not do some good things. But they are such experts at blowing their own horn and that horn is so loud. It is blowing so constantly. It is ringing in our ears morning, afternoon and night. So, the Government can blow its own horn. Our job is not to stand up here and blow the Government's horn. It is to point out the things that are not being done properly, not being done right, that should be done differently.

Planning: There are so many things. Pollution: Let us look at pollution.

MR. CALLAHAN: We might as well look at it.

MR. CROSBIE: Ah! ah! ah! ah! ah! ah! ah! ah! Pollution: Look at the Government's planning, pollution. The minister has to admit, in reply to a question yesterday, that the Government have not even had a study undertaken with reference to Come-by-Chance, on the pollution dangers down at Come-by-Chance. He does not intend to and has not had it done.

MR. HICKMAN: That is a reversal of last year's policy statement.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: What happened when the ERCO plant came in? Was there any planning then about pollution or any investigation? No! We all know the result of that. ERCO was started before I was in the Government. It was underway when I was in the Government.

MR. NOLAN: Yes. You said what, while you were in the Government at that time?

MR. HICKMAN: Tell him.

MR. CROSBIE: We were not allowed to say anything about the plant.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the hon. member permit a question? Does he intend to avail of the invitation that has been extended to him by the hon. Minister of Social and Economic Development.

MR. CROSBIE: Tell about Cabinet secrets.

MR. HICKMAN: The door is open.

MR. CROSBIE: If the hon. minister goads me enough, I might drop a few Cabinet secrets on the floor.

ERCO, that was a great example of pollution planning. Labrador: Look at what has been happening in Labrador. Look, at the great tailings of the iron, ore going into the lakes and polluting the waters of Labrador. What is the minister doing about that? Nothing! He told us last year that the Federal Government take a survey every now and then, as to the fish situation, with respect to that pollution. What is being done about that? What is being done about Come-by-Chance? Pollution: Pollution is a word that the Government have picked up in the last couple of years. It does very little about it. The minister is a veritable oil well of pollution. An oil well! A gusher! One of those gushers out of control, when it comes to pollution! The resources give-away. I wish I could really get angry. Resources give-away - the answer to Question no. 24. Canadian Javelin, Limited, cut 75,000 cords of wood last year, up in Labrador. They were assessed \$42,000. Now that is not much. That is not much. That is \$42,000 and 75,000 cords. It is less than a dollar a cord, or I am all mixed up.

MR. MURPHY: It is \$.60 a cord.

MR. CROSBIE: Thank you. It is \$.60 a cord. It was assessed \$42,000 and they paid the Government \$1,800. Now what does the minister say about that? He says they are not paying their royalty, because there is a dispute between Ottawa and the Province as to who must get the royalty. There is a dispute, my eye! What has our wood got to do with Ottawa? What tripe! The money should be paid to our Government. If there is any dispute, the two Governments can settle it. But look what our resource is going for, 75,000 cords and the royalty is \$42,000. Next to nothing, it is. Yes, it is so. That is what the question said. What is shipped and sold? It says 75,000 cords.

Let us look at another aspect. Every question tabled in this House, Mr. Speaker, you have to be a lawyer with your Ph.D to word it properly, because any little wording that enables the Government to give a false answer and a false impression, they will use. We are used to that. Listen to the great expert over

Mr. Crosbie

there. You cannot word it properly. Let us see the minister try and word a question. I would like to see him, when he is over on this side next year, when he is re-elected. Let us see how he words his questions.

MR. MURPHY: You are really optimistic, even for him to get on this side.

MR. CROSBIE: Well I doubt that he will even be here. Right!

