



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 3

VERBATIM REPORT

FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 11:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is a pleasure for me to welcome to the galleries today Mr. Carl Hiscock, Vice-Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Labrador City, and Mr. Art Randell, the Town Manager of Labrador City. On behalf of all honourable members I certainly welcome you to the House of Assembly.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Fisheries:

HON. J.C. CROSBIE (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1973, the then Minister of Fisheries of Canada, the Honourable Jack Davis, under the powers conferred upon him by the Fisheries Act, announced that effective immediately all commercial fishing vessels, traps and other catching units would be registered by the Fisheries and Marine Service, and that all vessels, skippers and operators would be licensed. Among other details of the plan the minister also announced that the registration of vessels and the issuance of operators licenses would begin early in 1974, and would "start with the large vessels and the fleets which are already limited in size".

There can be no doubt that the offshore fisheries to the limits of the continental margins, the herring fishery in our bays, and certain fisheries which have a limited and localized resource base such as lobster, salmon, crab and scallops should be managed and controlled. Licensing and a sound quota system may well be good means toward this end.

Fish stocks are most vulnerable to overfishing during periods of peak concentration which generally occur offshore during the spawning season or when certain conditions of the water or weather cause fish stocks to congregate. During the recent past close to eighty per cent of offshore ground fish have been caught by foreign vessels under internationally negotiated quotas. This means that only a portion of any planned overall reduction in total offshore landings would have to be borne by Canadian fishermen, while any cut back in our inshore fishery would come out of Newfoundland landings only.

The best information available to us at this time indicates that there is a direct relationship between increasing offshore fishing effort and between declining inshore catches. It has been shown that over the past twenty

years, during the rapid growth of the international offshore fishery, the average annual total landings from the area of immediate concern to Newfoundland have more than doubled. During this same period the inshore portion of the landings has dropped to about half its original level and has virtually disappeared in the hardest hit areas.

This strengthens our conviction that any reduction in our inshore and nearshore groundfish fishing effort by small vessels would be meaningless as a measure to restore or conserve the marine resources, because even though this fishery contributes greatly to the economy of rural Newfoundland, it only amounts to less than 5% of the overall catch taken from the Northwest Atlantic.

Further considerations are that pound for pound the inshore fishery produces fish at less cost and is generally more labour intensive, thus providing more employment to a greater number of people. As far as product quality is concerned, properly handled inshore fish is second to none and better than most other fish.

It is the intention of this government to foster the well-balanced and orderly growth of both the inshore and offshore sectors of the industry. We believe this to be essential for the survival and well-being of the independent small and medium-sized processing plants which depend upon inshore catches for a major part of their fish supply.

In view of the fact that the uncontrolled expansion of the international offshore fishing effort has been shown to be a factor in the decline of the inshore groundfish fishery, it is the contention of this government that entry into the inshore groundfish fishery of Newfoundland should remain free of restrictions as long as the balanced growth of the industry as a whole can be ensured through sound planning of the offshore fishing effort.

If additional guidance should ever become necessary or desirable, this could be effected through variation of the financial assistance available to inshore fishermen for the construction or for the purchase of fishing vessels or catching gear.

This government intends to see the development of a successful, economically strong, professional group of inshore fishermen who eventually will enjoy the security provided by an income maintenance plan tailored to the needs of "bona fide" fishermen.

Newfoundlanders have always been free to enter the commercial inshore groundfish fishery, and this government wishes to preserve this traditional freedom. Our government finds itself in agreement with the view that the successful implementation of an income maintenance plan and of the various financial assistance programmes will depend on their being restricted to "bona fide" professional fishermen.

We maintain that it is in determining the eligibility to participate in this plan or these programmes for fishermen, where equitable but rigid criteria should be applied to decide who is a "bona fide" fisherman. Whatever may become the criterion, the amount of effort, or the degree of success, or whatever yardstick may eventually be applied, it should be applied to determine the right to participate in the professional benefits, and not to determine a Newfoundlander's right to earn or to supplement his income by fishing for inshore groundfish. In other words, there should be no limited entry into the inshore groundfish fishery of this province. The question of whether you are a "bona fide" professional fisherman or not should be determined when it comes to participating in income maintenance plans or other schemes for the benefit of fishermen.

The Federal Minister's words of November, 1973, that the programme would "start with the large vessels and the fleets which are already limited in size" cause us to be concerned about the possibility of a future extension of entry restrictions to smaller vessels and to the inshore groundfish fishery. This government is opposed to the introduction of such entry restrictions under present conditions. However, since the successful management of the resource requires detailed and accurate data concerning the activities of inshore and

nearshore groundfish fishermen, we support a system for the registration of people who fish, their fishing vessels and their fishing gear, which would permit any desired level of activity surveillance.

I have today, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: Was that written by somebody over at Memorial University?

MR. CROSBIE: No this was written by some genius in my department, which is full of geniuses.

Mr. Speaker, I have written the honourable Romeo Leblanc today, and sent him a copy of this which outlines the government's position on the licensing of vessels and fishermen so that they will have our views. Now these views - do you want to distribute these?

MR. NEARY: (First part inaudible) We do not understand it.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman needs this in baby talk. We will remember that.

Mr. Speaker, I have five copies of the Storey-Alexander report which was prepared by a group of people at Memorial University who were asked by the government and the Premier to report on the federal licensing policy and its implication to the Newfoundland fisheries. The report has already been released by the university but I do not know whether honourable members have copies. I have five copies to table in the House here, in case any member is interested.

MR. NEARY: That is why they recommended -

MR. CROSBIE: Well, they make a number of recommendations. So these five copies of that report should be tabled, and it is quite an interesting and worth-while report.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the position of the government as far as the licensing policy is concerned. We believe it should apply to the offshore fishery. We believe that there should be no restriction on entry into the groundfish fishery inshore here in Newfoundland, and that the question of "bona fide" professional fishermen should be determined to decide who participates in programmes that benefit fishermen, but not to determine who should have entry to the inshore fishery

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition:

HON. E.M.ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I understand the minister's statement, and I think his summary at the end was perhaps a much better communication than the statement itself, which, you know, does unfortunately tend to lapse into bureaucratic jargon as was so effectively pointed out by my colleague from Bell Island, but the policy enunciated in the statement, I think, is a very sensible -

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Speaking of bureaucratic jargon, the gentleman from Burgeo adds his piece.

Mr. Speaker, the statement, I think, represents a very - well, the policy is a very sensible one. I was not aware there was ever any intention stated by anybody to limit entry into the inshore fishery, but if there was then it certainly should not be tolerated. I think it probably is a straw man, but the fact remains that we must have in Newfoundland the right of unrestricted entry into the fishery. At the same time I think it is essential, if we are to have the income support programmes which we must have if the fishery is to survive, that only "bona fide" fishermen qualify. The income support programmes are going to require a substantial amount of money from the Treasury of Canada.

I think every study I have seen on them, and everything I have been told, is that they are going to require, you know, heavy public subsidies. Indeed, we are getting them now. One of the most interesting figures in the fishery is that the fishermen of Newfoundland get back roughly twenty dollars for every dollar that is paid in by them to the unemployment insurance plan. It is a very good plan in that sense only, as there are obviously weaknesses in it. So, it makes sense to restrict the income support programmes which will require very heavy funding by the people of Canada. It makes sense to restrict them to "bona fide" fishermen. It may be difficult to lay down criteria as to what is a "bona fide" fisherman, but that can be done, that is not beyond the wit of the bureaucrats.

Finally I am glad to see that the minister has stated that licensing or registration is an acceptable thing. I think it should be because that is the only way we are going to find out exactly who is fishing, and how much fish they are catching, what gear they have, what kind of boats they have. And that is the basic information under which the policy makers will have to develop policy from here on.

I think the policy is a sensible one. I have no hesitation in saying that there will be no argument from our side on the policy as we understand it. What we are concerned with now is the application of that policy, and making sure that the fishermen of this province have access to the proper support programmes by government, both federal and provincial, and that all of the people of this province have the right to go and fish if they wish.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bonavista South.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to present a petition signed by 238 residents of the Community of Port Blandford. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, to which department the petition can be forwarded from the House. The petition is asking for the establishment of a community antenna based on the fact that the television reception in the community of Port Blandford is very, very bad from both television networks in the province. Maybe it will be possible for the Department of Transportation and Communications to take a look at this request from these residents. And it may be necessary to forward the petition along to the networks concerned in the province, for example, the CJON network and the CBC network. Maybe a booster station or a relay station of some sort would also serve the same need to overcome the problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition knowing that the television reception is very bad in the area. I support this request of these residents. I hope that in some government department there would be maybe a sort of funding available to provide assistance in the erection of a community antenna.

So I move, Mr. Speaker, that this petition be tabled in the House of Assembly and be forwarded to the department to which it relates. I assume in this case it is the Department of Transportation and Communications.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word in support of the petition. First of all let me say that as I understand the procedure we do not need a motion any more. I think the petition is received and automatically sent to the department to which it relates. I think the honourable member is right in suggesting that the appropriate department is the Department

of Transportation and Communications.

The subject matter of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is raised by a number of people in Port Blandford but it could equally be raised by a number of people throughout the province. There are a number of areas where our people do not get television reception even though the signal is available. The difficulty, of course, is the geographic contours of the terrain because television signals travel in straight lines, and if a community is down between some hills or if there is a hill in the way between the source of the signal and the community then there is no reception.

Now the obvious answer to it, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that people of Port Blandford might wish to look into this, is to incorporate a small association under the Companies Act, then to apply to the CRTC for a little licence. It has been done in Trepassay. It has been done in a number of communities throughout the Island. They will need a little money \$5,000, \$10,000. I know that in the past, I think it was done through the Department of Community and Social Development that Trepassay was given a grant of, I believe, about \$5,000 - the gentleman for Ferryland might be able to help on the point - that enabled them to purchase the equipment that they needed. And my understanding is that the CBC and CJON between them serviced that equipment, and maintained it, and if a tube burns out or something then they provide the replacements. But that is the answer.

I would think that we could take \$1 million in this province and provide - at most \$1 million and provide these little - all you need is a little receiver, Mr. Speaker, that can take the signal off the air and rebroadcast it in a limited area. There must be on the Island alone, there must be fifty communities where this type of arrangement is needed. I would suggest to the Minister of Transportation and Communications in supporting the point of this petition that this would be one of the most useful things which his department could do.

I am not going to get into a debate but there are lots of things that department does with public money that are not of anything

like the benefit to the people of this province. Television is no longer a merely recreational thing, Mr. Speaker. Television is one of the most important, cultural and educational tools that exist in this province today.

So I would suggest to the minister that he might find a few thousand dollars and provide the people in Port Blandford, or in St. Anthony, or in the District of St. Barbe South, in the middle part of that district, or in parts of Hermitage, or in Fogo, or in fifty other places around the Island,

AN HON. MEMBER: Raie Verte.

MR. ROBERTS: And then, of course, Labrador which is a little different problem -- provide these people with the television receptions. That is far more pertinent than this talk of cable television, and that sort of thing. It can be done. It can be done within the policy which the CRTC have adopted. It has been done in the case of Trepassey and Cape Broyle. I think it should be done for Port Blandford, and other communities as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

HON. J. G. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS):

Yes, I would like to rise in support of the petition, Mr. Speaker. We will certainly take it under consideration, and give an indication to the people of Port Blandford of the various options that are there. We will certainly talk to the two networks involved. We will certainly consider the situation which existed in similar circumstances in other locations in the province.

I hope very soon to be in a position to announce the appointment of a Director of Communications in the department which, I think, will be a great help to the department. I would hope that within the next couple of weeks to be in the position to do that.

I was up the other night in Hawkes Bay. They have a similar problem up there. I am sure, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested, there are other areas in the province which find themselves in similar circumstances.

So I rise to support the petition, and suggest that we will give it consideration as to the various alternatives. We will talk to the two networks, and we will also check into the feasibility of the grant situation that has existed in other communities. And we will certainly do everything we can to assist the people of Port Blandford in receiving a good television image.

NOTICE OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Minister of Transportation and Communications that a committee composed of the Hon. Minister of Justice, the Hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Member for Bonavista South, and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition be appointed to prepare and report within twenty days lists of members to compose the Standing Committees of the House as laid out in Standing Order (84) Subsections (a) through (g) inclusive. And when we come to Orders of the Day I am going to ask the consent of the House to pass a motion to appoint the committee so that the committee can recommend who should be on the various Standing Committee as now

laid out in Standing Order (84) including the Public Accounts Committee. The twenty days -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The Standing Orders provide, Mr. Speaker, that this report be done within twenty days. It does not have to be twenty days. And hopefully next week the committee will report back.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation has the answer to a question that I put to him a few days ago about the government's commitment to the '77 Summer Games? What the province will have to pay?

HON. T. DOYLE (MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND RECREATION): I will certainly obtain the answer.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations inform the House if labour's appointee has yet been made to the Minimum Wage Board? And if so, could the minister let us have the name of the appointee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

HON. E. MAYNARD (MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS): The appointment has not been officially made but we have the nominee of the Federation of Labour, Mr. Sneaker. It is a matter of routine. I would think of getting the paper to cabinet which has to make the appointment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Manpower could inform the House if anything is being done, or if any action has been taken on complaints of employees at the U.S. Naval Station at Argentia, about their pensions, and about their wages and salaries down there? Could the minister give us some information on that?

MR. MAYNARD: There were no official complaints made to my department, Mr. Speaker, because the situation there does not come under provincial jurisdiction. It is a federal jurisdiction, and any complaints that have to be made would have to be passed through the Department of

External Affairs in Ottawa and on to the United States Government.

I understand that the people involved have taken some action to pass their complaints on to the United States Government through the M.P.'s in Ottawa. Mr. Walter Carter has been working on it. But the province, of course, does not have any jurisdiction whatsoever over the working wage, or working conditions at the United States Base in Argentina.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Premier: Would the Premier be good enough to tell us whether the statements made last week by the Minister of Public Works and Services, the Member for Humber East, with reference to the government's decision not to advertise in "The Daily News" do represent the policy of the administration or are they, as the minister said, his personal opinions?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: They are as the minister said them, Mr. Speaker, that they were his personal opinions. I suppose a lot of people have personal opinions at various times, but as I said on that occasion that if it were the government's policy not to advertise in papers because of adverse editorials there would be no advertising, I suppose, whatsoever, But certainly it is not the government's policy to cut back in total on any publication and hopefully, if economics warrant it, the advertising in "The Daily News" will pick up again.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier be good enough to tell us whether the administration have changed their position then and I understand from looking at "The Daily News" that there are no government advertisements, there are one or two only continuing insertions in it. Are they going to continue to refrain from placing advertising in one paper only, the St. John's "Daily News"?

PREMIER MOORES: No, I will check with the Department of Public Works, Mr. Speaker, and see what the exact situation is, gladly. I am surprised that the -

MR. CROSBIE: We had ads in there yesterday.

PREMIER MOORES: We had ads in "The Daily News" yesterday. The Minister of Fisheries points out that there were ads, government ads, in "The Daily News" yesterday.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Monday, over a page.

PREMIER MOORES: And in Monday, over a page. So, I think the statement is not correct as has been pointed out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, would the - The Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission is a government agency but is not quite handled by the Department of Supply and Services, Public Works and Services. Would the

Premier undertake to lay on the table of the House, Mr. Speaker, I realize he would not have it here with him now, a indication of how much advertising the government have placed, the government, I do not speak of government agencies because the Power Commission handle their own advertising and so do the University and so do the College of Fisheries and the College of Trades - they may be using public funds but they are under independent, the Newfoundland Liquor Commission are under independent authority - how much advertising the government, through the Department of Public Works and Services, have placed in the advertising during the month of January, February and March as to date -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Order paper.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the minister can say "Order Paper", I am merely giving as a question of notice whether the Premier would undertake to get that information for the House.

PREMIER MOORES: If it is properly placed on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the Premier would tell us whether he has received a letter sent by the Press Gallery Association with reference to the government's decision to refrain from advertising in "The Daily News"?

PREMIER MOORES: What was that?

MR. ROBERTS: A letter from the press gallery.

PREMIER MOORES: What was the question, I am sorry.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh! Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could tell us whether he has received a letter from the press gallery I assume sent by or over the name of their President, Mrs. Cashin, but I do not know who signed it - but a letter from the press gallery protesting the government's decision to refrain from advertising further in "The Daily News"?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I do not know who it was over or under but, yes, I did receive a letter.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, has the Premier answered that letter, and if so, would he indicate what his answer is, please?

PREMIER MOORES: I have not answered the letter yet, but I intend to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, will the Premier make his answer public.

PREMIER MOORES: I would hope that - that is entirely in the press gallery's hands and the communication with them - I assume that they will. I have no idea, but it is their decision, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Finally, Mr. Speaker, would the Premier indicate whether any other papers or advertising media in the Province have suffered from the acts which has fallen on "The Daily News" allegedly in light of their -

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have not finished the question, if the Premier would allow. If Your Honour is ruling out of order, that is a different matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I shall permit the honourable Leader of the Opposition to finish his question.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. As I was saying, Sir, would the Premier indicate whether any other advertising media in the Province has had advertising withdrawn from it or reduced in it as a result of the policies stated by the Minister of Public Works and Services which the Premier has confirmed is the administration's policy of reducing advertising allegedly in reference to circulation?

PREMIER MOORES: The answer to that question is, Mr. Speaker, I do not know at this time. I will certainly check and find out, but the honourable Leader of the Opposition seems to be the one who is studying the ads these days. Maybe he can answer his own question, but I will certainly deem to find out.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier indicate, please, what arrangements the government have made to arrange to have public notices circulated in the areas of the Province where "The Daily News" provides the only regular daily circulation?

MR. CROSBIE: That is an improper -

MR. MORGAN: Ask your friend, Bill Callahan, boy.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for Bell Island:

MR. NEARY: Is the Premier going to answer?

AN HON. MEMBER: Obviously not.

MR. ROBERTS: He does not know.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the Premier is not going to answer that question I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications: I would like to ask the minister if the agreement between the province and Ottawa, concerning the St. John's Harbour Arterial Road has yet been signed?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications:

MR. ROUSSEAU: It has been finalized, but whether it has been signed or not I do not know. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs would be responsible for the actual signing.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROUSSEAU: No it has not been signed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister care to indicate to the House if there has been a change in policy? On December 11, I think it was, the minister indicated to this House that the government would settle for nothing less than one hundred per cent of the cost. Has there now been a change in policy? If so, would the minister indicate what the change might be?

MR. ROUSSEAU: The minister never in this House stated that it would be one hundred per cent period. I also stated that we were prepared to talk to them. Now I am talking about one half of a special agreement, only the highways section of it, the Harbour Arterial, because there is some other item involved in there which is not under my jurisdiction. But we said that we wanted to ensure that any monies expended on the Harbour Arterial were not to the detriment of any other roads programmes in the province. We are now satisfied that that is the situation and the cost-sharing agreement will be, I believe, seventy-five twenty-five.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROUSSEAU: It will be announced jointly at a future date when the actual signing takes place. We were prepared to talk. I never said "one hundred per cent". I said we wanted one hundred per cent and we certainly would have liked to have received it. What the final amount will be we do not know, but it will be jointly announced. I did suggest that the government were prepared to talk to DREE on the situation at that time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister: Would the minister indicate to the House whether the province's share of twenty-five per cent and Ottawa's share of seventy-five per cent just includes construction? Or does it include the purchase of property along the route of the Arterial Road?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, you know, when the thing is settled the details will be jointly announced by the provincial and federal governments. At that time all the information will be available.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister care to indicate if all the property has been purchased along the Harbour Arterial Road route? And if so, if it is not all purchased would the minister indicate how much it is going to cost to purchase the rest of the land? The rest of the right-of-way?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I think that would be a proper question for the Order Paper. I do not have the figures in my mind at the present moment. I know that all the property has not been purchased, but if the honourable member would like to put it on the Order Paper I will certainly undertake to get the answer.

MR. NEARY: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the minister could tell me whether or not the government are in the process of purchasing property and have been purchasing property all along? Or did the purchase of property stop when the financing of the road ran out? Or has there been property purchased, you know, just about every month that passes?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Negotiations have been ongoing and it is included in the arrangements. So when the actual announcement is made with regard to the Harbour Arterial, I will give the information to the honourable member, and in respect to that, if he would put a question on the Order

Paper I will certainly undertake to get the answer.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell the House what steps his department is taking to replace obsolete, worn-out highways equipment, especially snow clearing equipment?

