



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 11

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

FRIDAY, APRIL 2, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 11:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees.

HON. E. ROBERTS (Min. of Health): Mr. Speaker, under the Terms of the legislation enacted by the House last year, to amend the (what we can call the) Shaheen Act, one which we dealt with in the special session last summer, the Minister of Finance is required to table certain documents resulting from the Agreement. I now rise, on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Finance, to table these Agreements. They are somewhat lengthy and as I suspect, Your Honour, that most members will not want to take them home and read them of an evening. We have only had one copy made, these will be deposited with the Clerk and I assume any hon. member can have access to them.

These Agreements, Mr. Speaker, include the construction supervision Agreements together with two amendments thereto, that have been made necessary, the Management Agreement, the Sales Agency Agreement, the Agreement between the Minister of Economic Development, Newfoundland Refining Company, Limited, Provincial Building Company Limited, Provincial Refining Company, Limited and Provincial Holding Company, Limited. The main construction contract between Provincial Building Company, Limited and Procon (Great Britain), Limited. A letter from Procon, two letters from Procon (Great Britain) Company, Limited, making minor amendments to that. Approval of Newfoundland Refining Company, Limited, to the contracts, the Sterling Financial Agreement, October 16, 1970. The First Euro-Dollar Agreement, the Second Euro-Dollar Agreement, a copy of the Crown Grant, by His Honour, the Governor, of the land on which the Refinery is to build. A copy of the Indenture, under which the Minister of Public Works conveyed that same piece of land to Provincial Building Company, Limited. A copy of the Indenture by which that land, the buildings to be built thereon, was mortgaged, by Provincial Building Company Limited, to Kleinwort Benson

Company, Limited. A copy of the Second Mortgage between Provincial Building Company, Limited and the Minister of Economic Development, representing Her Majesty the Queen in right of Newfoundland. A letter from Newfoundland Refining Company, Limited, in which they undertake not to exercise their option to purchase the shares of Provincial Holding Company, Limited, while the first mortgage is outstanding and a debenture between Provincial Building and Kleinwort Benson, in England, the Guarantee Agreement, executed by Shaheen Natural Resources Company, Limited. A letter from the First National Bank of Chicago together with an Agreement by S.N.R., Delaware Newfoundland Refining Company, Limited and Provincial Refining Company, Limited, which relates to the provision of the \$10 million equity financing and, finally, a letter from Newfoundland Refining and Provincial Refining, under which they agreed to waive their rights to receive 2½ mill power.

The latter Agreement replaces the Can-Carib arrangement and as hon. gentlemen will recall, when we dealt with it in the House last year we said we would - the Can-Carib arrangement would fall and we would replace it by another means - this letter is that other means, of course. There is a question on the Order Paper, from the hon. gentleman from St. John's East, who apparently - his memory is a little defective on the point - He has asked for the Can-Carib letter - as it is of no concern whatsoever, of no force or effect, it is not being tabled.

Mr. Speaker, there are two agreements which we are not sure if they are covered or not, because the legislation exempts certain types of agreements. These are the Crude and Vacuum Distillation Process Unit Guarantee Agreement, between Universal Oil Products and Provincial Refining and the UOP Platforming Process License Agreement, between the UOP Process Division, Universal Oil Products Company and Provincial Refining Company, Limited. These are commercial Agreements, and the legislation exempts these. However, as they may be of interest to the members of the House any

hon. gentlemen wishes to see them on a private basis, because these are the commercial Agreements, we would be prepared to let any hon. gentleman see them. They are private and confidential, as the Premier reminds me. In any event, Mr. Speaker, these are the so-called Shaheen Agreements, I commend them to the attention of the hon. members, they are most interesting reading and I am sure each hon. member will want to read them.

MR. J. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with this, tabling this Agreement, can the Minister supply one other copy of these Agreements. If there is only one copy in the Clerk's Office, it is going to be very difficult for members to read them. There is going to be more than one member interested. Not only that, if there is only one copy in the Clerk's Office and cannot be removed, they all have to be read here in these premises. So there should at least be one other copy for members to look at.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I will see what we can do on that. Perhaps some of these Agreements are formal and others are substandard, if the hon. gentleman could let me have a list of the Agreements he would wish to peruse, we would undertake to provide copies of them. Some of these Agreements, such as the mortgages, of course, have been registered in the Registry of Deeds and, therefore, readily available. But if the hon. gentleman has some particular Agreement or Agreements in mind, if he could let me have a list, I will see if we can have an extra copy made to be circulated among him and such other members who may wish to read it.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

HON. S. NEARY (Min. of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I want to answer a question on yesterday's Order Paper, No. 359, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. (1) should be redirected to my colleague the Minister responsible for Housing. (2) I am unable to answer this part of the question at the moment, Mr. Speaker, because there is a special admissions committee set up comprising of officials between my own department and the Department of Health. It would be sometime

before this committee is in a position to report. They are studying admissions to all Government institutions, to determine whether we are getting the maximum use from these institutions. Until I get their report, I am unable to state what the precise use of this building will be, except to say that it will be used for senior citizens. They could be ambulatory or bed-ridden, they could be different types of senior citizens and if my hon. friend will bear with me, if the House is still sitting in July or August, when I get the report of the committee, I will be glad to pass the information along to him.

Question No. 16, asked by the hon. member for St. John's East Extern. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that I forgot to advise my secretary of Your Honour's wish that we make, I think it was eight copies, seven copies of the answers. It is quite a lengthy answer, with quite a number of figures. I only have two copies, if hon. members want me to read the answer, I would be glad to do it, if not, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could infringe on the very busy lady in the Clerk's Office to run off enough copies for members of the other side of the House. If they want me to table it, I would be glad to do it.

Question No. 17 tabled. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add that the Question that was asked in both instances was as of January 1966-67-68-69-70 and 1971, and as Your Honour knows, I made a ministerial statement yesterday that will now change these figures - they have been revised upward.

HON. J.R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No 195. on the Order Paper of March 29, (1) Lundrigan's Limited. (2) transfer of title to land, being a portion of the site of the Holiday Inn at St. John's. August 14, 1969. (3) yes. (4) the payment of \$50,000 for the land referred to, the value of which was appraised at that figure by the Senior Appraiser in the Appraisal Department of the Royal Trust Company. 806

MR. MARSHALL:

I wonder could the hon. Premier inform of the acreage of land involved, the area of land involved?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I do not know but it is the land on which Holiday Inns stands and that runs, my impression tells me, to three or four or five acres, somewhere around there.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to a couple of questions. 401 on today's Order Paper, asked by the hon. the member for Burin, the answer to the question is no. I have also the answer to question 36, that I referred to the other day, on the Order Paper of March 25th, asked also by the hon. member for Burin. I will be tabling a breakdown of this as soon as I can get it taken off, but I will just summarize the answer for the hon. member now, orally. The question asks the location of new schools, indicating in each case the number of classrooms which have been put into service since 1 January 1970 and (2) the location of rebuilt schools, indicating in each case, I take it, with rebuilt schools the hon. member means additions to existing schools, so I have that information, we had it, of course, in the department but I had it also checked with the Denominational Educational Authorities, since the primary records would be with them in the first instance. We have now come up with the totals, There were thirteen new schools built in that last year, I might say that in all but one instance these refer to action taken in 1970. It could be that in recent days a classroom has been added here and there and we might not have that information now. So, for all practical purposes, these statistics would relate to 1970 and during that year the number of new schools, completely new schools built, was thirteen. Hon. members may be interested to know that the largest of these schools was at Bishops Falls, a sixteen room school, two other larger schools, one was at Flower's Cove, a twelve room school, and one at Harbour Breton, a ten room school, and one at Roddickton, a ten room school. The total number of classrooms brought into being in these new schools, completely new schools, was ninety-seven, so that the average size of the schools work out at something like eight classrooms, on an average. I am referring only now to a new school, brand new schools starting from scratch.

MR. ROWE:

The new of schools rebuilt or extended;is much larger. The total number is thirty-seven schools that were rebuilt or enlarged and the number of classrooms added was 123 classrooms, 123 classrooms added to existing schools. This is in addition to the ninety-seven classrooms. Hon. members may also be interested to know where the largest of these additions were, two were at schools in St. John's, two schools,twelve rooms each, I do not have the actual names of the schools,I dare say hon. members might know which they are. Two schools were enlarged by twelve classrooms each, a school in Stephenville was enlarged by ten classrooms and the other enlargements ranged all the way down to one classroom. So the total number of classrooms,added last year to our school services,was ninety-seven and 123 for a total of 220 classrooms, 220 new classrooms were brought into service in the year 1970. The last one of these was in January past, the last one I have a record of.

Since hon. members might be interested to know what has happened in respect of their own districts,I will be tabling a breakdown of these statistics later this morning. The girls are taking it of right now.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. In the definition of new classrooms does he include portable classrooms?

MR. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, new classrooms could be either standard additions or in some cases portable ones. I do not have a breakdown of the number of portable one ,but if any hon. members are interested in that, I would be glad to get the actual number of portable classrooms that have been added. I seem to recall, speaking from memory now, that there have been some forty odd portable classrooms added sometime during the year. I believe, for example, that the one at Manuels, the extension in Manuels, my recollection is that at Manuels the classrooms added there were portable ones. I could get a breakdown if any hon. member wanted to know. Yes, I notice there, Manuels has a twelve room school, (no, it is the new school was built in Manuels, I am sorry) that is the new one built there. I will get a breakdown of the portable classrooms for hon. members and I will be tabling the breakdown of this later this morning.

MR. EARLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In connection with the portable classrooms, can the hon. Minister report to the House as to whether or not, generally speaking, these classrooms are found to be satisfactory and are they performing the service for which they are constructed in a good way. Are they regarded by the schools as being entirely satisfactory?

MR. ROWE: Well, I can only answer on that, Mr. Speaker, that I have to this moment not received a complaint about them. They have been put in use in a number of places around Newfoundland and I have not received any complaint. Normally, if there is any widespread objection, some of the complaints would be directed to the Minister of Education. The other thing is that I found myself once in a portable classroom and did not know I was in it. I did not know what I was in until, during the latter part of my visit, somebody pointed out to me that it was a portable classroom. As far as I know, they are giving satisfaction and I have heard nothing to the contrary.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answer to a question asked by the hon. member for St. John's West, number 328 appearing on the Order Paper of March 31st.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries? Can he inform the House whether or not the fishermen of this Province have been sufficiently informed or adequately informed of the implementation of new regulations under the Fisheries Act concerning the processing, packaging of fish. What I had in mind, particularly, was in connection with the Federal regulations concerning the canning of fish, where individual

MR. EARLE: fishermen are doing this either for their own purposes or for sale to small stores. Have they been informed and given adequate notice of the regulations controlling that at present?

MR. WINSOR: To my knowledge, every operator in Newfoundland has been notified, or at least there is no excuse for ignorance of the law. If we are going to produce the quality of fish, whether in tins or in any other form, then we must enforce certain regulations. We have not, as the Department of Fisheries, gone into really closing anyone down. I am sure the hon. gentleman will agree, if we are to hold our markets and produce a good quality, and put that quality on the market, then we must, we have no choice but to enforce certain regulations.

I know the problem the hon. gentleman has and I have it under consideration. I feel they are all aware of the regulation but it has just been procrastinating in bringing it into effect.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

HON. H. STARKES (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to a question. I wish to table the answer to question no. (177), (178) and no. (181). It applies to a question asked by the hon. member for Burin, regarding the erection of a certain sign near the Trans Canada Highway. Permits are not issued, Mr. Speaker, by the Department of Highways or refused to be issued by the Department of Highways. It comes under an entirely different department.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, what are the numbers the minister tabled? (177), what was the next one?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the hon. the Minister of Highways indicate to the House the department or minister who has responsibility for issuing permits for the erection of signs along the Trans Canada Highway.

MR. STARKES: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know the hon. member should know full well. I think he was a member of Cabinet longer than I. The Trans Canada is a protected road and protected roads come under the urban and rural planning division of the Department of Municipal Affairs.

On motion of the hon. the Minister of Justice, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Fatal Accidents Act." (No. 15). Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. the Minister of Justice a Bill, "An Act To Protect Certain Persons Rendering Aid Following An Accident Or In An Emergency." (No.24). Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. the Minister of Justice a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1968." Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. the Minister of Justice a Bill, "An Act To Establish The Newfoundland Law Reform Commission." (No.22). Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, of the hon. the Minister of Education and Youth a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Memorial University Pensions Act." (No.11). Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Social Services And Rehabilitation." (13). Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation a Bill, "An Act To Amend, Revise And Consolidate The Law Respecting Social Assistance," (No.14). Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs a Bill, "An Act To Amend, Revise And Consolidate The Law Respecting Accident And Sickness Insurance." (No.9). Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. the Minister of Mines Agriculture And Resources a Bill, 'An Act Further To Amend The Act 4 Ed. VII Cap 13 Entitled 'An Act To Provide For The Transportation Of Timber Over Streams And Lakes, And For Other Purposes In Connection With Crown Lands.'" (No.18). Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. the Minister of Fisheries a Bill, An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Made Between Her Majesty In Right Of Newfoundland, Newfoundland Industrial Corporation And National Sea Products Limited And To Make Provision Respecting The Making Of Certain Monetary Grants And The Payment Of Certain Subsidies And Respecting Other Matters Connected Therewith." (19). Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. the President of the Council the appointment of the following to constitute a committee under Standing Order (86), to prepare a list of members to compose a Standing Committee of the House named therein; the hon. the Minister of Education and Youth; the hon. Minister of Public Works; the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs; the hon. member for Gander and the hon. member for St. Barbe South.

HON. L.R.CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that item (12) be withdrawn from the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the item (12) be withdrawn from the Order Paper? Agreed.

The adjourned debate on Address in Reply.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order. What is the position with respect to motion (22) that notice was given of last night, and has the Leader of the house proposed to deal with it?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would ask the hon. member to speak louder or those in the discussion on the other side to speak much lower. It is difficult to follow what is happening on the floor of this House. If they are going to have meetings, let them go in the common room and have their meetings.

MR. SPEAKER: I quite agree, it is difficult for the Chair at times to hear what is going on, when hon. members are conversing too loudly. If they have to converse, I wish they would keep it down. The Point of Order?

MR. CROSBIE: The Point of Order, with respect to motion (22) Mr. Speaker, that was moved last night, when that motion should be dealt with. I would submit that that is a motion that should be dealt with at this time. Since the Government controls the business of the House, the Government can call what business it wishes.

MR. CURTIS: This is the hon. member's motion Mr. Speaker, which will come up on Wednesday. In the meantime, it cannot come up today because the order was not put in writing and tabled before six o'clock yesterday, as provided for in the rules.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the answer of the Leader of the House, I feel that this matter is of such gravity, Sir, and affects the running of this hon. House so seriously, I believe this motion should now be discussed rather than have this hanging over the House. As I say, I must second or speak to the Point of Order raised by the hon. member for St. John's West. Because, when we have a motion, such as this, which I think has been the first one that has been raised in this hon. House, and perhaps one of the very few

that has been raised in the Dominion of Canada. I think it is really very, very serious and grave enough, Mr. Speaker, to have it considered immediately.

MR. CURTIS: If this Order deals, Mr. Speaker, with the rules of the House, it should at least carry out the rules of the House, and order (29) provides "such notice shall be laid upon the table before six o'clock p.m." That is the rule of the House, I did not make it.

MR. MURPHY: Speaking again, if I may, Mr. Speaker, how could we lay it on the table of the House before six o'clock p.m., when it occurred at eight fifteen last evening? It is a physical impossibility.

MR. CURTIS: No notice has been given.

MR. MURPHY: At 6:00 p.m. today the House is in session. I consider we gave it enough notice, and I think the matter should be discussed.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on that point. This motion was moved last night, as soon as it could be moved after the events to which it relates took place. There is nothing at all stopping the Leader of the House from calling this motion. It is a motion that effects the whole rules and procedures of this House. It is not just a simple private member's motion for debate on private member's day. It is a motion that affects the whole business of the House and should be discussed now.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the only way it can be brought up now is by the unanimous consent of the House. If they want to ask for that.

MR. SPEAKER: The only comment I can make is that this was raised as a Point of Order. I am not too sure if it was strictly a Point of Order. I would have no objection, if the motion were called now, I would have no objection, obviously, to it being debated. But the House - the Speaker, does not call the order in which the items come, whether it is private member's day or any other day, he is advised. I can only say that the order has been called and we must now go into the adjourned debate on the Address in Reply.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, will the House give unanimous consent to having the motion called now?

HON. J.R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): Mr. Speaker, if there was some way whereby I could properly and in accordance with the rules express the unutterable

contempt I have, I would do so.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the Address in Reply.

MR. CROSBIE: We just had another demonstration, Mr. Speaker, of the contemptible way in which this House is run by the majority of the House. It is absolutely contemptible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: This is the resumed debate, Mr. Speaker, on the Address in Reply, or the amendment moved to the Address in reply which is; to be added to the Address in Reply the words, "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 and initiative in developing the natural resources and manpower of the Province."

I spoke on this motion last night, Mr. Speaker, and covered quite a few points. I do not have too much time left. The hon. minister opposite is glad of that. Another illustration, Mr. Speaker, of the lack of, the failure of the Government to provide for the well being of its citizens, and the lack of sound planning and direction lies in the labour relations field. The acting Minister of Labour is good enough to pipe up a few words there in the labour relations field, and specifically, Mr. Speaker, in the field of equal pay for men and women. What kind of sound planning, what kind of provision for the well being of the citizens of this Province is it, when a Government is in power twenty-two years before it announces that it is going to amend the law to provide for equal pay for men and women, doing the same kind of work in the same place? That has been announced a few weeks ago, but not yet implemented.

There are many peculiar things about that announcement, Mr. Speaker, that need clarification. Of course it was an adoption a policy that has been urged by the official Opposition in this House for many years and rejected by the Government year after year. We know that this year we are in a different situation. This is the last year that this House will sit, or this session of this House will sit. So, the Government has finally announced, after twenty-two that it is going to provide for equal pay for men and women. The question is

how is this going to be done, and when is it going to be done?

The Government announced that it was going to be done for employees of the Government and mentioned April 1st. I think the figure given was, that it was going to cost the Government \$750,000 a year to do that. There has been no breakdown of that cost, but if that is all that the Government estimates it is going to cost the Government to do, to implement equal pay for men and women in the civil service of Newfoundland, then there is something wrong Mr. Speaker.

In the Department of Health alone, if it is to be provided properly, equal pay for men and women, working in the hospitals of this Province in the Provincial Government service, the cost to the Government will certainly be in excess of \$750,000. This gives us some reason to think that perhaps the implementation of this proposal is going to be far different and far more restricted than the general statement of the position would lead one to think.

It was announced that under the Minimum Wage Act there is a period of six months before this comes into effect. Certainly it is wise, Mr. Speaker, to give employers some notice, at least six months notice, of this change, but we have had no more particulars since the House opened of how this is going to work and how this is going to work. What provisions are going to be made for its enforcement? There is no indication whatsoever as yet. We have had no statement either that the minimum wage is going to be increased. The minimum wage in this Province is inadequate, as it is, for men, so it would not be sufficient to simply have men and women given equal pay, based on the minimum wage as it stands today. We would expect and hope that there will be some announcement from the Government, during this session, that the minimum wage is going to be increased. Not just that women will get the same minimum wage as men, but that both will be increased this year to at least one dollar and fifty cents an hour. That was not in the Speech from the Throne. We can only hope that

MR. CROSBIE: that is going to be implemented. But, Mr. Speaker, it is easy to say equal pay for men and women, but there are so many ways of getting around that, that it is going to be very important as to how this is going to be carried out, and just the exact wording, and how the enforcement is going to be brought about. That will be the important thing. Who is to determine whether men and women are doing exactly the same job? There can be a little variation in the job, that may permit employers to say that women are doing a different job than men are. This is a very complicated matter. I do not know whether the minister or his department are making any study of other jurisdictions where there is equal pay for men and women, and what the problems have been in those jurisdictions. But, certainly if the department is not, then it should be doing that.

So after twenty-two years, the Government finally announces that it is interested in the women's rights in this Province, and that men and women will have equal pay for equal work. What we are waiting for now, Mr. Speaker, is an outline of the implementation of that promise. And some explanation as to why it was not done last year or the year before or the year before that, or ten years ago, or fifteen years ago, for the well being of the female half of the population of this Province.