Look how the Government dishes out information. Here is a Government that are really free with the information. Question no 66, asked about out-migration figures. What were the figures? No! no! We will be back on pulp - do not worry about wood. We are going to pay a lot of attention to the minister in his department. Do not worry about that. Question no. 66: What is the estimated out-migration of Newfoundlanders to other provinces, during the calendar year, 1970. Answer: "Information should be obtained from D.B.S. We do not have the information." Now this is a Government that is supposed to be dealing with the economic problems of Newfoundland. I have heard the Premier make so many speeches in which he has given the figures of so many thousands that left Newfoundland each year, out-migration and the rest of it. Yet, apparently, our Government do not have an economic statistics agency that is keeping the figures on out-migration and the rest of it. When it is asked a question about out-migration, it says the information should be obtained from D.B.S. Surely, we have got some economists doing research in the Government that are keeping these figures, or do the figures just spring from the Premier's skull? The Mayor of Toronto might know more about it. That is the kind of information we are getting in this House, on the out-migration figures. Look today at the questions answered and the way they are answered. What a sad farce it was! Just look at a couple of instances. Yes, you can do something right. You all resign.

Has any person been appointed to replace Mr. Denis Groom, the question was asked on this committee. The answer given (an incorrect one the other day) that Mr. Leo Stead had. Mr. Leo Stead was a member of the committee

Mr. Crosbie

before Mr. Groom ever resigned. The answer should have been Mr. O.L. Vardy was appointed to replace him. Why that is not admitted, I do not know. It is admitted to Mr. Vardy who is on the committee.

Then part of the question was: Who are the two other members and what is the remuneration or salary paid to them? That was not answered at all. Now that will go down in the books you see as an answer to a question. But the question has not been answered at all. That is question 341. Question 356 - no that is not a good one. I discovered I made a mistake there. I will pass on to 369: I have to admit. I will be the first person in this House, Mr. Speaker, to admit that I made a mistake. No, I made no mistake. I have made no mistake. Yes, 66 is right. That is the answer.

MR. MURPHY: I warned the hon. member at the time.

MR. CROSBIE: I will admit something that the Government members will never admit and that is that I made a mistake. I said today that the Government had not tabled the final report of the Phelan Commission. I have checked and found out that it was tabled last June. Quietly slipped in, no copies given to the members. But I will admit that I made a mistake. Now, it was not even a mistake of the heart. It was just a careless error. But still the members opposite understand. If they will all admit their mistakes like I did, they will be far better off for it. I can go on to other matters, if you are going to goad me. Look at planning, direction and initiative in this respect. Javelin Paper Corporation, at Melville - look at the planning that went into the \$15.7 million escalation and costs since last year. That was some planning. How did that happen? How did the Government allow there to be an increase in the costs of that project, in the last year of \$15.7 million? Now, I am only going to mention it in passing tonight, because there is a resolution down about that. But how could that happen?

Mr. Crosbie.

Surely, it is the duty of the Government, when it is giving an open-ended guarantee to a promoter or company, to see that the cost just does not escalate. It was \$300,000 a week for every week of last year, for \$40,000 a day. So that the people of this Province has to guarantee another \$16 million.

MR. EARLE: Would the hon. member permit a question.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, I think so.

MR. EARLE: The question is that the statement made - it was that one of the main reasons for this escalation was the increase in interest rates. Is the hon. member aware that during the past year, the past twelve months, interest rates in the financial market have generally been declining very rapidly but one of the main reasons for escalation, was it not that interest rates were increasing?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is absolutely 100 per cent correct. The explanation given by the Government, by the Premier for this increase in costs from \$75.3 million to \$91 million was inflation. We had inflation in the past year.

MR. CROSBIE: last year. That is some inflation, but as the hon. the member for Fortune Bay points out in the last twelve months the cost of borrowing have gone down, inflation has been met and conquered, the problem now is unemployment and conquering that, so it is not inflation. It is poor planning. It is lack of control. It is lack of supervision by the Government. The Government says it has got somebody called Dick Engineering, from Toronto, acting for the Government in this project. Well, Dick better get on the job. Will there be another \$16 million escalation by next year? Who is Dick Engineering? How many people have they got on their job? What are they supervising?

MR. MURPHY: He better get Tom and Harry with him too.