MR. ROUSSEAU: That is a matter which will be included in the budget.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member from Fogo:

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, a question to the honourable the Minister of Fisheries: The other day the minister stated that there were a number of fishermen, I believe over 200, who had not been reimbursed for loss of gear caused by ice damage last Spring, and he also stated that a number were fraudulent and false. Would the minister care to say how many of the 200 claims now standing are fraudulent and false?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman should try and listen attentively when someone speaks in the House. I never said that the 225 - odd claims that have not been accepted were rejected because they were fraudulent or false. I said that there are over some 225 applications that have not been accepted and will not be accepted because they were received after September 10, 1974, without any reasonable excuse. That is

the reason why those claims, and they may total more than that - the last time I checked it was 225 claims. It has nothing to do with those claims being fraudulent or false.

MR. WINSOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister now saying that none of that 225 will be reimbursed?

MR. CROSBIE: That is exactly the position, Mr. Speaker. There are some 225 who will not be reimbursed, who have been written and told they will not be reimbursed, but to whom it has been explained that a letter was sent to every fisherman in the province last Summer, who we had as registered on any kind of fishery statistics - who were told that every radio station, television station, and newspaper in the province gave full details of the programme last Summer, and the close off dates, and who wrote in months, in some cases a month, and in some cases three months, four months, five months after the end of the deadline saying that they lost nets, pots, and this and that and the other, and had never heard of the programme until this occasion - and when it was looked into there was no reason at all that we could ascertain why they were not in time. They had not gone to the Labrador, they were not fishing on the Labrador. You know, we accepted quite a few who went to the Labrador fishing and were not back in time, and therefore it may be that they did not hear of it, or could not take any action on it. These 225 were rejected- out, out, out, out of time. They have been told this is why it is. Now we did that with a great deal of reluctance. If there had not been so many, or if the programme had not far exceeded what anybody expected we would have reviewed the whole situation, and perhaps tried to include more of those. But these 225, or whatever the number is, were clearly out of time.

Some of them, for example, there is a certain person who writes the newspapers, and so on and so forth, extensive correspondence. This particular case, for example, just to give an example of the reason why some of them were turned down, this gentleman made a claim before the deadline expired for, I think it was, a salmon net. A month after September 10, or two months after September 10, he made another claim for lobster pots. Then two months after that

he made another claim because he lost two traps. So that if the gentleman has lost a trap, had lost lobster pots, and in addition to a salmon net one would think that he would make a claim for them altogether at the same time before September 10.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: So do not be so foolish. I just give that as an example, Mr. Speaker, of why claims are rejected. Now naturally we rejected his claim for lobster pots, and we rejected his claim for a trap. I mean surely it strains credibility to think that a man will claim for a salmon net before September 10, and forget to report that he lost a valuable trap, and lobster pots.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Finance could inform the House if he has received a request from the War Veterans in Newfoundland and Labrador demanding a government statement that their years of war service be included as credit towards their civil service pension? And if so, what action has the minister taken on their request?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Finance.

HON. H. R. V. EARLE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, several requests have been received over the past year or so. I suggest that the Hon. Member for Bell Island wait until the budget to get the necessary information on that particular aspect of things.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. the Premier. In view of the Premier's statement of last week, February 27, concerning the negotiations with Mr. Craig Dobbin for rental space, I wonder would the Premier care to indicate when the Minister of Public Works intends to table the information which the Premier indicated would be tabled?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Premier.

HON. F. D. MOORES (PREMIER): I will check on it, Mr. Speaker. I do not know.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: The Premier is going to check on it. A further question for the Premier on the same subject. Would he indicate when the government expects to call the public tenders for proposals with reference to the space it needs for the government?

MR. MOORES: Shortly, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shortly!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Would the minister inform the House if there had been many protests and objections to the one dollar a year increase added to the cost of driver's licences in this province for this year? And could the minister tell us who gets the dollars? Or what the total amount collected from this dollar is to be used for?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received some letters and answered them. The money will go, the Department of Finance would know, I do not know where it is going to go, but it will be used for the pick-up of, towards the pickup of abandoned car wrecks around the Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Finance could inform the House whether or not the dollar collected will go directly as a subsidy to this company that is collecting the car wrecks or will it be paid back to the minister's Department of Transportation and Communications for the work that they are doing in collecting these wrecks and stock piling in various parts of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. J.R.V. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, the obvious operations of government are that revenues which come in from any source go into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I presume that that is where this would go. The expenditures of departments on various programmes are covered in subheads as the honourable member well knows and these will be revealed when the estimates are tabled. This particular agreement, as I understand it, will be tabled in the House shortly and all the details will be available to members.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Finance: Would the minister care to tell the House why this dollar is also being collected in Labrador where no service is being provided?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I presume that you could say the same thing about sections of the southwest coast with which I am very familiar. It applies throughout the Province, through all areas. I think what is meat for one is meat for another.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Provincial Affairs or the Minister of Finance, Sir, whichever minister this jurisdiction falls under, inform the House if there have been any official complaints concerning a directive from Mutual Life Assurance Company to the drug stores, that they can no longer offer discounts to civil servants on their prescription drugs?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

HON. C.W. DOODY: That question was raised a few days ago by some concerned public servant through Mr. Peddle, their representative of Treasury Board. We are involved with it, Sir. The rumour had it that the public servants were not receiving the twenty per cent discount to which they were entitled from some drug stores who were in the discount business because of a government directive to that effect, to the insurance company. We looked into the matter and found it was completely unfounded. What we would like, and what we have said, and the case is simply this, that where a discount is applicable, it is applicable to the whole bill, the whole prescription bill. If a prescription is five dollars, that twenty per cent comes off the whole five dollar amount reducing the bill to four dollars. Eighty per cent is paid by the insurance company and twenty per cent is paid by the client. We would like to see the discounts increased to fifty per cent, eighty per cent, one hundred per cent free drugs if we could do it, but under the agreement, it is an eighty per cent- twenty per cent situation. That is the way it is being operated.

The public servants are not being penalized to our knowledge. If it is demonstrated that some drug store, as has been suggested, is gouging the public servants because of the insurance scheme, then we will certainly take steps to see that that is corrected. We have not any definite evidence of that as yet.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. DOODY: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services is so lippy, Sir, I would like to ask him if he is yet in the position to make a statement on day care centres, what the policy is?

MR. MURPHY: I congratulate the Member for Bell Island for reading the newspapers, a big article this morning. I gave a word to the News yesterday and he is chief clipper over there now. They gave him a new pair of scissors. We will be ready very shortly as announced in "The Daily News", Sir.

MR. BARRY: He is one of the reasons the barber rates are going up, too.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Industrial Development, Sir, no, perhaps the Premier, perhaps I had better put this question to the

Premier. Would the honourable the Premier care to tell the House what his government's reactions is regarding a request made a few days ago from a group of employees of the Newfoundland Telephone Company, that that company be provincialized?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Nationalized.

MR. NEARY: Provincialized. Well, would the Minister of Industrial Development or the Premier care to answer that question?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: We met with these people, the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations and the Minister of Transportation and Communication. They requested a hearing. They felt that the company should be nationalized was the term they used, although maybe if they had had the benefit of your advice they would have provincialized it instead.

We indicated to them that this Tory Government is certainly not philosophically opposed to the idea of nationalization or the public ownership of various companies where it is demonstrated that that is in the public good. We also told them that the evidence that they presented to us at that time was certainly not enough to justify immediate action. We will be certainly sympathetic to whatever position they brought forward to government who was adhering to exchange views. We have no intention at the present time of provincializing or nationalizing the Bell subsidiary in the Province. But as I said, the public ownership concept is not one that is repugnant to this government.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. DOODY: Pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Go ahead. Carry on.

MR. DOODY: Well, I just wanted to add that it was a group of people who were on an illegal strike with that particular company. We met them as a group of concerned citizens who were talking to elected members of government. We were not talking to them in their capacity as strikers or people who were out on an illegal strike. I would like to make that perfectly clear because we do not condone or sanction or in any way encourage illegal walkouts

wildcats.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir: Would the minister care to indicate then about the other requests made by this group about an industrial enquiry into this dispute with the telephone company?

MR. DOODY: No such request was made at the meeting unless they had a subsequent meeting with you and requested that -

MR. NEARY: - Minister of Manpower -

MR. DOODY: Well, the Minister of Manpower may have met with them but not at the meeting I attended.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. MAYNARD: Let me answer that very quickly, Mr. Speaker. I have heard through the media that there is going to a request for an industrial enquiry but there has been no such request received in my office up to this date.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I would like a question to the Minister of Justice. Perhaps the question I should be asking him first is what action he is going to take against all the fellows on his side who are obviously driving without their plates this morning, but that is another story. I would like to ask him instead if he can indicate to the House when a magistrate will be appointed to Harbour Breton to succeed the gentleman who was moved from there last June or July, I believe.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not certain that I can give that assurance or date. Four additional magistrates were appointed to the magisterial service in December. If the honourable gentleman from Hermitage has read the recommendation of the Steele Commission, which was an excellent report and I have not heard a critical word from anyone about it, he will see that there is a recommendation that the judicial council give very serious consideration to centralization of the magisterial service. The main concern is that a magistrate is available whenever required. Where he resides may not be quite as significant. These gentlemen, the new magistrates, will have completed their training in the Magistrates Court in St. John's by the end

of June, probably before, but postings are usually at the end of the school year. I would anticipate that the judicial council will be in a position to indicate to me at that time as to where they feel magistrates should be posted.

I do know that there is a variation in work load of the magistrates that is quite considerable. I suspect, in fact I more than suspect, that the work load in the Harbour Breton magisterial district is very, very minimal, which is a tribute to the people in the Harbour Breton area.

MR. SIMMONS: A question for the Minister of Tourism. I wonder would the minister indicate to the House whether he has received a representation in the form of a letter from the South Coast Regional Development Association concerning their concerns on the River Pond Park and could he indicate whether he has received the correspondence and also, would he, in particular, indicate what the government plans are to complete this park, the park on the Harbour Breton Road I am talking about?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Tourism:

HON. T.V.HICKEY (Minister of Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I can only acknowledge receipt of an enquiry. The documents have been passed on to my officials for investigation and comment, and it is not back to me yet. Whenever I do get the information I will be glad to pass it on to the honourable member.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary to the second part of my question: Can the minister indicate whether construction will proceed and be completed on the park this year?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give any such undertaking until I am in possession of all the facts. It would be totally irresponsible of me to make any definite comment on that right now.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister is undertaking to get the information for me?

MR. HICKEY: Yes I am.

MR. NEARY: Could the Minister of Finance, Sir, indicate to the House when the government will be bringing down this year's budget?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Finance:

MR. EARLE: An announcement will be made shortly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will accept one question now from the honourable the Leader of the Opposition and that will bring an end to the question period.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. They have not told the Minister of Finance yet, Steve.

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations: Has he any indication as to when the two parties to the trawlermen's strike will resume negotiations? And if so, may we ask when and where?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations:

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, my Deputy Minister has been in pretty well constant contact with both parties throughout the week. They have been having some individual meetings but they have not met together as yet. But I would assume that by the end of today the Deputy Minister will be

hoping to work out a definite time and place for a joint meeting of the parties, and we will be further advised at that time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the House to approve a proposal that a committee be appointed in accordance with Standing Order 84(a) to recommend to the House or report or whatever they do on the membership of the standing committees. That could be passed now with consent.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

MR. ROBERTS: For our part, we agree.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion "aye", those against "nay", motion carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Motion (1).

MR. SPEAKER: Motion (1), I think, was adjourned last day by the honourable the Minister of Justice.

HON. T.A.HICKMAN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I shall not take much more time of the House in debating this very vital resolution, because I do hope that before one o'clock today this resolution can be dispatched to Ottawa.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I was indicating the very real ground and evidence upon which we base our concern that Canada is not going to the Law of the Sea Conference with the kind of enthusiasm and the kind of muscle and the kind of determination that the people of this province has been demanding.

I have before me the verbatim report of the press conference given in Caracas on August 28, 1974, by the Honourable A.J. MacEachen, the Honourable D. Jamieson, the Honourable R. Leblanc and Ambassador J.A. Beasley. The question was raised, in fact these gentlemen were under very severe pressure by the press to try to define Canada's position, should this Conference not be as successful as one desires, with respect to unilateral action. And may I, in a more lighter vein and for the edification of politicians who want to become experts in double talk, indicate to you the way these two senior Federal Ministers handled

the press. This is one of the questions: "Evidently there is a long interval and there is a lot of internal pressure in Canada for some kind of action; do you think that if there is no treaty in the Spring or Summer of 1975, Canada can, in fact, take unilateral action?"

The honourable Mr. MacEachen replied; "Well, I think that is a question that takes me quite far into the future, and asks me to anticipate or foresee what circumstances might be at that time. Whatever circumstances prevail, then the matter will be before us but at this point it is not the policy option that I would recommend. It may be that the circumstances will alter and conditions will change and actions will be taken elsewhere, but that is for the future and the decision will have to be made on the basis of the circumstances that will prevail then. Maybe my colleague, Mr. Jamieson would like to comment on this point."

Now, Mr. Jamieson's comment: He first dealt with pollution and then he said: "Now on the question of whether or not we would, as I understood your question, be prepared to enter into a treaty which is not all embracing and I think perhaps, I might refer that back to Mr. MacEachen."

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: There is very little doubt that if anyone very carefully perused the statements made at that press conference, and the first question was a rather touchy one that they could not deal with, they were asked why they arrived at the end of the conference and what they thought they had accomplished by coming and it was quite clear that other than "getting the feel" as they said - and I do not quite know what they meant by that - "of the conference", it was a very pleasant trip and I envy them for going to Caracas to be there for the closing ceremonies.

But all through the statement that emanated from the Minister of External Affairs, it is abundantly clear to me that the progress that was made at Caracas is nothing like we in Canada and Newfoundland have been led to believe.

Again, Mr. MacEachen: "You may ask them, 'what have you achieved' and I think that the answer to that is that if we examine any important issue before the Conference we will have no difficulty in discerning real movement on the part of states at both ends of the spectrum. What has been occurring here in Caracas has been a movement in two directions towards common positions. We are closer together on some issues than on others."

Now, you know, what does all this mean? What does all this mean to the concern that is being shown and has been shown by the Government of this Province for the past two years with respect to the depletion of the stocks off our shores. Does it corroborate the suspicion that most Newfoundlanders, probably all Newfoundlanders but certainly Newfoundlanders who are at all associated with the fisheries, that because the fish production in Canada constitutes somewhere between two and four per cent of the gross national product that the Government of Canada and their public servants are not really losing any sleep over this issue? I suspect that they are more concerned about pollution, as important as it is, on the high seas, more concerned about new rules of the road, new navigational aids than they are about acquiring absolute sovereign jurisdiction over our Continental Shelf.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the most significant part of this resolution is the second part which says: "This House declares that Canada should by proclamation take such jurisdiction in the event that the Law of the Sea Conference, which will convene at Geneva, does not so constitute and declare an international regime by December 31, 1975."

This government, starting with the federal-provincial First Ministers Conference three years ago, in the Spring of 1973, and the Premier's Conference in Charlottetown, have led the way in trying to convince the Government of Canada, who have exclusive jurisdiction in External Affairs, that a firm position is required at the Law of the Sea Conference.

I get the impression that Newfoundlanders are not taken seriously in Ottawa when they start talking about fish, and declining stocks, and management of the Continental Shelf. We do not have to go back very, very far to recall that just a few years ago haddock was one of the most sought after, and caught, and landed specie off our coast. Our fishermen became aware of the destructive fishing methods being used by the Russians. Our fishermen became aware that the Russians were dragging over the spawning grounds. We were bold to tell the people in the Government of Canada, whoever they were at that time, that unless this activity ceased, and ceased very quickly the haddock fishery would be a thing of the past. No one paid any attention. The Government of Canada looked at the Soviet Union in fear and trembling and did not say a word.

In 1965 there were 155,000 tons of haddock landings, and in 1971, there were 12,000 tons.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Us simple Newfoundlanders who know something about the fishery, who will live or die by it, an economy which will live or die by it, have the greatest difficulty in convincing the alleged experts who dictate the policies as they relate to the fishery, the Government of Canada, those of us in this province, and in Eastern Canada are the last ones to be asked for advice. If we force the advice upon them we seem to be treated as naughty Canadians who want to rock the boat.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, it is so important that before 1:00 o'clock today this resolution will be on its way to Ottawa. Because if it does not get out of here by that time I can hear the Minister of External Affairs saying. Now if I had only known that there was a resolution passed by the House of Assembly in Newfoundland, unanimously passed, I certainly would have taken it along. I certainly would have given it great consideration but regrettably it did not reach my desk before I left for Geneva."

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier that I had appeared on May 3, 1974 before the External Affairs National Defence Standing Committee in the House of Commons. During that very interesting, and may I say, a proceeding that I entered upon with a great deal of apprehension, question arose as to whether or not the Government of Canada having acquired sovereign rights to the Continental Margin would be in the position to police and enforce the rights that we acquired. And I was asked by a couple of honourable gentlemen from the House of Commons as to whether or not I thought this could be accomplished? I suggested it could. I suggested it could be done by the close co-operation of the Department of National Defence. In fact, I almost suggested, but I was not quite willing to bring myself to it, but I almost suggest that maybe instead of having the Annual Bermudian cruise in the interest of the National Defence of Canada that maybe, just maybe that these corvettes or whatever is used - they are used out here-now could be brought into service, and sent out on the Grand Banks, the Banquereau, and Mizzen, and St. Pierre, and Green Bank, and Flemish Cap to enforce and police and maintain our rights.

There was one gentleman there who started hopping up on a point of order, and in a fit of righteous indignation and said this was an unwarranted attack upon the Department of National Defence. I had not attacked anyone, I had only simply thought that it might be a good idea to use these boats because obviously the little boats that we have that had to tie up at 5:00 o'clock, and are not allowed to go out at night, and they are not allowed to go out on Saturdays, and on Sundays, are not capable of policing the territorial waters that we presently have jurisdiction over. I could not understand why this man was so upset. It turned out to be a gentleman named Mr. Hopkins who was the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence - he was from Ontario, an expert on the Navy, he had never seen salt water, but he is going to. And he took - was he upset over this suggestion - that our defence forces would be used -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR HICKMAN: He is an elected member - he was the Liberal member for some constituency in Ontario, and he was a parliamentary assistant to the Minister of National Defence. I do not understand their procedure there but he insisted - and the Chairman did not quite understand why he was exercised-but he insisted on having his name put on the Order Paper so that he could debate this horrendous suggestion at a later date. Whether he ever debated it I have no way of knowing. And maybe he was quite right. Maybe I digressed from the rules of procedure that are laid down when appearing before a Standing Committee of the House of Commons. And if I did he was quite right in so doing.

But that was not what concerned me. It was the attitude that I sensed. Obviously in the position that he was in he would be articulating the attitude, the feeling of the Government of Canada. Despite some alleged announcements that had been made of late that there will be better surveillance and some fisheries officers will be put on board of some of our ships of war I suggest to this House that anything that is done by the Department of National Defence to enforce Canada's jurisdictional rights off our shore will be done with something less than enthusiasm, and will only be done if public pressure continues particularly from Eastern Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Someone sent me some newspapers from the State of Maine last Summer. There again you see an almost identical situation - gear belonging to their inshore fishermen, and their middle distance fishermen, being destroyed by foreign fleets. Again their federal government not responding until it is too late.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to re-emphasize, because I hope the people of Newfoundland fully understand the imput that has gone into this particular problem by the government of this province during the past couple of year. It started in 1973 when the committee was appointed. And as I said yesterday, in 1973, six months before the Government of Canada had no firm position on it. Then they did come down with a firm position on what is called the species approach. When our people took issue and said that is not

what we want, that we want the economic zone concept, back came the official position - this is April now of 1974 - this is a month before they head South - saying that the Department of External Affairs had again reviewed our proposal, and that our distinction was more apparent than real. No, I am wrong, that was in February it came back. In April we went back with further representation.

The appalling thing is that two months before this conference opened in Caracas those advisers who were going to represent the Government of Canada at that conference still had no real conception as to what the economic zone concept was all about. They were subscribing at that time to the species view which would allow fishing to be carried on by foreign fleets based to a large extent upon the foreign fleets assessment of the sustainable yield on the banks off our coast.

Before they left for Caracas, there was a fairly firm commitment given to us, and given to me in May, that our position would be the one that they would put to the Caracas meeting, but even then they watered it down. There is still talk of traditional rights, traditional fishing rights of other North Atlantic nations.

Mr. Speaker, this is not acceptable, I suspect, to anyone in this House. It is totally unacceptable to the Government of Newfoundland. It is totally unacceptable to the people of Newfoundland. I would love to convince myself that the Geneva Conference will succeed in attaining what we want to see attained. I have very grave doubts that this will come to pass, but if it does not come to pass, Mr. Speaker, there can be no compromise insofar as the people of this Province are concerned as to what should then flow from the Government of Canada. That is going to take some doing because the Government of Canada is not thinking in terms of unilateral action.