We have a Royal Commission, the Cohen Commission, which was originally the Rand Commission, on labour matters. I do not know if that was appointed, it must have been three years ago now. Unfortunately, the late Chief Justice Rand died, the commission was taken over by Professor Cohen, I think, that is at least two years ago, certainly a year and a-half ago, we still have no report on that Royal Commission, Mr. Speaker.

Surely a Government that appoints Royal Commission can take some measures to keep in touch with these Royal Commissions and to try to get them to speed up their work and bring in their reports. There will not be any implementation in this House of the Cohen Royal Commission Report, because

MR. CROSBIE: it will not be received until the House is over, or if it is received while the House is still meeting, there will not be time. The Government is derelict in its duty in not seeing that the Royal Commissions expedite their work. We have the Royal Commission on Forestry, appointed in 1967, that only reported to the Government several months ago, and the report was only tabled several days ago. We have the Frazer Commission again, Question No. 223, that was answered, I think, it was answered yesterday. The hon. the Premier was asked; "has the Government received a report of the Royal Commission on Taxation and Revenue for the City of St. John's established in 1965?" The answer was "no". "If not, when does Government expect to receive this report?" "Do not know." The Government does not know. Well, surely, Mr. Speaker, after a five year period, the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Premier or some member of the Government should be in touch with the commissioner and ask him when they can expect to have his report. Not just to report to this House and the public that they do not know when the report is going to come in.

The question was asked; how many times have the Commission sat since 1 January, 1969? Answer; "do not know." The Government does not know how often that Commission have sat or even if it has sat since January 1, 1969. Why does not the Government know? Surely, it is the Government's duty to see that this Commission reports or, if not, appoint another Commission or replace the Commissioner. What is the cost of this Commission, was another question asked? The reply to that was answered later, the answer will be given later. This is not the answer to a question, Mr. Speaker, to say an answer will be given later. An answer tabled here a year ago, showed that the Commission had costed, as up to one year ago, \$23,735.00. What has been spent since that year ago? \$23,000 it cost up to a year ago, still no report.

The subject is not that complicated, Mr. Speaker. The tax structure and revenue sources of the City of St. John's, the jobs can be done in six to nine months by anyone who puts his mind to it. The hearings were held

MR. CROSBIE: some four years ago. As the Board of Trade said the other day, the brief they put in is outdated now. It was put in four years ago. What value is the report going to have when it is based on briefs submitted four years ago, and hearings held four years ago? The hearings are strangled, not only marinated. It is the responsibility of the Government, Mr. Speaker, when it appoints a Royal Commission to see that it takes some action under the Government Commission, or that it reports within some reasonable length of time. And, if the Government cannot get any action out of the Commission, then the responsibility is to cancel that Commission and appoint another. The Commission was announced, in the first place, just out of the blue, without any consultation with the St. John's Municipal Council. And, when it was appointed, and announced in December 1965, the hon. the Premier said, the Commission would be reporting and legislation would be brought in at the session of the House of Assembly held in 1966, at that session. That was the announcement made in December 1965, "This is an emergency." This Commission will bring its report before the 1966 session and legislation will be passed at the 1966 session in accordance with the Commission's Report, if the Government accepts it." Here we are in 1971, no report, and no explanation from the Government as to what has happened. The Government just does not know, and apparently does not care.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, I have to advise the hon. member his time is up.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

So for the reasons that I have been enumerating last night and shortly this morning, I can see no other choice but to support this non-confidence motion. Because it is amply shown, Mr. Speaker, that the Government have failed to provide for the well being of our citizens, have failed to provide sound planning, direction and initiative, in developing the natural resources and the manpower of this Province.

MR. T. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Motion that is before the House is really a Motion of non-confidence based on the failure of Government to provide sound planning, direction and initiative in developing the natural resources and manpower of the Province. Now that is a pretty all embracing motion and one which, I submit, hon. members could spend many, many hours dealing with the various aspects, in fields of development of our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to restrict my comments primarily to the failure of Government to plan at all or properly plan for the development of our fisheries in this Province. Last month or the month before last, we witnessed a conference at the Arts and Culture Centre and a statement by the Minister of Fisheries. And in that statement the hon. the Minister of Fisheries outlined programmes which may or may not be implemented in this Province, and it is rather difficult to take any real issue with the programmes that were announced or recommended or suggested by the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

The total cost of the proposed programmes, spread over many years, is \$37 million, of which the Federal Government will be asked to join in a joint cost, a joint-shared fisheries development programme, amounting to \$10,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I direct this House's attention to the various items that the hon. the Minister of Fisheries set forth in this plan. It is not a plan, it is simply a statement, without any indication to what planning has gone to it or what plans are behind it, to implement it. But all of these items, pretty well all of these items, with the possible exception of the last two; druggers subsidies of \$2 million and the joint-share fishery programme, deal with the inshore fishery.

Now in dealing with the inshore fishery, I believe this House and Government must take a pretty long, hard look at the productivity and the prospects of the inshore fishery in this Province, and in so doing should not exclude from its thinking and from its planning a segment of

MR. HICKMAN: the fisheries of this Province, which last year landed 318 million pounds of fish, as against 180 million pounds of fish from the inshore. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the ground fish production, the offshore production of fish in this Province. And, when you read the statement of the Minister of Fisheries, and when you look back over the Government's planning with respect to the deep sea fishery, then I submit, Mr. Speaker, that you will be hard put to find any plan. True it is that from time to time when a fish company, a deep sea fishing company, gets into trouble, it comes to Government, it asks for financial assistance, it gets financial assistance by way of Government guarantee. It is saved from insolvency or from closing its doors and the crisis passes, and then they go on again for another few months.

Well,

Mr. Hickman.

Mr. Speaker, that is not planning. That is not the kind of planning that the planning that the deep sea fishery in this Province requires today, if it is going to survive. What we would hope for, and I believe what the people of Newfoundland and particularly the people along the south coast, really from Catalina, more than the south coast, from Catalina around to Port aux Basques, are entitled to expect, is one overall, comprehensive plan, to indicate to them as to where we are going in maintaining and developing the frozen fish industry and the ground fish industry, as prosecuted by offshore fishermen.

And tied in with that, Mr. Speaker, tied in with that are other allied industries. Last year, in this House, I raised the question, and it was raised by other hon. members, of the most discouraging and most disheartening situation, that has prevailed in my hon. friend's district of Placentia West, with respect to the Marystown shipyard.

Now that Marystown shipyard was designed and conceived for the purpose of taking care of the needs of the deep sea fishing enterprises of the Province of Newfoundland. The projections at the time indicated, and they were quite unrealistic, because, as the hon. member for St. John's West said tonight, that the amount of thought and planning that went into that yard was minimum. In the beginning there was a suggestion that that yard would produce a dragger a month. In point of fact, it produced two draggers and then the bottom fell out of the market. The Federal subsidies disappeared and that is all we have heard.

But, Mr. Speaker, this time last year, I submitted to this House statistics and figures furnished by the frozen fish industry, which indicated that their projected needs for the next five years, in order to maintain the present production of ground fish, not to increase it, to maintain the present production of ground fish, was twenty-seven new draggers.

Now we have lost a year. The production of the offshore fleet is decreasing each year and again last year we witnessed the same decrease in production. But, as of today, nothing has happened in Marystown. We have heard

Mr. Hickman.

an announcement about National Sea Products, a large company, a great company a company that according to the Toronto Globe and Mail had a most successful year last year, a company that obviously is not in need of the same financial assistance as some of our local companies and a company that does not have anymore expertise in its midst than many of our local companies in this Province can produce at this time. We now hear of some very generous terms granted to that company, to enable it to open the Ross Steers Plant in St. John's and eventually to have two draggers built in Marystown at this time and sometime in the future, draggers number seven to ten inclusive will be built at the Marystown shipyard. But where does this leave the frozen fish industry in Newfoundland, generally? Because remember, Mr. Speaker, that whilst we are going through a period of comparative prosperity in the frozen fish industry at this time, it is a prosperity that is not dependent entirely, indeed, I do not know how dependent it is at all on the productivity that has come from the Eastern Seaboard of Canada. It is a prosperity that is dependent to a large extent on the failure of the Poles and the Icelanders and the Scandinavians to produce the same quantity of fish that they have produced in previous years. So, we have to assume that, if we are going to remain competitive, we have to assume that, if the frozen fish industry is going to continue as a viable operation, that we cannot rely on periods of prosperity which inevitably follow in the fishing industry by periods of recession.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when this programme was announced - you know, it would be easier to be against motherhood than against an announcement that will result in the opening of a frozen fish plant anywhere in this Province. Where does this leave the other plants? Where does it leave the plants that are competing in the same market with National Sea Products? Because the competition in the frozen fish markets (and our only market is in the United States) is so keen that if one large organization has a financial advantage over the other, a financial advantage provided not by their earning capacity, not provided by their perfection in management but provided rather by Government grants, if they have an advantage over our local producers in days of tight competition (and this has happened so often in the past during the 1968, during the 1966 to 1968 to

Mr. Hickman.

1969 period) that they can undersell and undercut our producers in the market, and they have done it. A quarter of a cent a pound can result in the loss of the sale of Newfoundland produced fish, when the market is tight. What I would like to see in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is a plan for the overall development of the frozen fish industry, one that is available to every frozen fish operator in the Province. I think that six months ago, more than six months ago, a year ago, the frozen fish operators in this Province should have been told or they could have been told that there was an indication, from the Government side of the House, that this would be given consideration. There is now available to you, today, 1970 subsidies in addition to the subsidies being paid by the Government of Canada, to enable you to place orders with the Marystown shipyard right now. This would have done two things. It would have reactivated that yard. It would have helped the yard maintain the few skilled personnel that did not leave, when the close-down took place a year before, and to attract back, hopefully, other skilled personnel that are necessary, if we are going to build the type of modern dragger that is required. So, this was not done. There was no activity. There was no activity at all. There was no planning at all. There was nothing to indicate to our frozen fish operators as to where they turn next, if they are going to maintain the present production.

Now they find themselves in a rather awkward position. The yard is not yet functioning, from the point of view of building offshore draggers. The subsidy that is coming from the Province so far is being restricted to the Nova Scotian company that is moving in. They are now faced with a rather awkward situation. They need, today, more draggers. They need a schedule of delivery of draggers over the next five years. That schedule has not been made available or is not available. It could not have been given anyway. Now they are faced with the prospect of having to go abroad and buy draggers and bring them into this Province and, Mr. Speaker, it should be a matter of some concern to this House, when knowledgeable people in the frozen fish industry indicate that they can go to Europe, to many of the shipyards in Europe, build a

Mr. Hickman.

dragger, forfeit the Federal Government subsidy, land it in Newfoundland at a cheaper cost than they can get it built here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to use the multiplier effect, if we are going to say that when you establish a primary industry that service industries or allied industries must flow, then obviously the planning for the development of the offshore fishery, which should have been on-going, has to be on-going and which was debated at great length in this hon. House last year. It should have been sufficiently advanced that every frozen fish operator in Newfoundland today would know when he can get his draggers built and that he can get them built in Marystown. This is not happening. All we know now; that there are two draggers in Marystown, at terms that had not been made available to any of the local fishing companies.

Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: As a matter of interest. Have any of the local fish companies asked to have similar terms extended to them? I mean the hon. gentleman - can only speak of his own knowledge, of course, but does he know of any fish company that has asked for this assistance and been refused or not been granted it?

MR. HICKMAN: Well I can only know what I read from statements made by the spokesman from the fish trades. It was indicated to the public, I think, it was in December of last year, that the frozen fish trade, as an organization, has met with the leader of the Government and, I presume, others and had asked for some clarification of the fisheries policy and as to where they stand and had pointed out their need for draggers now.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman think that, from that statement - let me put it as a question. Is he aware that the Government are prepared to make the same assistance available?

MR. HICKMAN: I am not.

MR. ROBERTS: That is what I thought.

MR. HICKMAN: I feel reasonably certain that the frozen fish operators - if they

Mr. Hickman.

were, then why would they be negotiating outside the Province.

MR. ROBERTS: Because the prices are incredibly much cheaper in Europe, as the hon. member has just told us at great length.

MR. HICKMAN: Delivery dates are very relevant. Of course, prices are relevant, but..

MR. ROBERTS: And delivery dates.

MR. HICKMAN: But what I am saying is on the question of prices, that if the same subsidy is made available to the Newfoundland fish operators, then the price of the Marystown shipyard will be competitive. Then

MR. HICKMAN:

we are concerned only with the delivery dates.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman drew a conclusion and I have, I think, through his own words, shown that his conclusion was invalid. The hon. gentleman did not know what he was talking about.

MR. HICKMAN: You know I love to be put in my place by the hon. member from Rennie's Mill Road, on the frozen fish operators but, Mr. Speaker,

MR. ROBERTS: I do not live on Rennie's Mill Road, you live on Carpasian.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: I know the information, Mr. Speaker, all you have to do is go to a meeting of the frozen fish union in either Burin or Grand Bank, they share the concern or to any clients that I used to have before I went into public life. You know some people give up clients when they go into public life, it is a practice that I commend to anyone. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that, in any planning for the fishery development of this Province that no Government can overlook the needs and demands of the segment of the frozen fish industry that produces 318 million pounds of ground fish and concentrate its entire emphasis on the segment of the frozen fish industry that produces 180 million pounds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Health, in outlining the Government's economic development policy, before the fire chief's convention on August 5th of last year, indicated that he believes that the inshore fishery does not have a very satisfactory and sound future insofar as that segment of the fishing operation is concerned. Now maybe he is right.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not what I said. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could read the speech, it is better than the one he is making.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, that is a matter of opinion.

MR. ROBERTS: I agree, on opinion it is a better speech.

MR. HICKMAN: I did not see any screaming headlines of compliments following.

MR. ROBERTS: One does not expect screaming headlines.

MR. HICKMAN: These new jobs may just about disappear, just about replace the disappearing jobs in the inshore fishery. There are about 20,000 Newfoundlanders who make some kind of a living from the fishery and my

MR. HICKMAN:

understanding is that even with the maximum development Newfoundland in the future might be able to provide a decent living for about 12,000 fishermen.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not to say that the inshore fishery is disappearing.

If you are going to quote me, quote me accurately.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, is the inshore fishery disappearing or is it not?

MR. ROBERTS: I have not said that.

MR. HICKMAN: I say that it is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, well then you are saying it, not me.

MR. HICKMAN: I say that it is disappearing for a very simple reason that if the inshore fishery is going to remain a viable force in this Province that it has to have a great deal more in the way of mobility than it has at this time because, basically, Mr. Speaker, the inshore fishery or two-thirds of it is conducted in the part of Newfoundland, which by the very nature of geography in parts of Newfoundland their operations are very much restricted. Now, Mr. Speaker, in this programme of development -

MR. WORNELL: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, Sir.

MR. WORNELL: Is the hon. gentleman aware that in Francois, in my district, there are nine dories operating the inshore fishing and when I was there about two weeks ago they were landing around 17,000 pounds of fresh fish per day, that is in dories?

MR. HICKMAN: Two-thirds of it conducted, prosecuted in areas, as a result of geography, are restricted to six months operation maximum per year. On the South Coast of this Province we have an inshore fishery that has never been as viable as it could be. There is an area where we have real possibilities insofar as the inshore fishery is concerned. In the town of Lawn, over six to eight week period, the production from the inshore fishermen runs eight to ten million pounds. Now that is a lot of fish, but when you have that kind of production, Mr. Speaker, crowded into a six to eight week period, this does not yield the maximum return to those who are involved in the prosecution of the fishing, for the very simple reason that they cannot find, they are unable to find outlets for their production that comes in

MR. HICKMAN:

such huge amounts during such a restricted period.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the statement just made by the hon. member; six to eight weeks fishing in Lawn, I wonder if I could direct a question and ask him why it is only eight weeks, the fishery there, with fish so plenty?

MR. HICKMAN: Well there is a very good reason for it, Mr. Speaker. The Lawn fishermen have traditionally been trap fishermen and the trap fishery in Lawn lasts from six to eight weeks.

MR. ROBERTS: Today all over the Province the trap fishery is six to eight weeks, we do not tell the fish where to come in.

MR. MURPHY: I am trying to get the hon. member to explain it.

MR. HICKMAN: Right, and this is what I am about to explain.

MR. ROBERTS: I hope he gets better advice than he is getting from the -

MR. HICKMAN: Here is the unfortunate situation with respect to Lawn and the same situation prevails with respect to Red Harbour, I have no doubt, and I see my hon. friend nodding his head, I have no doubt that the same situation prevails up the Western Shore, in the district of Hermitage and in the districts of Burgeo and La Poile, that these trap fishermen, these fishermen are traditionally trap fishermen but they are also located in an area where the fishery could be prosecuted and prosecuted successfully twelve months of the year. For instance, off the port of Lawn there is a bank called Martin's Rock; it is a grey sole fishing bank. There are two or three other known good fishing grounds in the vicinity of Lawn and, fortunately for the people in that area and the fishermen in that area, they are not plagued by dragger operations, be it a foreign or Canadian, the draggers cannot get into that water to do the necessary fishing, but the fish is there.

Now where does planning come into it, Mr. Speaker? It comes into it in this way; for years and years the Lawn Co-operative Society then the Lawn Town Council and lately the Lawn Development Committee have been saying this port, and the same applies to Red Harbour and formerly to Port Elizabeth, these ports have real possibilities for an all year round

MR. HICKMAN:

production, if longliners were introduced to the South Coast of Newfoundland. The longliner fishing operation, on the South Coast of Newfoundland; for instance, in Fortune Bay there is one but they are faced with pretty heavy expenditure. They want boats of sufficient size and strength and design that will enable them to fish in the months of January and February and March, as they do in the Rose Blanche, Isle aux Morts area. They fish in a different type of boat, it is not really a longliner.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not a big job, it is not an industry that is going to provide great announcements or great glamour but many years ago, in the 50's, there was built in the town of Lawn a salt cod fish plant, which was subsequently taken over by Government when the salt cod fishery failed then given by Government, for a dollar a year, to the Lawn Co-operative Society. Mr. Aiden Maloney, when he was assistant Deputy Minister of Fisheries, tried to get something going there, worked out a formula which did not succeed, and the next thing we knew that plant was being used as an abattoir. Now they come back again and I think they have a very good case to make. The reason why they have a good case to make is because of the potential production in that area. I think the people of Red Harbour can make a good case for an all year round fishery. We know they want to do it.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have not even tried to fish all year round.

MR. HICKMAN: They certainly are in Lawn and I think it is significant that the residents of Port Elizabeth, who moved to Black Duck Cove in Burin, do fish in the winter, on trawlers. So obviously they have the inclination to fish, if they are given the opportunity. Now this does not involve the expenditure of millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure that it involves, right now, with the price of fish, the expenditure of any money on the part of Government. What it does demand and what it does need is a change of philosophy on the part of Government, that this is real industry, that these are real permanent jobs, that these are jobs that are resource based and that we are prepared to exert the same kind of effort in attracting, be they outsiders, or encouraging existing fish operators in 830

MR. HICKMAN:

Newfoundland in going into Red Harbour or Lawn or Francois or places on the Southern Shore or places in St. Mary's Bay, as we are in bringing Mr. Shaheen to Newfoundland.

MR. HICKMAN: These are the labour intensive industries. I know that everybody gets up and they talk about the fishery and they talk about Newfoundland sitting on the doorstep of the great fishing grounds of North America. That used to be true. I am not so sure that it is true any more, when you look at the declining catch. I do say that so long as it is there, Mr. Speaker, that this is where the real thrust must come in the development of our resource based industry. If the rest of it comes, fine. If we find uranium on the Burin Peninsula or in the Clarenville area, great, that is something that we did not anticipate before and we will take it as an extra plum. But, we do know that this resource is available, we do know that it is not being developed to the extent that it should be, and we do know that the concentration on it has been woefully lacking in the past.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems, when you talk about the fishery, is that we are talking about a field in which we have a divided jurisdiction. In fact, I do not know how divided it really is, because the Government of Canada seems to have far more jurisdiction and far more control and far more power of determination, as to the future of the fishery, than does that of any Province.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot turn our backs on the various statements that have been forthcoming from knowledgeable people in the fishing industry in Newfoundland and knowledgeable people in the Department of Fisheries in Ottawa. When you pick up the newspaper of September 12th, 1970, and you see headlined, "Fishery in state of collapse." and then it goes on to quote a statement or a speech made by Mr. Gus Etchegary, who was referred to on opening day, by the hon. the Premier, as one of the (and he is) one of the great fish producers, or knowledgeable fish producers in this Province.