MR. CROSBIE: Tom, Dick and Harry are all needed over there, obviously, with this \$16 million escalation.

So, when the hon. member for St. John's East moves this Resolution, it is a soundly based Resolution. It could not be more soundly based. Look at the planning that has gone into that Melville situation. A \$16 million escalation, something that was to cost \$75 million. What is the percentage increase?

MR. MURPHY: A little over twenty percent.

MR. CROSBIE: A little over twenty percent increase in one year. And the people of Newfoundland are on the back of it. It is an opened guarantee, it starts at \$53 million and it went to \$58 million, and now it is up \$58 plus this \$16 million. Where will it end? Where is the planning and the direction there?

There are a whole lot of other instances that could be given, if one wanted to be critical. There is the Oil Refinery at Come-by-Chance, we discussed that so much last year, it is hardly worth discussing again this year, except for this, we all remember last summer when certain agreements were signed, that there was a great ceremony and the hon. the Premier passed over a cheque for \$5 million or he took a cheque for \$5 million. There was a great to do about the \$5 million. It was said that the Interim Financing that the Government had advanced, that the \$5 million that the Government had advanced, without any security, in 1968, was now being paid back

MR. CROSBIE: by the Shaheen people or by the Crown Corporation or by somebody, I never got this straight. I heard recently that the money was borrowed from Hotel Buildings, Limited, passed around the table and put back again in Hotel Buildings, Limited. I would like to have someone from the Government confirm or deny that - this \$5 million that was suppose to be repaid. This so-called Interim Financing.

And I would like an explanation for something else that appears in the prospectus, Hornblower & Weeks-Hemphill, Noyes. How is it that, that \$5 million was repaid? How can this be explained? Page fifteen, the middle of the page, the Refinery is being constructed under \$155 million fixed price, turnkey contract. Right? That is the \$155 million we heard about last year, the famous "155". You know, "155". The next sentence - another \$5 million has already been spent for certain preliminary engineering and construction costs at the refinery site. That is our \$5 million, I say that is our \$5 million that was advanced as Interim Financing.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Our \$5 million?

MR. CROSBIE: Our, o-u-r. But, you see I was born in St. John's or somewhere and I cannot pronounce me words right. So I said, hour.

MR. ROWE: St. John's East.

MR. CROSBIE: But, the meaning is still clear enough. That is the \$5 million of the people of Newfoundland, are down there in that preliminary engineering construction cost. That is the \$5 million Interim Financing. Who has paid for that, if the Interim Financing is paid back? Where did that \$5 million come from? How about some explanation of that? That famous \$5 million cheque that was passed around last summer in front of the T.V. cameras and so on, with the Premier smirking and laughing with the Minister of Health. giggle, giggle, this is the \$5 million they resigned about. We all remember that last summer, the usual solemn ceremony, when the Government have a number of agreements signed. The question is, is that \$5 million really paid back? There is \$5 million gone into the ground and gone elsewhere

MR. CROSBIE: put in the ground at Come-by-Chance, as reported in this prospectus. It is \$155 million plus \$5 million, and that \$5 million is ours, I am darn sure that is not Mr. Shaheen's, that \$5 million. That is for sure. That is for sure and positive. That is not Mr. Shaheen's. He has not got \$5 million. That great planning, that sound planning, bunkum. We have heard so much about Come-by-Chance, so I will not press on too long with that one either.

Oh, yes, the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, ha, ha, here is a good one. Now hear this. Now hear this. Wait until I get it out.

I mentioned Leichtenstein the other night. Leichtenstein that is a country we should know more about. It is not as big as the Avalon Peninsula, but it has got a lot of money.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The Leichtenstein Polka

Well, I asked the hon. the minister of Mines, Agriculture and Leichtenstein Resources last year, Question No. 132 and Question No. 133, on the Order Paper. I asked him what persons, firms or corporations have any rights to the mineral resources of Labrador? And in each case, what is the nature of those rights? For what period have they been granted? For what consideration? I asked the same question about our forestry resources. Would not one think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a question that should be answered? Who have rights to our mineral resources in Labrador? Who has rights to our forest resources? What did the minister tell me? The minister said; "this question is all in the Public Registry," and he did not give an answer. This information is not in the Public Registry. This information is in the minister's department. Why should we not know what persons, firms, or corporations have mineral rights and forest rights, timber rights in Labrador? Surely, the minister's department has got a list of them.