I was at a dinner in Fortune in 1971 and suggested that the time had come to take unilateral action to extend our limits and there was present a federal minister who immediately followed me and told me that as a lawyer I should know better than to insist or suggest that that kind of action should be taken by the Government of Canada. Whilst there has been some recognition that the people in Eastern Canada are looking for a bit of muscle on the part of the Government of Canada, that it is now becoming a politically sensitive issue, which it is and should be, and I use political in the broad sense of the word. There still has not been any firm, unequivocal statement emanating from our Federal Government that unilateral action will be taken in order to protect the fisheries off our coast.

If this happens, Mr. Speaker, if we should ever get control of it, if the Government of Canada asserts its influence and its rights, establishes sovereignty over that area, we are going to be in the very delightful position in Eastern Canada where we are going to have to put on a crash programme to be able to harvest the resource that is left there. It will be left for us. You will suddenly find, I predict, that the gross national product insofar as fisheries are concerned will alter very greatly so that two to four per cent will suddenly go to ten per cent.

When that happens, Mr. Speaker, when we control this, when we become the area where these species are landed, that also puts us in a position where we can start calling the shots as to where this food product is going to be processed. We are not in that delightful position that we should be in now because of the fact that our fleets, our foreign fleets are going on the Grand Banks, selling indiscriminately, selling sometimes at subsidized prices. I find it difficult to reconcile the position of the Government of the United States where they say they will not tolerate any subsidized food going into the United States from Canada, but will enter into a treaty to accept totally subsidized production of food product from Poland, but they do it. It is an inconsistency, but whatever the reason for it is, as Canadians we have to, obviously, move with great caution and be sure that we comply with the requirements of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the other honourable members of this House and as the representative of the largest fish producing constituency in Eastern Canada in supporting this resolution.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The Member for Twillingate.

MR. GILLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I might say for the benefit of my honourable colleague from Hermitage that I did rise to my feet yesterday, but a little bit behind the honourable the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps this resolution is the most unique resolution or, I should say, proclamation, but at least it is a resolution as it is now, to come before this House in its entire history, it is a unique resolution in more ways than one. First of all, because of the manner in which it was compiled as we have it before us and because of the unanimity of it, because I am quite positive it will receive unanimous approval.

In other words, this is not a resolution of the administration. It is not a resolution of the opposition. It is a resolution of the people's House and therefore it is a resolution from the people of Newfoundland. That is one way in which it is unique. Another way in which it is unique is that this resolution is going forth from this Assembly, I hope and pray,

not only to the Federal Government or to the honourable the Minister of External Affairs in that government, but to an international Conference in Geneva, Switzerland. I hope, if the resolution is not read at that conference, it will certainly be presented to it in some form pointing out to that conference the necessity of Canada gaining jurisdiction over the Continental Margin.

Now, going down through the resolution, the whereases, I see in number six, it says, "And whereas such resources, this is fisheries and minerals and others, still belong to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador." Now, I hope that that section will not turn off the federal minister and he and his colleagues will not say to themselves, "Well, if we accept this, it is a sort of acknowledging to Newfoundland that the resources do belong to them whereas in actual fact we are trying to battle that thing out at the very moment." I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this section should be used, at least in the international conference, to enhance the position of the Federal Government, of the Government of Canada because, as I understand, and here I am not a lawyer, but I do understand that constitutionally when we entered Confederation the Continental Margin did belong to Newfoundland and consequently it still does. I hope this is correct.

Now, actually, I did not consider this resolution was presented for debate. I thought it was presented so that anybody who wished to speak to it would offer his two cents worth or, let us say, his finger of powder in the old muzzle-loader, so that when it is finally fired, the boom will be heard throughout the entire Geneva Conference.

The honourable Member for Bonavista South was the first one to introduce a debate into the whole question, but what we are trying to accomplish here, little Newfoundland, or Canada through little Newfoundland I would say, is jurisdiction, jurisdiction which is the

administration of justice or the authority, let us say, over the territory in question. I think if it is presented properly to the Geneva Conference and if the Conference is made aware of what has actually happened in this little Province, let us face it, this is the part of Canada, in fact the part of the Atlantic Ocean, the North Atlantic at least, where the stocks of fish have been down through the ages, the greatest stocks, I suppose, in the entire North Atlantic. So, it is of grave importance to us. It changes our way of life if it goes and furthermore, it reduces our economy to a, definitely to a have-not Province and therefore tends to reduce our people along the coastal lines to the depths of poverty.

I think if this was presented, Mr. Speaker, properly to that Conference, that we want the jurisdiction over this area, we would like to have it, pointing out to them that naturally we cannot harvest, we definitely cannot say, - I know it has been said here by my friend, the Member for Bell Island, that we put a notice up "Keep Off". We cannot do that. It is not as easy, Mr. Speaker, as we think it is or a lot of people think it is. We are not that naive to think that it is quite that easy. Here we are talking about an area which extends in one position or one location out to six hundred miles. It is not quite that easy. These countries are fishing there. They have a thousand ships. I understand that the Soviet Union alone has a thousand ships. They are not only fishing off Newfoundland. They are fishing off the United States. They are fishing everywhere. So they are fishing in the main for food for their people. Therefore, they are going to have to have food. But if we get jurisdiction authority over the area and allow them to fish a quota which meets with the approval of Canada and that that quota cannot and not be exceeded, then I think we will have accomplished something.

The main object of this resolution is to get the jurisdiction over the area. I do not think for one moment we could ever hope to drive the foreign fleets off the fishing grounds and say to them "You cannot fish there anymore." I do not think we could ever hope to accomplish that. Then we talk of controlling it, policing it. I do not think that is the proper way to go about it either, Mr. Speaker. I think I have to disagree with this method of using

the navy and the airforce or whatever arm of the forces that we have at our disposal. It was only this morning that I heard Mr. Kissinger's remarks on the radio where violence does not go towards a pieceful settlement of any dispute. We know that. I think it might be possible, Mr. Speaker, to arrange some sort of a programme with the foreign fleets. Just supposing, for argument sake, they did consent to have a Canadian, an officer of the Federal Government or whatever you want to call him, on board each foreign ship. The Soviet Union has a thousand ships. That is a thousand men who would get jobs. They would report each night by the radio to some central ship, say his ship perhaps, and that ship in turn would report the two to the authorities in Ottawa or in St. John's here, wherever the case might be, Halifax, would all be computerized and each ship would be told in turn, when he was overfished or when he had his quota.

Some way could be worked out. There is no doubt about it. If we are to survive, if this world is to survive and if we are to acquire the proper diet, the proper balanced diet and the protein which is necessary for that diet, if the area surrounding our shores is producing a great percentage of that protein, Mr. Speaker, I think surely goodness it is possible to come to some agreement with these countries and fish there so that everybody, Newfoundland, can get its share of fish as well as Russia, Poland, all the other countries. I think, of course, Mr. Speaker, that we, I said this before, that we do have to provide the ships to take our men out where the fish is, not necessarily ships as large as the foreign fleets because they have so far to come to fish. If we have to take our men out there, we have not presented them with that opportunity, so we cannot say yet whether or not they are willing to go, whether they are willing to go and fish on the Hamilton Banks, whether they are willing to stay out fishing a month at a time. We do not know that. We know that they have not protested for it. There have been no marches on the hill, no placards carried, no strikes protesting that their boats are too small, they cannot go out and get the fish where the fish is.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. GILLETT: Absolutely! We have to have larger. We have to have boats that will harvest all of the species that are here to be harvested. You know, Mr. Speaker, just supposing we do, and I hope and pray to God that we do, get that jurisdiction and get it in a diplomatic way. Final success rests in the hands of our fishermen. We can pass all the legislation we want. We can get all the resolutions to Ottawa we want. We could even get the jurisdiction perhaps, and I hope we do, over this area, but finally, it is the fishermen themselves who have to make it a success.

Therefore, it is a co-operative venture and I say venture, although that word is not received very well in this Province right now, by the trawler fleet at least, co-adventurer, but it has to be that and we have to have that co-adventure spirit. We have to have that co-operation but we have to also guarantee to a point the fishermen who go out there, that they will be protected, that their families will, they will receive a remuneration for their efforts commensurate with the work that they do. That we will have to look after. But in the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing today is trying to make possible for our fishermen a means of gaining a greater and a better livelihood, not because anybody is short of protein in Newfoundland, not because we are short of fish in Newfoundland because I doubt if you could find a quintal of fish in St. John's today if you wanted to, but we are doing in and we are trying to do it so that our coastal areas will enjoy an even better way of life than they have today. We are trying to do this so that our inshore fishermen can live traditionally as their forefathers did, so that our social structure will not be broken down, and in doing this, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that every fisherman and every fisherman's son and all those who love the sea will appreciate and understand. They have to have a great input, the fishermen themselves have to have a great input into this programme.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of Newfoundland will watch with great interest and great concern the proceedings at Geneva. I would like to see somebody, say, the Minister of Fisheries or the Minister of Mines and Energy

take this resolution by plane today to Ottawa. Not just send it on your telex, take it. Deliver it in person and also deliver, as either of these gentlemen is quite capable of doing it, very eloquently by -

MR. MORGAN: Send a delegation from the House.

MR. GILLETT: No, no. One person is enough.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Member from St. John's -

MR. GILLETT: You might scare them. You might scare them.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. GILLETT: No. In person to point out, if the Minister of External Affairs is not aware, to make him aware. Put the words into his mouth that he could use when he gets to Geneva. Do not leave it with him. Supposing we got a resolution, for argument's sake, from the Northwest Territories, how could we relate to it if somebody from the Northwest Territories did not come and tell us exactly what the picture is.

Between two and four per cent of the Gross National Product -

MR. MURPHY: Someone would have to find Newfoundland on the map.

MR. GILLETT: If that had to go on the computer and the Gross National Product is, we learn it is, between two and four per cent, the computer would reject it. But that is not the point. That is not the point, so therefore, we have to put into the very mouth of the Minister of External Affairs the words to use in Geneva. Nobody can better put those words into his mouth than those of us who live here, work here and those of us who love Newfoundland and every last fisherman in it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. GILLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dunphy): The honourable the Minister of Finance:

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, this is one resolution which I am very happy, I think, in common with most members of the House to see on the Order Paper. It is something which any Newfoundlander, and most certainly both sides of the House, can be of one mind on. And whereas anything that affects the fisheries is of such demanding importance to us, I think it is really compulsory to us almost, even though we were hesitant to speak on it at this particular time. But any member

representing a fishing district should have something to say on this important motion.

The present turmoil in the fishing industry is one matter. But this particular resolution goes into an area which has far-reaching effects and far-reaching implications long after any disputes which may currently be in the fishing industry are forgotten and done with. Unfortunately, the basis of a lot of the present trouble in the fishing industry is really the sum and substance of this resolution. Where the stocks of fish are being depleted, the earning powers of our fishermen are automatically declining and this is really a lot of the basis of the present dispute. Now I will not refer anymore to that because it should not be referred to at this particular time.

But going back a little earlier into the history of this sort of thing, I do agree with previous speakers that Canada as such has never taken what, in my opinion, is a really serious interest in the fisheries. It is true that there have been many millions of dollars spent federally and provincially in this province in assistance to the fisheries, but not on the scale, in my opinion, that the industry warrants. I recall vividly years ago, just after we joined Confederation, I was in Ottawa on a delegation at that time from the Fish Trades and got into a very heated argument with the late Stewart Bates, who was the Deputy Minister of Fisheries at the time. We ended up by crossing swords to the extent that I said that we were not even speaking the same language.

The attitude in Ottawa at that time, and I am afraid it comes right through to today, was that the fisheries was something which, well, we have to pay attention to it but it is a bit of a nuisance. It is not of such great importance to Canada that we have to give it the attention that it should be given. This is honestly my feelings about it. Now I hope and pray that our present Minister of Fisheries will be able to change that attitude. I feel quite honestly that if anybody from this province can do it, he will.

It is going to be a hard battle. It is going to be an extremely hard battle to get the proper interests from the federal government in the fisheries. I think the ultimate insult to the fishing industry of Newfoundland is to have it coupled with the environment.

The very fact that it is under the Environmental Department indicates in my mind that the whole thing is not regarded as seriously as it should be.

Now on the other hand, in comparison, the European Countries do regard this as a vital industry and this is where the problem comes in, controlling their efforts or trying to bring some rationale to the amount of fish taken. I recall very vividly back in 1959-1960 I was a member of ICNAF, the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries and to understand the problems which are involved in International negotiations one has to be a member of an international body to see just how complicated issues can become.

In the first instance you have the language problem and no matter how good the interpretation is, the interpretation which different nations put on what is said is sometimes entirely contradictory to what is intended. I saw this happen in Moscow, and true, there the interpretation facilities were not very good, that it was sometimes a day or a day and a half before we got the translation of what was said the day before.

But even at that, the interpretation which was put on what was said was something completely unrealistic and I can well understand that a conference the size of what was held in South America last year will again be held in Geneva this year, has a great danger of bogging down in misunderstanding. Probably not intentional misunderstanding but misunderstanding which arises from a complete different view on the whole problem.

Just to illustrate to some extent the importance that these fisheries of ours represent to some other nations of the world and here I have to agree with my friend from the other side,

from Twillingate, that it is not an easy manner to settle because it is of such importance to them. Meals of fish in many European Countries are regarded at least, if not a daily occurrence, several times a week.

At the time I was over there in Moscow there was a plant which I visited had 3,000 workers and had seventy-two varieties of fish. Their fleets ranged from all sections of the globe, over all sections of the globe. They bought them from the Atlantic, Pacific and from Arctic and Antarctic and everywhere. They felt, naturally so, that having the equipment and the men available and prepared to put the effort into it, that they could range the world in their fishing fleets.

Now years ago I recall when the Portuguese and the southern European Countries were the most active on our Banks and so on, There was not the same problem because these people came out to the Banks, fished far offshore and generally got quick loads and went home.

I remember loading loads of fish in Fogo at the time when we used to top off the cargoes of Bank fishing fleets with dry fish which we had prepared. They would come in, these Portuguese druggers and load up and go on, finish off the cargo with dry fish which they bought in Newfoundland. At that time, the fish which they had in their holes, I used to see many hundreds, thousands of quintals of it, was huge stuff. There was not a fish in the cargo under thirty inches in length, hardly. It was tremendous codfish at that time.

Now gradually over the years, the size of the catch and the size of the product which is being taken off these fishing grounds has diminished to the point that it is almost uneconomic to catch it and it is really only the scroff and the leavings of the deep sea fishery that is now coming ashore and this is where the danger is, that what our shore fishermen are catching, with one or two exceptions, is very, very small fish. Fish beyond any economic

March 7, 1975

Tape No. 237

NM - 3

reason for processing. It is doubly expensive to handle. It gives a poor return to the fishermen and it is one of the major stumbling blocks in developing our industry. That is why it is so essential that some form of control be put on these deep sea fishing fleets.

We heard a resolution this morning and we heard some comment from the Minister of Fisheries as to how this government was going to try to help assist and try to impress on the federal government how the shore fishermen should be assisted. It is a very worthy and commendable theory on our part, but it will only be a theory unless the fish are there to catch.

Now, I feel myself that also what was said about properly regulated or controlled fisheries insofar as having a group of professional fishermen is also an essential part of it because while we do not want to restrict the effort of every Tom, Dick and Harry who wants to go out and catch a few fish - I do not think he should be restricted - the proper, real, professional fisherman should receive proper recognition. I think it is the only way that we will encourage the men to really get into the fishery.

On many sections of our coast, you have in every settlement a few really dedicated, thoroughly competent, good fishermen who demonstrate through their efforts that a good livelihood can be had from the fishery. Regardless of what the conditions are, these men very often make a good livelihood. Now, if we could built up a hard core of such dedicated, professional fishermen, I think our production effort would go up very, very substantially. Not only would it improve the production effort, but it would improve the quality of fish that we are putting into our plants, because, as was said this morning, the shore fish when caught is of a much higher quality, much better quality, to improve the end product. This is what we need to encourage because Newfoundland will survive and the fisheries of Newfoundland will survive if we get a high class of fish, a better class of fish, a better quality of fish than our competitors can produce. This is where the shore fishery of Newfoundland is so dramatically important, so very important and why it should be encouraged.

I do not intent to speak at any length on this, Mr. Speaker, because I know others want to speak on it, but, in my opinion, this resolution is of paramount importance if it does nothing else but

shake up the apathy of the federal government with respect to our fisheries. I believe in all the legal approaches that could be taken, and this has to be done on an international scale. Surely to heavens, in an industry of such importance to us here in this section of Canada, we cannot afford to sit around for three, four, five, six, ten, eight, twenty years while all of this is being dealt with on a legalistic basis.

As I started to say when I got up to speak, this thing goes back a long way. I was speaking this morning of hearing these very discussions fifteen and twenty years ago. Now, what has happened in the meantime? I know at that time the control of the mesh, the size of mesh was the great thing under discussion, the size of the mesh of nets. At that time, I recall very vividly, George Clark was the Deputy Minister of Fisheries in Canada. Now, we were on the other side. They were talking about controlling the effort and inspecting the ships and all this sort of thing. Clark said, "Canada is prepared to enter into an agreement to try to control and police the fishing effort." The Russian stood on his feet and he said, after it was translated, he said, "How many men are you prepared to put at this job and how many ships?" Clark sort of stumbled and said, "Well, I guess we have two or three of these that we can send out." The Russian laughed and he said, "We can have 1,500 ships and 20,000 men if you want them on the Grand Banks."

So, really, when Canada speaks of a fishing effort, we are not in the same league. For us to talk of controlling this and driving these fellows off, it has to be done in some orderly, sensible fashion. Therefore, I think that Canada, our federal government, must take a really serious look at this. I hope that this resolution among the other approaches which are made to Ottawa, particularly by our very belligerent Minister of Fisheries, will have the necessary affect.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): The honourable member for Labrador South.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention originally to speak to this debate since, as it has already been pointed out, it is a unanimous decision, I hope, to send this resolution to Ottawa. But I do not believe it would be correct for me to let it pass without adding my name to the list of those who have supported it, and making that a matter of a record. I think it is abundantly clear that if any action is going to be taken it must be done by the federal government, and as has been demonstrated over the years the federal government are not prepared to act without pressure. And I think it is incumbent upon everyone of us here through work in our own constituencies to get the public as well behind it. I would like to think that this resolution is merely the start of a larger pressure movement to try to finally move the federal government into action.

I would agree with the remarks made by the honourable gentleman for Bonavista South when he said that we can hope to see very little come out of the Law of the Sea Conference. Nevertheless we would be irresponsible if we did not try at this point to inject some kind of sense into the delegations who are going to attend that meeting. It is important that we get the resolution off as soon as possible. But I think we should be looking at some further action, some alternate means of putting pressure on Ottawa when, and if, as we suspect, that Law of the Sea Conference is not going to produce the desired results.

I believe it is also illogical for us to be talking about unilateral action. Because Canada as a nation, with our history of rather gutless diplomacy is not in any position anyway if we were to declare a 200 mile limit to defend, and protect, and control that 200 miles. The total numbers of men and women in our combined Armed Forces comes to something less than the numbers of policemen in the combined municipal and state police in the State of New York. I do not think that we would have very much luck in trying to keep the Russians away. We are the only Arctic nation with ships that are not equipped to operate in ice. It is senseless to talk

of unilateral action. I believe what we have to be doing at this point is to get together diplomatically on the diplomatic level with the United States and Mexico and take a trilateral stand on the protection of the entire North American Continental Shelf.

I would just like to reiterate that I hope this is merely the start of more political pressure to be put upon Ottawa by not the legislature, but by all members of the public. And hopefully honourable members here will take that back to their constituencies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Hermitage,

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to rise and make a few comments about this resolution. Apart from my immediate interest in it I certainly come from a constituency, or represent a constituency which has a very real vested interest in this particular subject.

First of all let me say that I certainly will be voting for the motion, and otherwise giving my unqualified support to the motion. I welcome it. And I welcome the atmosphere in which it is being debated. It is the kind of thing that deserves to have the unanimous support of the House, which I hope it will. And indications are that it will.

I share the sentiments expressed by my colleague the Member for Twillingate when he suggest that perhaps instead of having this thing just wired to Ottawa, or mailed to Ottawa, or whatever, that perhaps it ought to be taken to Ottawa.

MR. BARRY: I will be there on Monday anyhow so -

MR. SIMMONS: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: The Minister of Mines indicates that he will be there in Ottawa so he will have an opportunity to put our case a little more strongly than one can do by letter. The Minister of Social Services indicates that he would like a trip to Ottawa. Well, all of us on this side would certainly like for him to have a trip to Ottawa or somewhere, or anywhere as a matter of fact.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

March 7, 1975

Tape 239 (Morning)

PK - 3

MR. SIMMONS: I will move that. I would certainly move that for the honourable minister without no hesistancy at all.