When you look at the disaster, and it is a disaster, that has overtaken our offshore fishermen in the last few years, then it seems to me that we have to forget jurisdictional responsibilities and jurisdictional rights and use our best efforts and even better efforts, if we can find them, to try and bring to the attention of the Government of Canada that we will not tolerate inactivity and inaction, as we have seen it in the past. There is suddenly a big cry now about the seal fishery. Properly so!

There has been a cry every time a foreign dragger or a south coast dragger sticks its nose inside the twelve mile limit, and properly so, but where is the hue and cry emanating from here to Ottawa with respect to the real problem that is now facing and has overtaken the fishermen? Let me give this House just a few facts: The catch first; with respect to the inshore fishery. The catch and quantity of our inshore fishermen in Newfoundland has dropped roughly by half over the last ten to fifteen years. The average catch of the average small inshore fisherman in Newfoundland is about fifty percent of what it used to be in the mid-fifties.

At the same time, and this is the significance, Mr. Speaker, at the same time the total catch in the North West Atlantic, by member nations of the International Commission of the North Atlantic Fishery, increased from two million tons, in 1958, to four million tons, in 1968. The Soviet catch in this area increased from 117 thousand tons, in '58 to 741 thousand tons, in 1968.

The cod catch of the member nations increased from 880 thousand tons to 1,860,000 tons. On the other hand, in the period from 1963 to 1969, Newfoundland's total catch dropped from 450 million pounds to 300 million pounds, despite the fact that Newfoundland fishermen have been operating at their efficiency peak and are better equipped than they have ever been in the past.

The statistics, Mr. Speaker, in haddock, are frightening. In 1965, the total catch in the North West Atlantic was 249 thousand tons, of which the Russians took 129 thousand. The total catch in 1968, by all nations, was 97 thousand tons. In three years, from 249 thousand to 97 thousand tons. As far as Newfoundland fishermen are concerned, the haddock fishery is gone. The thing now is like the great auk on the funks, you read about it, we used to have a haddock fishery, gone! The decline in red fish, from 1958 to 1968, has been from 325 thousand tons to 182 thousand tons. Cod; we are told by the scientists that cod, in their opinion, has passed the sustainable yield.

You say, what has all this to do with this hon. House? Why should we even talk about it? Why should we talk about it? Because there is Federal nonsense, Mr. Speaker. Here we are, faced with the decline and the collapse of

a segment of our fishery, which employs 10,000 people on shore and off. The warning signals are up, the evidence is there, and what do we do about it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Go to another world.

MR. HICKMAN: We do not go to another world. We do not go to any other world at all. What we do do is, we tell the Government of Canada, we do not care what political party you belong to, we do not care how embarrassed you may be by this, the simple fact of the matter is that one of our resource industries is in real trouble, but you can save it. Not simply by putting in price support, not simply by giving subsidies to dragger operators, but you can do it by starting to assert your rights over the continental shelf, now. That you bring in controlled fishing areas. It is all very well to come back to the Government of Newfoundland, to the people of Newfoundland, and say, "Look we are negotiating, we have international treaties, we cannot offend the Portugese, we cannot offend the Russians, we cannot offend the Americans, we cannot offend anyone."

But, Mr. Speaker, let me direct this House's attention to the fact that negotiations through ICNA and other international organizations have been going on, without any real results, for the last ten to twelve years. I do not see the United States Government sitting back and saying, "If we cannot negotiate this on a friendly basis, you can clean out George's Bank or Brown's Bank to your heart's desire." They have evolved a continental shelf theory, and supposing they are one hundred percent right, supposing they are, and supposing the Government of Canada goes out and says, "Not that we are going to stop and preclude and say that you are not allowed on the Grand Banks, or you are not allowed on Pearl Banks, but we say you are not going to be allowed on certain sections of the Grand Banks or on Mizzen, or Quaero, or St. Pierre Bank during the spawning season." This is what they have now done in George's Bank and Brown's Bank, to try and bring back the haddock.

Regretfully, the scientists and the biologists, the marine biologists, are not too hopeful of success, but at least it is worth a try. Why cannot we, why do we not have that same thrust, why do we not have that same

determination to go to Ottawa, as we see emanating from Western Canadian Premiers when their wheat is in danger? When they are faced with their rivers being polluted, they do not care who they embarrass in Ottawa, they go to Ottawa and they will stay there and they will embarrass anyone in sight, but they bring back the results.

Mr. Speaker, even though we are not autonomous, insofar as the control of the fisheries are concerned, we are autonomous in the sense that we have the right to go to Ottawa and say, "You have the evidence, we have the evidence, the scientists have the evidence, and the facts speak for themselves. we want protection and we want it now." If you look at it from a purely selfish point of view, and maybe that is the only way to look at it. Only last night or the night before last, there was a gentleman, I cannot remember his name, from Memorial University, on the news media. He was expressing great concern over the decline in food production throughout the world. He started to refer (I do not know if he was trying simply to make a point, or if he was speaking statistically) but he started to talk about the starvation that would come upon this earth, in areas of affluence, before the turn of this century. In fact, I believe he talked about the eighties.

We have a great food product off our shores, and the demand is bound to increase. The anxiety to get their hands on this food product is increasing on the part of European nations and even the Japanese. But we do have some rights, you know. We had some off-shore rights prior to Confederation, which we never gave up to the Government of Canada when we joined. No offers nor no generous statements from the Prime Minister of Canada, about sharing off-shore mineral rights returns, can be treated as anything more than an attempt to take away from us certain vested interests that we have and that other Canadian Provinces do not have.

What I would like

Mr. Hickman.

I would like to see, in the processive plan, a planed, concentrated, bi-partisan assault on the Government of Ottawa and ask them now, not next year, now, to bring in restricted fishing areas on the Grand Banks, the Quearo Bank, Mizzen Bank, St. Pierre Bank, Green Bank and any other fishing banks we have off our coasts. The decline, for instance, in the Labrador fishery: The hon. minister told us last year that the Labrador fishery just about disappeared, and I guess that fact speaks for itself. But then he drew attention to a very significant fact; the Hamilton Banks, this time of the year and even earlier, which I am told is the spawning season for that part of the North Atlantic, are just scraped clean, primarily by the Russians in that area. Obviously, the statistics now show that, when you have uncontrolled and irresponsible offshore fishing, that that reflects itself in the production inshore. This year, I suspect, not as a result of any control on the part of any Government and not as a result of any international agreement, that we will see some improvements in the Labrador Fishery, this year. It has failed before. The hon. member is quite right. But I see one bright spark, but it is only a spark. This year some control was exerted over the Hamilton Banks, not by agreement but by Mother Nature. This year, fortunately, for the first time in many years, the foreign draggers could not get in there in January and February and commit their acts of wanton destruction. This is what they have been doing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, whatever emphasis is placed on the inshore fishery - as I said earlier, to be against emphasis on the inshore fishery would be about as difficult as being against motherhood. Whatever emphasis is placed on that, I do submit, should not be at the expense of the offshore fishermen of this Province. They are the great employers of all-year-around labour. They are the men who keep the plant workers occupied. They are the

Mr. Hickman

men who in January, February, March, when they are out on the Grand Banks, keep the shop keepers and the barbers and other service industries going, and the lawyers and everyone else. In fact not the lawyers so much on the south coast but the hon. Minister of Health, he looks forward, as I do, to an extension of these services, as I look forward to an extension of the circuit services to the south coast as well as to other parts of this Province. I would be more than happy to have the hon. minister as a partner in the shopping centre in Marystown, and coming events may very well cast a shadow before them.

Interruption (Inaudible).

The hon. member has not been involved in real estate practice since I was called to the bar in 1949, you know. I realize sincerity is not a word that commends itself to the other side of the House.

MR. NEARY: I challenge the hon. member to make a statement now and set a good example for his colleagues.

MR. HICKMAN: Will you keep the hon. minister - is there anywhere that you can keep the hon minister of mushrooms quiet?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sincere, did you hear that?

MR. NEARY: Not going to accept the challenge.

MR. HICKMAN: There is another..- why does not the hon. minister exert his influence to further the recommendations of the Kotaszek Commission?

MR. NEARY: Now is the chance. Now is the chance.

MR. HICKMAN: He is in Government. I am not.

Mr. Speaker, quite recently, last week, in fact we had on the south coast of this Province the Executive Vice-President of the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, Mr. Harry Flemming, a man of great qualifications. I am sure, from having heard the gentleman, that he is highly qualified, not in

Mr. Hickman.

public life. He told us when he was being introduced that he has been the Liberal candidate in Halifax (well he was not prepared to count) but he is not in public life, as such. He is a man of high qualifications as an economist and he is a thorough-going, loyal, native and resident of the Atlantic Provinces. He indicated and brought out, to those in attendance at that dinner at Grand Bank, certain suggestions and certain warnings and certain plans, which I believe are very applicable to the Government of this Province. He told us that unless the Newfoundland and Maritime Provinces are prepared to work in a much closer alliance - he did not go as far as to say that Newfoundland should become part of the political alliance with the other Maritime Province, as some people are now mooting and some people are now suggesting.

But what he did say was that we must have far closer co-operation between the four Atlantic Province than we have seen in the past. He said, if we do not work together as a safeguard against Federal commitments or we must work together as a safeguard, to preserve Federal commitments to promote economic development on the Eastern Sea Board. He made a very relevant statement: He said that, because of problems in Quebec, Ottawa no longer appears to regard the Atlantic Provinces as the primary problem area for Confederation. But in attempting to gain Federal assistance, priorities in the future, the east coast region will have more than Quebec to compete with. The economic aspirations of Western Canada are going to have to be given greater consideration. The possibilities of the Arctic are being recognized. To realize them, Ottawa must be the spearhead. The problems of the major cities are going to require even great attention by the Federal Government. The noises of Canadian nationalism are becoming stronger every day in Central Canada. Who knows whether the day may not be far off when we

Mr. Hickman

in the Atlantic Provinces will be denied the access we need to foreign capital to develop our resources.

Now that, Mr. Speaker, is one of the reasons, it is one of the disadvantages of being caught up in national policies. Everytime we pick up the paper now, we hear some great nationalist in Southern Ontario, who is overly influenced by what he sees on the American television. It gives him an inferiority complex. We hear of nationalists in Western Canada or in Quebec and they say; we have to keep Canada Canadian. We have to keep the Canadian resource industries in the hands of Canadians. We have to restrict the movement of American capital into the resource industries of this nation.

Now this may be very well for Ontario. I am not sure it is. I am not sure that even the people who live in the Empire of Ontario have been that generous with their investments in their own industrial development. But nothing could be more disastrous, for the Atlantic Provinces of Canada and in particular the Province of Newfoundland, than to allow or for this nationalism to become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who is familiar with the political history of Canada knows that, if you keep harping on it long enough, if the forces of nationalism continue to grow, that some day some political party will come along and say this is a pretty good plank to put in our platform, and they will get themselves elected. Then we will have the great lectures on nationalism again. There will be more Maritimers, more Newfoundlanders crucified under the guise of Canadian nationalism. It is not Canadian nationalism at all. Canadian nationalism, as I interpret it, is the philosophy that says; we have got a programme (you would almost call it a foundation programme) or we have got a nationalistic belief that says that the affluence

Mr. Hickman.

of Canada must be open to all parts of this country . That is good Canadian nationalism. But I will tell you what is not Canadian nationalism. I will tell you what is poor, petty, unadulterated provincialism; is when some gentleman stands in a public forum in Toronto or Vancouver or Quebec City or in the House of Commons or in the Parliaments of Quebec or Ontario and says; "We must keep Canadian industry Canadian." That is not nationalism. He calls it nationalism. It is nothing like it. That is pure unadulterated, selfish provincialism. Do not anyone ever think that the Atlantic Development Board and the Atlantic Development Grants ever had the blessings of the people of Upper Canada.

MR. HICKMAN: They were not against it. They say, oh, yes, you people down there in Eastern Canada and the Atlantic Provinces you should get some money. We are going to be generous to you. We are going to make Atlantic Development Board Grants available to you. The next day you would hear that same gentleman stand in the House of Commons or you would hear him stand in the House of Assembly in Ontario, or you would hear him talk to a Service Club in Hamilton. He would say, I am questioning the wisdom of the Diefenbaker Government, that Pearson Government. They are sending down money to the Atlantic Provinces, you know they are handing it out to them. They are given to this Atlantic Development Board and they say, "here, take it," you know. Our money! It is not businesslike. Now they always ask, "well, we would like to see the Eastern Canadians, they should get their share. We would like to see it, but they cannot get it on these bases." They try and nationalize it. They try and - what they try to do, Mr. Speaker, and what they have been doing for generations, they have been doing it since 1867, they use Canadian nationalism, as a crutch for their own Provincial economy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are not being unCanadian. We are not being petty Provincial politicians. We are not being a factor of division within this country. If we, as a united Atlantic area, lay our cards on the table, we have not got the political influence that we should have. If you put us all together, we do not do anything more than compare somewhat favourably with the number of members from Toronto and Montreal.

All of what this means, Mr. Speaker, that in any planning for the future of this Province, whilst we have our own peculiarities, and whilst we have our own special interest, and whilst we must demand, whoever may find themselves in public life, determine effort to develop our resources, one of the worst things we could possibly do, in this Province, is to turn our backs on our neighbouring provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. Because when you put all four of us together, and when an election

MR. HICKMAN: is approaching, and you talk to the Prime Minister of Canada, I am sure that he counts on his fingers the number of seats in Toronto alone, and then looks at the ones, all four of us have, here in the Atlantic Provinces.

I have not seen, in the planning for this Province, the kind of association, the kind of enthusiastic co-operation that we must have amongst the four Atlantic Provinces. I am not talking about political unity. I am not talking about the province of. (I do not know what you would call it) Nova-Brunswick-Scotia, I do not know what we would do with Prince Edward Island, because that is not realistic insofar as Newfoundland is concerned. I am convinced that it has real possibilities and real probabilities insofar as the three Atlantic Provinces are concerned. But, what I am suggesting is that we have got to have, we cannot stay away from Atlantic Premier's Conferences, We cannot have our officials stay away from conferences called by other Atlantic Provinces' Premiers. We cannot have this diversity of educational facilities that we now find in the Atlantic Provinces. You know, I once represented the hon. the Minister of Education at a Research Conference that was held at Memorial, three or four years ago, and it was an attempt to try and come up with a programme of research that would keep our universities abreast of what is going on in other Canadian universities. They had a formula there as to what the students population should be, to maintain a viable research centre, and the total student population to maintain that research centre could be found in the Atlantic Provinces, if you took all the universities and you counted even the very small parochial universities that you find in certain parts of New Brunswick and, I think, the Gaelic College in Cape Breton, you could do it.

But, what do we find when we get in there? Dalhousie was saying, the place for it is here. We are the largest university or the oldest university, or we have got the professional and the staff to implement this

MR. HICKMAN: and we have the Dunne Grants and the C.D. Howe Grants. You had the University of New Brunswick making similar claims and pointing with pride to the benevolence of Lord Beaverbrook. And you had our university saying; not likely. Not likely, you are not going to go outside of Newfoundland, if we are going to have it in Newfoundland. So what has happened? It is lost. It has not come to fruition.

The former Minister of Education in Nova Scotia told me that he tried for years to get an Atlantic Province Conference of officials on this very thing, but he was doomed before he started. Because everybody put their own selfish needs ahead of the research needs of the universities of the Atlantic Provinces. And who takes advantage of all of this? The people who take advantage of it, the institutions that take advantage of it and profit by it are the institutions of learning in Ontario and British Columbia. Then we will sit and lament and we rub our hands, and we are moved to tears when we talk about the exodus of young, educated Newfoundlanders, moving out of this Province.

The hon. the Minister of Labour, he knows, he has got a brother who is an outstanding professor, I presume he still is in Queen's.

MR. NEARY: Western, he has always been.

MR. HICKMAN: Western, and I had the very good fortune of meeting Professor Neary. This is the same thing that you hear all the time, What is the matter with the university institutions in the Atlantic Provinces? And I am sure the hon. the Minister of Education agrees with me. I have heard him espoused these doctrines that, unless we get unity of effort in research facilities, that the monies that are available from Ottawa will continue to pour into Upper Canada, will continue to pour into Simon Frazer and U.B.C. and we sit back and lament the fact that the professor, the Dr. Neary's and the Dr. Jones and the Dr. Smiths and the Dr. this and that have to leave this Province, that we have educated them up to the masters level and off they go somewhere else.

MR. HICKMAN: Now, we could stop this, Mr. Speaker. We can stop it by a bit of co-operation on the part of Governments in the Atlantic Provinces. We can stop it by close co-operation between the universities in these Provinces. We can stop it, if we start to get the message through our people, that we and Nova Scotians and New Brunswickers and Islanders that our hearts have to beat as one. That our aims are the same. That our problems are the same. And, if we want to have a voice in Ottawa, we are only going to do it and get it, if we go there as a united body. I am not the slightest bit concerned who the Premier of Nova Scotia is, or who the Premier of Prince Edward Island is, or New Brunswick or Newfoundland. I am concerned with the unity of purpose on the part of whatever administrations find themselves in power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just one other thing in the field of planning, which points up the desperate need and the sometimes unfortunate results that can occur when any province, in this anxiety to develop, obscures the necessity or disregard the necessity for planning. We have had changes -

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am sitting only two or three seats away from the member for Burin and I cannot hear him, and I would appreciate, if Your Honour would draw the attention of other members of the House that, if they want to conduct meetings they could go outside the confines of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, sit down you jack ass!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have already mentioned that if hon. members have to converse, they have to do it undertone, so it cannot interrupt the proceedings of the House. Would the hon. member please continue?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on another point of order, is the use of the term "jack ass" parliamentary?

MR. SPEAKER: The use of the term is not parliamentary.

MR. CROSBIE: So the hon. the Premier should withdraw the unparliamentary term, calling another member "jack ass."

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Perhaps, that is so. That is too much to expect.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Would the hon. the member for Burin
continue.

MR. BARBOUR: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, I suppose age and planning go hand in hand, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, last year we saw the change of administration in several
provinces of Canada, and two in the Atlantic Provinces.

MR. HICKMAN: New governments in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick. They said, before we can embark on a course of development, before we can embark on a course of industrial development or anything, we have to find out where we stand?

MR. CALLAHAN: The first thing they had to do was fire half of the civil servants

MR. HICKMAN: So this they did, and the Liberal Premier of Nova Scotia, Mr. Regan, had certain studies carried out and yesterday he made known in the reports, and the radio indicated that there was a shock of horror and contempt and ridicule of the previous administration. But, here is what he found, he said; in the case of the power contracts. Listen to this now, Mr. Speaker, in the case of the power contracts, guaranteed by the Province of Nova, between Nova Scotia Pulp and Provincial Power Commission, quote: "substantial losses would be incurred by the Commission, over a period of ten years," the Premier said in the speech Wednesday. "Cost projections indicate the loss to the Commission in 1971-72 Fiscal Year could exceed \$500,000, and in 1973 is expected to be in the vicinity of \$700,000 to \$800,000." Mr. Regan said; they could be expected that these losses would escalate, as fuel costs increase," because the former Government specifically refused to allow the Power Commission to put the normal fuel cost escalation clause in the agreement. A contract with Pyro Minerals, Limited for a ten year period, starting 1966, with estimated cost assignable to Industrial Estates, was based on indicated energy requirements and current fuel oil prices at the Thermal Plant, and it would cost the Province some \$1.8 million to this date."

Now, the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and P.E. I. and Manitoba are faced with the same desperate need for new industry as this Province. And sometimes, they may have to take very desperate steps in order to attract. But, I do suspect, Mr. Speaker, that in our planning we would be most unwise, if we did not profit from the mistakes of other administrations. I think Premier Regan espousing the doctrine of his Liberal Government, is correct when he expresses concern over the fact the previous administration did not make provision for escalation in the

MR. HICKMAN: cost of fuel and escalation in the cost of producing power. And I submit to this House that, that same philosophy, that same yardstick that same caution has to be used by the Liberal Government of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the Auditor General's Report, and he talks about, under subhead 1502 - payments, under the Industrial Incentive Act, of \$3 million for the cost of providing electrical power by the Newfoundland Commission to ERCO, an additional payment of \$145,490 apparently had not been budgeted. Then you can see the difficulties, experienced by Premier Regan, will be manifold in this Province in the future.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type, I cannot use cost benefit studies, because that is not a word that is accepted. I cannot use priority, because that ^{has} been derogated and subject to all sorts of ridicule all over the years. But, I do say, Mr. Speaker, that in our anxiety to attract industry and, if the Deputy Speaker was in the House, I would use his words that he made and wrote so forceably just two years ago. That, if we would put out the announcements before the fact and waited until after the industry was in hand, our powers of negotiation would improve a hundred percent and we would not then be in the clutches of people who know they have us, because of the political implications following the first announcement. In that my hearts beats in accord with the hon. the Deputy Speaker and the member from St. John's North.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, the hour is very close to 1:00 P.M. If the House so wishes, I will proceed until then, but I wish to adjourn the debate at that time, or if it is your wish, it could adjourn until after lunch.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member may continue. It is just five minutes to 1:00 P.M. Whatever the House wishes? If the House wishes, we can call it 1 P.M. and resume at 2:30 P.M.