MR. CROSBIE: Then he was asked; has any company incorporated in Leichtenstein acquired any right to the mineral resources of Labrador? And if so, from whom did such company acquire such rights? What is the nature of those rights? What is the name of the company concerned? The minister said he had no knowledge of this. No knowledge of it. The minister of the Government, responsible for looking after our resources, does not know whether a company incorporated in Leichtenstein has rights to our mineral resources in Labrador?

There was an article in "Maclean's Magazine", Mr. Speaker, about twelve to eighteen months ago, in which it was said, in that article, that a company by the name of "Society Transshipping," a company incorporated in Leichtenstein had acquired rights to the timber in Labrador to millions of acres of the timber of Labrador. Yet, when the minister is asked; "has a company incorporated in Leichtenstein got any rights to our mineral resources in Labrador or our forest resources in Labrador," he says he has no knowledge of it. Why does he not have? How can a company incorporated in Leichtenstein acquire any right for the resources of this Province and the Government not know it? If the law is such that these records are not kept in the minister's department, then the law should be changed. Surely, the minister must know who the Government is granting exploration rights to, or leases or grants? And surely, the minister must know who they have assigned them to, if they assigned them? Is not that rudimentary? Is this Province to have its resources owned by all kinds of foreign companies, without the Government even knowing who has got the rights to those resources? That cannot be the fact. If some fly-by-night company, incorporated in Leichtenstein, a refuge for hot money, like Switzerland, in Europe, has got rights to millions of acres of our timber in Labrador, surely the Government must know or, if it does not know, it can find out and tell this House. That is the kind of information we are getting from the minister. If the minister has not got this information he should resign and the Government should resign with him. If our resources are

MR. CROSBIE: going to people or companies that we know nothing about, controlled outside of Canada, that we do not even know about, it is time there is a major change. I do not think there is anything that can be more important than that. Mismanagement of resources!

Now here is something that baffles me, Mr. Speaker, is this planning. Now the Minister of Welfare is a gentleman who is suppose to be able to answer about this.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No, the same minister, you cannot teach an old dog new tricks, even if his name is changed.

The Minister of Social Services, who needs to be rehabilitated, should be able to deal with this. There is a question and answer, here this afternoon.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: There will not be a vote tonight, Sir, no.

Now hear, Kentucky Fried. There are some members of the House who are out getting Kentucky Boiled, when the House is suppose to meet at 8 o'clock.

Here is something I would like for the minister to explain, Halfway House Limited, who owns the Halfway House in Carbonear? The Government guarantees an issue of bonds of Halfway House for \$350,000, and that is when it was a private enterprise that was operated as a Hotel. The Government guarantee the mortgage or the bond, \$350,000. Then there was default, the operation was not a success. So the Government had to pay out on its guarantee. I think,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Just listen now. Just listen. Just listen old man, you can say all you like about E.P.A.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No, it is not the same at all. Just wait until we get to the point. Did the E.P.A. default? Did it? Well, tell us all about it. Have

April 1st. 1971

Tape 190

PK - 6

MR. CROSBIE: you bought E.P.A. and paid three times as much for it, as the bond issue is worth? Now, just wait until we get to the point here, you see. Do you not worry about E.P.A. I have not got a share in it. I do not get a dollar from it. Not a share. You see, it has no connection with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

Mr. Crosbie.

The minister is, perhaps, calling me a liar. When I say I have not a share in something, that means that I have not a share.

Now we have the Half-Way House. So, the Government were on a mortgage for \$350,000. There was default. There was a question answered in the House this afternoon of interest, \$80,000 or \$100,000 or some large amount of interest the Government had to pay.