MR. F. ROWE: When it hits the cold air it will go straight up.

MR. SIMMONS: Not at all. I cannot think of anybody more qualified, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the offshore fisheries than the Member for St. John's Centre. A man who must be eminently qualified in the subject.

He knows as much about the offshore fishery, Mr. Speaker, as -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: He knows as much about the offshore fishery, as he knows about another subject that we had to beat him and get after him and harass him in every way possible -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: before we got the information, Then he should be an expert on the fishery.

MR. MURPHY: I think you left your head in the water too long.

MR. SIMMONS: Anky Panky.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Anky Panky.

MR. SIMMONS: Anky Panky.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Anky Panky.

MR. ROBERTS: We are your friends, Ank. You should hear what your enemies say. You should hear what your enemies say.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am so interested in hearing the expertise of the Member for St. John's Centre on this subject that I do not know whether I should yield the floor to him.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I will yield the floor if you want to speak on the fishery and I can speak when you are finished.

MR. NEARY: Big fishery problem down there in St. John's Centre.

MR. SIMMONS: Do you want me to yield for a minute. It should not take longer than that to tell what he knows about the fishery, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the offshore fishery, of course, is the life blood of the South Coast and this has been brought home dramatically during the past few months because of this strike situation, the trawlermen's dispute. People who live on the South Coast, many of whom were not directly involved in the fishery or who think they are not directly affected by the fishery, have realized during the

past few weeks just how completely they and their businesses and their livelihoods are dependent on the success of the offshore fishery.

We have heard a lot about declining fish stocks. We have heard a lot about the need to extend the jurisdiction as is outlined here and certainly that there be no doubt about where I stand on that, this is a position which I can support without hesitation or without qualification. But I would be less than honest if I sat down without saying that extending the jurisdiction is not of itself the answer insofar as Newfoundland is concerned. We can extend it out there 300 miles to the Continental Margin or 600 miles, you go where you want out there, as long as this administration here in Newfoundland insist on pursuing its present, I was going to say policy, but more accurately, Mr. Speaker, its present lack of policy with respect to the offshore fishery, the fishery generally, the jurisdiction over the Continental Shelf will not help our fishery one iota. It will not help it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the answer was contained in a document which I keep for memories sake, The answer to the offshore fishery was contained in this document of November 1973 when it was announced at that time that the government has decided to establish a trawler programme at a cost of \$60 million over the next three years.

MR. NEARY: What year was that?

MR. SIMMONS: 1973.

MR. ROWE: The year of the by-election.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, if you want to find out when the government first indicated its intentions in this matter, it did it in -

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on. Mr. Speaker, can we get on with it?

MR. SIMMONS: They do not want to hear it, Mr. Speaker. Because it hits too close to home. Because it puts the finger on what is the real issue insofar as the offshore fishery is concerned in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: A mackerel molecule.

MR. NEARY: The clown of the Tory Party.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in March 1972 the Throne Speech gave notice of government's intention to introduce legislation to establish a trawler corporation to own or lease rights on a new fleet of trawlers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Be quiet now.

MR. SIMMONS: Then in April of the same year, Mr. Speaker, in April of the same year the Premier gave notice at Harbour Grace -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the gentleman opposite that the Member for Bell Island is a statesman. It is by accident that they recognize it, of course. I would look for either authorities if I wanted to know who the statesmen are in this House.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Why do you not become friends with Anky Panky, the big hypocrite?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I have got all the time in the world, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, this debate is really getting out of hand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying the Throne Speech of 1973 gave notice of the government's intention to establish a trawler corporation. The Premier reaffirmed this a month or so later in Harbour Grace when he again, well he went on to say that, he went so far as to say the trawler programme was an established fact,

another example of where the facts are often depending on his interpretation of what the facts are. The trawlermen on the South Coast, Mr. Speaker, do not think it is an established fact. The many people in the Community of Harbour Breton who have had to either lose their jobs at the fish plant or who are only working there part time, and I am not making reference to the trawlermen's dispute per se, but I am talking about the period before that when they were working twenty or thirty hours a week because the fish supply to the plant was not sufficient to keep them going on a full-time basis. They will not believe the Premier, neither in 1973 nor in 1975 that the trawler corporation or the trawler fleet is an established fact.

Mr. Speaker, my point in making reference to these matters now is to say, let us not get so caught up in this particular resolution—and do not misunderstand me, we ought to get completely caught up in this one insofar as it is concerned—but let us not use this as a scapegoat for the other problem, a problem which has been accentuated by this administration by failing to act on its own commitment of three years ago. Three years ago this was recognized.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ah, come on boy!

MR. SIMMONS: Three years ago this government recognized that part of the solution to this problem, a very large part of it, lay in increasing, in improving, in stepping up our fish catching capabilities. We can have all the resolutions we want —

MR. MORGAN: Resource depletion.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, we are talking about resource depletion. The Member from Bonavista South wants to tell us that the reason we are not catching as many fish is because of the dealling supply. That is partly true, Mr. Speaker. That is partly true, but I put it to you this way, Mr. Speaker, the Russians are catching fewer fish but they are catching a lot more fish than we are. And they are catching more because they have provided the additional fish catch capability. We would be catching a lot more fish if the government of three years ago had lived up to its commitment and provided the additional trawlers

to supply the additional fish to those plants, particularly along the South Coast.

Mr. Speaker, it is a particular disappointment to me, representing a constituency which depends very heavily on the offshore fishery, a particular disappointment that the government have not seen fit to give attention to improving the fish catch capability of our trawler fleets by adding to the number of trawlers nursing the fishery.

Our unanimity at this particular moment on the subject of the resolution, our unanimity and support of the resolution which I hope will be unanimous when the vote comes, I hope every member will vote for the resolution so that the Minister of Mines and Energy or whomever conveys the sentiments to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister or whomever conveys that sentiment will be able to go with the additional strength of a unanimous resolution behind him.

Mr. Speaker, shall we call it one o'clock?

MR. SPEAKER: It is noted that the Honourable the Member for Hermitage adjourned the debate. It now being one o'clock I do leave the Chair until three o'clock this afternoon.

The House resumed at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Before we proceed with business, we have several groups in the galleries whom I would like to welcome today. From the A.P. Low Elementary School in Labrador City, we have eighteen grade five students with their teachers, Mrs. Wanda Saunders and Miss Gagnon; and from the Holy Trinity Regional High School in Hearts Content, forty-two grade eleven students with Mr. Charles Way and Mr. Eric Legg, from Curtis Elementary at St. John's, eleven grade six students with Mr. Meadus and Mrs. Martin, and from Gander we have seven boy scouts with Mr. Claude Hendrix here. On behalf of all the honourable members, I certainly welcome you all to the galleries today and trust that your visit here is most interesting and informative.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I have an announcement to make.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable minister have leave to-

MR. NEARY: No, no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOODY: It is an answer to a question you asked this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable minister - if there is not unanimity then I cannot recognize the honourable minister.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, my colleague has the floor. The Member for Hermitage, Sir, is addressing the House in the debate.

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

MR. EARLE: How small can you get.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: You should have had the courtesy and come over and ask us beforehand.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. EARLE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: We are going to have a budget on Wednesday, we know that. We were told that this morning by the Minister of Fisheries.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if I could pick up where I left off before lunch.

We were discussing the resolution concerning the Continental Margin and the importance of all of us presenting to Ottawa, all of us as members of this House, presenting a united front to Ottawa in terms of our feelings about their extending jurisdiction, not only out to the two hundred mile limit, but to include the Continental Margin as well. As we recessed one o'clock, I was making a point that in addition to being very, very firm on this matter of the extended jurisdiction, we ought at all times to keep in mind that the having jurisdiction over the Continental Margin, of itself, will not be of much benefit to the offshore fishery in Newfoundland. Even if we achieve this and Canada agrees with our position, which I sincerely hope it will, and even if it can persuade the Law of the Sea Conference in Geneva later this month to subscribe to that position, even if all that is so, Mr. Speaker, and all that happens, unless we get more action, unless we get some fulfillment of the commitments made by the present administration here in the Province, then we will not benefit one iota from the extended jurisdiction.

I think it is a point that needs to be made and made again, Mr. Speaker. I have been, during the past few days, relieved, and relieved by the atmosphere in the House as we engage unanimously in a matter, get behind a matter in which we all firmly believe. I had not intended to take what may be interpreted by some as a partisan note in this particular debate. I had intended to follow the precedent set in this debate by my colleague, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition and certain other people who succeeded him. But in view of the fact that two or three of the ministers, in particular the Minister of Justice, sought to spend most of his time parading and blaming, I ought to say, blaming others for the woes of the Newfoundland fishery, rather than leveling with the people of Newfoundland and telling them, telling us here in the House that the real problems we are having with the Newfoundland fishery now cannot alone be blamed on the lack of jurisdiction on the Margin or the declining stocks or any of these problems alone. These are factors, Mr. Speaker, and they are very

important factors, and they are factors which are having an impact on the kind of fishery we are having these days, but the factor over which we have control. We cannot control at this particular moment the matter of jurisdiction as a province. We cannot control the fish stocks or the fact that they are declining. But there is an area in which we have control. It is an area of which this government has been aware of for a long, long time, has paid lip service to for three years or so in campaign promises and in Throne Speeches. In the 1972 Throne Speech we had reference to it. In various elections propaganda put out at election time, the Tory Party has given notice about its plans to improve the fish catching capability, but yet it has done nothing about it.

We do not have that trawler fleet. We need that trawler fleet. If we had that trawler fleet that was promised in 1972, the offshore fishery, particularly along the South Coast of Newfoundland and on the Southern Shore and in parts of the North East Coast, that offshore fishery would not be as near to the brink of disaster as it is today. It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that while we all stand here and mouth nice sentiments, and sentiments that have to be stated about the need for Canada to take the position which we are taking in this resolution, I hope that we will not use this occasion to try and gloss over the other problem, the problem over which we do, as a province, have control, the problem of declining fish catches.

Now, the obvious answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is that the fish are not there anymore. Of course if they are not there, why are we all pepped up about this particular resolution. Of course they are there. They may be declining in numbers, but, as I said earlier, I believe, the Russians and the other nations represented on those Grand Banks, true they are catching fewer fish than they did in previous years, but they are still catching a whole lot more fish than we are.

There is one reason why they are catching a lot more fish than we are. Because they are much more aggressive in their pursuit of the fishery. They are prepared to put their money where their mouth is and we are not. We will talk and we will print and we will shout and

we will bluff and we will do everything to tell people about what great trawler fleets there are going to be if they vote for the right party, but when it comes time to put that \$60 million that is talked about here by the Premier in his election promises, or that was talked about by the Premier in April, 1973 over in Harbour Grace, or the commitment that was made in the Throne Speech of three years ago, 1972, when it comes time to put our money as a government or its money as a government where its mouth is, nothing happens. Then they begin to pontificate about what the real problems are and they begin to talk long and hard about their experience as conferences, as the Minister of Justice did this morning. They begin to wax long and eloquent about how if we had that Continental Margin jurisdiction, how we would have all our problems solved.

Mr. Speaker, let us not be fooled by that kind of argument. It is an argument which is alright in its place, but if it is used at this time, in this debate to draw attention away from the real responsibility here, the real problem here, the problem of declining fish catches, a problem that has been ignored by this administration, a problem that has been accentuated, aggravated because this administration has not kept its commitment of three years ago to provide a trawler fleet, if, Mr. Speaker, we allow the unanimity of the moment to gloss over what is another big issue troubling our fishery, we will achieve nothing because we will have, optimistically speaking, we will have jurisdiction in time over the Continental Margin with all its resources. I am at this moment in my comments addressing myself to the fisheries resources. I do want to say something in a moment about the mineral resources.

I was saying optimistically speaking we will have jurisdiction in time if this resolution meets with the success we hope for it. We will have. We will have nothing more. We will be catching no more fish. There will be still just as many people in the fish plants in Gaultois, and Harbour Breton, and all the others we could name along the South Coast, and the Southern Shore, and on the Northeast Coast. We will still have hundreds upon hundreds of people working part-time in the plant instead of full-time because there is not enough fish to keep the plants going full-time, because there are not enough trawlers out there catching fish. And notice what I said, Mr. Speaker. Not because the fish are not out there but because there are not enough trawlers out there catching the fish, not enough trawlers from Newfoundland catching those fish.

Oh if we only had that trawler programme the Premier talked about so often! If we only had it. He said three years ago it was a fact. Well it is far from a fact. His version of facts maybe, Mr. Speaker. But we have had examples during the past two weeks that we should not tend to rely on the Premier's version of the facts, His version of the fact, and I quote him. He said in Harbour Grace in 1973, "the trawler programme is an established fact." Tell that to the people down in Harbour Breton, Mr. Speaker, who cannot get a decent week's wages because they are working twenty hours instead of forty.

MR. A. EVANS: We have not got an established market, though, have we?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward as I have been for a year-and-a-half in this House to hearing a speech from the Member for Burgeo-LaPolle.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Again I remind honourable members that when a member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence. Even though the member speaking may be provoked somewhat it still does not give him the procedural right to make any comments with regards to a statement made by a member opposite.

MR. SIMMONS: I was going to be very kind, Mr. Speaker, as my comments about the honourable member are always very kind. I was going to invite him to give us his thinking on the subject of markets. I look forward -

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. Member for Hermitage is merely changing words around to get back to a point that he was not making before, and thus not being relevant to this debate.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying before I was interrupted by the Member for Burgeo-LaPoile.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Being near the weekend, Mr. Speaker, I will try and be charitable towards the Member for Burgeo-LaPoile. He did bring to mind, of course, another area, the area of marketing which does require a fair amount of debate on which I would be prepared to give him my thoughts at any time. But right now I would like to pursue the point I was making. I believe very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that we can miss the boat on this one, in this discussion, in our atmosphere of unanimity we can really miss the boat on this one. I do not think the government are at all missing the point. I think indeed as apart from taking it, what is an admirable position, in supporting the resolution as introduced by my colleague the Leader of the Opposition, apart from doing that, which is admirable, I believe the government have another agenda here, another item on its agenda. I believe the government sees this as a beautiful scapegoat item. An item to detract, an item to detract away from its failure over the past three years -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: I shall not look to the Member for Bonavista South to decide what is partisan. His judgment on that matter is fairly limited and well known. Partisan or not, Mr. Speaker, I must make the

point which concerns me as a member from a constituency which depends so heavily on the offshore fishery, I must make the point that the problems we are having in Harbour Breton, and Gaultois, and the other communities on that coast depend on fish plants in particular. I am not, I stress, Mr. Speaker, alluding in any way to the immediate problems created by the trawler strike. It would be improper for me to be commenting on that at this particular time because negotiations are in process, and I am not even indirectly alluding to that. But I am talking about the kinds of problems which we had even in the absence of a dispute. The kinds of problems we had last Fall, for example, when there was no trawlermen's strike.

And those problems, the problems of inadequate fish supplies in the fish plants on the South Coast. The onus, the blame for that kind of problem, and the spin off problems of lack of job opportunities and lack of hours of work, the blame for those problems must be laid squarely at the feet of the government for their failure to keep the commitment to provide that trawler fleet.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding I would want to just say a few words insofar as the resolution affects and relates to resources other than the fisheries resources as such. Here again, Mr. Speaker, it is essential that all of us get behind this resolution again insofar as it affects our mineral resources. I recognize and the motion recognizes that we already have a much more substantial claim here, or I should say have established a much more substantial claim here, than we have insofar as our claim in the fisheries is concerned.

The only comment that I would want to make here because I believe most of the rest have been made, relates to the wording of the resolution itself, the first part of the "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED". I am not suggesting any amendments. I believe the framers of the amended resolution are probably quite aware of the implications here. Just for the record I would like to mention that in the last part of that, the indented part of the resolution, if I might call it such, where the word "maintain" appears. It reads, and I quote, "And that it maintain Canada's existing rights and jurisdiction over the minerals, etc." The point I want to make here, of course, is that I think we are all aware in discussing this resolution that the intent of the resolution is to set forth Canada's position in relation to the international situation.

I hope that the Minister of Mines and Energy or whoever seeks to elaborate on this resolution when it is presented to Ottawa, will use the opportunity to again point out our stand, and I believe it is the government's stand and certainly the Liberal Party's stand and Newfoundland's stand really, that although the context here says, "Canada in relation to the international situation" insofar, of course,

as the rights and jurisdiction problem is concerned in Canada, it is first Newfoundland's existing rights, Newfoundland's existing jurisdiction. I would gather, and perhaps the minister could confirm this, that the use of the word "Canada" there is intended vis-a-vis the international situation only and would in no way subtract from our stated and oft stated position in terms of Newfoundland's particular rights insofar as offshore minerals.

MR. BARRY: The fact that Canada owns them, does not mean that the federal government controls them.

MR. SIMMONS: Right. I think we are on the same wave length here, but just for the record, Mr. Speaker, I just did want to reiterate again our firm position insofar as Newfoundland's particular rights - I say particular and unique, unique because of the way of our coming into Canada in 1949 and the status of our government or at the time of our coming in the status in relation to or in contrast to the status of the other provinces at the time they joined the union.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would just like to say that I wholeheartedly support this resolution and I would certainly invite all members on both sides of the House to give it their unanimous consent and thus allow the Minister of Mines and Energy and the government of the province to put forward to Ottawa the strongest possible voice on this very important and crucial subject.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Social Services.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may and I will not keep the House very long on this. I do not come from a fishing area as such, but I might say that St. John's is just as much interested in a successful fishery and protecting it as anywhere else.

I rather enjoyed the debate up until the last speaker who showed his usual, I will not say ignorance because that is not a word I could use. But I was rather pleased, Sir, with the suggestion made by the honourable the Member for Labrador South when he said, you know, do not let it only die here. The idea has been put forward now that the Minister of Mines and Energy will be in Ottawa to present it. I do not know if this will be followed out but I think it is an excellent idea.

Following that up, Sir, we have seven M.P.'s. in Ottawa, we have I do not know how many senators. I would like to make this thing as official, as Newfoundland, as we can. If arrangements could be made now, Sir, to have an official presentation of this in Ottawa, and I do not know if the Minister of Fisheries himself can go along with this thing, but I think it would be something. Because as one who has been in this House since 1962, have heard the hardy annual of the fisheries brought up on this House floor, and heard the various members of the former regime put forth much the same things that we are talking about now. This continued, I will not say for twenty-three years, because I think it is only in more recent years that the great invasion of foreign fleets took place off our coast.

I can see now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Burgeo-LaPoile, Mr. Hodder, stand in his chair there almost week after week after week and plead the fact that from Channel Head, and I can almost see him now as he looks out to sea, and there is another city operating off that particular area of the Southwest Coast, Russian and foreign fleets.

We have been chastised. My leader, my Premier has been severely chastised because some two or three years ago, Sir, he said that we were going to have a trawler programme. He said that he was going to have a trawler programme. He did not say that he was going to

have a trawler fleet in two years. This is a physical impossibility for anybody to have. But in over twenty-three years - and I am getting just as bad as the Member for Hermitage now because he sort of got under my skin and I am being a little political - this same crew who are now criticizing us, Sir, went on and on and on and the leader of that party said that we would want a navy and I do not know how many thousand ships to defend this particular thing. I think many honourable members here will bear with me on this because I listened over there very attentively. We did not get too much chance to talk in those days. There was no Oral Question Period or anything like that as you see in the House now. We just listened and listened and listened.

But, Mr. Speaker, at one time I made a suggestion, I made many suggestions but at this particular time it was that we talk about a navy. Let us talk about a coast guard in the sense, and at that time there was a great hue and cry that our young men were not going to sea any more, they did not want to fish. I put out the suggestion, Sir, why did we not have our own coast guard fleet to take on young men, even during the summer holidays, young men out of high school possibly, or back from university, to train in this type of thing. And that we have a sort of mother ship out there, something - and I sort of talked about the "Gil Eannes" at that time, the Portuguese Hospital Ship that moved around among the trawlers at that time to sort of look after them and cater to their needs.

I also said, Sir, here we are, our seamen from the Southwest Coast particularly, go out for some nine or ten days, spend nine or ten days at sea, away from their families. Why could we not have two or three times as many trawlermen who would work regular shifts, Sir. And with transportation as it was, as it is, as it has been in recent years, what is the great cost of helicopters, perhaps, transferring these crews after one or two days at sea and bringing them back and then being out another six or eight? I would say, Sir, that it would be a very humane thing to do. Because that is one of the big complaints we hear today with the trawler fleet. They have to spend twenty-four

or thirty trips at sea, or whatever it is for, ten days away from their families, Sir. I do not think that is right, and I did not think at that time three or four years ago, Sir.