I now call it 1:00 P.M. and I leave the Chair until 2:30 P.M. Is it 2:30 P.M. or 3:00 P.M. the wish of the House?

MR. CURTIS: Three o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Until 3:00 P.M.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 12

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

FRIDAY, APRIL 2, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumed at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I move that we now proceed to order 22 on the Order Paper of today, which is a motion THAT this House regrets the failure of The Speaker and Deputy Speaker to enforce The Standing Orders and Rules of the House, fairly and impartially. I move seconded by the Leader of the Opposition. The position, Mr. Speaker, is that this motion is on the Order Paper, the Standing Orders of our House state that in cases not covered by -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, this matter has been disposed of today and cannot be referred to again today.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, no motion similar to this was made today. This was discussed on the point of order this morning and I am now moving that we proceed to another order, as is permitted by the rules, and the reason for it is that the authorities, the Parliamentary authorities at Ottawa can confirm, Mr. Speaker, that on a motion such as this -

MR. SMALLWOOD: On a point of order, may I have a ruling from Your Honour? May I have a ruling from Your Honour please? May I have a ruling from Your Honour?

MR. CROSBIE: vote of censure in 1956.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the hon. member has stated his point of order, I presume. The situation is this, that the matter that the hon. member for St. John's West has referred to has been disposed of earlier in this sitting and, secondly, the hon. member now has the floor on the adjourned debate. He was speaking when we recessed at 1:00 o'clock. Now we are interrupting the proceedings to introduce another motion. Will the hon. member please continue his speech?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, under Standing Order 33. Standing Order 33 states that when a question is under debate no question is received unless to amend it, to postpone it to a day certain, for the previous question, for reading the Orders of the Day, for proceeding to

MR. CROSBIE:

another order, to adjourn the debate or for the adjournment of the House, and I have moved, as is permitted by the rules, to proceed to another order, namely order 22, because all Parliamentary precedent is that a motion of this nature must be dealt with before any further business is undertaken. This was what happened at Ottawa on June 4th, 1956, when Mr. George Drew, the Leader of the Opposition, moved a motion similar to this, with reference to the Speaker at Ottawa. That was called as the first business on June 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th, when it was eventually voted upon, and the authorities state that a motion such as this should be debated immediately, because the Speaker's position remains in doubt, if he occupies the Chair despite the possibility of a nonconfidence in the Speaker being passed by the House.

It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that this motion, that this is not a private member's motion, this is a motion that takes precedence, it is a privileged motion that should be dealt with by the House now, and I cannot see how the House can function properly unless this motion is dealt with that is now on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already said that, if you look upon this as a question of privilege, it was stated and a ruling was given on it this morning, now the hon. member for Fortune is in the process of making a speech, he had already started it before one o'clock, when this House recessed for lunch, and he is now in the midst of his speech. I therefore rule that he has the right to continue his speech now, uninterrupted.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I have given the ruling and there is only one thing that any hon. member can do about that.

MR. CROSBIE: In that case then, Mr. Speaker, I appeal the Speaker's ruling. I have no confidence -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: and I want this motion dealt with as it should be.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is that the ruling of the Speaker be sustained. Those in favour "Aye" contrary "Nay." I declare

MR. SPEAKER:

the motion lost.

DIVISION:

MR. SPEAKER: When the House is about to divide there will be silence, that is in the rules too.

Those in favour of the motion please rise: The hon. the Premier, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. the Minister of Highways, Mr. Noel, the hon. the Minister of Labrador Affairs, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Strickland, the hon. the Minister of Education, the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the hon. Minister of Community and Social Development, the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the hon. Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, Mr. Barbour, Dr. McGrath, Mr. Moores, Mr. Saunders, Mr. Mahoney, Mr. Wornell.

Those against the motion. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickey, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Earle, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Burgess.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I had hope that with the opening of the curtains today and the letting in of some sunshine that perhaps the atmosphere of this House might have thawed a little and that our normal good temper and friendship across the way would be returned. Unfortunately, I do not see the slightest chance of that, in fact there is no chance of it whatsoever.

This is very, very unfortunate for the people of Newfoundland because there is no danger of good feeling and good fellowship returning until there is an election to settle this matter once and for all. I could only hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that this type of bad feeling, which is now being generated by this House, would be hastily brought to a conclusion with a calling of a general election so that we could once and for all settle this matter. The conduct of this House, in this session, has been deplorable beyond any imagining. I could only wish that the television had been present for all sessions, to let the people of Newfoundland see what is going on in their House.

I do not know what it is, Mr. Speaker, some of us are getting a little older, some of us have been here a long time, a few of us have been

MR. EARLE:

here altogether too long and this spirit of irritability, bad temper is certainly growing as time passes. May that time be brought to a hasty conclusion very soon.

Mr. Speaker, to get on with the subject at hand, the motion of the hon. member for St. John's East is so all-embracing as it is, in effect, a motion of censure against the Government for what it has done, for what it has not done or for what it has failed to do properly over the years and this, of course, covers such a tremendous range of activities, mistakes, errors and omissions that it is almost impossible to know just where to start. My other friends on this side of the House, during the past few hours, have covered some of the subjects and I will attempt, this afternoon, to cover a few more.

I will just, if I may, Mr. Speaker, refer to a few things which were of recent happening, which have been highlighted in this House by questions asked by us, either verbally of the Ministers or on the Order Paper. In particular this morning I asked a question of the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, about whether proper information had been conveyed to the fishermen about the restrictions or regulations which were brought into effect to control the canning of fish, either for sale or personal use. Now I have had some experience, over the years, in canning, probably as much as anybody in the Province of Newfoundland. I recognized what the hon. Minister had said was very, very true indeed, that there needs to be regulation and control, but he did not answer my question. The question I asked was not whether there should be regulation of this nature or whether there should be control but whether the information had been conveyed to the fishermen, those who look^{to} these activities as a partial means of livelihood. We did not answer that question.

My reason for so asking was that I had had an approach from my district, only this morning, by telephone, where fishermen were now ready, and ready to go fishing in a certain area which took them ten miles from their homes, where they were about to start on their spring operations, and they were in a quandary, they were puzzled because they did not know about these

MR. EARLE:

regulations and they found that the preparations they have made were of no avail and that they were going to be hampered in what they normally undertook. But whether or not this hampering was good or otherwise, it should have been conveyed to the fishermen that these regulations were in effect.

It is no good for the Minister or anybody else to say that this appeared in the Gazette or some other publication, because 99.9 per-cent of the fishermen never see these publications and have no means of knowing what is going on.

So, in effect, what I am saying is that the Government's relationship with the fishermen of this Province and their contact with them somehow or other over the years has been eroded. They have lost contact with the people. The people, as the other side of the House so frequently boasts, are hand and glove with the Government because they understand the Government, but my contention is that the Government is now so far removed from the day to day every day needs of the people that the people just do not understand what is going on. This has been revealed all the way through this session and I suspect that it will continue to be revealed, as the session proceeds, in the silly types of answers that we get to our questions.

The complaint comes from the other side that if they merely say, "yes" or "no", we are not getting enough information, if they go into hours of debate we are complaining because they are saying too much. Now this is a childish and silly attitude to take. Actually people holding portfolios and Ministers of the Crown should be above that kind of childish sort of comment. What this House needs and what it wants and what it should insist on is not abrupt rude answers nor does it want verbose silly answers nor does it want all of the private members day taken up in extending answers so that the clock runs out so that we cannot get across our points at all. This is what has happened in the last few days. What should be done in this House as is done in all other democratic Houses across Canada is that the question period be limited. It is true there are something like 400 questions on the ^{Order} Paper at the present time, but probably

MR. EARLE:

this House will and should meet this year until August, and there will be ample time to answer not 400 questions but if necessary 4,000 questions and to give proper answers. There is no need for this kind of comedy, comic opera, if you like to call it, or pretense, with the real objective, of course, of hindering the proceedings of this House. This, I am afraid Mr. Speaker, has been what is responsible for the signs of bad temper which emanate from this side of the House.

We are absolutely sick and tired of being kicked around, just because we happen to be a minority over here. We represent a great number of people throughout this Province. We were put in this House to get for them the information, to do a job for them, and we expect the courtesy, from the other side of the House, of treating us as properly elected representatives of the people.

The type of answer to which I refer was conveyed in some of the remarks, particularly of the hon. the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation but it was even more dramatically illustrated in the statement he made, I think it was yesterday. Now out of that statement came questions, from this side of the House, on the recent controversy and public comment about the unfortunate children in the home for delinquent boys and girls, these homes. The Minister revealed, in his answer, that there was something like 468 breakouts had happened in the past five years. I asked the hon. Minister why in the past five years, if there have been that great number of breakouts, why it was only during the past six or eight months that publicity to these had been given at all. I served in the same portfolio as he did, I had the same number of these breakouts, the same number of problems but did I use these particular unfortunate children - and they are very unfortunate children and to be pitied, for personal

Mr. Earle.

publicity in the press? This is what was behind all of this trouble with these homes. The boys and girls in these homes were built up to expect publicity and notice. Unfortunately, the minister is responsible for using them to get his own name in the press, so that all of this sort of thing reacts very, very badly to what is - the minister who was in that department, namely myself is quite prepared to rest on his record.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. EARLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The public can judge that, as to what happened when I was Minister of Welfare. That is not for the minister to say. I think that the department was conducted as well as it ever had been conducted. There was no turmoil. There was no silly publicity on things which should not have been made public. There was no attempt on my part..

MR. NEARY: Capitalistic hypocrit.

MR. EARLE: Ah! hah! Capitalistic hypocrit. What is wrong with the hon. minister?

MR. NEARY: Fish merchant.

MR. EARLE: What is wrong with the hon. minister. I suppose he is a socialist or something. He calls himself a Liberal.

MR. CROSBIE: An opportunist.

MR. EARLE: So it is a socialist opportunist.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Opportunist!

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to keep your mind on what you are saying, but..

MR. NEARY: That is for sure, with that kind of trash.

MR. EARLE: Thank you. Thank you. It is being echoed from the other side. I appreciate the hon. minister's comments. They are most helpful.

Mr. Earle.

This particular minister, he has revealed it again now, his whole inward thinking is directed towards people who somehow or other have been fortunate in this life and have had some advantages. He thinks that they are all his enemies. We are not his enemies in anyway. We sympathize with him. We have terrific sympathy for his inability to grasp..

MR. NEARY: Only the classes who exploit the masses.

MR. EARLE: For his inability to grasp what this world really means. He has been talking baby talk since he has been elected. He continues to talk baby talk, so we cannot expect anything else better from him. This continued reference to lawyers' fees and all this sort of thing, the great champion of the people. He does not have to go very far to question lawyers. We are sitting all around him. If he is so anxious to know what money lawyers earn, why does he not ask some of these lawyers on the other side, just what they got in fees in recent years? What firms, from which they are associated, collected from the Government? When all these firms come into the country, under big corporations and so on, who gets the business? This House would be astounded, if it were revealed to them the law firms which lawyers on the other side have been connected with for years, have collected astounding fees. This hon. minister, whom I like referred to as the "little bull dog."

MR. NEARY: The hon. member is going to defend the lawyers.

MR. EARLE: He loves to try to pinpoint the fact that there are only lawyers on this side. Of course, all the lawyers on this side are only engaged in gouging high conveyance rates for land title and so on. It is so ridiculous. I do not think we need to go any further into that.

MR. CROSBIE: He is a little cracky.

MR. NEARY: There is mutton chaws again with his wit.

MR. EARLE: The hon. the Premier was kind enough to refer to a remark that

Mr. Earle.

I made during the great Development Conference in which I said that, because of the revelation of what I consider to be the forthcoming Budget Speech and estimates of this House, which had not been presented to this House, I said that I thought the ministers of the Government should resign. I still think that. Because since that Development Conference, and even building up to it, the Ministers of the Crown have used every possible opportunity they could to tell the public what they were going to do by way of expenditure in this coming financial year or 1971-1972. Now none of this, up to this time, has been disclosed in this House, in detail. And, if nothing else, the Government should have the courtesy, to the people's House, to make these announcements here in this House, not at an economic conference or so-called economic conference. The proper place for them is here, where they can be discussed, argued about, voted on, passed or not passed. But not, for political purposes, to come out publicly and tell the people, before it is being passed in this House, what they are going to do with the people's money. This is what I meant, where the Ministers of the Crown should resign, because they have been literally, this year, disclosing budget facts, since the turn of the year took place. Last year, when I rose to speak on a number of occasions, I was accused of breaking Cabinet secrecy. I never did that. I never approached anywhere near it. But I contend that what has been happening in this year of 1971 has been a disclosure of a far more closely guarded secret of Government, in all democratic governments, and that is the Budget Speech. This has been done for nothing but rank, partisan, political purposes, which tried to tell the people in advance and to fool the people into the feeling that great things are going to happen.

We had the usual sentimental eulogy the other day on the anniversary of Confederation. It is proper that this House should recognize that great anniversary and pay due tribute to it and all that it has meant to Newfoundland. But it is extremely sickening, after twenty-two years, to find the members of Government bending over backwards to pat themselves on the back for all that has happened in the last twenty-two years. It is so ridiculous,

Mr. Earle.

It is so infantile to make this sort of a statement. This Province has spent in the last twenty-two years, I would hazard a guess of upwards of \$2 billion. That is \$2,000 million. That is not chicken feed. That is a lot of money.

Now if we do not have something to show for the expenditure of \$2,000 million, there is something very much wrong. But all that this side of the House is contending, that the world is progressing. The world has progressed in the last twenty-two years and Newfoundland has progressed with it. A lot of these things, which have been done with that \$2,000 million, could have been done much better, if there had been a more democratic government operating in this Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Tory Government would have done better?

MR. EARLE: The Tory Government should hang its head in shame if it had not

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is including the years the hon. gentleman was in the Liberal Government?

MR. EARLE: Yes, including the years that the hon. gentleman was in the Liberal Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He includes himself in that indictment?

MR. EARLE: What is the favourite saying of the Premier?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman had his way, he would be over here now.

MR. EARLE: Burns there a light so - what is it? The vilest sinner may return. I just forget that quotation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What did the hon. gentleman, sinner, return to? Returned to the Tory Party.

MR. EARLE: The hon. gentleman ...

MR. SMALLWOOD: Returned to the Tory Party!

MR. EARLE: The hon. gentleman referred to, as the Premier well knows, was the only one, I think, in his experience, that before doing anything of which he knew the Premier would disapprove, and would not agree, had the courage and the guts to go before him and pass him in his resignation.

He did not go behind his back.

MR. EARLE: It was not accepted. But what happened after that is a matter for history.

MR. CROSBIE: Things changed a week later.

MR. EARLE: However, after having welcomed Sir Humphrey Gilbert in the House and gone on with a lot of this stuff, it is all so tiresome. We have heard it so long that I think it is high time that the House got down to business. I have, Mr. Speaker, in discussing the actions of Government and the proposals of Government and the planning of Government, discussed a little of each department, where I can. We are in a very peculiar position this year, a position which I do not think has happened in Newfoundland for many, many years, if at all, and that is that what is proposed to be done this year has already been revealed. A lot of it was revealed at the Economic Conference or the Development Conference. While I object to this, on the principle that I have already mentioned, that this is a revelation of what should be done in the budget and in the Budget Address, I take even greater exception to the fact that much of this was so politically slanted that it should never have been allowed to have been uttered in the conference which pretended to be a development and economic conference. To take the outstanding instance of that, I think I have already referred to this in the House. But the outstanding announcement out of that conference, which had to be retracted by the Minister of Education a few days afterwards, was to suggest a proposal that the Government were considering taking over the capital costs of all schools, the construction of all schools. This was to do away with the assessments and so on. This smelled so much of actual partisan politics...

MR. ROWE (F.W.): To a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, to a point of personal privilege. The statement the hon. gentleman has just made has been made three times here in this House. It was made last night by the hon. gentleman there, who offered us solutions to all the problems of Newfoundland and Canada in the space of a three hour talk.

Mr. Rowe (F.W.)

It was made by the hon. member for Burin earlier. At that time, I stood up and I gave documentary evidence as to what I said and showed and still can show that my second statement was merely to confirm what I had said at the beginning, nothing more or less.

Now my hon. friend has just said that I retracted what I said in the beginning. He is either wilfully misstating the facts or he does not know what he is talking about, one or the other. I am prepared again, Mr. Speaker, to document this. If my hon. friend would accept my word, I would be very happy. If he does not, I will be compelled to rise again on this matter and to present the actual words that I said and to ask Your Honour to rule on whether or not there was a retraction. To use the other gentleman's words, that I recanted on this. I did not recant. I did not retract. I merely tried to explain and did explain and restate what I had said at the beginning - no retraction, no recantation, merely a restatement of what I said. I am prepared to restate that, anytime here that the hon. gentleman makes a statement just as he just made - a statement which is either untrue (It is untrue. It may not be untrue for him. He may not know the difference) or he is either misstating the facts. He is either telling a lie or he does not know what he is talking about, one or the other.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I think I am as good a judge of the truth as the hon. minister on whether it was a retraction or a restatement or another statement or what it was. The point which I make is that it should never have been made in the first place, whether it had to be retraced or repeated or whatever it was. The damage was done the first moment that statement was mentioned, because it was done for a particularly unsavoury purpose. Passing on to a number of other failures of the Government, or in my opinion, matters on which they could have done better; There has been very little said, in this session of the House so far, about

Mr. Eadie.

the resettlement programme. I have been very close to this for a number of years, because the district which I represent, namely, Fortune Bay, was one of the earliest sections of the country where resettlement from settlement to settlement started. A lot of this in the early days was voluntary. The people, themselves, moved into other places, for very good reasons; to seek work and to go to better locations and so on. A number of settlements were vacated.

Now that was speeded up, accelerated, if you would like to call it, when the various programmes of the Government came into force. I have no quarrel with the Government on these programmes, because I think those who wanted to settle or resettle deserved all the help they could get. The only thing was that they did not get enough or sufficient. But this applied to those who wanted to resettle. We can literally say now, today, that nobody was forced into resettlement, which I suppose technically is true. But as the circumstances develop in these places, there was no other alternative for the people but to resettle. And cover it up as we may, or talk about it as we may, it left a great deal of heartache and hardship in people's hearts, especially some of the older people. The point, which I feel should be stressed at this time, was that where people of themselves decided to move or where they were helped to move, the job was not carried far enough. I have one outstanding example of it, in a little place called Garnish. Garnish is a fine town, with a fine group of people. They were joined by an equally fine group of people from a place called Point Rosie. I took my political life in my hands, in Point Rosie, and I had a political meeting which I think, if those were there, would go down in history. It has been probably the most hectic one that was held for many, many years. But at the time of the last election, in 1966, I went into Point Rosie. They were clamouring and had been clamouring ever since that had been a Liberal member down there, to have a road built for that settlement. It is eleven miles from Garnish.

Mr. Earle.

It was at the end of nowhere. It had no harbour and, as far as I could see, it had very little future. I told the people quite frankly that I thought that their children would be better off, if they decided to move somewhere else. But this did not satisfy them at various times that I went in there. They were very fond of their homes. They wanted to stay on.

The people wanted to stay on. They were fond of their homes. They wanted to remain there. The price of remaining there, of course, was a road to that settlement, about eleven miles, to bring them into the modern day and age. When the last election was called, I was offered \$25,000 to make a pretense at starting a road to that settlement. I would not accept it. I went into Point Rosie and held a public meeting and told them. I said that I would be only fooling you, if I started a road, because it would never be finished. Therefore, I am not going to recommend to Government that a road be started. Now, if you wish to stay here, that is your own business to stay here, but I suggest that, as long as I am your member, you may never get that road. Well the place went up. You can understand. But I can say this, Mr. Speaker, that the people from Point Rosie, who are now mainly living in Garnish, I say are the best friends that I had in Fortune Bay today. I respect them, and they respect me. I think we worked out a compromise, which is most satisfactory to all of them.