Now in that situation, the Government are entitled, having to pay on its guarantee, to take over the assets. The assets were a Half-Way House building out in Carbonear. What did the Government do? The Government did not do that at all. Instead of that the Government bought the property for \$930,000 - \$930,000. Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation bought the land and buildings out there and furniture for \$930,000. Why? When the Government were already on a mortgage for \$350,000 and could have foreclosed, under the mortgage? There was a second mortgage also on furniture and so on there. I think it was for \$150,000 or \$140,000 - \$350,000 plus \$140,000 would have been \$490,000 for the whole thing. The minister is going to use it now, we are told, for a Home for the Aged, or it is going to be used for some purpose, by the minister. Yes, I like to go out to Carbonear occasionally. I want to go out and visit the site of the hospital and see how construction is proceeding there. So, when the minister gets a chance, perhaps in this debate (we are discussing today planning, sound planning, direction and initiative) will he explain how it could be sound planning to pay \$930,000 for something that could have been acquired for \$400,000, at the maximum \$490,000, the two mortgages \$350,000 plus \$140,000? I do not call that sound planning, direction or initiative.

When we come to sound planning, direction and initiative, the Minister of Public Works, or the Minister of Finance or the Newfoundland Liquor Commission, should also explain to us how they have entered into such wonderful lease arrangements on liquor stores at Marystown, Placentia, St. Lawrence and Grand Bank.

MR. HICKMAN: I wish you would not associate liquor with Grand Bank.

MR. CROSBIE: Well there is a liquor store there, which would cost about \$35,000 to erect. The Government are paying \$12,000 a year for twenty years to rent it.

Mr. Crosbie.

And they will not even own it at the end of twenty years. That is twenty times \$12,000. That is \$240,000 in rent, which the Government will pay over the next twenty years, for the liquor store down at Grand Bank, a building the Government could have built for \$40,000. Where is the sound planning in that?

MR. MURPHY: Who owns that building down there?

MR. CROSBIE: The building is in the name of the Royal Trust Company. We do not know who owns it.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes you do.

MR. EARLE: Yes you do.

MR. CROSBIE: We can only guess.

MR. HICKMAN: Take a guess.

MR. CROSBIE: It is not you, is it? It is not the hon. member?

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. CROSBIE: Somebody has a definite bargain down there. Then we have the Elizabethan Towers, on Elizabeth Avenue. One could only call it Elizabethan, because of the opulence of its appointments. That is another monument to sound planning. That is a real monument to sound planning. We do not have the latest figures on that. But, I do remember, last year there were some figures which we got on it. Only one-third of the apartments were occupied. It was reported in the papers, last year, that the Elizabeth Towers is not costing the taxpayers anything. That was Mr. O. L. Vardy, who stated that on January 26, 1970, from the "Evening Telegram," it is not costing the taxpayers anything. Then on January 13, 1970 - no, that was the "Telegram" that said it was operating at a loss. But Mr. Vardy came back and said that it was not costing anything. That is that it was not costing the taxpayers anything. What does the Auditor General's Report say, this year, about the Elizabeth Towers? Let us have a look. The audited statement says - that was certainly badly needed in St. John's, that Elizabeth Towers, the luxury apartments - \$5.5 million..

MR. MURPHY: Subsidized housing.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know if you call it subsidized housing. The Public Accounts, page 200. It gives us the financial statements of Elizabeth Towers, Limited. Elizabeth Towers, Limited is a subsidiary of St. John's Housing Corporation. The place that

Mr. Crosbie.