With transportation, as I said, and we see the helicopter that goes in and out here I do not know how many times a day, I do not know if she is operating now but back and forth from that oil rig just off the coast here.

AN HON. MEMBER: The oil rigs.

MR. MURPHY: The oil rigs. We have helicopters. The cost would not be too great, Sir, and I say this, and for heaven's sake do not let someone say the government should do it. We have a very strong Fishermens' Union, we have the merchants and we have the government, a tri-partnership if you like, that could perhaps arrange that type of thing. Again I am not getting into the wrongs or rights of the trawlermen's strike. That is something between the employer and the employee, if you like. But let us look at

some of these things, Sir. Let us look at today. I do not want to get into it at the present time. I will speak to it in the Speech from the Throne. This idea that the Minister of Education and the Premier has about our young people, forming a very, very active and integral part of our population, Sir, and I throw forward again, for those living in areas near the sea, that if they would like to have salt water in their veins, our young people, let us talk about some kind of a coast guard fleet that will eventually patrol our waters off our coasts. It is still in a lot of our young people. They still love the water, the sea, but this thing has arisen now, Sir, and I say let us go forward from here, no more backing away, no more backing away. It is do or die now, Mr. Speaker. It is do or die now, not withstanding what anybody wants to say about this thing. This is not a matter of who moved it or who did not move it. I do not give a darn who gets the credit, Sir, for the resolution, but I want to make sure that our fishermen get the benefit. That is what we are here for.

Whether the Leader of the Opposition or the Minister of Fisheries moved it, who cares who moves what resolution. We are all here, Sir, in this honourable House to work for everybody in the Province, whether he be fisherman, farmer, labourer, whatever he is, that is what we are sent here for. I want to congratulate those, Sir, who took part in the debate because I know that their hearts and their thoughts are in the right place to do the right thing. So, let us get this thing now passed unanimously. I do not know, quite frankly, why I am speaking so long on the thing. I do not know anybody who spent an hour and a half talking on it. All someone should have said, "Let us make a motion, it is seconded, have it moved unanimously." Is there any debate on this type of thing, Sir? There should be no debate. There is no doubt in anybody's mind that this should happen. God knows we have been living with this thing too long now. Why debate something? Will we debate the fact that the sun should not be allowed to shine in Newfoundland or we should not share in the air? This is as natural to our Province, Sir, as the sun shine and the fresh air. I look at my honourable colleague from Twillingate, from Pogo, these people. They are very much concerned

as am I concerned because St. John's Centre is not the greatest fishing district in this Province, but there is an awful lot of fish landed here in the City of St. John's by the Battery. There were some very good families of fishermen in my own district, Sir, that got a real good living from the fishery.

So, let us do away with who is going to put a trawler fleet out or who is not. Let us say that the ten, twenty, thirty, forty trawlers we have can get their fair share of the fish. That is all we are looking for at this time. Let us debate the shortcomings of the Premier or this government a bit later on, but for God's sake, for once, for once, let us get together on this for the good of the fishermen of Newfoundland and as a consequence for all the problems of Newfoundland. I say again Sir, if it is your intention, whoever will be directing this, the Minister of Fisheries, or whoever it is, or even the Leader of the Opposition, and someone is going to present this, I would suggest today, Sir, let us make it an all Newfoundland deal with our M.P.s and our senators with probably an arranged presentation of this with the very, very unanimous support of every member of this honourable House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Pogo.

MR. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I suppose we all want to get into this debate now that a debate has been started on the resolution before the House. However, I must agree with the Minister of Social Assistance, Social Services rather, that when the resolution was presented, and in my opinion I thought it was a unanimous decision to have this resolution, to pass it and get it to Ottawa as quickly as we can. However, a debate has developed and I think now that there is a debate that every member of this honourable House who has a district representing the fishermen of this province should make his voice heard.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, I think Canada has a greater chance now of getting the 200 miles, or beyond the 200 miles to the Continental Margin, than it had last year at the Law of the Sea Conference for one or two reasons. One reason I think, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that since that conference, the United States has come out advocating a similar limit of 200 miles.

Now, Sir, this in my opinion too, was one of the barriers which the Canadian Government had to give very serious consideration to. Because, Sir, suppose Canada had agreed, not by unilateral agreement, but agreed that you could not get an agreement and then we were going to enforce gunboat diplomacy. What kind of a state, what kind of a state would that put the fishing industry of this province in?

First, Mr. Speaker, I would submit, the United States would retaliate by increasing the tariff on our fresh fish into that market, consequently our fresh fishing industry would probably die. If then the British market, which we do not export too much to at the moment, would take similar reaction, retaliatory action, what then would be the position of our fresh fish industry in this province?

So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I feel that Canada today

has the sympathy of the United States and it is going to strengthen her hand in negotiations. I feel that we have a better chance now than we had a year ago.

There is another reason, too, I think in our favour. It is an established fact that there is less and less fish on the Banks. It is costing the foreign fleet more and more to prosecute that fishery. In many instances, the foreign fleet, the owners and operators of that foreign fleet now are asking themselves the question if it is worthwhile to send their ships all the way across to the North Atlantic to prosecute the fishery.

But nevertheless, Sir, they are doing it and we have to acknowledge the fact that they are doing it. And unless we, the Nation of Canada, can take some steps to control the area, whether it is 200 miles or beyond the 200 miles, then, Sir, I fear that the fishing industry, of this province especially, is in very serious trouble.

However, getting back to the negotiations again, there is another problem I think which we all have omitted and that is from a military point of view. Now, Mr. Speaker, those of us who have had experience in the convoying in the North Atlantic and in the Atlantic during the last war realize what a monumental task it is to patrol the North Atlantic. It took all of the Canadian Navy when it first started, practically all of the American Navy, the British Navy, to provide escorting facilities and, Sir, if we are going to enforce, or if Canada is going to enforce gunboat diplomacy, I would suspect that there is not enough surveillance capability in Canada

today to do it, because, Sir, the area we are talking of is a vast, vast area, one which cannot be patrolled by a half a dozen ships or a half a dozen aircrafts. We are talking about a very extensive coastline, and you go beyond that to 200 or 600 miles. Sir, what would happen if there was a war? What would happen then to our 600 miles? God forbid that there should ever be another one. I was born in the end of the first one, and the last one I want through many others. Sir, the consequence of all of this - I am sure this is the area in which the negotiators have to give some thought to when they are negotiating. It would be a wonderful thing, Sir, if at this Geneva conference now, that Canada can establish a fact, and can establish mutual agreement. I doubt very much if she is going to get unanimous agreement, but the majority of the nations will go along with Canada to enforce this Continental Margin that we are thinking of, because, Sir, there is no doubt that our inshore fishery is in a very serious state of depletion. It will be depleted if it is not already depleted.

I recall along the Labrador Coast, five or six years ago fish was very plentiful, but for the past three years, it has been a complete failure, extending all the way from Blanc Sablon to Chidley. Now, Sir, something is causing that. It is the opinion of people in the know that it is because of the foreign invasion overfishing our Hamilton Banks. Sir, if we do not get this agreement I fear for the outcome of our fishing industry. But, Sir, you know, let us not be slow in going to Ottawa for the things that Ottawa is responsible for, but there is an area of responsibility that this government cannot shirk its responsibility from. I hesitate to bring this up here, but it has been brought up. I would say that the Russian trawlers and other foreign trawlers are laughing at us. Here they are today out there sweeping up our produce, our raw materials, laughing at the Newfoundlanders, and there is not one trawler or dragger from Newfoundland fishing along those banks. Sir, we sit idly by and watch the trawlermen's strike go on, and do nothing about it. This is one of the most serious things that

has happened to this province in its fishing industry ever. What are we doing? What are the government doing? Absolutely nothing.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

CAPT. WINSOR: I would say, Sir, that it is about time - I am not the government, but here we have -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Order, please!

CAPT. WINSOR: - here we have a strike, Mr. Speaker, that has gone on for three months -

MR. NEARY: He is not the Premier.

CAPT. WINSOR: - and nothing has been done,

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: That is what you think, he might be.

CAPT. WINSOR: I am not the government. If I were a member of that government, I would naturally make some suggestion. I think it is time that we got off our fat fannies and make some suggestions, get those trawlermen back fishing.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Order, please!

All honourable gentlemen have the right to participate in the debate at the proper time. This has been brought to all honourable gentlemen's attention on many occasions and, of course, the gentleman speaking, has the right to be heard in silence.

CAPT. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can appreciate how your patience must be taxed at certain times, when certain members are speaking in this honourable House.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that this resolution will have or has the unanimity which will make, no doubt, will lead the people responsible at Ottawa, who will be attending this convention at the Law of the Sea Conference, exactly where we stand. It is a good thing. But, Sir, I feel that now we have this unanimous consent, let us get on with the resolution, let us get it to Ottawa, and

let us lobby for whatever support we can get so that the people who will be attending this conference, and will be presenting our case, will know exactly where this Province of Newfoundland stands.

MR. NEARY: Send over a select committee from the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Is the House ready for the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): The Hon. Member for Port-de-Grave.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand in this honourable House and speak to this resolution on the Law of the Sea Conference.

I think the resolution goes a long way. And while I am speaking to this, the reserves of the fishery, as far as that is concerned, we do indeed try to maintain and protect and harvest what we can harvest.

That is the problem with the government we have in Ottawa, the good Liberal Government in Ottawa. And I maintain now that the seal fishery - it was only a few days ago I heard in this House about all the unemployment. I went to the seal fishery when there were 2,400 and some odd men went to the seal fishery. We had a Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa that condemned the whole situation. I hope that at the Law of the Sea Conference, and I figure like the honourable Member for Bonavista South there is not very much going to come out of it when we have our own government in Ottawa, the federal government, that have seen our seal fishery die when there were lots of men who could be employed into it, and a good benefit to this province.

Why I am interested in the fishery, my district is made up of fishermen, and also there are other things pertaining to the Law of the Sea and the Continental Shelf. Let us not put too much emphasis on fishery. We have already heard here today, and last year and the year before, that the fishery is declining. I figure myself that we can be carried away by the people of this province by placing too much emphasis on the fishery. There are other things, and other areas that this province is just beginning to come into that has a great affect to the well-being of those who live in this province.

Surely we all know it is not going to be taken care of by just the handful of people who are in the Province of Newfoundland without any extra help. I would say when we entered Confederation, Mr. Speaker, to Canada, and becoming this tenth province that we brought them a vast lot of riches. And in return for that I am pretty proud to stand in this honourable House, on the government side, to hear that we want to be a have province, not a have-not province.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see any way that we will become a have province if we have the government in Ottawa, our federal

government, not allowing us to keep the fishermen from operating in the seal fisheries, which is a big industry in this province.

I will go further than that and say here, Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Hon. Member for Hermitage with his great input he had into it. He started off pretty good. But finally the mud and the filth and the rot that came out in the middle of his speech which upset the whole applectart. I was very attentive in listening to the honourable Member for Twillingate, in the person of Mr. Gillett, I think who gave a good contribution to this debate. I figured along those lines, Mr. Speaker, that probably we would join hand in hand, opposition and government, to see if something could be done about it. I am sure when it comes to this there is no one looking for any praise of who did it, or who did not. As far as I am concerned this is a thing that has been long waited for.

I quite agree it is going to be something to do to maintain what we expect as far as war ships or anything is concerned. But I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that it is the intention of this government to declare war on other fishing ships. As far as that is concerned we got along in the past, and I think we have got along now, mutually, and had a good affect.

And coming back to that again

I heard the honourable member for Fogo speak of what this government had done for fisheries and what not. The dishonesty was done to the fisheries of Newfoundland when they were told to burn their boats and get out of the fishing boat. That is where the dishonesty was done. I am proud to stand here and see that our Premier, whatever the thought is, has maintained and tried to bring back the fisheries. Myself, I do not have it figured that it is going to come back as it did in the past where you could go on the Labrador Coast with five or six men and probably land 2,200 quintals of fish for seven or eight men and even be split with one splitter and made with six or seven men.

Our younger generation, by being told to burn the boats, had no intellect because they never stood in the fishing boats and therefore they knew nothing about it. There is a possibility if that was kept going, they would have went in the fishing boats as well as go back to the college. They were discouraged.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who did not get discouraged and perhaps this is the reason why I am into this government, because of what I had believed in for years and years. I think if we can get together as a government, and the opposition, I call on them this very moment to have some input to put into the government. Not get up in this honourable House and try to pick someone apart because probably they are standing pretty good in their district or something, to bring out their education. "They are uneducated. They are unlearned." I challenge those on the floors of this House who have said that. The honourable member for Port de Grave may be unlearned, but I will take them to task anytime as far as that is concerned.

I never came here to tear any honourable member apart. I came here with the intention of doing something for my district. By doing something for my district, I will be doing something for my province. Therefore, there will be some input. I think those who have brought this on the floor of the House about the Law of the Sea Conference, I think that we should all stand together on it. Like many others of the members have said, it should not be just sent along in an envelope,

but it should be taken with a good hard jawed member from this government, and that could be the Minister of Fisheries, and place our case with our federal members who I think are doing a good job in Ottawa. I thank you.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to add more time to this debate but I have followed it with much interest and of course the fisheries of this province as most intrinsic to our economy. Without it, there would be no province and we would not be in any way at all sufficient. We would have more than fifteen or sixteen per cent unemployed. We would be in a very, very desperate situation.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard from members on the opposition. The one who most amazed me, of course, is the honourable gentleman who last spoke in the opposition, the member for Fogo who although he agrees with this resolution - I certainly do as well, and I congratulate those members of the House, the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy for introducing the resolutions to the House - but I am amazed that a member of the opposition can stand and support the resolution but cannot make any suggestions as to how it should be followed through. He does not believe in, as he puts it, gun boat diplomacy. Even if such a programme were undertaken, he feels that this nation of Canada does not have the capabilities of undertaking such a programme of policing the offshore limits.

I cannot say that I agree with him. I think that Canada does have the capabilities of providing the proper policing of our fishing grounds out to the two hundred mile limit, even beyond. There are a great group of people on that side who, too, condemn but when you ask them for their recommendations as to how they would provide these services, or what they would do if they were in government, their answer is, "I do not know. I am not in government." They do not know how, they want to take over the government but they do not know how they are going to do it. If they get in government, they will not know how to perform when they do get here, if they did. We will give you another fifteen years to find out, I guess.

Mr. Speaker, as far as surveillance of the offshore limits is concerned, if Canada does not have the armed capability to undertake it—if indeed it has to be armed, I do not necessarily think that it does—then I suggest that perhaps what we could resort to are those satellites that we have flying around the skies every few minutes of the day. This sounds very far fetched, Mr. Speaker, but in the environment movement today we have water monitoring stations in various parts of Canada, I am not certain, I think there are one or two in Newfoundland which are being monitored via the satellites. These are very small stations. They take up no more room than perhaps the chair which my colleague is sitting on. That station is being monitored hundreds of miles in the sky by a satellite. What we are after, of course, is water quantity and we get read backs as often as we need them through satellites.

So, if there is any doubt whatsoever as to whether or not Canada has the capabilities of policing our offshore limits, they can be allayed by the suggestion because all they have to do is employ the services of satellites. There is no problem in the world, we can now tell the weather forecast through satellites many days in advance. There is no reason why this method could not be employed to determine how many foreign ships are off our coasts. That indicates the capabilities of the honourable Member from Bell Island who conceive of new ideas and new technology.

March 7, 1975.

Tape 252

RH - 2

Mr. Speaker, I fully support this resolution and I do indeed join with my colleagues in their suggestion that this should be presented personally to the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour of the motion "aye", those opposed "nay", carried.

MR. NEARY: Divide, divide.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): I did not detect any "nays".

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! Order, please! Do honourable members wish to divide?

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Three men. Call in the members.

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

If the honourable gentlemen will permit, while the House is waiting for honourable members to find their way into the House, no honourable members have the right to carry on a debate between themselves, neither one of whom has the floor. I am sure honourable members are aware of it. The two honourable gentlemen to whom I refer are of some long standing in this House.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I apologize, I was not aware that the House was so formal that when we are waiting for members to come in, it has always been the custom, it may be a rule that I might have to look up, but -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): I suggest that is the case.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: I am here to learn even after so many years.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Are we ready for the division?

Those in favour of the motion please rise.

The honourable the Premier, the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy, the honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the honourable the Minister of Health, the honourable the Minister of Social Services, the honourable the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, the honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment, the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the honourable the Minister of Education, the honourable the Minister of Justice, the honourable the Minister of Fisheries, the honourable the Minister of Industrial Development, the honourable the Minister of Finance, the honourable the Minister of Rural Development, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Senior, Mr. Carter, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Evans, Mr. Young, Mr. Howard, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Gillett, Captain Winsor, Mr. Neary, Mr. Rowe, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Martin.

MR. ROBERTS: - those against.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Those against.

I declare the motion carried unanimously.

Order (3), "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro Electric Corporation." I believe the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing adjourned the debate and I recognize the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

HON. B. PECKFORD, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:

Mr. Speaker, after such unanimity in the House on such an important resolution, it is perhaps a little difficult to get oneself tuned up about a very important bill before the House that has already had a fair amount of discussion on it, namely, "An Act Respecting the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Electric Corporation."

Many members here in the House have taken different approaches towards the bill. Some have discussed it purely on the principle of setting up this corporation to encompass the development of the Gull Island Site as well as being responsible for CFLCo and the other hydro potential in the province. Others have looked at in more detail, some of the clauses which they find they have to object to. And one honourable member the other day took what I thought was perhaps the approach that should be taken at this stage in the debate and that was the Member for Placentia East who tried to indicate to honourable members and to the House just exactly what this kind of a bill means to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador,

I would just like to perhaps reiterate some of the feelings that the honourable member for Placentia East brought forward the other evening. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we look back over the history of this province from 1497 on up through, we always seem to find ourselves at the bottom of the totem pole, if you will, in relation to many things when we compare it to other provinces of Canada or other states, the United States and so on. For a long while we were not even allowed to live here on this island. When we were allowed, it was a pretty low existence. It was a pretty difficult time. Fishing was the central and major occupation of our people. It seems that it has been a constant struggle.

Of course, many people have over the years, historians and sociologists and others, have done fairly detailed studies on the kind of life many Newfoundlanders lived. We have been saying since 1949, and I suppose even before that time, many politicians and other learned gentlemen around the province and in Canada took note of the fact of the hardship that our people endured and of the kinds of trials and tribulations that we have had to put up with. People have voiced the idea, "Will the day ever come when this province will be now, since 1949, a have province?". We can say all we like about the fishery and its importance, and its major importance was in the total economy of the province. We can talk about the forest industry and our new forestry legislation and all that will mean in the years to come. We can talk about our mining industry even as it relates to the copper mines and the fluorspar mine in St. Lawrence and the Buchans operation and the operations in Wabush and Labrador City. We can talk about all these things, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, but these things alone will not ever, no matter how much management is put on them or taxes are put on them, these things alone will not guarantee or even come close to guaranteeing that we can see the day when we can proudly say that we are now a have province and can contribute in even a more positive way to the overall Canadian Confederation.

As has been said by speakers before me and people decades before me, our only hope seems to be now and our only real chance in history seems to be. I do not know how much it means to many honourable gentlemen in this House, but it means a fair lot to me to be able to stand here now with such an important bill and to recognize its implications in the next few years for the development of this great hydro resource, to think that this might go a long way, a significant way, to having our people become a part of a province that no longer will depend upon equalization payments but will be able to contribute to the Canadian treasury, to dispense those monies to some other part of Canada that remains a have not province.

It is with this hydro development at the Lower Churchill and with the offshore oil and gas and the jurisdictional dispute that now exists on that, that the only chance that we will ever have, as I see it unless something very strange happens geologically in this province or some other way to give us another resource, that will ever give us the chance to reach that stage where we will be earning more new dollars or making more new dollars each year so that we will no longer qualify for equalization payments. Surely this is the whole impact that this bill has outside of the various clauses within it that might be somewhat revolting.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: No, but it is through a development like the Lower Churchill. It is through revenue that we hope to obtain through a commercial find off Labrador and perhaps off the North East Coast and perhaps even off the South Coast in the next decade, that we will ever have a chance of becoming a have province. Surely that must mean something for to be here as a people since 1497, to see the way we have had to eke out an existence for so many years, and to find ourselves at this point in time and history with one or two major developments which might mean in the next fifteen years or twenty years that we will be a have province. Surely it is a fairly historic and major time in this honourable House. I think that too

much cannot be said considering the bill in that light.