But this brings about the point at which I started, and that is to say that these people who were God fearing, fine people, who had fine clean homes, moved into Garnish and a plan was set up. They bought a nice little plot of land. Some of them bought houses around the place. They started to fix it up and move in. Now, it was nearly two years, in the process, before those people got properly settled away and some of them are not quite settled yet. Some of them are elderly people. Some of them are not capable of doing much more for themselves because they have reached the age, where they cannot.

April 2nd., 1971

Tape no. 204

Page 9

Mr. Earle.

I think that in a circumstance like that that the hard and fast rules of a resettlement programme should not have applied, or should not have been made to apply. There was just this little bit extra that needed to be done to see that

April 2 1971 Tape 205 page 1.

the people were made as comfortable in their homes as the homes from which they moved. But it was this little that was not done that made the people so annoyed and so terribly disappointed with the Government's action, and the fact that it took two years to do this only rubbed salt in the wounds. You can understand and I can sympathize with the people in a circumstance like that.

The Hon. Minister for Social Services and Rehabilitation is out of the Chamber. But I did want to refer to his department because I have had some experience with it. He made an announcement the other day, which I know will be accepted very favourably by a lot of people, where the Social Assistance rates to short-term recipients, that is the people who are temporarily without jobs and so on, will be increased. As my hon. friend, the member for St. John's West, pointed out, this is only replacing what was taken away from them years ago. But, I felt, in the limited experience I had in that Department, of only ten months, that what should have been done there, and I was working hard at it when I was transferred to another department. Instead of, in a sense almost - and this is putting it very very broadly I am afraid - instead of giving people an incentive to stay on welfare, the main objective of that department should be to try to help them to help themselves. I wanted a number of new people appointed, twenty-five I think it was at the time, to go around this country, spend some time in each of these settlements where there is a very high volume of welfare, to talk to them, and to try to help them to educate themselves into doing something to help themselves. This programme, to the best of my knowledge, was never carried out.

I have been in a lot of welfare homes, I have been in hundreds of them. I have talked to many, many of the people and I have come away with the impression that no matter how low a man is, how hard up he is, his main desire in life to become independent. He wishes above everything that he could get some

work and get something to do so that he could be independent and earn his own living. Now there are a few exceptions, there always are in the world, but the great majority of them want to help themselves.

In our welfare system, I feel this is where the present Government has fallen down quite badly on the job, because that part of it has not been stressed enough. There has not been enough attention to helping people to help themselves. I have seen virtually miracles take place in welfare. I will not name a settlement, but I know a settlement where, when I went there first there were at least, I would say, seventy per cent of the people on welfare. There was a particularly tough welfare officer in the district. He was a fellow who was a, he knew his business, he knew his job very well. He was not liked. But he carried out his duties officially and well and he got across to the people, after many rows, what he was trying to do.

The last year I went in that same settlement, on a midsummer day, there were a few women and children around, but no men. So I asked some of the women: "where were the men?" They said: "they are all on draggers and fishing and one thing and another." I said, "how are they getting on?" They said, "they are making good income!" I said; "you seem to have your homes fixed up a bit." "Oh yes, Sir, we are doing all right now." I said, "well, boy that is great." I said; "do you remember Mr. So-and-so who was here and the times you used to have with him and how you had despised him." I said, "he helped you did he not?" They said; "yes, they admitted he had helped them. He had helped them to re-establish themselves, and this is welfare as welfare should be, to help those who sometimes have not got the intelligence to help themselves, sometimes do not know how to go about it, and, of course, real help for those who are too sick to help themselves. This is the way in which the welfare department should be run. Of course, the Hon. Minister is not in the building, at present, or he is not in the Chamber. He is kind enough to tell me I did nothing in welfare. I would let the people of that place answer whether I did anything

for the welfare or whether I did anything for them. I think they would give him the answer, there would be no question about it.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other departments, which I feel has been sadly neglected, I always find it rather puzzling to know why. That is Tourism, in this Province. I think there seems to be an attitude in Newfoundland, among a great many people and sometimes a lot in Government circles, that our climate is so bad, our season is so short that you cannot really build up a Tourist Industry in Newfoundland. People are going to go elsewhere, where it is warmer and more comfortable and there are better accommodations and so on. Now, this may be caused by the fact that so many of our Cabinet Ministers themselves are very apt to go to warm climates and stay there for extended periods. Perhaps they have been south and they have been a little bit sunstruck, and they think the only places worth going to are places where there is lots of sunshine.

But over the years, before I was ever in Government, and while I was in Government, and since I have come to this side of the House, I have travelled a great deal around the world, in many, many places. Particularly to people who have had some experience in going to various places in the world, there comes a time when you are so fed up with the pushing and shoving and the gouging that you get when you move ten miles away from home, or preferably a thousand miles away from home, that you wonder why you ever spent the money to go there; because Tourism in so many places, has become, a case of, take every thing you can off the visitor, leave him completely drained out, and send him home the most unhappy person that ever came to your country.

Newfoundlanders, fortunately, are not like that, and the greatest asset we have here is the kindly, friendly attitude of the people. If we could draw into this Province a great many people - thousands of people, not necessarily young people who are looking for excitement and razzmatazz and all

that kind of stuff, and bongo drums and everything else - but if we could get people that want a nice holiday and a nice rest. In my experience there is no part of the world where they could better come. They enjoy the people. They enjoy the scenery and they can put up with the weather. But it is only up to us to provide for such people, to think of the people that we should attract here and to provide for them the sort of facilities they need.

Now, I remember very well, at the time I was Minister of Education, I took a trip across North America and in England, to try to discover what we could^{do} upgrade the eating places and the food service industry in this Province. I visited a great many of these cooking stores and places and I came back very, very enthusiastic about improving the catering services and so on in Newfoundland. Well, fortunately out of that, over the years, there has been some improvement, not nearly as much as there should be but there has been some. But, I will never forget the experience I had when I came back, all enthusiastic and all ready to go. I held a great meeting over in the College of Trades and Technology and I got all the food service people there, all that I could get to come into that thing, and feeling full of pep and enthusiasm I got them all together and I gave them what I thought was a good pep talk on beefing up the food service industry.

After I had finished what I hoped was a very sensible address, I asked if there were any questions. One fellow stood up in the back of the hall, I will never forget it, and he said: "Mr. Earle, after all your travels do not try to tell me how to cook chicken legs and chios, I can do the best in the world." "Well," I said; "my Heavens." "A guy that can only think chicken legs and chios" I said, "the easiest and the most common food in the world, and here we have some of the best natural products in life, in the whole world, and all you can get is a feed of chicken legs and chios, and believe me they are not always cooked the best way either."

But to attract people from the mainland on chicken legs and chips, you are crazy. You can go anywhere at all - this is where the direction of Tourism and the encouragement of Tourism should stop and give some thought, to the kind of thing that we can develop here. But, I do not know, there is a feeling of apathy or indifference, I do not think it is recognized as to what this can really be worth to the Province. I am quite sure that it has never been fully explored.

In speaking, as I do this afternoon Mr. Chairman, I have to go back over a number of experiences which I had when I was on the other side of the House, because they are all related to what is happening in the Province at present. I refer particularly to the deplorable situation which took place in the recent teachers' strike. That, in my opinion, should never have come about. It only resulted in bad feelings, animosity, and to some degree damage to our children's education. Now, I contend that that could have been avoided. I think the Government had five years to consider that and avoid it, because, about the time I left as Minister of Education, we had arranged a contract with the teachers, where they would get successive raises over a period of three years, and they were quite happy about it. But that three years was about to run out and nothing was thought up to replace it until it came to a crisis pitch. Then, when it came to a crisis pitch, the most deplorable thing happened, that the Government had to go out in large publicity to defend itself, which forced the teachers into the same position. You find a battle of words taking place in the press and on the radio, which, in my opinion, downgraded and diminished the regard for the teaching profession and it certainly downgraded and diminished any regard it had for the Government. This should never have taken place, that should have been done by educators within education and not get into a publicity binge, because that is what it was.

Referring to education, all this brings to mind the thing which my hon.

colleague, the member for Burin, mentioned this morning and I would like to re-emphasize it. In education we so often see that there is a passing of the buck. By that I mean that, where there is a sticky situation that the Government does not wish to live with, they very often say, well, this is the Churches responsibility, because, after all, the Churches own these buildings and so on. But no Government, I do not care who they are, can just shove off that responsibility, no matter what the legalities are or anything else, nor what the Terms of Union are. The Government owes the responsibility to the education of our children and, whatever happens in that scheme, it is not good enough to say that this is the Churches responsibility. The Government must participate in it, and if it means working it out with the Churches, that is the way they have to work it out, with the Churches. I always found, during the term that I was Minister of Education, that the Churches themselves were the most co-operative people that you could work with.

The Churches in Newfoundland have never been out to destroy education. They, throughout history, have fostered the education of children in this Province. They have been in the forefront of it. They are still anxious to play their part and to develop the education in this Province and they have put untold millions of dollars into doing that. They are anxious to see that the children should get the best possible education. They are not the ones that we need to fight with, but they are the ones that we need to understand and they to understand us. I am quite sure, with co-operation, with careful examination and careful study, the Churches and the Department of Education can develop a programme of education which will be what this Province needs.

Now, steps have been taken, last year or so, to bring that about and I am very happy. I congratulate the Hon. the Minister of Education for the part he played in it. I have some criticisms of my own, on the way it happened and the way it is functioning and so on, but that is a matter, perhaps one personal opinion

against another. But nevertheless, this, given a proper chance, should over the years work out. But, unfortunately, for us, things are going at such a pace in Newfoundland that we cannot afford to wait too long, we cannot afford to walk, we have to run in Education, particularly in the matter of school construction. I feel that there has been, with Government acquiescence, a great deal of money wasted in school construction. I was chairman of the largest school Board in St. John's for, I think it was six years, and it used to horrify me at that time, with the limited funds that we had at our disposal, some of the ideas that were promoted and fostered and built. But this is how it was or seemed to be. Now where the Government, in my opinion, fell down at that time, and is still falling down to some degree, although I believe this is in the process of being mended, is that a proper planning and construction division of the Department of Education should

MR. EARLE: be very, very active indeed. Because school boards, being as well meaning as they are, in many cases dedicated people, very often do not have at their disposal the necessary knowledge to do a truly efficient and good job when it comes to school construction. I feel that the Government have been altogether too slow and too delinquent in bringing about the necessary co-operation in that particular aspect of education.

Other things, when you speak of the shoving off responsibility, there is also this fact in Newfoundland today that we are divided people in a sense, that we are under Federal responsibility, we are under Provincial responsibility. And very often you see happening, that where something is in a grey area, one Government says it is the Federal responsibility and the other government says it is the Provincial responsibility. Consequently, nothing gets done. And, of course, the people who suffer are those people who are wanting something to be done and need something to be done, but cannot get it done because of this bureaucratic tangle.

Now an outstanding instance of that, here again it applies particularly to my part of Newfoundland, the part that I represent, is that in the Commission of Government days, there was a great deal of work done in these places by way of breakwaters and sea walls and protection from erosion by the sea and all this sort of stuff. There was really amazing public works done in that time, where all of the fishermen's premises and the houses and so on were protected by these walls, and these breakwaters and this sort of thing.

It has been a tremendous battle ever since I have been in politics to try to get somebody to admit responsibility for that. It is not a Provincial responsibility, it does not appear to be a Federal responsibility in many cases. The consequence is that these things have been allowed to deteriorate and disappear, in many cases at a grave hazard to the homes of the people and the fishing premises. Not only that, but, it downgrades a settlement to go into it and see public works of that nature so neglected. How can you expect people to have a pride in their settlement, if the very

870

MR. EARLE: things which they had, they are just allowed to rot away and disappear? This is the sort of thing, where endless numbers of things which need to be done, in the smaller places around this country. Where actually there is no excuse, if a proper means could be found, for men not to be working. Because, we could work for the next hundred years fixing up Newfoundland and then it would be far from finished.

Just before Christmas I went to a little place called Rencontre East. If you want to see a backward and neglected area of Newfoundland, I suggest sometime that you go up in Fortune Bay and go into Rencontre East.

MR. CALLAHAN: They need a new member.

MR. EARLE: The paths there are still old cow and goat paths. In spite of all the persuasion that I tried to put on Government over the years, virtually no road work at all, no fixing up of the settlement, and I have tried, as the hon. member knows he has tried in some cases to get things done and cannot get them done. And it always annoys me, and always did annoy me and still continues to annoy me that I go into one of these places and I ask for \$500 to do this little job, to get that fixed up. You cannot do it. If it is not in the estimates or the budget, it cannot provide that much. Then the next day you will hear an announcement of the millions and the billions and the triple millions and so on, all on certain things, my goodness gracious! when you come to think back upon it, you think of the parades that we are costing Newfoundland to celebrate, the opening of the Trans-Canada Highway, you think of Pearson's Peak out there, and what that little job cost.

This is just a figure that anybody can take out of the estimates and see. If I had what that cost for Rencontre East, there would be a model settlement in Rencontre East. But you cannot get it. This is only one of the hundreds of things which have taken place over the years, the money has been spent recklessly for show. For show in places, where it is most evident to the numerous people passing by and back and forth that this

MR. EARLE: is a great Government. That is all it is done for, it is not done really to help the people.

While speaking of the Trans-Canada Highway brings to mind another very troublesome feature this country presents. Here again, is something which the Provincial Government would immediately say; "it is none of our responsibility." You take the C.N.R. bus system, the C.N.R. buses go across this country, sometimes overcrowded to the point of near disaster, standing room only. Now I am not going to get into the argument as to whether buses or trains are preferable. Personally, I like the old train. I was sorry to see it go. It was a conveyance, which, I think, we all enjoyed in going back and forth. But, whether or not the modern day should replace that with buses, whether they carry passengers quicker or more efficiently, I am quite prepared to accept an argument on either side. But, what I am not prepared to see is our Newfoundland people treated like second-class citizens. I am not prepared to see them standing up in buses, from stop to stop and from stop to stop, and children caught out in snow storms and this sort of thing, and no facilities provided, no means of giving them warm milk or comfort of any sort, and all this kind of thing going on.

Now that is not good enough in Canada. It is not good enough in Newfoundland, which is a Province of Canada. And, if the C.N.R. has been given the franchise to provide the buses across this country, it should be stipulated that they give proper service and comfortable service. All emergencies accepted, I mean emergencies accepted are something that a transportation company should be prepared for. But, apparently, it has been quite evident that in the past two winters, that they have not prepared for it, and they have not offered the people the comfort that they should have, when they start out from their homes to travel across Newfoundland.

Well, all right, it is the C.N.R. responsibility, it is a Federal Government responsibility. But, who is to look after the people of Newfoundland? Who is to be the voice to speak for them? Is it the Provincial Government or is it the Federal Government, or is it the combination of both?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. FARLE: Most certainly. The silly six have been doing not too badly. I wish the hon. member would speak as much sense, as some of the silly six. I would like him to see -

MR. ROBERTS: I saw Mr. Lundrigan last night on television.

MR. EARLE: Perhaps, if he could look at Mr. Lundgrian's programme last night, that was not bad. That was not bad. It was not bad at all. Well, Mr. Lundrigan, he rather worries the Leader of the other party. In fact, he worries some fo the members too, because you know I travelled a great deal throughout the centre of Newfoundland and I am glad somebody brought up this subject. Mr. Lundrigan has quite an influence out there. He has an astounding amount of influence, as the members on the other side of the House will find out when the election comes. Somehow or other the people in that area like that young man. They like what he says. And they like it a lot more than some of the silly clap-traps they hear coming out of this Assembly. And only time will prove which one they are going to listen to.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: My hon. friend, who has just come in, did go pretty extensively into the fisheries this morning, but, he spent most of his time talking about the deep sea fisheries. Now the deep sea fisheries is as much concern of mine as the shore fisheries, because in the area that I represent a great many of the people did go on dragners and seiners and they get their livelihood that way. While I agree with my friend that the deep sea fishery needs a tremendous amount of attention, which it has not got from this Government, the inshore fishery is also something which is even being more badly neglected.

I am in a controversy at the present time over herring seiners operating in Fortune Bay. We have had this on the cards for a couple of years, We succeeded, after making a lot of noise, in getting these herring seiners barred from the east side of Fortune Bay, because they were going

MR. EARLE: right into the harbours and into the bays and where the shore fishermen set their nets. They were going in after dark and, under the cover of darkness, they were sweeping up gear, destroying the fishing grounds and just behaving as they saw fit. So fortunatley, with persuasion on the Federal Minister of Fisheries, we got that situation changed. So then, of course, immediately what happened, the herring seiners that were driven out of that part, were driven over to the west side of Fortune Bay, where they are now concentrating, all of the ones that used to go on the east side and those that used to go on the west side, so that the situation over there is even worse. The people are protesting, because what is happening, fishing being a fairly lucrative industry now for shore fishermen who work, there are a great many people getting more and more interested in trying to make their income from it. And in areas such as Belleoram, Pool's Cove, English Harbour West and that area, there is quite a revival of activity and interest in the inshore fishery. For instance, in Belleoram, not Belleoram, Pool's Cove, they recently put in a new bait depot and a fishing-holding unit. Quite a number of fishermen are making very good incomes. I heard of one chap the other day who got 1700 pounds in one haul, which was not bad. They are making \$60, \$80, \$100 on a trip. That is not bad money for them. They are doing extremely well. But, they are resentful and rightly resentful, when they go home and go to bed at night and they look out of their window and see these boats, many of them local boats, local herring seiners, right in on their doorsteps, sweeping back and forth over the grounds where they have to try and fish the next morning. What they are even more worried about is that the bait fish and the lobsters and all of this sort of thing will be so disturbed and so thrown up that that fishery will very quickly disappear. Now it is a battle because nobody wishes to deprive herring seiners of a means of livelihood or the men who work on these herring seiners, because they are entitled to a livelihood, as much as are the inshore fishermen. But, surely to heavens, there must be a compromise in all of this. There must be some way both can get full value from their fisheries. In herring, for instance,

MR. EARLE: by far the greatest value come from those who catch herring to be processed for food, whereas the herring seiners catch herring mainly to be processed for fish meal, which gives a much lower return

So in my way of thinking, I do not think that I am wrong, the fishermen who catch herring for food are those that should be given the greatest protection and should be the most protected of the fishermen. And it spreads around the far greater number and gives a far greater number an opportunity to make a decent livelihood. So I do not think, in this case, it is good enough for the Provincial Government or anybody else to say, well that is the Federal responsibility. All right, indeed it maybe a Federal responsibility, but we, particularly we who are members representing a district, have to represent our people. We have to try to help them protect their livelihood. We have to fight like all-get-out and we need the backing of the Provincial Government in a thing like this. Not just a statement; "Ha! Well, that is a Federal matter." It is not good enough in this day and age.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: I am sorry, I give the House permission, Mr. Speaker, I give the House full permission, if the hon. member will please subside into a nice doze, he looks much prettier with his eyes closed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am getting through with, much to the delight of my hon. friend, the Minister of Social Development, I had covered to some extent some of the weaknesses, I think, in education, in welfare, particularly, both of which departments I was associated with. Also, I think, perhaps some reference should be made to finance. This, of course, was the main reason why I passed in my resignation as a member of the Liberal Government.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it was not. Come on now.

MR. EARLE: All right. I will leave it to the members on the other side to be honest with themselves and to judge what really happened there. They

MR. EARLE: know better than anybody else in this House. They know very well indeed. And they are laughing to cover up their sins, because I could not credit that people who are respected, and frankly I respect many of them now, I have no vindictiveness or no ill-feelings towards them. but, I could not credit when the chips were down, that when the chips were down that some of those were so very, very courageous indeed. Oh, were they ever courageous. You can see the fellows who speak so frankly now, and those who stand up and orator in this Chamber. Boy, did they not have guts, when the chips were down and their master called the shot did they have guts? Oh, boy! The tale will be told some day, Mr. Speaker. But, anyhow. Oh, I got sidetracked from financial policy.

MR. WINSOR: I wonder if the hon. gentleman would permit a question?

MR EARLE: Yes, I would.

MR WINSOR: In relation to the Pool's Cove and Fortune Bay seiners, is the hon. member

MR. WINSOR:

cognizant of the fact that the seiners have been fishing a little too close to the shore there. We did make representation to the Federal authorities, they in turn ordered two patrol boats in the area and have done some patrolling and the last report that we had it seemed to be working out all right. However, apparently it is not satisfactory to one or two people in Pool's Cove and the thing is all over again now, but we have taken the action to notify the Federal authorities, They, in turn, have assured us that they are doing what they can to correct the situation.