was not to cost the taxpayers anything (It is stated in the revenue and expenses, on page 203, and it is a statement for the six months ending 31 December, 1969)- shows a loss for the six months of \$141,125. So, that is, when you take the total revenue and deduct the various expenses, there is a loss of \$141,125. The Elizabeth Towers cost altogether \$5,284,000, approximately. All of the money, just about, borrowed. There was \$2.5 million, \$3 million or \$4 million borrowed, the guarantee of the Government and with advances from the St. John's Housing Corporation, \$124,000. Now the St. John's Housing Corporation, an agency of the Government, supposed to help in providing lots for buildings, developing building lots in St. John's, developing industrial parks and the rest of it. Its job should be to keep the cost of these lots as low as possible, not charge whatever the market will bring, not make a profit. It is a public agency. It should be setting the market by keeping costs low. But instead of that, it is selling it at whatever the market will bear, and making money. That corporation has put \$1,224,000 into that Elizabeth Towers Limited - \$1,224,000 that should have been invested in subsidized housing or in shell housing or in housing for those who cannot assist themselves or invested in producing building lots or industrial lots at cheap prices. Instead of that \$1,224,000 is misdirected into the Elizabeth Towers, luxury apartment building. There should not be a cent of public money in that Elizabeth Towers. The public money should only be used in housing for those who need Government assistance to get decent housing, not people who can pay \$200, \$300, \$400 and \$500 a month in rent. They never need to worry about finding an apartment. They can find an apartment easy or they have their own house or they buy a house.

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

MR. CROSBIE: Certainly.

MR. EARLE: Is he not also aware that in that building the great percentage of the rent is paid for by the Government itself, through operations of the computer centre and the liquor store?

Mr. Crosbie.

How true that is, Mr. Speaker. The building is not making money at all on the apartments. In fact, it would be collapsed altogether except that the Government have put all kinds of operations, paying large rent, into that building. There is the - I have the figures here somewhere. If I had my research assistant, I would immediately give them to you. There is \$153,000 per year going to Elizabeth Towers, Limited, from Government outfits: Newfoundland and Labrador Water Authorities; Newfoundland Medicare Commission; St. John's Metropolitan Board; Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services. So the Government are taking it out from one pocket and putting it over into the other pocket. That is all and paying high rent to do it, to help keep Elizabeth Towers afloat.

MR. HICKMAN: Now the next floor is going to be occupied.

MR. CROSBIE: There is another floor now to be torn up. It is already done. Another story has been converted from apartment units, living units, into office space. What Government agency is going in there? I have no idea which agency is going in. I do not see how anybody can call that sound planning, direction and initiative in developing the natural resources and manpower of the Province. It is the exact opposite. I have another minute, I think.

In the housing line, Mr. Speaker, we have another sad situation down at Marystown, where a lack of planning and foresight resulted in a number of public housing facilities that had never been properly used. I think the minister said, the other day, there are a considerable amount of economic rental units in Marystown still unoccupied.

MR. HICKMAN: Thirty-seven.

MR. CROSBIE: Thirty-seven. They are still unoccupied after being constructed two, three or four years ago, because of lack of sound planning. I remember the houses that were built at Marystown for management people that were going to

MR. Crosbie.

go into the fish plant or the shipyard, and the Government spend a huge sum of money in building houses down there for these people. All in a rush, because there had been no planning, when the 1966 election was coming. There were houses built down in Marystown which cost \$55,000 that could be built normally for \$20 or \$25,000. Houses that cost that much are being rented by the Government for under \$200 a month, at a loss. All because of a lack of planning and haste and the election fever that was on in 1966. How much of that, Mr. Speaker, is going to go on this year? The subsidized rental housing at Marystown took a long time to catch on, but apparently it is all occupied now. There are only two unoccupied apartments there now. Presumably these are people moving in from around the peninsula. That is another area, the Marystown area, Mr. Speaker, where, if there had been sound planning and direction in connection with the shipyard and the fish plant, if those projects, these two projects, had not been rushed so much, because an election was coming, if it had been allowed to proceed normally, they would have been built at a lot less money and would have a lot better chance of operating successfully now; particularly, the shipyard. I do not have much time do I? I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this debate be adjourned. Carried.

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Friday at 11 a.m. and that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER : It is moved and seconded that this House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Friday at 11 a.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m.