One can talk, as many have, about the environmental impact of the Lower Churchill project upon the area. Just a few days ago the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment presented a study that has been done on the environmental implications of the Gull Island development when it occurs. I am sure that this administration is sensitive to the many groups around Canada and Newfoundland that are eager to see that any major industrial development in the future must take note of the fact that the environment must be protected at all costs. Hence, I do not see it, at this point in time, nor do I see it down the road a couple of years, where this administration in its development plans for the Lower Churchill will ignore, or not pay due attention to the environment as it relates to the Gull Island site, nor do I see in relation to the natives who might have some claim there, I am convinced and I am sure that when the minister gets up to close this part of the debate, he will have things to say about the sections in the act dealing with the native rights. I think it is section twenty-four.

It suffices to say for me, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time, that it is my feeling that this administration will take cognizance of any rights that can be established by native groups in that area and that they will be sufficiently and adequately compensated if they can so prove their claim.

It was very interesting to hear, Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition had some very choice words to say about this bill. As the Minister of Fisheries has already pointed out, on the one hand he complained quite strongly about the substantial amounts of funds involved in the Lower Churchill project, \$1600 million, and how concerned he was about this large amount of money, of course, which is a very large in the Newfoundland context especially. In the next breath, the Leader of the Opposition could speak about a transportation tunnel to be a part of the transmission line across the Straits, which would cost an additional \$3 million or \$4 million.

It seemed like he was trying to have it both ways at the one time. He was saying, "Well, now the administration, you people, better be kidding. This is an awful lot of money and you just might not be able to do it. This is a lot of money." In the second breath he was asking for that amount of money to be increased so it could take into account his concern about a transportation tunnel as well as a cable coming across there. Complete inconsistency on the part of the Leader of the Opposition in dealing with the amounts of money involved in this project!

It was also quite amusing, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the justification trying to be put forward by members of the opposition in relation to the development of the Upper Churchill and to trying to justify the giveaway that occurred there while their party was in power. I was especially amused to hear the member for St. Barbe North talk about how poor, little Newfoundland was surrounded by Quebec at the time and how they had such power that we were here helpless as Quebec were pushing down our throats this kind of a deal, and that therefore because they were so powerful and we were surrounded by Quebec that we had no other alternative but to go for whatever deal Quebec put on its plate to us.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

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

MR. PECKFORD: What a senseless attitude to take. It would be far better for the member for St. Barbe North as well as most of the members on the other side to stay sort of quiet about the deal that was consummated by their party when they were in power rather than to try to justify it. Because each time they attempt to so justify, they just dig the hole a little bit deeper because the justifications are completely invalid and they just make, somewhat, fools of themselves in trying to do that.

It has been established, I think, beyond anybody's doubt in this province - I do not think you would find too many dissenting people who would not agree that the deal that was made on the Upper Churchill was a sell-out to this province. The administration in history will score many black marks on that point.

So, Mr. Speaker, just let me say that in the development of this Lower Churchill, by having it under the aegis of the Power Corporation, that we have a far better opportunity, one could even say that it will not happen again, that the kind of deal that was signed and followed through with on the Upper Churchill will not happen on the Lower Churchill.

Just let me reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that it is my firm opinion that outside of some of the major clauses which people have some disagreement with, which the minister who introduced the bill will deal with when he stands again in his place, that I think outside of those, and some of them are major objections, I agree, that we should remember that in this kind of a bill that we now have -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: That the major thrust of the remarks made here should concern ourselves with the fact that we must try as politicians, as leaders in this Province to insure that our aims are always set on trying to insure that we bring in measures and programmes, major programmes that the aim of which will be that this Province can stand on its own two feet within this Confederation. I would be very sad indeed if I thought that the day would never come, say within the next twenty or twenty-five years, when we could not, if we were still alive, or our children could not say that we have done a service to the Province that insured that they now are true Canadians in the sense that they can contribute to some other part of Canada that is now have not. I do not think we should lose sight of that because this bill can go a long way to assist the Province in becoming the have Province that we all want it to be. Surely, that is the point of all of us being here. We are not -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do you really believe that?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, I do. I do believe it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: I am saying it in relation to the Lower Churchill, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you could ask the honourable member to keep quiet, he will have his day to speak.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I have spoken already.

MR. PECKFORD: Well, you have had your day. Keep quiet. Keep quiet and let me speak in silence, complete silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: But if our -

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! The honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing's statement is quite correct. A couple of honourable gentlemen to my right have been interjecting, sometimes successfully, sometimes unsuccessfully, to the honourable minister's speech and, of course, this is quite out of order. Honourable members know that.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the other day in the Speech from the Throne when the opposition like to cod the government about its lack of vision and its imagination, that is the very thing that I am trying to get across today, Mr. Speaker. If, in all our dealings, if all we are trying to do here in this Province is to simply see that we put another \$1 million into a water and sewerage capital programme, if our only purpose here is to see another hospital go in some part of the Province that needs it, if our only purpose is to see the immediate short term of all these things and do not look to the long term to see that what we have to try to do if we are ever going to put those water and sewerage facilities everywhere that we want them, if we want to get the kinds of hospital facilities we want, if we want to get the kind of educational facilities we want, if we want to enlarge the university or have the polytechnical institute that we want, if we want to have all of these kinds of things which are necessary and needed and essential, that the only way that this Province is ever going to be able to have them, because otherwise we will not be able to pay for them, is if we move on the industrial and resource base front towards trying to see that this Province one day will be able to pay its own way.

Right now in this Province, as everybody knows, in the field of water and sewer and in the field of roads and everything else, hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars are to be needed to even come up to the standard of 1975 that now exist in Ontario, say, or British Columbia or Alberta. Surely, it must give all of us some chance to turn green when we look at a Province like Alberta, because of its resources, can eliminate almost completely its

income tax and have the kinds of surpluses in its budget that it is having this year and next year and the years to come, and so that in the long term we must always look at it and have it in our minds and not be narrow in our thinking towards major bills that come before this house. I should think that as we proceed in this debate, that some honourable members who speak in it should try to address themselves to the overall idea, the over view of Confederation and that its whole point, and this, I suppose, is one of the main arguments that Newfoundland has in its case on the jurisdictional dispute. If Confederation is what it says it is, then the Federal Government should realize pretty soon that we want to be able to contribute more to the Canadian Federation. One way this can be brought about is if they will give us a fair deal on that jurisdiction so that we will get sufficient revenues to become the have Province that surely Ottawa must want us to be and surely we ourselves want to be. No other way can it be done.

If we are going to have, just to repeat, all of these kinds of millions of dollars of requests coming in continually on the service end of it, to ever be able to finance that, is going to take additional dollars created by the economy of this Province. That is what has to be done, right now as everybody understands, that for each new dollar that is created by this Province, by the economy, we lose that dollar on equalization, so that we are still talking about the sum, the same sum number of dollars until the day, until the day that we can create more new dollars in this Province than we would get through equalization. Otherwise, we are still talking about, essentially, the same number of dollars, are we not? There is no difference. The pot is the same size. There is no difference in it and that is the dilemma that Newfoundland has. That is Newfoundland's enigma. That is what we have to try to address ourselves to in the policies that we define as being the ones for the next ten or twenty years. We have to get out of that kind of every year seeing that we - so we create another ten dollars for simplicity sake. Immediately we lose those ten dollars through equalization. Any additional dollars that we create as an economy, we lose those from the Federal Government.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Exactly, but what I am saying is then that we must, you know, we must identify the dilemma and then try to move towards the day when we can create new dollars, more new dollars than we get from equalization. The only way that can be done, albeit we must have a sound fishery and must have a sound forestry and so on, we must also, because these alone will not by themselves or together be sufficient to create the dollars over and above what we get through equalization.

The only way we can do it is with a Lower Churchill which will help give low cost power to industry and also through a fair return and an equitable return from any commercial finds of oil and gas. Otherwise, we will always continue to have that dilemma and will never reach the day when we can say with Alberta and British Columbia or Ontario, "Okay, P.E.I. or New Brunswick, you still have not, we are contributing to the pot of Confederation to transfer to those have not places."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: So, that is what we should be addressing ourselves to, as we talk about major bills that come up in this House and that we should all be trying to keep that in the back of our minds that the long term and in the long term, all the short policies must be related to the long term, that we want to get out of this dilemma, we want to get out of this bind and it is only through these kinds of policies where the Province itself is taking upon it to develop this hydro resource rather than give it away, by having a fair and equitable solution to the offshore that we will ever find it and it is at that time that we will be able to have, be able to say to the five hundred population place in Notre Dame Bay or Fortune Bay or Hermitage Bay, "Here is your water and sewer system." This community, although it only has five hundred people has a way of life unique, and everybody wants to stay there and live there and the majority of people are working there. "Here is your water and sewer system. You are entitled to it as a basic necessity and you can have it. It is yours." But, until such time as we can find ourselves in a financial position that I am leaning towards, then we will always continue to cringe under those unpleasant conditions that

exist in rural Newfoundland.

Surely, it has been the policy of this administration, and of this party, for some time in the past and hopefully some time in the future, that we will continue to say to rural Newfoundland that it has its own identity and it can contribute substantially to the economy and after saying that and after enunciating that, then we must continue on to say, "You must then, are entitled to the same services or at least some of the basic services that they have in the larger centres." But there will be no way to get to the day to give all those basic services unless we improve our economy,

and we have more dollars than we get from Ottawa in equalization payments. Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say on this bill. It is a significant and a historic time in this House, when we pass this kind of major legislation, and I only hope that in the next year or two, we can continue on, after the bill has been passed, to see that this development becomes a reality, and brings us closer to the day when we will be able to stand even prouder than we now stand in Canadian Confederation. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): The Hon. Premier.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure and pride to speak in this particular debate, dealing with this particular bill. We are talking here today, really, about a corporation that will take in the operation of the Upper Churchill, the sixty-six per cent interest we have in that great company; we are talking about a corporation that will also co-ordinate that with the development of the Lower Churchill, and also the hundred per cent of the control of what we know as the Power Corporation for the distribution of power in our province, as well as the development in the future of other sites in Labrador and on the island part of our province.

During this debate we have heard a great many, what I consider to be non-issues, raised, which I will deal with in a few moments. All really what we are talking about, Sir, is probably the greatest single achievement through this corporation or certainly this government or any other government is likely to take as far as having an effect in our province is concerned.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has commented on several aspects of the bill. A lot of his points have been well received. It is most unfortunate that he does tend to get personal, and use the innuendo on occasion, but that is his own prerogative I suppose. I have a quotation here, Sir, which I think is very interesting considering the attitude of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and it says: "Everyone

in public life in Newfoundland today agrees on the great and urgent need to develop the water resources, power resources of the Lower Churchill River, and the other rivers in Labrador. However, the growing need for jobs for our people, the ever increasing necessity to develop new industries, and the need to increase the revenues coming into the provincial treasury, all these points irresistibly to the fact that the Lower Churchill must be developed." Those are the words of the Leader of the Opposition last year. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would be thrilled to be compared to his previous leader.

AN HON. MEMBER: He will never make it.

MR. MOORES: One thing about the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, he has said that it is his right and, of course, it is to change his mind. I think it is a very wise thing for the Leader of the Opposition to change his mind. If he would only do it in every instance, he would at least be right fifty per cent of the time, which is better than what we are seeing now.

We have heard other comments such as the fact that BRINCO were flicked out of Labrador. The Member for St. Barbe North made quite a thing of the fact in the method the government arranged the buying of the Churchill Falls Company. Contrary to what most people think, the financial world and the governments of the world thought that the arrangement was handled in a good manner, an excellent manner. As a matter of fact the Financial Times of that time said in an article, in its opening article, in planning, execution and style, Newfoundland's move to gain control of BRINCO Ltd. must rank high among the great take-over bids of recent years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. MOORES: Equally, they went on with some of the difficulties that the Newfoundland Government had a problem with. The difficulties centred largely on Newfoundland's fear that it would be forced into another deal that would be as bad for the province as the one negotiated by the former Liberal Premier, Joey Smallwood.

AN HON. MEMBER: God forbid! God forbid!

MR. MOORES: The fact is, Mr. Speaker, and I will be coming to this very shortly on the contract that presently exists between Quebec Hydro and the Churchill Falls Development, before so doing, I think we should deal with the various controversial items that are in the bill, but always in the context of what was said by myself when the Churchill Falls Corporation was being bought and that quote is: "When my government set forth to develop the Lower Churchill hydro potential, we were determined that this great tool for industrial development must be harnessed for the greatest possible benefit for this province and its people." Now, Sir, the tool that will bring that about is the Hydro Commission which can co-ordinate the generation of power, the planning for future development of power, the renegotiating of sales of present power into Quebec and the distribution of that power in the province.

Now, Sir, on the points that have been mentioned by the opposition and by some members on the government side as well, I might say that I think the points in the bill that seem to have caused the most consternation, in my opinion, are non-issues. Article 6, section 8, regarding the M.H.A.'s capacity to serve on the board of directors, well, Sir, that is left in there - I will come to that in a moment, but certainly this government has never appointed, and it has had the authority to up until now, we certainly have not appointed any M.H.A.'s to the old Power Commission or to the new Power Corporation. The few M.H.A.'s that were there were asked to leave. We certainly have not appointed any nor do we consider the role of an M.H.A., a role that he would be normally suited to.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. MOORES: Nor would we anticipate appointing any to such a board. We were left with an option of leaving it in and possibly some day some great energy authority would be elected to this House who could serve on such a board meaningfully. It has become obvious that with the opposition, the Liberal, if you like, track record, and the possibility that twenty

years from now, Mr. Speaker, they may be re-elected again, that it probably, at that time, would be abused as was their wont in the past. The fact is, Sir, that it is a red herring to try and detract from the magnificent energy record of this government and the board as such. Even I, for instance, am concerned about any great number of senior civil servants being on the board of that company. Because I think the board of hydro has to be autonomous as much as possible. I think it has to have the very best brains, because you are talking about, in total, something approaching \$3 billion worth of assets with the Upper Churchill, the Lower Churchill and the Power Corporation, not to speak of the future potential of harnessing other rivers. You have to have the best brains and the top men to give you the most efficient operation and with an eye to getting the greatest return to the province, because after all, Mr. Speaker, it is a crown corporation, and its profits will return to the people of this province.

Primarily because the Opposition have raised this as a red herring, we have no intention of appointing any M.H.A. to that board, and we certainly have no qualms about deleting that particular phrase from the bill.

Regarding section 17 (d), regarding petroleum products, I would like to point out: (1) that in no way does this affect the existing public tendering act; and (2) what it does, in fact, is it removes the monopoly of Golden Eagle so that other oil companies can bid. We intend, Sir, to leave that section in the bill. The section regarding native rights, section 24, we have found out from all opinions we can find that it does not affect any of the rights basically of the native peoples. Any of the kinds they may have are still protected with this section in the bill. However, when we talk about the rights of native people today, we are talking about a very sensitive area. It is one of the many sensitive areas in our society today. Mischevious statements by the Leader of the Opposition have created considerable concern amongst the native peoples that things have changed before they have had an opportunity to research their rights.

March 7, 1975

Tape no. 256

Page 5

This I find, Sir, to be very unfortunate, but I am afraid it is the case. We do not know what the rights of the native peoples are, and this is what they are researching themselves.

But this province did agree to recommend to the federal government that funds be given so that they could do this necessary research and I think some \$60,000 to \$70,000 was made available, which the native rights people told us would not have been made available if we had not encouraged the federal government to do so.

So we, Sir, are for the native peoples' researching the titles to their properties, or what they feel to be their rights. We respect the native rights of people and respect the people themselves. We would not do anything, Sir, that would impede their rights and if it helps clarify the situation rather than make a mountain out of what to us is a molehill, this clause also we are prepared to delete.

The final clause that caused much discussion was the twenty-six, twenty-seven and twenty-eight, the Financial Administration Act. Now, Mr. Speaker, without going into any great detail here, there is number one, no change from the existing law. We will not be deleting this section from the act. What we will do, however, is introduce a separate bill that will, because of the enormity of this project, because of the very size of this project, will set limits as to the borrowing for the project itself. The borrowing that would be set I would suggest will be approximating the cost of the project.

There has been some misunderstanding with respect to government's intentions relating to its borrowing policies affecting the Lower Churchill Development. Let me make it quite plain that it is not the government's intention to use any provision of this bill for the purposes of allowing borrowing towards the Lower Churchill Project without, in fact, full reference to the House of Assembly.

I wish to assure the House that the government would intend to bring a bill authorizing borrowing of amounts necessary to develop the Lower Churchill, as I have said, because of its enormity and will lay such information as is necessary to satisfy this House in order to fully inform all members of the situation before the final

financial package is put together.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, when I started these, I think, this covers the four major issues that have been raised. The honourable the Minister of Mines and Energy will be dealing with them in more detail when he speaks. But I would like to review just the four factors I mentioned before, the Upper Churchill, the Lower Churchill, the other potential developments in Labrador as well as the distribution of the power itself.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. MOORES: I beg your pardon.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. MOORES: Another provincialized what?

MR. NEARY: Is the distribution power?

MR. MORGAN: This is not question period.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Bell Island is still on his kick. I am not sure what he is saying over there. But I am not sure he is either.

The fact is, Sir, first of all dealing with the Upper Churchill, as the Minister of Fisheries spelled out I thought quite clearly the other day, regarding the financing of that particular aspect, the Province of Newfoundland through its Crown agency, the Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation purchased a majority of the equity position in Churchill Falls, as we know, from BRINCO, for a purchase price of \$130 million for the site at the Upper Churchill and for \$30 million for the water rights in Labrador. The total purchase price, as we know as well, was at \$160 million.

Since that time the top management of the Hydro Corporation and CFLCo, along with legal advisers and financial advisers and our provincial financial officials, have been assessing the best financial strategy for the Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation, such complex and major considerations, such as the taxable status of CFLCo, further expansion of the Upper Churchill Project itself by developing the

Romaine Diversion and other things that can be done to increase the power capacity and the organizational complexities of inter linking various aspects of the Upper and Lower Churchill Projects.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in computing the benefits accruing to the province resulting from the purchase of BRINCO's fifty-seven per cent, the following assumptions are relevant. Number one, the fact is that the corporation will now no longer be taxable as it will be a Crown Corporation because it is owned by two governments.

Number two, the discussions currently taking place with the other major shareholder of CFLCo, and that is of course Quebec Hydro, will result in the agreement for CELCo to pay directly to the province a twenty-two-and-a-half per cent tax on its profits. An agreement in principle has already been reached on that particular point.

There are many other factors, Sir, because, for instance, the effective date for the dividends is now September 1, 1976. No increase in CFLCo profits resulting from the possible diversion of the Romaine River are included in the calculations, as I mentioned before, and the water rights will be held for the province by NIDC and will be sold to Newfoundland Hydro as it requires them for the development of the hydro resource. For example, the value of the Gull Island water rights, site rights, are included in the amount for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, very briefly, the fact is with the additional equalization payment that will be received from Ottawa as a result of the Crown corporation status, the equalization adjustment will mean some \$4.8 million to this province per year as well as fifty-seven per cent of the profits which would allow in excess of \$21 million that will be accruing to the province. There is a return on the investment that was made of approximately sixteen-point-three per cent and it means that the project itself will be retired in twenty years.

Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Paying \$20 million interest.

MR. MOORES: No, Mr. Speaker, we are not paying \$20 million interest. Even the honourable Member for Bell Island multiplying nine by thirteen does not come up with \$20 million.

MR. NEARY: Nine by 160 will.

MR. MOORES: Well even nine by 160, do you make that \$120 million? You probably do.

Mr. Speaker, in that Financial Post article I mentioned previously, it says, "The government estimates that in its first thirty years Churchill Falls will yield an estimated annual average of only \$14 million to the Provincial Treasury, thus about \$2 billion a year in dividends. During the same period BRINCO sales to Quebec are expected to be worth about \$5 billion."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the comparative rates that we are talking about that this power is so far being sold for, at the present time power is being sold to Quebec Hydro until 1980 for 2.77 mils, and that reduces by the year 2016 down to two mils for power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is happening at a time in our history when we are looking at power being sold into the Northeastern United States, power being sold in a great many parts of Canada, for as high as, well in the range of 20 to 25 mils. For instance the thermal plant at Holyrood I would suggest is, what do we have, 20 mils, 23 mils, cost of the thermal plant.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. MOORES: Approximately 23 mils it is costing us, Sir, to generate power at Holyrood. While here we are looking at a situation where this power, this tremendous amount of power from Labrador, comes down to 2 mils, by the year 2016.

Now, Sir, each mil that we get for that power means \$34.5 million to this province. There is one thing that has to be made very clear and that is that the negotiations with Quebec Hydro and the Province of Quebec have to be initiated by this government or by the Hydro Corporation, whichever is the appropriate vehicle, as soon as the case can be thoroughly documented to ascertain what is the maximum value we must have

for that power at the present time.

The situation is, Sir, that Ottawa, the federal government, agrees that this particular agreement has to be reopened. The Minister of Mines and Energy in Ottawa in conversation with myself said just that.