MR. EARLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am glad that you did take it up, you did not say when but I took it up about six months ago. I wrote Mr. Davies the Federal Minister of Fisheries, I wrote his representative here, Mr. Bradley, and what you said was partially undertaken, But I do not think, and this is my own opinion from what I get from that section, that the surveillance and the protection is being sufficiently enforced. This is maybe a matter of opinion but certainly, from the comments that I am getting from that side of the bay at the present time, it would appear to be so.

I was talking about finances, when we got off the subject and, unfortunately or I suppose fortunately, in a way, to the average person in Newfoundland, who has been so indoctrinated and so filled up with talks of millions and millions and millions of dollars he does not very often stop to think that that is very much business of his. This is something which he is prepared to leave to Government and which he does not understand and is not prepared to worry too much about. As long as things are going along all right and he can get a job or his welfare cheque comes in on time, he is not too much worried about whether somebody on this side of the House raised the question of the public debt or something of that sort. They say, "Oh, that is only politics, nothing very much for us to worry about and let the boys fight it out back and forth, this will go on all right." That is the greatest fallacy in Newfoundland today and the people who should really be worried about it and the people who are worried about it, I know because I have sons and daughters of my own, are the

MR. EARLE:

young people, the young people who are looking for a future in this Province and they are worried about the inheritance that we are going to leave them.

Newfoundland is already the most expensive Province of Canada in which to live, our taxes are some of the highest and we are borrowing at such a rate that every indication is that the cost of living in this Province will just accelerate and go up and it will not be just pure inflation. We have a tremendous burden of debt to carry in this Province. We had such a burden of debt that, in comparison with other Provinces, this is frightening and frightening indeed. When you hear of tight money and these excuses which have been given, tight money is a catch phrase. It sounds good but what tight money really means is that we are having to pay altogether too much for our money. I was in Montreal about six weeks ago and a friend of mine, who only knows Newfoundland by name because he knows me, said to me, "I invested \$50,000, in Newfoundland bonds the other day." I said, "Great that is fine!" and I said, "Thank you very much indeed for supporting our Province. Why did you do it?" He said, "Because it is the best investment I can make." I said, "I am delighted to hear that and I hope you really feel that the finances of the Province are so secure that your money is quite safe." He said, "Well, I do not know too much about that but what I do know is that I am getting the best return, you are paying more for your money than anybody else does and I am getting a very, very good return indeed, so I am prepared to take a chance on that."

Now what that meant, in essence, was that Newfoundland has to pay a very high sum indeed for its money. It has to pay a very high figure and that is possibly why we can borrow so many, many millions, but there must come an end to this sort of thing. If this is carried on to the extent that it is accompanied by reckless spending, and we can see from last years budget or what is now beginning to be revealed in this House, that in spite of the assurances that were given to this House last year as to the borrowing programme of this Province, it would now seem to be very, very greatly exceeded. The latest bond procedures indicate that the borrowing last year

MR. EARLE:

may go from somewhere between \$125^{million} and \$135. million. That is a long, long way indeed, in fact it is in the \$50^{million} and \$60. million dollar bracket more than we were told was going to be borrowed. Now that was last year, which was not an election year, and this is an election year. We have had a great development conference, We can total up in our minds what is going to be spent or what is promised to be spent, emanating from that conference. So we are headed into a year, in my opinion, of extremely reckless borrowing, on top of which we have, in the next few years, to pay back very substantial borrowings, which were made in recent years, for which there is no sinking fund.

So not only are we going to embark on a frightening programme of borrowing but we are also caught in the vice of having to pay back or roll over tremendous borrowings which are now falling due. I hope that this Government will keep enough common sense on their shoulders to recognize the dangers and are not being carried away with election fever to the point that they will borrow us into extinction; and that could happen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is getting near the end of my time for this particular discussion, but I cannot close without some reference to the conduct of the House in the recent days and the way in which the Government has attempted to ride rough-shod over the Opposition. It may be all fun and games in the public's opinion. They may listen to this on the radio and see it in the newspaper and say: "Well, ah! well, that is politics, that is Joey again up to his tricks. He has put one over the Opposition. All good clean fun, what do they expect? Are they men or mice?" That is the sort of attitude you may get, but I think, at last, it is dawning on the people that that is not just so. It is not a case of games, this is a very, very serious business indeed, this House. We are elected here to do the business of the people, in the people's House, and we are to do it according to rule and the fact that the Government uses its huge majority to override us, to cut short our periods, when we want to discuss things, to enforce closure, something which has not happened since Confederation and then on private members' day, to use up all the time answering questions and not

MR. EARLE:

allow us to go on that night and talk. What is behind all this?

You hear the Premier on his "Conversations with the Premier" say; "Well, what is wrong with that bunch, they only work three hours a day anyhow." Is there anybody foolish enough in Newfoundland to believe that sort of trash? The man should be ashamed to make such statements, because this is so flagrantly false that an infant would know that it is incorrect. Any member on this side of the House, and there are only comparatively few of us, of necessity, if he is to think at all, he must do some homework. He must try to keep up with what is going on in the House and he must take home the documents and study them or come here and study them. He must try to prepare speeches. He must try to think about what he is going to say and he must try to understand what is in the bills etc. that the Government are slapping before this House. He must also be ready to counteract some of the foolish statements that come from the other side and he must also be prepared to obstruct foolishness.

MR. NEARY: Not obstructive. Constructive ideas possible -

MR. EARLE: He must make constructive statements and he must obstruct foolishness from the other side. This is part of the game here. So for any man to come out publically and say that a member on this side of the House only works three or four hours, is so ridiculous that I hope the public will relate all of his other statements to statements of that sort. If the public could only judge a person by the sort of foolish statements which are made, they would have no doubt whatsoever who is making a sensible statement and who is making a foolish one. Now this in itself is essence enough to condemn anybody but, unfortunately, what is happening? The hon. member for St. John's North, the Deputy Speaker, is now in the Chair (with deference to you, Sir). In your remarks, in the Address in Reply, a statement was made, I believe, I am subject to correction, that this Government had dispensed more information to the people, was more open and more communicative than any other government had ever been. I agree. I agree with you, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has probably given more publicity and made more statements than any other Government

MR. EARLE:

in probably Canada but statements are not necessarily facts. This is the great difference. I have heard programme after programme and statement after statement and I have said to myself; why did he stop there? Why did he not continue and give the full story? Because it was not advantageous to give the full story.

Anybody can talk, anybody can go so far, anybody can say so much, but what needs to be said sometimes in addition to that and is left unsaid is where the people are fooled, and this is what I regard as so deplorable and so outrageous. This game seems to be, if you cannot fool all of the people all the time, well try to fool most of the people most of the time.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is original.

MR. EARLE: That is very original, I admit but this seems to be the theory, try to fool most of the people most of the time and, if it is a-half truth or a shade of the truth it does not matter, just convey what needs to be conveyed or what we think needs to be conveyed. This is the information and the type of information that our people are getting. They are not getting the whole facts, the whole truth. We, here on this side of the House, can try as we like, through questioning or through debate or through anything else, to get the true facts, and when it comes to the point that this information is not of advantage to the other side, the debate stops or the answers stop or some other answer is given.

The conduct of the House in this particular session has been absolutely terrible. I suppose we can only say that it is an election year and a lot should be forgiven because it is an election year. I do not mind, for one. I have no ill feeling towards my friends on the other side. If they wish to interrupt me, make snide remarks, try to make me look foolish, that is their privilege, if they wish to do it.

MR. NEARY: We do not have to try very hard.

MR. EARLE: Well, I think that is quite true, coming from the hon. gentleman, because the reflection shining in his eyes must depict the intelligence of the super-brain. I mean, this shows up so much that I cannot possibly compete with it.

MR. NEARY: Champion of the fish merchants.

MR. EARLE: I cannot compete with it, Mr. Speaker, I would not dare try.
So let him speak on because speak on he must -

MR. NEARY: Look up in the gallery now, look up again now. You will get two columns tomorrow.

MR. EARLE: This up here I cannot see but those over there I think understand what I am saying, I hope they do.

MR. NEARY: The people down in Fortune Bay know what you are saying too.

MR. EARLE: Yes, indeed they do. The people down in Fortune Bay, fortunately understand me quite well, they understand me extremely well.

MR. NEARY: They can distinguish between the "haves" and the "have nots."

MR. EARLE: Oh, here we go again, the communist, here we go, the socialist and the communist. My goodness gracious can you not get off that, the old business - how many generations ago has this thing died? This is the tactic that got this Government elected, this. Let us thrust at the fish merchants.

MR. NEARY: Let us not do anything for the masses. Let us not do anything for the classes.

MR. CROSBIE: John Shaheen, John Doyle, they are the masses. Newfoundland Engineering, right in there with the masses.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Would the members of the House please be kind enough to allow the member to address the House?

MR. EARLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had intended to finish speaking but I must end up on this note because the hon. Minister was kind enough to remind me of it. Before I ever entered politics I was for thirty years in the fish business, in the salt fish business, and I travelled all over the markets trying to get the best price I could, both for myself and for the fishermen, the hon. Minister can believe that or not just as he wishes, but we were quite successful. As a matter of fact, if you were to compare the expenses of the organization which we ran at that time with the present

MR. EARLE:

expenses of the Salt Cod Fish Board, you would die of fright because this thing is going to cost the fishermen of Newfoundland far, far more than the old system ever cost them and I, so far, have not seen the results. But anyhow that is just a side light. What I was about to say is, those of you who remember the headlines in those days, and I was very much involved in it, remember that the fish merchants and the people who were trying to promote the fisheries in Newfoundland were constantly coming under abuse from the Premier. There would be headlines come out, "Premier kicks the fish merchants' teeth in" and this was where I remember on one occasion I was on the Board of Trade and we made quite a joke about this, because I was speaking as President of the Board of Trade and this particular headline had come out, "Premier kicks the fish merchants' teeth in". So, in the course of the evenings address I wished the Premier well and I said; "I would be delighted if the hon. gentleman, who knows so much about the fish business, would spend his forthcoming vacation in -" and I stopped and the headline in the Daily News the next morning was that Mr. Earle, President of the Board of Trade, tells the Premier to go to -. So this was quite an interesting little conflict at that time, but it had a serious side and I was really annoyed. I did not do that out of pure levity or any vindictiveness. What I did it for was this, that I had just come back from markets and trying to sell fish, we had a surplus of fish at that time which we were finding very, very difficult to sell, and I had been in Jamaica, I had been in Puerto Rico and Trinidad and I had been -

MR. EARLE: struggling for days and weeks to try and sell fish to these people. They were trying to beat us down on price and beat us down on price. Do you know what they used as their main ammunition when we went in to try to sell fish? They would haul out a copy of the "Evening Telegram" or the "Daily News", and they would show you a headline. "Premier condemns the fish merchants." Premier says this about the fish trade. "Premier says there is scandal there." This was going on all the time, and our very best customers in these markets would use this to try to get the prices down against the Newfoundland fishermen, and here we were supposedly having a Government that was trying to encourage the fishery.

I am glad the hon. minister reminded me of that, because these were hectic days and very exciting. Believe me, although the hon. minister, I cannot expect to believe, those of us who were in the fish business in those days did not know from one day's end or one week's end to the next whether we were going to survive financially. I ended up many a year with the red ink so deep on one side of the ledger that you wondered if you would ever recover.

I remember meeting a fisherman one day, an old fellow from Little Catalina. He was a cute fellow, he had a great sense of humor. I was getting into a tirade about this because we had had five successive years of losses, and I said, "I am prepared to show this gentleman our ledgers anytime if he wants to come and see them." This fellow who had a real sense of humor stood up and he said, "Ah yes, Mr. Earle, but think of the turn-over." The turn-over, of course, it did not matter whether you turned it over at loss or profit, to him you were handling large quantities of fish.

Mr. Speaker, this is where in the past twenty-two years the present Government has gone through a series of ruling from crisis to crisis, from dramatic incident to dramatic incident, from publicity for the sake of publicity, from patting themselves on the back for the sake of fooling the people into believing that they are the salvation of the country, I have nothing else to do with a resolution of this type than to support it. Because, it will clearly indicate to the people of this Province from the speeches that we have heard, and I hope will hear, that this present Government has been guilty

of the most disgraceful neglect.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to amend the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, because, included in it. here it is stated that this House lacks confidence in the Government by reason of failure of this Government to provide for the well being of its citizens, and to provide sound planning.

Now the reasons given by the previous speakers on this side of the House, who have supported this motion, have been more than adequate to describe a state of affairs that exist in this Province, that is pathetic to say the least.

AN HON. MEMBER: What do you know about it? You were only a baby in father's time.

MR. BURGESS: Well Mr. Speaker, I will never - I can never be accused of divulging Cabinet secrets, so I can in essence repeat conversations that I held with members of the ruling Government. I can remember the snide remarks that have been passed recently, and just this moment, about the fact that I am a youngster in this Province, the fact that I came from Ireland. I can remember the first time I ever had the occasion to sit down with some members of the Government, just shortly after being elected, and I was told, when I mentioned the fact that there was a possibility that, the fact that I was not a native born Newfoundland that it may react against me. I was told, "not at all, because, you are not a Newfoundlander by birth, you are a Newfoundlander by choice and that is the best type of Newfoundlander."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! hear!

MR. BURGESS: Believe you me, I feel much more of a Newfoundlander than the hon. gentleman with his snide remarks, because of the fact that I am representing the people that elected me honestly, which is more than I can say for the hon. Minister.

As I was saying Mr. Speaker, the previous speakers have more than adequately described their reasons for supporting a motion of this nature, more than adequately described. For myself, and for the people whom I represent, and on behalf of Labrador, the Labrador section of the Province, I say this:

We have been told, we have listened, particularly since this is election year, I have listened for a year, for two years now, of the descriptions, of members of the Government describing the great feats and the great deeds, and the great progress that they have brought to this Province. I say this; even though the Liberal Government has been in power for twenty-one or twenty-two years, and even though it was a great thing that Confederation was brought about, I say this; that after twenty years of this rule the ultimate fact remains, that we are a Province of Canada with the second lowest population and we have the highest per capita debt.

We have the highest unemployment ratio, we have the highest cost of living and the lowest per capita income. Now, if that is what you call the results of good administration I would hate to see what bad administration is.

On behalf of the area and the people whom I represent in Labrador West, how many times have I sat in this House and heard expressions coming from the Government about the gratitude that they deserve, about the hundreds and the literally thousands of miles of road that they have built in this Province. How many hundreds of millions of dollars have they spent on the building of these roads?

Mr. Speaker, any of those members here in this House who care to think back, particularly to this ludicrous page in the "Daily News," called politics '70 or '71, will remember an article from the Liberal propagandists, and it was obviously directed at some of my statements because I have been maintaining and contending that Labrador is being neglected. They were talking about the number of miles of road that have been built in Labrador. Now at that point I did not know exactly how many miles of road we did have built in Labrador, but in that column it was quoted how grateful the people of Labrador should have been because there were 202 miles of roads constructed after twenty years. Here you have a section of the Province that is three times the area of the island part of the Province, 202 miles of road - I say "big deal!" 202 miles of roads and I am sure that included in that was the road that is presently, or was anticipated, that was going to be built from Churchill Falls to Goose Bay and presently has a sixty or seventy mile section in the middle, that apparently will never be started on again.

Then we have this statement of the hon. the Premier when he held a meeting in Happy Valley sometime ago, when it was inferred that the people of Labrador West, because of their geographic location, and because of the fact that they wanted to be taken into the main stream of Canadian living, desired the building, or at least the attempt, or the negotiations between the Province of Quebec and the Province of Newfoundland for the purpose of building roads out of Labrador West, to the north shore of the St. Lawrence. We have that now famous statement, that if every man woman and child in Labrador petitioned to have a road, roads built in the Province of Quebec, that it would not come about.

Recently we witnessed the fact that a new mine, Mount Wright, discovered not too far from Labrador City in the Province of Quebec, and the Quebec Cartier Mining people, who own that mine, deciding that they are going to use Labrador City as a railhead in order to bring supplies from Seven Islands to Labrador City, and construct a road from Labrador City to the operation at Mount Wright, totally at their expense, totally at the expense of the company. What do we hear? We hear the announcement, on behalf of a company called Quebec Cartier Mining, located in the Province of Quebec, we hear the announcement being made by the Premier of the Province of Newfoundland: "Not one cent, not one cent of this Province's money going into that, towards the cost of that."

How many times have I stood up in this House of Assembly, from the first term that I was elected, from the very first, I have asked and beseeched this Government to intercede on our behalf with the Federal authorities, or the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to bring about an improvement in radio, t.v. and communications in general in Labrador? How many times have I made that request? How many times did my predecessor in this House of Assembly make that request? What do we see today? In Goose Bay they have television, by virtue of the courtesy of the American Airforce. In Labrador City we have television by the courtesy of the Iron Ore Company of Canada. We have two, at least one hour a week of Newfoundland orientated programming, one hour a week. The rest is typical CBC standard presentation.

That is identifying with a section of the Province. It is not that

the problem has not been made, been brought, to the attention of this Government. It was only last year that our radio programmes emanated from the island of Newfoundland, a part of the Province, prior to that for years we were getting all our radio from the other maritime Provinces. That is twenty years after confederation, and this is a section of the Province, particularly the Labrador West section of the Province, that is paying a huge percentage of all revenues that are accrued by this Province, by virtue of the fact that there are great mineral resources.

Sometime ago, Mr. Speaker, during the last session of the House, during the discussion on the estimates, I asked a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing - if there was any likelihood that his apartments would assist or participate in the building of homes in my district, Labrador West. Mr. Speaker, for anybody who is familiar with the district of Labrador West, it is common knowledge that the only people who can acquire homes in Labrador City and Wabush are direct employees of the Iron Ore Company of Canada, or the Wabush Mines.

There are secondary industries there, I would estimate a floating pool of people, approximately five to eight hundred people, who can never look forward to residing in a home in Labrador City, under the present set of circumstances, because, they work in secondary industries, related industries, but they do not work for the companies. The companies have control of the lands. The companies can only build "X" number of homes for their employees in the course of a year. It is not their responsibility to look after all of the secondary industry employees, and nobody can expect that it should be their responsibility.

We have heard great speeches from this House of Assembly chastising some Newfoundlander who go there and after a short period of time refuse to stay and come back. It is very difficult Mr. Speaker, to ask a man to reside there without a family.

MR. BURGESS: I have seen instances in recent months where individuals employed in these secondary industries have made application for relocation grants under the present provisions that provide these grants, and they have been told that at such time as they acquire permanent housing in the area, that their request for a relocation grant will be considered. And, if the present circumstances exist, that means that these people will never receive a relocation grant, because the most of them now, the ones that are fortunate enough to have accommodations, are residing either in trailers or apartments.

We look at this section of the Province, where we expect protection or to be drawn into the main stream of the Provincial way of life. And what do we see? For instance, sixty-seven cents for a gallon of gasoline, sixty-nine cents for a gallon of gasoline, I am told that it is not even that here. And here we are, here we are connected to the Mainland, where transportation if anything, is considerably less. Considerably less, so the cost to the consumer should be considerably less. But, no this is not the case. And in any event, what are gasoline taxes for? For the building and maintenances of roads; which we do not have. And, because of the nature of the environment, because of the excessively long winters, it would appear that the use of what is commonly called, a ski-doo now, is much more prevalent than it would be in other parts of the country. We are not even, despite the fact that a request have been made, we have to pay the normal cost for a gallon of gasoline, to operate these ski-doos, which are not allowed to use the roads anyway.

And recently, Mr. Speaker, of course reference having been made to the fact that this happens to be an Election Year, a month or a month and a-half ago, the residents of Wabush have received a promise that the Government will assist or finance the building of a stadium in Wabush, because they do not currently have one and they are using the facility that the Iron Ore Company of Canada provided in the Town of Labrador City, four miles away. And they received a promise that this year they will

MR. BURGESS: receive financial assistance from this Government. And these people well remember, well remember the same promises that were made in 1966. Maybe, not necessarily, to the people of Labrador West, but to the people of Labrador North, where the sod for the stadium was actually turned in the Election Year 1966, and to this date that is the only work that has been performed on the building of that stadium, is the turning of the sod.

In this House of Assembly, in the last session, I asked the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, as to when he considered his department or the Government would participate in the building of a Provincial park in the Duley Lake area in Labrador West. I was told that it would not be considered for at least another two years, that at least another two years would pass. But, who incidentally, enough seeing that this is an Election Year, it is a sheer coincidence. I look under this there as nothing else, we are told we are going to get it this year.