It is unbelievable to me, Sir, that any government before could possibly sign up a contract for sixty-five years. Now they say that that was the best deal that could be done at the time. I am quite confident that it was the best deal that could be done at that time but to sign up any contract for sixty-five years without any reopener clause whatsoever, no chance to go back and look at it to reassess your position, is almost an unbelievable situation, Sir, in this day and age when negotiations are so important.

Not only are Quebec Hydro getting a reducing rate to two mills for the power and selling that to industries in Quebec for much less than we can generate it for, but also, Sir, they are getting one-third of the profits from Churchill Falls. So they had the best of both worlds. I do not think that anyone could criticize that remark.

Now a lot has been said by the Leader of the Opposition about the Hon. Minister of Justice, and the Minister of Fisheries particularly serving in the cabinet of the Premier of the day, myself being on the Commission of Economic Prospects. But, Mr. Speaker, it must be remembered that in the previous Premier's dangerous days I am not sure that the cabinet were even aware of a great many things that were happening, but I would certainly think that his advisers were.

The Leader of the Opposition was appointed special assistant to the Premier in 1964, two years before either of these gentlemen I mentioned were in the cabinet. He was elected as an M.H.A. in 1966, and appointed parliamentary assistant to the Premier. Then he came into the cabinet in 1968.

The fact is, Sir, in those days there was the Hon. Leader of the Opposition advising on the right hand. I know that Mr. Vardy was the economic adviser - it is fairly obvious by the state of the economy of the province. He was on the left hand. But, Sir, they were both on either one hand or other of himself.

MR. NEARY: What about Bully Boy, I wonder. Where was he, in the middle?

MR. MOORES: No, no, no he was not in that office at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MOORES: Now the fact is, Sir, we must open the Quebec Hydro contract. The prices have to be looked at. And another thing that has to be done as well as the prices, we must look the need for re-call power. Because we are talking now about the development of the Lower Churchill. We are talking about the price that we can get for power, and the route that power will be sold from the Lower Churchill. But it is only until about 1990 before our own province can use all this power, if not before. At that time we will need to

have more re-call power that we presently have from the Upper Churchill, or we must have developed other sites. But with escalating costs today certainly the re-call power from the Upper Churchill would be by far the most desirable of those two.

Sir, the Upper Churchill has more potential, as has been mentioned. The Romaine Diversion being put through that particular facility would increase its output by about ten per cent, or an extra 500, or approximate, mls. The Leader of the Opposition the other day said that there were 5,800 megawatts from the Upper Churchill. He was absolutely sure of that, quoting all kinds of facts. Checking with the Power Corporation it is 5,225 is the correct figure. I only mention that for the record.

Regarding the construction on the Upper Churchill it is virtually finished, and the operation is being carried on, in an excellent manner, by very competent and capable people who were there previously.

Now, Sir, one of the other things that should be mentioned when we are talking about the development of energy, hydro energy in this context, is the business of water rights, not just for Gull Island, but the other power potential rivers in Labrador. I will just name a very few. Naskaupi, for instance, with 1,150 megawatts, which in fact is a huge development. What is Bay D'Espoir, Leo?

MR. BARRY: Four hundred and fifty megawatts.

MR. MOORES: Four hundred and fifty - well it is two and a-half times the size of Bay D'Espoir, and about over half the size of the Lower Churchill itself. Eagle River at 600 megawatts, and others ranging down to 140 megawatts. And all together as I understand it there are enough isolated individual rivers in Labrador, and still left on the Island to more than match the total development of Gull Island, and the Upper Churchill put together.

So, Sir, the opportunity for hydro power is still a major factor in this province. It will remain a major factor. I only mention it here to assure the honourable House that the reason for the \$30 million

for water rights in Labrador went considerably beyond the development of Gull Island, and involves a great many more potential developments in the future.

Now, Sir, regarding Gull Island itself. I think it is very important to identify the method of financing envisaged by the province for that particular development. At the present, as it has been mentioned, the federal government have offered \$343 million, which in fact escalates up to about \$460 million when one realizes that the interest is deferred. So that is \$460 million of the \$1.6 billion.

Now, Sir, one of the things about \$1.6 billion is the fact, and it should be explained here, that between thirty per cent and forty per cent, it varies according to the various items of escalation, or inflationary factor, if you like, has now been built into that figure. The dam and the power house is going to cost approximately \$700 million. But taking all these facts into consideration, Sir, with the \$450-million from Ottawa, approximately, it leaves us with about \$1, 150,000,000 that has to be borrowed. That, Sir, is a great deal of money for a small province like Newfoundland to have to go out in the open market and try to arrange.

The markets that have been seen, and we are now continuously in contact with our experts in this field to try and put together a total and comprehensive package, are the traditional financial markets in the U.S., and in Canada, the European markets, other governments, and certainly not last of all will be the federal government again. Because, Sir, I think the Member for Bell Island the other day did make a very meaningful remarks when he mentioned the DREE function. The fact is that irrespective of which project is taken, or wherever, the fact is the DREE function is to develop regional economic expansion. Certainly the development of the Lower Churchill comes under that term of reference, or that description of the department itself.

Sir, I am sure that in time we will have to go back to the federal government, but we should not go to the federal government now

and keep after them, and then find out what the balance is. Because we have an obligation as well, we have an obligation to do our bit, to try and put together as responsibly as we can, and we have been two years at it - it is not, as someone said it is an overnight deal, it is not - but we do have a responsibility, Sir, to exercise our maximum efforts before we go back to Ottawa saying what else can we expect to get from you.

Now, Sir, the borrowing as it happens, as everyone knows, is going to be done over several years. For instance, in 1975 it will be between \$35 million and \$40 million; in 1976, it will be \$61 million; in 1977, it jumps very quickly to \$316 million; in 1978, \$370 million; 1979, \$321 million; 1980, \$237 million, and the balance is in lesser amounts thereafter.

We, Sir, as I have said, will move carefully. The financial prospectus and the engineering studies and so on are things that we will have to discuss in time, and it will take time. We also must discuss, which I will be doing in a moment, the industrial development that this will mean for the province, as well as the domestic affect it will have.

Now, Sir, as concerns the construction at Gull Island; a few of the figures that may be of interest to this House, some of which are known - it is approximately 1,800 megawatts, and with line losses and re-call in the area, it is approximated that 1,400 megawatts would be delivered to the Island part of the province. That, Sir, is 11.65 billion kilowatt hours. And that is approximately double our present requirement on the Island.

But the island economy and demand for energy is growing fast and will grow, Sir, with that power available, much faster.

First of all, to give some idea of the scope of the size of the project itself, I think we should talk about, for instance, the power house and the dam. The dam that is being built will be some 300 feet high and one mile wide. Sir, that is a huge structure when you consider the size of that. The earth fill that will be needed for that is some 20 million cubic yards of earth fill. Fortunately, with a dam type structure, it means very little flooding and very little environmental damage because it will be the river valley in fact that will be flooded and not as in the Upper where a huge expanse of land was flooded making this huge lake.

The fact is in the Lower Churchill the environmental impact will be much less than most developments of this sort anywhere in the world. The power station itself, Sir, will have some six generators producing some 300 megawatts each. One of the figures I wrote down - it is not really of great significance - but the spillway for flood periods handles some 520,000 cubic feet of water per second. That is staggering. That is the only reason I wrote it down.

This year, Sir, the work that will be carried on in the area itself will be the road upgrading and the bridge repair from Goose to the Upper Churchill. That will be the road from Goose Bay to the Lower Churchill and from there to the Upper Churchill. It is approximately 180 miles and it is expected that some \$10 million to \$12 million will be spent on that highway this year just so the equipment and so on can get into the site in a comparatively easy manner.

I think it also should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that this is \$10 million to \$12 million which in fact is being spent on the Labrador Highway, because this will be the route of the Labrador Highway. It will be eventually from Goose to the Lower Churchill to Gull Island to the Upper Churchill, then to Esker

which road is being done as everyone knows, and then the only remaining part of the road that has to be hooked up in fact is from Esker to Labrador City, then out through Quebec.

The reason for the road this year, Sir, is to mobilize the camp for the diversion contractor. The main camp will start next year but the services will be installed for that main camp this year. The diversion tunnel contract will be let this fall and the Site Labour Agreement, hopefully, will be completed this year.

Now, Sir, as regards the transmission line, which is the major cost of the project, there are two 800 megawatt lines and one set of lines come down to some 472 miles from Gull Island, terminating at the Grand Falls station. The other parallel set of lines comes 662 miles and terminates at Soldier's Pond just outside of St. John's. What it boils down to, Sir, is that there are some 1,134 miles of what they call circuit lines, that will actually have to be strung for bringing this power down. That is a lot of distance to cover.

It is even more amazing, Sir, that when you consider there will be some 4,800 miles of cable, a huge diameter cable that would stretch in fact from here almost to Vancouver. This is what will be required to bring that power to the province. The towers themselves, which are 150 feet high, and 150 feet high, I would suggest, Sir, is probably as tall or taller than this building. There are 5,500 of those needed to string the wires on which is an absolutely incredible - I am only mentioning these figures to give some idea of the scope and size that we are talking about.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MOORES: Aluminum metal I would think.

The transmission line itself, the great survey, the 662 miles will be done this year with a small amount of the right of way as well. The towers will be designed as will the lines and the tunnel, and in June the support facilities will be put at Flower's Cove and Point Amour to get it started. The tender for sinking the shafts will be called

in September for commencement on January 1. Now, Mr. Speaker, the shafts as I understand it, go down underneath as opposed to a runway up for vehicular traffic. Shafts themselves are some twenty-five feet by twenty-five feet, and the tunnel, as I understand it, is some seventeen feet by fourteen feet. Is that correct? I think so.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Seventeen high and fourteen wide.

MR. MOORES: Seventeen high and fourteen wide. Anyway, it is a much bigger tunnel than I certainly envisaged to bring a few pipes across.

Now, Sir, as far as the jobs are concerned, the work schedule for jobs on the site will be - the hydro site in 1975 at Gull will have 400, the transmission line, 330, the tunnel, 50 for a total of 780 people this year. In 1976 the hydro site will have 700 men, the transmission line, 1,075 and the tunnel, 200 for a total of 1,475 in 1976. In 1977, 1,450 men will be at the dam and power station site, 1,470 on the transmission line, 350 will be working in the tunnel for a total of 3,270. 1978 will be the peak year for employment. There will still be 1,450 on the dam and power house. There will be 1,870 on the transmission line and 350 on the tunnel for a total of 3,670 men working that year.

In 1979 at the hydro site, the power house and the dam site, 1,000 men, transmission line, 550 and the tunnel 350 for a total of 1,900. In 1980 the total project backs down to some 620 men because then the power is coming on stream.

A few of the things, Sir, that may be suggested, here we are talking about a total of 8,500 man-years, which is a lot of work, 8,500 man-years or 100,000 man hours, which is a lot of work. The management team, Mr. Speaker, for this particular development is being put together with the expertise that was acquired from CFLCo when we brought control of that corporation. Also, by recruitment, we have managed to get Mr. Dennis Groom and we will be appointing other people I would suspect shortly. We also had the good fortune to have men like Mr. Wally Reid and others in the power corporation who have made a big contribution. Basically, Sir, the management team for both the transmission line itself and for the dam and power house are being put together carefully. They are moving ahead carefully, but surely and the project is getting

under way.

Now, Sir, regarding the distribution of power which I think is very important and which seems, in a lot of cases, to have been overlooked as far as what happens. The one thing that has to be identified and identified very clearly - I would ask particularly the member for Labrador South to realize the intention of this government - is that first of all Labrador must have first priority on the power. There will be a line into the Goose Bay - Happy Valley area and hopefully we suspect over the northwest point in Northwest River as well, because, Sir, there is a tremendous opportunity for industrial development in that part of Labrador.

Now, we all know the ice problem in that area. We all know the shipping problems that that creates, but the fact is, Sir, with power at the price it can be delivered for up there as opposed to the much more costly power delivered to the island, the opportunity for industrial development will, I am sure, be realized in that area which will make changes that have not been seen before in the area.

They have also got the offshore oil and gas potential off Labrador. Certainly the potential of the area itself is something that is almost unique by any standards anywhere in Canada. I mean, it is almost amazing that you can have a major hydro-development sixty miles one way and you can be looking at a major offshore oil and gas discovery another 100 miles the other way. It is most unusual to have this amount of potential in such a small area.

I was very disappointed, and I am sorry he is not here today, the other day when the member for Labrador North - I would certainly hope that he was not serious - said he would prefer that the power rather than come to the island went to Quebec. Certainly if we look at the Liberal attitude of previous years, that would seem to be the case.

Sir, we feel

that the power of Labrador and the other benefits that the island part of our province has must be shared as one province. What it will mean, the power coming to the island as was very ably spoken about by the Minister of Industrial Development the other day, is the development of deep-water ports, and the development of an industrial base that will allow us to do the things, the services that the people of this province demand and quite rightly insist upon. Sir, as far as industrial development is concerned, it is somewhat of a chicken and egg situation, because until the power is coming, and until there is a price for that power, no industry is going to come on the hope that we are going to develop it. So the fact was that we had to go ahead with the power development before industries would form up as far as coming here is concerned. Now without the energy availability, of course, we would not have had the industries. Domestically, in this province, it will mean a great deal. It will mean stability in the price of power to the homeowner, not only stability but I would suggest that by the time the power is here, reasonable costs compared to the alternate sources of energy.

The Hon. Member for Bell Island the other day, and I am sure even he admits in this case he did not know what he was talking about, when he started talking about nuclear power plants and their installation here, he mentioned the fact that three times as much power for \$1.25 billion. The Can-do plants, Sir, for one six hundred megawatt unit is \$720 million, plus the fact that it is very, very expensive to operate. The fact is that three units that would match the output of the Lower Churchill would cost \$2.1 billion. The peculiar thing is, Sir, that one would be too large to put into the island system, because too much dependability would be on that one unit, and we have been informed by professional people that you would need a minimum of two for back up and support which, of course, makes it totally out of the question. We have studied it, the Ottawa people studied it, and the federal officials that, thermo power, coal fired generation, every aspect of, Sir, was looked at, and it is by far the best aspect and the best approach is for the development of the Lower Churchill.

Now, Sir, in closing, and I want to make one point, this bill will come up again, it is a borrowing bill, and the subject certainly will carry on for many years to come, but this bill has to be one of the most momentous of its kind or most momentous of any bill that has been introduced in this House because, as I have said, it sets up the vehicle that will allow for the proper development of the Lower Churchill. It will set up the proper operation and the operation responsibility for the Upper Churchill. It will be responsible for looking at the sales contracts we have with Quebec Hydro. It will be responsible for the distribution of power in Labrador and on the island. And even in the future, the future development of other sites. It is a very major corporation, Sir, one that needs a tremendous amount of expertise and one which will have a tremendous bearing on this province.

This, Sir, in my opinion, is the best ever for this province. It is the best bill and the best project that we have ever taken on. I think it will work both ways. Labrador will benefit as will we.

Mr. Speaker, all I want to say is that I am very proud to be participating in this debate. I am very proud to be able to be Premier at a time when such a momentous step in our history is being taken.

MR. NEARY: Joey had a great dream. All the thanks goes to Joey Smallwood.

AN HON. MEMBER: Joey had a great scheme and a great dream.

AN HON. MEMBER: He probably will be back.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): The Hon. Member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped I could delay this a little bit. I am not in the best of shape having picked up the flu bug in Goose Bay. I am hoping that somebody else will fill in the time between now and when we have to close the debate because my colleague from Labrador North also wishes to speak, and he is also still marooned in Goose Bay due to the strike.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. MARTIN: May I try then, Mr. Speaker, for an adjournment of the debate until tomorrow?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MARTIN: I cannot? Okay, I will struggle on. I will struggle on, never mind.

The bill is really, in effect, an amendment of the bill that has governed the Power Commission. With the exception of several controversial clauses, I do not think there is any way that any of us can stand up against it.

The point that immediately comes to mind, when I went back over the history of how this thing developed, is the fact that the federal government is getting away so easy and that in similar developments connected and concerned with energy resources and the development of energy across Canada, the federal government has put in a far, far greater percentage of the total cost than they are doing here and that which we are letting them get away with. We see in Prince Edward Island -

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if I might interject for a moment?

MR. MARTIN: Certainly.

MR. BARRY: If the honourable member indicates that he is not feeling too well, if the honourable members wish, by the leave of the House, I would be prepared to go and just reply to the points that have been raised to date by the respective speakers and then have the Member for Labrador South and for that matter, the Member for Labrador North speak on Monday, if that was the case. If I had an opportunity then to reply to any matter raised by both those honourable members, that would be acceptable to the government's side, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: If we can do this procedurally. I am now on my feet and speaking in the debate, and once I sit down, I understand, I will lose my place.

MR. BARRY: By leave.

MR. MURPHY: If you want to, it is up to yourself.

MR. MARTIN: I would prefer to do this by leave, if that is possible.

MR. MURPHY: We are all prepared.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: The Member for Hermitage is ready to speak now. If he spoke now, and then if he does not occupy all the time, which he will not, the Minister of Mines and Energy will start his reply to conclude the matter, but on Monday, the House agrees that the Member for Labrador North and the Member for Labrador South can speak. Then the minister would just wind it up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Gillet wants to speak.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, Mr. Gillett, well the Member for Twillingate can speak this afternoon. That is fine, yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. GILLETT: Mr. Speaker, we seem to be in a situation here where I understand the Member for Labrador South is not feeling well. We do, on this side, want to prolong this debate to enable our colleague from Labrador North -

MR. BARRY: We will let him speak on Monday if we can get back here.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. GILLETT: However, Mr. Speaker, I can surely put in five or ten minutes, perhaps, on it. I was thinking as the Premier was speaking and giving us the facts and the figures of the potential of the Labrador, as far as water power resources are concerned, I thought we could add to that song, "Thank God We Are Surrounded By Water," But thank God we have so much of it running in the northern part of our province. We, in Newfoundland, I suppose, are the envy of all of North America, at least, because we have so much water power for this little province. To harness this power is going to be costly. The figures are so astronomical that they are far beyond my comprehension. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I think for generations to come they will be very beneficial particularly if we can bring into this province industries which can avail of this cheap power and thereby give employment to our people.

Actually, we are debating this bill. The points and contentions put forward by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, were well taken. He was supported, in fact, by members from the government side. I was very glad to know that the Premier has consented to remove, at least, two of them. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, why an amendment cannot be brought in to change section 26 or paragraph 26 and thereon. I do understand that the Premier plans to introduce a further bill to limit the amount of borrowing, but I believe he said up to the amount of the project which is, of course, to date \$1.6 billion. We shall have to deal with that bill, I suppose, when it is presented. I, like my colleague from Bell Island, thought the same way. Why could this one not be amended? It would do away with any doubts that we might have concerning this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how we can contest the bill in principle. We do not - actually, it is to set up a corporation to handle the overall operation of the Upper Churchill, the Lower Churchill and any other Churchills that might spring up in Labrador. I think it is a good idea really. The principle of the bill, we all support, but I still think the amendment could be brought in, Mr. Speaker, and introduced in the committee stage. I understand that it cannot be brought in. It has to be brought in in the committee stage, right?

So, to get away from the bill, perhaps, for a few moments, Mr. Speaker, and to contemplate the end results of the harnessing of this Lower Churchill, bringing it in to the island and first of all, of course, distributing it in Labrador. What happens after, say 1988 or 1990, I believe, the Premier used, 1988, the Teshmont Report tells us that the island portion of the province will be able to absorb the entire output of the Lower Churchill or the Gull Island site, what happens to the power that Goose Bay-Happy Valley area is using or any part of Labrador for that matter? Does it mean to say that by 1988 this province will have to undertake, again, another similar project,

another \$1.5 billion project or can we recall sufficient power from the Upper Churchill to take care?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. GILLETT: Depending? I understand we can recall 600 megawatts?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is three.

MR. GILLETT: Three. Also by tying into the national grid, which will take place when we do hook up to Quebec, tying into the national grid, in the case of an emergency, it is possible that we could get at least emergency energy for a while?

MR. BARRY: I am afraid not.

MR. GILLETT: Mr. Speaker, many of us, I know, will not live to see the full fruits of this development. I look forward to seeing the completion of the Lower Churchill. I was very happy and very proud and I stood, as I said, in this House with awe at the accomplishments in the Upper Churchill. I am sure that we, on this side of the House, commend, at least I do, this administration for continuing on in the plan that was -

CAPT. WINSOR: The foundation of which was laid.