Is it coincidental that in 1966, in the year of the last election, is it, also, entirely coincidentally that a Department of Labrador Affairs was formed? A department that was suppose to look after and administer the problems of Labrador, and that has since degenerated to a sorry state, where all the employees in that department do, are basically politics for the ones who are directors, and the rest processed returns that the Government paid to Eastern Provincial Airways.

In 1966, also in the election, we were told that the people who resided in the Labrador part of the Province would receive a subsidy on Eastern Provincial Airways. And that subsidy has since been cut and changed and modified to such a state that it is really is no longer a subsidy.

During the great Development Conference, I am terribly sorry I did not ask for a fire engine during that conference, Because, I am sure I would have been able to drive it while I am down here in St. John's, instead of having to walk.

MR. BURGESS: I asked the Minister of Health, I expressed, I indicated to him the problem that we, the residents of Labrador West, are encountering with regard to doctors in the area. I am told, by people well qualified to know, that the national average, the national ratio across Canada is one doctor for every 900 people. I am also told that in the Province of Newfoundland there is one doctor for every 1500 people. In Labrador it is one doctor for every 3000 people, and in Labrador City there is one doctor for every 5000 people. Mr. Speaker, you might think that I am joking when I tell you that people in the last month, in the last two months, have called up for an appointment with their doctor, the doctor that they want to see, and they have been given an appointment six weeks hence.

MR. ROBERTS: (first part inaudible) why there are not more doctors?

Labrador City, as the hon. gentleman, is a so-called private practice area, which means that it should be a gold mine, instead of an iron mine, for a fellow in private practice, under Medicare. I wonder if he could give us an opinion as to what might be done?

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I respect the fact that the hon. minister is asking me this, to give him an answer to this problem. I say this with no degree of sarcasm, I do not happen to be the Minister of Health, I am told by the doctors in the area that they have tried to attract other doctors to that area.

MR. ROBERTS: So have the Iron Ore Company, to my personal knowledge.

MR. BURGESS: The Iron Ore Company have indicated to me that they have made various attempts, various efforts to attract people. But, does it mean, because of the failure of a doctor to induce his friend, or does it mean because of the failure of the company to attract competent professional people, that the Government sit back and say, no, I am sure that at least some avenues could be explored, at least some adverts. could be put either in newspapers around the rest of the country or even Ireland, for that matter.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the hon. gentleman, not just even Ireland, we have recruited a great number of doctors from Ireland over the years. Would the hon. gentleman - it is not an area where we have direct responsibility, and

MR. ROBERTS: it is not a so-called cottage hospital area. Would he, for example, wishes us to take the administration of the area under the Government directly, in which case it would be comparable, for example, to the Town of Bonavista, represented by the member for Bonavista South, and Bell Island, where we hire the doctors on salary. Not saying that we could attract them, but would he want that?

MR. BURGESS: No, Mr. Speaker, that is not what I am asking, but if I remember correctly the hon. minister did tell me, when I asked or when I informed him of the situation, during this Conference, the hon. minister did tell me or indicated to me that some form of study was being made relative to this problem. I have heard nothing about it. I do not know what has transpired. I do not know -

MR. ROBERTS: Have you asked me?

MR. BURGESS: I believe, I was of the understanding the hon. minister was going to consult or at least let me know what steps were being taken.

MR. ROBERTS: All right, even if that is so, is it not fair to point that out to the House?

MR. BURGESS: You just pointed it out yourself, and I agree with what you have said.

MR. ROBERTS: I did not mean to interrupt the hon. gentleman, I wanted to make a point. If we could lower the decibel tone, I think, it would achieve the same effect.

MR. BURGESS: Unfortunatley this radical, liberator, this radical Irishman is not capable of talking in any lower decibel.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I know the hon. gentleman is, because in private conversation, he is quite conversant. But, you know, the hon. gentleman has the right to speak as loudly as he wants.

MR. BURGESS: Well, the hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation was indicating that he was on the verge of going asleep with the last speaker, so I am making sure it will not happen again.

MR. ROBERTS: And so he was. So he was.

MR. NEARY: I can hear the hon. gentleman, I can assure you.

MR. ROBERTS: When I was on the seventh floor seeing an official, I heard the hon. gentleman.

MR. BURGESS: I hope my constituents in Labrador West can hear me as well then.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, perhaps, it is better to reply upon the press or the telephone and try not to shout to Labrador West.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, there are so many problems, there is one great problem in the district of Labrador North that has been brought to my attention and I am quite positive that it has been brought to the attention of the hon. member for that district, relative to the fact that, the main industry in that area, the main industry, practically the only industry happens to be the Armed Forces of the United States and the Armed Forces of this country of Canada. During the last years, there have been moves on the part of the American authorities to reduce or to phase out or cutback, to say the least their complement of people located in the Goose Bay area. And funny enough, it is amazing, absolutely amazing and I might add, confusing to the people of that district, wherein where it was indicated by the American authorities or by the Commander concerned or whoever was in a position to make these statements of a cutback. It seems that statements ^{are} in agreement with the fact that there is a cutback, but that more jobs are going to be provided, comes from this Government.

Now all kinds of people in the Labrador North area are totally dependent upon this military installation, and who have been employed for great numbers of years in that installation. There is no question, there is no way they can avoid, not having a basic feeling of insecurity as far as their future goes. Because they have witnessed a complete and utter and absolute phase out of similar installations in other parts of the Province, Argentia, Stephenville, Pepperrell, being examples. They have seen the pattern that these phase-outs took, the direction in which they went and they know basically that they are undergoing or going through essentially the same pattern and the same phase. One cannot help but understand as to why this basic feeling of insecurity, relative their future is inherent, or in their hearts or in their heads.

MR. BURGESS: And there is no doubt in my mind, I have said it myself, I have made the statement and I have heard various other members of this House of Assembly make the same statements that this Government should not leave a community totally dependent or at the mercy of a foreign Government and that they should try and inject their influence between the community and this foreign power, this former employer, in order that when and if a basically obsolete operation is phased out that a transition can be made in a smooth and fluent fashion, instead of hitting a panic button, which we have seen so many times relative to operations of this nature in the past.

MR. WINSOR: Would the hon. permit me to speak for a moment. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not want to mislead or misquote in this, but if he is referring to the statement made by Colonel Penrod a few days ago, he will surely notice that the statement said that there were forty-nine more people, more civilian employees employed there in 1969 than there were in 1968, or I think, it was 1970 than 1969, I am sorry.

I do not think it is the hon. member's intention to throw an atmosphere of despair and skepticism in the minds of the civilian workers at Goose Bay. This is no joke, and it is no time to try to make politics of such a situation. But, as we are informed by the American authorities,

Mr. Winsor.

There is no intention to phase out that base. I wish the hon. member would be fair in his comments on that.

MR. BURGESS: There have been no stated intentions on the part of the Government to phase out that base. I did not say this. What I did say was that one cannot help but understand the basic feeling of insecurity in the minds and in the hearts of the people who are in that situation, because they have seen similar installations going exactly in the same manner. At no time, relative to these other installations, was it ever said, point blank, at the start, by the American Government or by any other authority, that they were completely phasing out that operation - at no time.

MR. WINSOR: There is no indication of it phasing out, hey?

MR. BURGESS: Well the American Government are basically putting their cards on the table. The U. S. Consul, Mr. Richard Strowse, had announced a cutback of twenty-five per cent in the personnel at Goose Air Base.

Am I correct in that?

MR. WINSOR: Military personnel.

MR. BURGESS: Military personnel

MR. WINSOR: Right.

MR. BURGESS: As a result of that, there were some civilian employees whose jobs were eliminated.

MR. WINSOR: Yes, but..

MR. BURGESS: And a subsequent of reshuffling of individuals who were not, essentially, demoted. They just went down the scale. When their job was eliminated, they bumped into a job in another capacity.

MR. WINSOR: They were found other employment.

MR. BURGESS: They were found other employment, but what consideration has been given to the individual who was basically in one class and the only job that he can bump into is so far below that in utter despair or disgust he quits his employment completely?

MR. WINSOR: Do you know how many altogether?

MR. BURGESS: If the hon. member wishes, I can certainly get him the figures.

MR. WINSOR: We know about thirteen.

MR. BURGESS: Now, when I spoke about this Government injecting their influence between this foreign employer and the people of these communities, there was an attempt also, coincidentally, in 1966, prior to the last election, when these people were informed that a great new industry was being built in that area; mainly, the chip mill, relative to the operation at Stephenville. And we all know what happened, because of economic decisions, most likely, this decision was altered, whereby this chip mill did not go in the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area. Coincidentally, the election was over at that time.

MR. WINSOR: No such thing ever occurred.

MR. BURGESS: References have been made to the hon. member who represents, the hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs, relative to the facilities of the Goose Bay Airport, which, I do not doubt for one moment, is one of the best equipped air ports on the Eastern Seaboard, let alone Eastern Canada, on the Eastern Seaboard all the way down to Florida. Reference has been made - indications have been given to the Government and requests have been made as to why more promoting of these great facilities that happen to be there, why they cannot be utilized. Part of the argument that has been given, part of the Government's attitude has been that because of the fact that it is basically a military installation, that it would interfere with commercial air traffic. This has been part of the reasons given as to why this great facility is not being used to better effect, as far as commercial aviation is concerned. There was a study made, of which I have never heard the results, (I do not believe too many other people have) as to the feasibility of utilizing this facility, this up-to-date modern facility, for the use of commercial aviation and this was a feasibility that was carried out. I do not know what the results were and very few other people know what the results were.

Mr. Burgess.

But apparently, at least, on the surface, very little noise or very little selling, as far as these facilities are concerned, is being carried on. I know that the consensus of opinion of the people who are dependent upon this installation, in the Goose Bay-Happy Valley, they feel very strongly that at least a minimum standard should be applied to the Goose Bay Air Port. If the employment of 'X' number of civilians, if it falls below a certain minimum, the negotiations should be conducted between the Federal Department of Transport and the American Government, for the purposes of allowing the Goose Bay facility to be used for commercial aviation purposes, which in itself would generate a lot more industry in that area. I am told that the lease to the American Government comes up for renegotiations or renewal next year. This, I know, for a fact is what the majority of people in that area would like to see incorporated or at least discussed, so as they can understand, the understanding between these authorities. If they are not going to pay them completely, then at least they set a minimum standard; whereby, if the employment levels fall below that minimum, that commercial aviation on a greater scale, on a far greater scale than is currently being utilized, be allowed to be carried on in that area.

Also, at this Development Conference, Mr. Speaker, I indicated what you can only term as a thoroughly ludicrous situation that exists in Labrador West, whereby Newfoundland residents, of the Province of Newfoundland, are unable to board their Provincial Airline, E. P. A., to proceed to Montreal, despite the fact that the aircraft leaves there five days a week with as many as seventy or eighty empty seats aboard. The residents of this Province, of the Labrador West section of this Province, are not allowed to board that aircraft, despite the fact that they may be wait-listed on the other airline, Quebec Air for as high as three days. You have an empty

Mr. Burgess

aircraft leaving the area and, we Newfoundlanders are not allowed, because of the Department of Transport regulations, to get aboard that aircraft and proceed to Montreal.

Now if that is not the most ludicrous, ridiculous situation that anybody could possibly know about, then what is? A Provincial airline and the residents of the Province are not allowed to avail of this service, because of the fact that somewhere along the line a franchise has been given to Quebec Air, whose only route is between Montreal, Wabush, Shefferville and Churchill Falls. I have seen instances where people have been wait-listed for as many as three days and then to have the - I would like to look into their minds, when they see an aircraft leaving, proceeding to Montreal, where they want to go, with fifty empty seats and a rule that exists that forbids them to board that aircraft. Also the fact that, if I am in Montreal and I cannot board Quebec Air from Montreal and I desire to go to Wabush, I cannot board that Eastern Provincial Airways Aircraft that leaves Montreal and proceeds to Wabush and then on to Churchill Falls and thereby down to the Island. I cannot get aboard that aircraft! Now what kind of citizens are we that we are denied that right? I believe the hon. member has heard me speak about that on more than one occasion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out earlier on, the previous speakers to me adequately demonstrated, at least, to my mind, as to why they feel that a motion of this nature is in order, based on the performance of this Government. I have tried to the best of my ability, to represent the feelings of the people whom I represent to this hon. House. I do feel that since Labrador, since she is making that massive economic contribution to this Province, that three members to represent her in the House of Assembly is not enough. I had the audacity to say that during the last session of the House, I believe I was quite (small c) conservative, when I said that I felt that at least five or six members should represent Labrador in order for it to have a bigger effect on the political decisions that are made in this

Mr. Burgess.

House and, of course, it was pooh-pahed because it was not logical.

MR. WINSOR: We would have all five Liberals then. What are you going to do then?

MR. BURGESS: Then I went by sheer accident to a newspaper of 1966, where the Premier himself said that he foresaw the day, in the not too far distant future, when Labrador would be represented by no less than twelve members, based on our economic contribution. I feel very strongly that if Labrador were represented by twelve members in this House of Assembly, which would radically effect the political decisions of this House of Assembly, then Labrador would be further into the main stream of this Province than she is now.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot finish without making reference to the fact, as to the rumour abroad, although it perhaps cannot be called a rumour, because the statement was made by a very reputable Canadian businessman, Mr. Mulholland, when he indicated that a uranium refining plant was something that they had in mind in the future. And automatically, when a statement of this nature is made by somebody who is prominent and head of such a vast corporation as BRINCO, automatically, it makes some people stop and think. Maybe quite justifiably so. The hon. the Premier stated that, as far as he was concerned, the logical place for this uranium plant was Lake Melville. And maybe that is the most profound and logical statement that the hon. gentleman ever made. I am not saying it is not. But what I am saying is this: You are talking about \$1 billion operation. We all know the period of time and the effort it took the Premier to bring about the start of construction on Churchill Falls. We are talking about basically an operation, at least, of the same vast size as the Churchill Falls. We all know the many years. We have listened to it long enough or often enough, a struggle to bring about the start of

April 2nd., 1971

Tape no. 210

Page 6

Mr. Burgess:

this massive, great monument to his memory. I do say that.

MR. BURGESS: But it occurs to myself and a lot of other people that conceivably the same amount of time would elapse in order to bring about, at least to start our construction on the uranium plant. Statements have been made, by people far more knowledgeable than anybody in this House, relative to that plant, maybe, they were not as knowledgeable as BRINCO, but they are far more knowledgeable than anybody in this House, relative to this subject.

And now the people of Labrador North once again have been injected
AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BURGESS: Just wait and see, they have been injected with enthusiasm at least an attempt to inject them with enthusiasm. I know that in any political situation that some of those people are possibly expecting that uranium plant to be up and in operation before Christmas.

MR. WINSOR: Ah, you do not give the Labrador people much credit for much intelligence, brother.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, they will remember the Chip Mill. They will remember the turning of the sod on the arena. They will remember the Bills passed in this House to discuss Government Buildings in Labrador West and other areas. Bills that were literally passed in this House and nothing ever done about them. So the hon. gentleman is wrong when he says, I under-estimate them. Because they know better than I do. I am just representing their views in this House.

MR. WINSOR: Not Labrador North.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly endorse this motion -

MR. WINSOR: Shame on you!

MR. BURGESS: of non-confidence.

MR. WINSOR: Shame on you!

MR. BURGESS: Wholeheartedly endorse it, by reason of its wording, of the failure of this Government to provide for the well-being of its citizens. Because it would appear a lot of the citizens of this Province residing in the Labrador section, there are periods that they certainly

MR. BURGESS: do not feel like citizens. In the coastal areas, as referred to by the hon. recently elected member for St. John's, where he referred to the situation of roads being closed down in the Labrador South District, for weeks at a time, because of inadequacy of the snow clearing equipment. I would like to see that happen on the Trans-Canada Highway, await for weeks for a snow plough to come along and clear it. And why is that? Mr. Speaker is because of the fact that there are not enough votes in that area to influence the seating of this House. That is the only criterion.

MR. WINSOR: The hon. gentleman did not make much of an impression up there last year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Tories made even less on their great tour the other day. I have a complete account of that. It is one of the funniest things that ever happened to them.

MR. BURGESS: Yes, it will be extremely funny.

MR. CROSBIE: Going down hill up there.

MR. WINSOR: Carry on.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, in normal circumstances the older a person gets, the wiser he gets, but the later it gets in this House the more juvenile some members become.

MR. WINSOR: We will hear that now.

MR. BURGESS: Words of wisdom.

MR. WINSOR: That is very obvious, the last twenty minutes.

MR. BURGESS: Relative to that area of Labrador South, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I would like to see the same set of circumstances exist in the Island part of the Province whereby it takes that period of time to get snow clearing equipment operative for the benefit of the people who are paying the taxes. Also, Mr. Speaker, this House and a large number of people in this Province have been aware of the feelings of the people of Labrador West, particularly relative to the matter of school bus transportation.

MR. WINSOR: Ah! We figured he would get around to that one.

MR. BURGESS: which was brought up also at this great Development Conference. and it was brought up during meetings with representatives from the Department of Education. And the answer given by the hon. Minister of Education, the fact that school bus financial participation of this Government is not forthcoming to Labrador City and Wabush and other areas of Labrador. The reason that no financial participation comes from this Government is because of the fact that we have got basically compacted towns and very few children reside less than one mile from the school.

MR. ROBERTS: More than one mile, further away.

MR. BURGESS: More than one mile from the school. I believe, the hon. gentleman must have been the smartest kid in the second grade, for four years.

MR. ROBERTS: That is true, but at least I got out of the second grade.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will have to remind the galleries once more that they will take no part in demonstrating, in the gallery itself. They are here to see, but not to be heard. Now, I do not want to have to call upon, to have the galleries cleared. Still remain absolutely quiet.

MR. BURGESS: I do not need the hon. gentleman to tell me about parliamentary procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. gentleman proceed please.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman ever gets an idea in his head, he better get rid of it quick, because it will die in solitary confinement.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Will the hon. member continue.

MR. BURGESS: The reason why we do not have a peaceful country in Northern Ireland is that people with the mentality of the hon. minister of Rehabilitation there.

Mr. Speaker, the first time I have seen a prune with hair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I spy strangers.

MR. SPEAKER: I have warned the visitors in the galleries that if they participate or took part in any noise or disturbance, whatsoever, we will have to clear, the galleries to be vacated. I have no other course left open.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a drastic thing to clear the galleries, but it is more drastic to have the galleries taking part in the debate. That is worse than clearing the galleries. I suggest that Your Honour make a stern ruling that, if it happens again, now or any other day for the remainder of the session, the galleries be cleared instantly. We can laugh. We can joke. We can talk. We can row. We can do almost anything on this floor, but, the public are not allowed to take part in the proceedings of this House. That is the Law. It is not allowed.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, just a word or so on that. Do not the rules say that once somebody says, "I spy a stranger in this House," it is the duty of the Speaker to clear the House or not?"

MR. SPEAKER: He may take it upon himself to do so, if it is necessary. I would take it as the very last step to have the galleries cleared: regardless of what it says, what the procedure is. It is a drastic step to have the galleries cleared. I think, myself, possibly some of the people in the gallery are not quite conscious of the fact that they have to be seen and not heard. In spite of the devastating wit that they have to listen to, they still have to be quiet and to take no part in the demonstration. May we consider the matter closed for now. But, if there is any other attempt by any person in the galleries, just one person, we will have to ask to have the galleries cleared.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the point raised by the hon. the Premier. It has to be pointed out that this issue is never raised except when there is a laugh from the gallery in connection with something said by a member of the Opposition. That should be pointed out.

MR. SPEAKER: May we continue with the debate, without having continuous and continual debate. The hon. member for Labrador West.

Order please! The hon. member for Labrador West continue, and I stress that there be no further interruptions.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Education, based on the provision of the current Education Act with respect to school bus transportation, informed myself, through his representative and by wire, telegram and verbally to various people of my constituency, that there was no method by which he could amend or modify or get around the provisions of the Act, as it currently existed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully imply that on more than one occasion laws that have been actual statutes, laws that have been on the books of this Province have been circumvented or changed or modified when it suited the people involved to change and to modify them. Now, Mr. Speaker, think of the concern in the mind of a parent, whose child lives literally seven-eighths or nine-tenths of a mile from that school. I know whereby I speak that even in some instances a child lives more than a mile, it maybe only one-eighth more of a mile from the school, but they are denied transportation, school bus transportation by virtue of the fact that this law is allowed to remain, as is on the statutes, in the Education Act.

Think, Mr. Speaker, look into the minds of the parents. The parent who lets their child leave the house, and this winter particularly, Mr. Speaker, I use it as an example, we have had a particularly cold winter in Labrador West this year, particularly cold winter. And for as much as two weeks the temperature has at no time gone above thirty degrees below zero and in lots of cases went down as low as fifty degrees below zero.

Now with the greater knowledge from people involved in forecasting weather, a weatherman in general, with a greater knowledge that we have today, they can provide you with charts that indicate the actual temperatures, the degrees of temperature, and it can also define the actual temperatures that exist, based on wind conditions and climatic conditions, and on occasions, Mr. Speaker, it has been required of some children, in that area to walk to school in degrees as low as a one hundred below zero. I am not exaggerating, as low as one hundred below zero. And, when you stop and

MR. BURGESS: think about it, Mr. Speaker, the fact that walking to school in the morning, walking home for lunch, walking back after school, walking home when school is finished, that is a total of four miles a day.

Adults in that area, Mr. Speaker, adults will not walk two hundred yard, a quarter of a mile to the shopping centre, if there automobiles are not operative. They will not walk in temperatures such as this, I do not see and the people certainly do not see why a child should be compelled to walk four miles in temperatures of that nature.

I beg and I request of this Government, so many answers that I have been given have been that we will not consider it, because we will be required to provide the same thing to other areas of the Province. And we would not dream of doing something like that other Canadian provinces, with similar conditions, are not providing for their people. Thereby saying that, if there are nine areas in nine other provinces of a similar nature, does it necessarily mean that nine wrongs make a right? Let us be the leader in this field.

Labrador is unique in the sense that it enjoys different climatic circumstances than those ^{of} the Island part of the Province. It is unique in that sense. If it is unique in that sense, unique solutions have to be provided for its inhabitants and for the welfare of the people there. And I ask this Government to, for goodness sake, consider, consider that particular problem, because nothing is closer to the hearts and the minds of parents than their children.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one question I would like to ask of the Minister of Highways, I am quite sure he will not be in a position to give me an answer, because I am quite sure he will have to look it up. If he could tell me, for my benefit and the benefit of the people of Labrador, as to the total cost of all road construction in Labrador so far? The amounts of money spent by this Government over the period of time since Confederation?

Mr. Speaker, I am inquiring on behalf of

some of the younger residents, or the younger people in my district. In the fact that the Election Act calls for a minimum age of nineteen in order that an individual will be allowed to vote. I know the circumstances under which if, an individual reaches the age of nineteen between the time the election posters came out and the time of the election itself, I know that they can be sworn in at the polling booth, but clarification is necessary, I feel so, because of the fact that I have been asked the question so often, "what happens if I come of age after the time limit set out on the posting, the actual Electoral list?" It is just a matter of clarifying for the people in that age group.

Mr. Speaker, with the best of my ability I have tried to demonstrate my reasons for being in support of this motion. I feel sincere in what I have said relative to the area that I represent. I would like to wholeheartedly endorse what is on this paper, the amendment as it is presented to this House.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member concludes his speech, I wonder if I can be permitted to direct a question. We have heard during particularly this session of the House, serious pollution in Labrador West as the result of the tailings from this mine? The hon. member could advise us on this?

MR. BURGESS: Well, there is no question about it, it would be evident to anybody who has had occasion to fly over what is commonly known as Big Wabush Lake, that is approximately forty miles long. I am told that it is possibly the main artery as far as lakes and waters are concerned in Labrador and one has to fly either on Eastern Provincial Airways or Quebec Air, on its way to Schefferville and look down and see the extent or the nature of what this tailings is actually doing to the water. I do know for a fact, literally it has discoloured the water, it has made it very muddy in appearance. I have, based on request from my constituents, I have been asked to approach the companies on this matter. I have done so on numerous occasions. I have been assured by them that there are no actual biological effects to the fish in the water or the - this is what they have told me - I have never had an

independent analysis by somebody who is qualified to make an analysis on this thing, but I do know certainly that pollution, in appearance alone, it looks great, certainly great, and I would say that anybody who has any curiosity about that thing should institute an actual study as to what this tailing is actually doing to this Big Wabush Lake. So, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this amendment.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister recommend that the study be done, should not the Government undertake such a study, the Minister of Mines, Agriculture & Resources?

MR. BURGESS: Would the Minister of Mines, Agriculture & Resources accept the recommendation to, or has it been pointed out to him?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would permit me to ask him a question perhaps I can indicate what can be done? Mr. Speaker I wonder if the hon. gentleman is aware that for the past approximately eighteen months, we have been dealing with the Iron Ore Company of Canada, in respect of their tailings disposal, and working with them co-operatively, with advice from the University, the Federal Department of Fisheries and Forestry, and, of course, our own departmental people? On the design of the pilot plant to treat the tailings from the I.O.C. operations, indeed the hon. gentleman must know the plant has been built and is shortly to go into operation. This is a plant which would recover, it is estimated, up to ninety per cent of the actual iron content of the tailing. It would do, Mr. Speaker, by a chemical process, so that there would be chemical quotations. The important part of the study that has been done up to now has been to determine absolutely the chemical residue would not in fact be dangerous in any way to the water body. But the plant has been designed and built, on the basis of very careful study, it is to go into operation before very long and it will result in the extraction of, as I said, about ninety per cent of the iron content of the tailings. That is one thing.

The second thing, the hon. gentleman is quite right what you have in fact

is a condition, not of pollution meaning the injection into the water bodies of harmful elements, foreign elements, but rather a problem of floating particles of dust in effect in the water with a somewhat higher, not very much higher I am told, a somewhat higher iron content than the normal ground through which the water is running anyway. Really, what you have is a, as you would have with the stirring up of silt, on the bottom of a river, you have a turbidity problem, you do not have a biological problem or a problem really of chemical reaction or anything of that nature. It could over a very long time, I am told, become a problem in respect of vegetation in the waters and possibly over a very, very long time in respect of fish. But at this point, other than discoloration which appears to mean that something perhaps serious is occurring, there is really no serious effect. This does not apply to the Wabush Mine situation where the tailings are impounded and are not going into the river system.

I was supposed to make it a question. I should say, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman aware of that?

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, just a couple of points I would like to cover. Not too much to be said after having heard the number of speeches today on this subject. I would like to say at the outset Sir, that I feel obligated to support the motion, ^{of} my hon. colleague, not because I sit on this side, Mr. Speaker, not because I am a Conservative but because I am a Newfoundlander, with some concern for his Province and its people. I would have to support a motion of non-confidence in this Government, Mr. Speaker, as long as the rate of unemployment remains as high as it is, without any definite plan to solve this problem. We are told that the coming year is going to be one of the best, if not the best, yet. Sir, it will have to be, to even pick up the slack, as it were. I would suggest that, if all the jobs that we are told about becomes a reality, there will still be a great number of our

people unemployed, possibly more than ever before. As long, Mr. Speaker, as this Government continues to support large companies, and tend to ignore the smaller ones, one can hardly support a policy such as this. I refer specifically to the fisheries. On numerous occasions I have cited this problem, evident in my own district, I am sure if that is the case it must be evident in other districts in the Province. Small loans are requested, the Government apparently - I say apparently - are just not interested in helping those small fish plant operators.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is sincerely interested in providing jobs certainly, they must acknowledge that one of their responsibilities would be to ensure the people already in jobs to continue to hold those jobs. Or where small companies are concerned, who are interested in expanding their businesses, are given the opportunity to do so by way of Government loans.

Mr. Speaker, another matter is the welfare situation which exists in the Province: I was rather surprised today when the Minister responsible more or less told my colleague, hon. member for Fortune Bay, while he was in that Department he did nothing. Mr. Speaker, nothing can be further from the truth as the present Minister is well aware. I would say to him that my colleague, the hon. member for Fortune Bay, was not in that Department long enough, after the suggestions that were made from this side of the House, to implement them. Members of the Opposition are continuously told that they do nothing but obstruct. They offer no suggestions. Mr. Speaker, I will not go into all of the suggestions that have been made just in this Department alone. I will save that for another opportunity.

I will just cite a couple that appeared in a ministerial statement yesterday. It looks as though the Department is becoming revolutionized. New ideas. Mr. Speaker, I should say at this point it is wonderful to see that those changes are being made, but for the records Sir, let us acknowledge where they came from. They came from this side of the House. They came from

members of the Opposition. God Knows it took Government long enough to see the value and to implement them. I recall for my own part, my maiden speech in this House pointing out the need for something to be done to encourage people in receipt of welfare to look for employment, to do away with this attitude that the Department had, and still has, I might add, up until yesterday, of cutting welfare cheques when a person shows the initiative to get out and earn some money. He shows the initiative to get out and help his family, we are finally seeing something done in this connection. I could go on Mr. Speaker, but the hour is getting late and there are other people who wish to speak.

Before I finish I, feel obligated to say something in connection with the kind of trash that has been thrown around in this House in recent days. A few days ago, as Your Honour knows, I was forced to discontinue my speech. Today, Sir, we find that the people in the gallery were almost told to leave. Why? Mr. Speaker, I will tell you why. Because of the fun that is poked across from the other side. Now it would be most unfair for me to just leave that statement as is, I do not intend to, I intend to point out

MR. HICKEY: Something. One of the greatest offenders of this is the hon. the Minister for Social Services and Rehabilitation, who by the way, when he is speaking very, very often does not even permit questions, and there are others. All of the Government side cannot be blamed for it. Why do people laugh in the galleries? Because there is so much fun and in some instances so much dirt, dirty digs, thrown across from that side of the House. Opposition members have no choice but reply, they have no choice but answer. I challenge any member on the other side to point out one instance where an Opposition member took the initiative to sling some mud across. I would like to know, I would like to know who it is, and I would like to know who started it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fact of life. Anyone who visits those galleries know this to be true. It is impossible for an Opposition member to rise to make a speech without being subjected to insults and all sorts of things. I say it is about time, Sir, that something was done about it. It is about time that the situation was corrected. There is supposed to be a Select Committee responsible for revising the rules of the House and improving upon them, and I would suggest, Sir, that that committee should get to work forthwith. If there is going to be any disciplining done around here, I would also suggest. Mr. Speaker, that it start on that side, with regards to the people responsible. If there are any on this side, then certainly, let those people be governed accordingly.

For my own part, Sir, I have no intention of standing here and taking some of the mud that is being thrown at me, and if I have to, in replying, have to forfeit time, if I have to be ejected, if I have to have anything else done with me then I guess these are the breaks. But I have no intention of putting up with some of the insults that are being thrown across. One prime example, Mr. Speaker, happened just a few moments ago, when my friend, the hon. member for Labrador West, was told to go back to Belfast. This is a peaceful country. What is the implication, that he is part of what is going on over there? That must be the implication. Dirty low-down politics, to rotten to even mention.

Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this motion.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, there is only a short time left to say a few words. I do not plan to go all over the discussion that has taken place here, because, if I wanted to speak at length on why I am on this side of the House and not on the other, I could go on for many days.

Mr. Speaker, the first and foremost thing in mind today, with reference to this Government, is this past week. Mr. Speaker, I suppose never, and I say never, in the history of any democratic parliament have we seen what happened in this House during the past four days. We had a black Tuesday, we had a black Wednesday, we had a very black Thursday night, and today Sir, could have been the darkest of them all. Because, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this Government, the Leader of this Government and some of his Cabinet Ministers, hon. Cabinet Ministers, have been in power too long. This afternoon Mr. Speaker, the Premier arose in his place and he said "I spy strangers," because, Mr. Speaker, certain of the people, who we are told own this House, perhaps were taking part in the fun that takes place in this House every day of the week.

Perhaps we should try to get bookings at the Arts and Culture Centre, perhaps some of the night clubs, and put on some of the performances that we have seen put on here in this hon. House.

Mr. Speaker, there is one matter I would like to straighten out before I sit down, and that is with reference to a remark made today by the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources over a radio station. This statement was, that the happenings here last night were due entirely to the Opposition, who were aware that there was a certain function taking place in the Newfoundland Hotel. That it was more or less intimated to us, as members, that the House would be a bit late in starting, and that we took advantage by being in our seats at eight o'clock, knowing full well that there would not be a quorum in this House until much later.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to put on record actually what happened in this hon. House yesterday. I am glad to see the hon. Leader of the House is back with us now, because, he is one that was mainly concerned with the events that happened here yesterday. I am not going into any debates, any motions. It is just a natural statement of facts that happened in this 913

hon. House of which I was so proud to be a member. When I was elected to this House Mr. Speaker, I thought it was the greatest thing that could happen to me as an individual in this Province of ours. I really enjoyed it, and I have tried, to the best of my ability, Sir, as was humanly possible to pay respect to those who deserve respect, to the Chair, to the Speaker, who is the supreme officer of this House, and to any others. I have tried to stay out of personal insults and anything else.

All right, there has been a little bit of banter back and forth, but I have tried to keep it clean. Yesterday afternoon, about five o'clock or so, the hon. Leader of the House spoke to me here in the hallway and he said, "We are planning to call the six o'clock around five thirty." Some people may think this a bit funny, but this can be done in the House. We say "It is now six by the clock," but it is only five thirty. I more or less said "What is this for?" This was this affair that was on last night, and I may clear that up now. This was put on my desk yesterday afternoon, at ten minutes to five, actually, the envelope was put on then, I opened it sometime afterward. This is a formal invitation, by the hon. Minister of Natural Resources, beautifully printed, to attend a function two hours afterwards at the Newfoundland Hotel.

AN HON. MEMBER: I did not get mine until this morning.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. Minister perhaps was lucky. He was not ignored, it just went to the wrong department possibly. But Mr. Speaker, to carry on, I was trying to tie this in, the hon. Leader of the House said that they were planning to call six o'clock at five thirty. "Do you agree?" And I said, "No, I do not agree." Because, I do not agree to any deals being made with anybody in this House any more. I got scorched once and that is enough for me. I said, "what is the reason?" "Well this affair is on at the Newfoundland Hotel where the hon. Minister was entertaining some guests, and this AMOCO Canada Petroleum Company. "Well", I said; "this is on, why, the House will not be meeting tonight." "Oh yes" he said, "the House is meeting." I said, "Meet tonight with this on, I presume the members will want to attend. There is a showing one, then there is a few snorts afterwards, it all goes with it, the reception." He said; "oh yes." "Well" I said, "We wanted to meet last night, 911

Wednesday night and the House would not agree to it." "Well" he said, "after all, I am not the boss." "Well" I said, "I must agree to that." It is self evident that the Leader of the House was not the boss, that the boss had decided. Well, then it was more or less intimated that the House, on rising at six would adjourn until eight-thirty. This is fair enough, to give some of us a chance to get home, get something to eat and freshen up a little to come back for the night session, But shortly before I left the building the hon. Leader of the House again came to me, I think it was in my office, and I said "Did I hear the House is adjourned until eight o'clock?" He said, "yes, I suggested to the Premier that we adjourn until eight thirty, but the Premier insisted that it was eight o'clock," and again the Leader of the House say, "I am not the boss." We adjourned until eight o'clock.

We quite frankly were quite surprised in the Opposition rooms, because we figured that this do was on and, in fairness to members who did want to attend this, it would give them a chance to go down there. Now this was stressed eight o'clock, not eight fifteen, not eight thirty, but eight o'clock. So, I do not know if anybody on this side attended, I think there were one or two, but we came back as usual. We were sat here, five of us, I think. The hon. member for St. John's West, the Hon. Member for Fortune and two others on this side were sat here at eight o'clock. We sat, and sat and sat until eight fifteen came, and in the meanwhile we were consulting everything we could find on Parliamentary rules. We knew what action had to be taken. Were the Speaker in the Chair and there was no quorum at eight fifteen, he just gave it up and went home until tomorrow, you know, you may get a quorum back tomorrow.

We consulted with the Law Clerk of the House, there were more Beauchesnes flying around, and Mays and Standing Orders, but nowhere could we find a rule governing if no one shows up - the Speaker does not show up, what happens? I immediately phoned Ottawa to try to get a ruling on it. The first one that was contacted was Stanley Knowles, who is an expert, supposed to be after thirty or forty years. I did not speak to him directly but through an intermediary, and this gentleman said to me that Mr. Knowles was aghast to think that something like this could happen in a democratic

Parliament, where the House is called for eight o'clock. No Speaker at that time! Incidentally, at around eight fifteen or so we saw the hon. Deputy Speaker come to the hallway. The hon. member for St. John's West went up to him and said, "What about sitting in the Chair and let us get things going." The hon. Deputy Speaker said, "I am not the Speaker."

So all right, he was not the Speaker, so we sat here. In the meantime we got three or four opinions and as they said, it was never known in Parliamentary history that the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker were not there on an order given by this House to be here at eight o'clock. This was an order given by the House on the motion to adjourn and I presume, once the Leader adjourns the House this is an order for the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker, at least one of them to be here at eight o'clock. This did not happen. Following this, I think it was about eight twenty-eight, that I heard that the Speaker had been in his office and I went to the Speaker and I said, "what about it, let us get the session going." He said, "Yes, we will get the session going." At that time, by a very, very, very significant coincidence fifteen or twenty members entered with the Speaker.

I immediately got up and suggested to the Speaker, that in view of the fact that there was no quorum here at eight fifteen that the House should adjourn according to Standing Orders. But the Speaker said to me that he had no proof that there was not a quorum at eight fifteen because he was not here himself.

Now Mr. Speaker, I am becoming just a little bit disillusioned with democracy, Parliamentary procedure, Standing Orders, Beauchesne, Mays and everybody else that has anything to do with running Parliaments, just a little bit discouraged. As I say, there is a motion on the Order Paper and I do not want to go into it at the present moment, but I would just like to further add what these Parliamentary experts said, as far as the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker was concerned. They said, it was complete effrontery to the House. There was another paragraph on this I just forget his actual wording, but it was "And a complete dereliction of duty. A complete dereliction of duty on the part of the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker.

Now Mr. Speaker, as I said, we have run the gamut of why we have no confidence in this Government. I could go on, and on, and on, and on, but the hour is getting late and I am sure - I do not know if we are meeting tonight. There was some indication earlier that we would be adjourning for the week, for the trip to Louisiana. If it was Alabama I would be able to sing you a little song, "I am off to Alabama with the banjo on my knee." But, we are off to Louisiana to size up these 4,000 oil drillers or whatever you call them in Louisiana, and I am sure that the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Resources will inspect them, as he did the one in Halifax, and give it his okay.

Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a reason for me to vote non-confidence against this Government, I think this week of Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday's happenings, and what nearly happened this afternoon, when the Premier said, "I spy strangers," and the rule says, page (8), Standing Order (12), 'If any member takes notice that strangers are present, Mr. Speaker or the Chairman, as the case maybe, shall forthwith put the question that strangers be ordered to withdraw without permitting any debate or amendment, provided that Mr. Speaker or the Chairman may, whenever he thinks proper, order the withdrawal of strangers.'

The Premier has verged two or three times this past two weeks on having this House cleared of people who, through the high class of entertainment they are getting, some of the comedy that is being presented, become just a little bit over excited and take part in the debate.

I think Mr. Speaker, it is a clear indication that the Government, the Premier and his Cabinet Ministers have reached the stage of all most complete frustration. That they are becoming very, very upset with what is happening in this hon. House, when the members on this side have been trying to get information, information for the public of the Province. Information, all legitimate questions, if they are not legitimate they do not pass through the clerk's office in here. The Speaker, has the right to look at these questions, and if there is anything wrong with the questions they are not permitted on the Order Paper. Any question that appears is perfectly legitimate

and Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest of pleasure to second this non-confidence motion, and with no feeling of confidence that the vote will be passed, that the motion will be passed, because of the fact that we have so many people on the other side of the House desperately, in complete desperation, trying to hang on, keep the election away as far as we can and hope that this summer, when we get the flying sods, the hot asphalt, and the excavation for the water and sewage.

I am very pleased Sir, to second or support this motion of non-confidence.

Mr. Speaker (Mr. Ngel)

The motion is that the following words shall 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 provide sound planning, direction and initiative in developing the natural resources and manpower of the Province.

On motion amendment lost.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday the 13th April at 11 a.m., and that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER : The motion is that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 11 a.m.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, may I just ask a question on the motion to adjourn? There are certain documents to be tabled within fifteen days of the opening of the House. Apparently, that cannot be done now, because we would be more than fifteen days, sir, and these are the Governor's Warrants. I am wondering if we will be able to get them during the week so we can study them? When the House opens, after the fifteen days, another flagrant breach of the regulations.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: This House do now adjourn until tomorrow at 11 a.m.