MR. GILLETT: - set out by the former Liberal Administration, the foundation of which was laid, as my honourable friend and colleague from Fogo has already said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak in the debate because I felt certain that everything had been covered. The Premier gave us his assurance that changes would be made in the bill, I hope to the satisfaction of both sides of the House. In order to ensure that our colleague from Labrador North would not be left out of the debate and, in fact, if he would be able to speak before, not after, but before, the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy stood to wind up the debate, regardless of whether this afternoon would have wound up the debate or not. I did want the Hon. Member for Labrador North to be here and to hear, at least after he had spoken, to hear what the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy had to say covering the entire bill and the entire project.

Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat that I, for one, support the bill in principle, and I look forward to the day when we shall all benefit, and certainly the generations to come behind us will benefit from this great undertaking, the second great undertaking for this little province in the past few years.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like to say a few things here in this debate on the Hydro Bill if I may call it such for brevity.

It falls to my lot, Mr. Speaker, and happily too in addition to putting my immediate reviews on the legislation, to respond to some ideas that have been thrown out and some assertions that have been made by certain of the speakers opposite, and that I shall do, I hope, during the course of my remarks.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the sentiments expressed, I believe, in part by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, when he talked about the Upper Churchill. Without attempting to put words in his mouth, and this is not my intention, I am not particularly concerned at this point in time whether the Upper Churchill was a good deal or a bad deal. I am in an academic -

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Exactly. Exactly. As the Minister of Municipal Affairs interjects, it is what is happening on this particular deals is of importance.

Academically, you know, as a student of Newfoundland history and so on, I would be concerned. I would like to know whether it was a good one or a bad one so I would have my facts straight and that kind of thing. We are engaged in a dangerous exercise when we try and project ourselves backwards twenty, twenty-two years and lay blame retroactively. I am not concerned with doing it, and as a member of the Liberal caucus here, even if every other member of this House can show that it was a lousy deal, I do not see where that, in any way, restricts my present, or limits my present ability to make a decision on this particular deal. If it was a bad deal, well by all means let us learn from it. But in the name of the Churchill project, in the name of everything that we believe in, let us stop fighting the ghost of the past, let us stop running against the Premier who is no longer Premier, let us stop aiming our barbs and our campaigns at something that we do not have to beat any more. Let us talk about the Lower Churchill. I could advance what I think are my theories about the Upper Churchill but I think that is quite beside the point. The Member for St. Barbe North, in part, touched on it when he related the cost of many years ago to the revenue at that time versus the cost now to the revenue now, and that is worth taking into account.

I am not wanting, Mr. Speaker, to get into the virtues or the weaknesses of a deal that was made several years ago. That is not said to try and push it under the carpet or whatever the appropriate expression is. It is said rather to focus on what is the important issue. The important issue is whether or not we can make a good deal, to use the expression, in respect or with respect to the present Churchill or the proposed Churchill development.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with particular interest to the speakers on the opposite side, and it is now a matter of public record that three of the members in particular, the Member for St. John's North, St. John's South and St. John's East, took strong exception to section 26 of the bill, and in so doing supported the position taken first in this debate by the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for White Bay North.

AN HON. MEMBER: Red herring.

MR. SIMMONS: Pardon?

MR. BARRY: A red herring.

MR. SIMMONS: A red herring. I hope, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines, who just interjected that this is a red herring, can prove to us that it is a red herring, and not only prove it is a red herring, can prove that if it is a red herring, why it is in the bill, why it is here? It is in black and white. Somebody took the trouble. We cannot blame it on the draftsmen in the Department of Justice. They must have had instructions to put it in. It cannot be claimed to be a red herring, Mr. Speaker, or an oversight.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Pardon?

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: I will give the opportunity to the minister to respond to what I have said, because he will close the debate, and in that he will have the opportunity. In the meantime I would like to respond to what the Premier said, and I will come to that in a few minutes. But for the Minister of Mines, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that this is somehow a red herring or somehow just got in there by accident, is begging the truth, Mr. Speaker. It is there many times, and it is more than a red herring if the people who instructed the draftsmen what to put in here saw to it that it was not only in there once but many, many times. We can only assume, Mr. Speaker, we can only assume from what the Premier has said this afternoon in response to the points that have been made by the members for St. John's North, South, East and the Leader of Opposition and, I believe, most of my colleagues opposite, we can only assume one of two things, that as a result of the argument that has been advanced here, he has been constrained to change his mind on the subject, because it is obvious what the original intent of this bill was.

MR. BARRY: It is staying in.

MR. SIMMONS: The original intent, Mr. Speaker, was to give unlimited power to cabinet. That is what it says.

MR. BARRY: It is staying in there.

MR. SIMMONS: We can only assume that the Premier has changed his mind.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to be heard in silence or do I have to listen to the babblings of the Minister of Mines.

Mr. Speaker, we can only assume that the Premier has, in his wisdom, and that is quite an assumption, Mr. Speaker, we can only assume that the Premier, in his wisdom, has given heed to what the members on his own side, the three so-called rebels, the musketeers, the Tory trio, and other complimentary names which have been bestowed upon them in the past few days and with reason,

we can only assume that he has given heed to their objections to this sections and given heed to the objections of the Leader of the Opposition and my other colleagues on this side of the House. I hope that that is the reason that he was motivated to stand in his place this afternoon and give notice that separate legislation would be introduced.

We can assume that is the case, Mr. Speaker, that in his wisdom he has seen the light, or else, Mr. Speaker, we can relate what he said this afternoon to other actions of his over the past several months. We can harken back, Mr. Speaker, to the occasion here in the House last Spring when in responding to the Member for Labrador South, he promised great changes in the Redistribution Bill after we had passed that bill. We have not seen the changes yet, Mr. Speaker, and I would predict we will not see them.

I would predict, Mr. Speaker, that in relation to what the Premier has said this afternoon about separate legislation that you will never see that separate legislation under the sponsorship of the present government or the present Premier. You will never see that legislation, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I hope, Mr. Speaker, it is rubbish. I hope I am dead wrong but if I have to go by the Premier's track record on these matters, his word cannot be taken in those issues, Mr. Speaker, and we will never see the legislation.

MR. NEARY: If we do see it, which piece of legislation is going to be -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It is clear the honourable Member for Hermitage is probably straying somewhat from parliamentary language in inferring innuendoes and certain things with regards to the character in the words made by the honourable the Premier this afternoon.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I certainly apologize to Mr. Speaker

and to the Premier if I was doing that kind of thing. What I was attempting to do, Mr. Speaker, and let me try it one more time, what I was attempting to do was draw on my experience of his track record and suggest, and I have only given you my interpretation of his track record.

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, is that parliamentary? I know it is normal for him but is it parliamentary, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I would like to remind the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy that when a member speaks he does have the right to be heard in silence. I think his wording of it there was unparliamentary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order, Sir, would Your Honour remind the Minister of Social Services that he is not allowed to speak in this House unless he is sitting in his own seat, Sir?

MR. MURPHY: As long as I do not address the Chair, I can speak to the honourable member to my left.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am sure the honourable Minister of Services is well aware of that particular rule.

The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the Premier's statement this afternoon, giving notice that he would introduce legislation to nullify, I can only assume, to nullify what is in this section 26. I can only assume that it results from one of two reasons, either he has given in to the proper and justified demands of the people in his caucus and the people on this side of the House concerning their objections to section 26. He is running scared on this point or he has seen the light. In his wisdom he has decided to change

government's mind on this matter, or Mr. Speaker, and I do not attribute motives on this particular comment, I rather suggest that the Premier is going to be consistent. He is going to be according to his past actions and I say, Mr. Speaker, in reference to -

MR. BARRY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, you have made a ruling on the vicious, low, insinuations and innuendo that the honourable Member for Hermitage, the honourable Member for Hermitage, is engaging in, Mr. Speaker. Now he is slandering a member of this House, he is slandering the Premier by the typical, sly innuendo, Mr. Speaker, and I ask that you again point out to him that this is unparliamentary.

MR. SIMMONS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the Minister's point of order is because I had just introduced the term Premier and had not proceeded to make any points, so I do not know where he gets the idea about slander.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair reminded the honourable Member for Hermitage a while back that it thought he was making unfair and contentious motives towards the honourable the Premier and the honourable Member for Hermitage did continue changing some words around to sort of cast the same reflection. I will certainly let him continue but I think he should be a little more careful over his imputations.

MR. SIMMONS: I want, Mr. Speaker, in parliamentary terms without being harassed unduly by the members opposite to respond to what the Premier has said this afternoon. I want to know, Mr. Speaker, if I can vote for this bill, or if I cannot vote for this bill. The Premier has asked us this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to vote for the bill because he is going to change Section (26) with some new words, with a new bill.

My point is twofold. First of all, Mr. Speaker, if that is his intention why does he not introduce an amendment to Section (26) instead of asking us to rest on a promise.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: On a promise, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: On a promise that later on, some time later he is going to introduce another bill. Why another bill when he has got a bill here that we can properly amend. The procedures of the House provide for it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Why this double talk, Mr. Speaker, about let us get this through so that we can bring in something else which will nullify what we just voted for. Double talk, Mr. Speaker, of the first order. If I attribute motives to the Premier in bringing that point out, Mr. Speaker, well so I do, and I stand by your judgment on it. But there is no need, Mr. Speaker, of this double talk. If the Premier means what he said this afternoon let him sponsor an amendment to Section (26) and the other appropriate sections which will give the affect that he claims that will be gained by bringing in new legislation. There is no need for new legislation. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is so much more double talk. The kind of double talk that we are used to hearing from the Premier over the past few months, the kind of double talk that the Member for Labrador South heard from him on redistribution.

Let the Premier have the courage, if he has the convictions on this particular point, which I doubt, let him have the courage

of his convictions and introduce an amendment to Section (26). He now places this, Mr. Speaker, in the awkward position of wanting on the one hand to support certain principles in this bill, and on the other hand not being able to support Section (26) and the other related sections because I am not prepared, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to take the Premier's word that he will introduce the legislation. Because his past record shows -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: I ask that Your Honour direct the Hon. Member for Hermitage to unqualifiedly retract that statement.

MR. SIMMONS: What do I have to retract?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think the Hon. Member for Hermitage now for the third time I had to remind him that I think he is imputing unfair motives to the Hon. the Premier. He should not do that to the Premier or any other member of this legislature. I would certainly ask him to withdraw those comments.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I will by all means withdraw anything that I have said is unparliamentary. I am experiencing some difficulty making the point that I wanted to make. The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is this. If the Premier intends to bring in the legislation I am inviting him now to bring in that legislation as an amendment to Section (26). That is not imputing any motives, Mr. Speaker, it is an invitation. A clear invitation to the Premier to put his money where his mouth is. To bring in the legislation he is talking about before I have to vote for or against this particular bill because of the offensive sections in it. Let him bring in that legislation not as a separate bill, not as a separate motion, Mr. Speaker, but as an amendment to this particular bill. Is that too much to ask of the Premier, or is he above that kind of a request too, now?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: This is an offensive - two, or three, or four sections here, Mr. Sneaker, and no amount of eulogizing about how it is going to change for all time, and it is going to be a new bible, and the next book of the bible and that kind of a thing. No amount of eulogizing of this document, Mr. Speaker, will subtract from the fact that in terms of its restrictions or its attempt to restrict the financial control of the House of Assembly. In that sense, Mr. Sneaker, it is the most infamous document ever to come before this House of Assembly.

To suggest, Mr. Speaker, that three or four men in cabinet -

MR. NEARY: Joey said you should all be put in jail over there.

MR. SIMMONS: That three or four men in cabinet, Mr. Sneaker, should have - and I say three or four. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that there are more than those in cabinet.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: But it is -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, may I have the right to be heard in silence, or must I listen to that cracky over there?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would like to remind honourable members that members to my right and to my left were talking to each other while the Hon. Member for Hermitage was trying to say something. If the Hon. Member for Hermitage wishes to refer to another member he should refer to him in the right terminology.

AN HON. MEMBER: Everything will be under control by the House Leader.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Sneaker, I apologize, I was correct but not parliamentary. I shall refer to him in future as the Member for Hermitage unless I lose my cool once in a while.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker,

he is the one member in this House, Mr. Speaker, who completely confuses me. Nobody on the South Coast knows what district he represents and I forget sometimes too.

MR. NEARY: Yes, well do not forget your own.

MR. SIMMONS: Do not forget my own, no. Mr. Speaker, I am so busy getting ready for the next election that all the terms, of course, have kind of confused me.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I was in my district much more recently than most people on that side of the House I will tell you.

Mr. Speaker, try as they may, they may succeed in subtracting from what I am saying right now, but a lot of people in the future will remember that government for a long time if they pull this infamous stunt as outlined in section twenty-six of this bill.

There are people on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker, who waxed long and eloquent four or five years ago because a cabinet would allow \$5 million for bridge financing without bringing it before the House. They have finally succeeded in dragging the people in here involved.

MR. CROSBIE: Why do you not say something original?

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not very original, and the minister who just spoke is most aware that it is not original because he is the person who has got to think about it most. He talked about not pawning his conscience the other night. He has been pawning them the last few days on this bill. He has been pawning his conscience.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Ah ha! Ah ha!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: And what an insult!

MR. CROSBIE: No wonder. We have juveniles in here.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Anything else you want to say "Bully boy"?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if the "Bully Boy" is finished, I will continue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would remind the honourable the Minister of Fisheries that he should let a member be heard in silence. For the second time I would like to remind the honourable member for Hermitage that he should refer to any honourable member in his rightful capacity. If he continues in this way, I will have to ask him to resume his seat.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am being provoked and I apologize for calling the minister a "Bully Boy". I abjectly apologize for that. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that they were so abject in their apologies about this infamous document here insofar as the financial sections are concerned.

MR. CROSBIE: I gather they are not going to support it.

MR. F. ROWE: Oh, do not be so foolish. There he goes again.

MR. SIMMONS: I will restrain myself. If the member will keep quiet - I will listen to him - and allow me to make my points. If he wants to respond to them, that is his business, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, no amount of yahooing from the other side, no amount of deliberate attempt to interrupt will subtract from the fact that section twenty-six and the other following sections related should not be in that bill. It is, Mr. Speaker, an infamous step and it does, Mr. Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You voted for it.

MR. SIMMONS: I never voted for that nonsense. Of course, I did not. No way.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, there is no way -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That is not parliamentary now.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Do you want to call it a day.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, boy, go ahead.

MR. SIMMONS: Call it six o'clock.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, and have him come back on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I trust this is not coming out of my forty-five minutes. I am trying hard to make a point but those members are -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Found your point yet?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes I have found my point, and you guys are afraid to listen to the point.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: I ask the Premier to restrain himself until six o'clock and then allow himself to think as he wishes. Mr. Speaker, no amount of yahoing will subtract from the infamy of this section twenty-six, no amount of it, Mr. Speaker. No amount of commitment or promise from the Premier standing in his place as he did this afternoon will subtract from the fact that this bill attempts - now do not tell me it was an accident, do not tell me it got in there quite by coincidence. It was put there deliberately, Mr. Speaker, to take away from the House of Assembly the financial control which is rightfully belonging to the House. You cannot, Mr. Speaker, give to four or five strong men in cabinet the effective, the de facto right and responsibility to decide that the province shall be put in hock or put in the hole or put in debt unlimited amounts of money, in this case, \$1,600,000,000 just as a start. Mr. Speaker, that is unheard of.

The other night the Minister of Fisheries talked about not pawing his conscience those years ago. He may not have pawed it then, Mr. Speaker, but he has been pawing it

the last two days, Mr. Speaker, How a man who took one stand in 1969 about \$5 million can take a completely opposite one and can stand in his bullying fashion -

AN HON. MEMBER: That was only last June.

MR. SIMMONS: Can stand in a bullying fashion, tell people if they do not like it to go across the House and that kind of thing, ram it down their throats. Much more dictatorial fashion than the man he so despised over the years. That man, whom the Minister of the Fisheries so despised, was never that dictatorial, Mr. Speaker. At least at times he was discreet enough to go through the pretences but not this fellow, not this fellow. Blatant, he stands there and tells his colleagues right behind him, "If you do not like it, lump it. If you do not like this government, vote against it."

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Of course. Of course. That is fair until you put it in context, Mr. Speaker, and when you put it into context that it was the other night, Mr. Speaker, where a member of the House of Assembly has to stand up and make a statement, Mr. Speaker, like this one. The Member for St. John's South speaking, and he quotes -

AN HON. MEMBER: Table it.

MR. SIMMONS: I will table it if you want it tabled. He says, "I would ask," here is the Member for St. John's South, "I would ask the government to get the feelings of the members of the House." "I would ask the government," that is a member of the PC caucus talking, a member of the government caucus talking, and he is standing in the House appealing to the government to get his feelings on the subject. Why do they not do any homework over there, Mr. Speaker? If they were more anxious, Mr. Speaker, in getting a concensus from caucus beforehand, we would have much more sensible legislation than we have, instead of just browbeating them after because they did not stand up and support the legislation.

MR. CROSBIE: Is there another leadership convention coming up this year?

MR. SIMMONS: Well you will not be a candidate. In either party he will not be a candidate, Mr. Speaker, not even the NDP Party would have him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Member for Hermitage should direct any remarks to honourable members through the Chair and not directly to the member.

MR. SIMMONS: I am sorry. I forget myself, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BOODY: Will the band be available if you are not using it?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: If the Minister of Industrial Development is a candidate, Mr. Speaker, he can lead the band.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SIMMONS: He can lead the band. Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Fisheries, of course, is the candidate, which I doubt, but if he is he will be the band, the whole circus, the whole works. He beats most bands I have ever seen or heard.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, he would make a good bagpipe, Mr. Speaker, a bagpipe ready to blow, all blown up and ready to blow.

MR. ROWE: The Minister of Justice can practice on him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is a shameful performance, shameful.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Ha ha!

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, point of order, Sir, My colleague now, Sir, has been trying desperately for the last twenty minutes, Sir, to -

MR. DOODY: If you were not laughing so hard you would have been up.

MR. NEARY: To make his contribution, Sir, to make a contribution to this debate. Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The proceedings, Sir, of this House in the last twenty minutes have deteriorated to the level of a beer garden because of the attitude and because of the actions of members on the government benches, Sir, and I would ask Your Honour to direct the members on the government benches to try to restrain themselves so that my colleague can carry on with his speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! On several occasions I have had to remind members that a member when speaking does have the right to be heard in silence for, I have forgotten the number of times, I will make the same request.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have been wanting to make some comments about other sections I have gotten - I have zeroed in on this one, perhaps I have spent more time on it than I had intended to but that is thanks to the assistance I have had opposite.

Before leaving that particular section, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there is no need for the Premier to talk about new legislation, no need at all. Because without attributing any motives at all to anybody, the Premier or anybody else, I have in my own mind, without saying anything in this House about what I think about his motives, I have in my own mind to decide before I can vote for this bill, if this section 26 remains unchanged, I have to decide really, whether there is a reasonable chance the promised legislation will be brought in in this session and I say there is no need for the Premier to put us in that kind of a position, he can solve that problem, he can solve the dilemma of me and the members here and the Member for St. John's North, the Member for St. John's East,

March 7, 1975

Tape No. 266

NM - 4

and the Member for St. John's South, he can solve the dilemma by introducing the amendment and indeed one of his own colleagues suggested what the amendment ought to be. He did not put the words, mind you, but the Member for St. John's East suggested that the amendment for section 26 could well make reference to the Financial Administration Act and would in

part be subject to the provisions of the Financial Administration Act, and then make the provision of that particular clause. Now that to me, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: By all means, yes.

MR. MARSHALL: Surely does not the honourable member feel that the word of the government to the effect that it is going to bring in an act, and lay this information before the House before there is any borrowing, is even stronger than any such amendment? I mean you have talked about the word. The word of the Premier, the word of the Leader of the Opposition, indeed I would submit that the word of the Hon. Member for Hermitage is entitled to be taken in this House too.

Now a commitment from the government to the effect that it is going to bring in an act before any substantial monies are spent, would not the Hon. Member for Hermitage feel that this is adequate?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in response to the question, if I may, I am not originally here today on another point. I am not original in being cautious about taking peoples' words, because the gentleman who just asked me the question, Mr. Speaker, is a man who has said publicly that if he was not sure he could take the word of the Premier on a particular matter. Mr. Speaker, there are things I would like to say but they are not parliamentary. So I will restrain myself. But no, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question I will not take the word of the government on that particular point, and I have precedent why I should not, Mr. Speaker.

We took the word of the government on the redistribution that was going to be done by an independent commission. We all know what happened to that one. No, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question I will not take the word of the government on that. I say that they should not put us in that position. All they have to do is bring in the kind of amendment that the Member for St. John's East himself suggested a few nights ago in speaking in the debate, an amendment which would make those sections subject to the provisions of the Financial Administration Act. That would clear up the whole matter,

Mr. Speaker, and would not leave us having to make the heart rending decision about who we trust, or who we believe, or who we do not believe, or what motives the fellows on the other side have. We would not have to make those kinds of decisions. I have my own private opinions on those subjects. But I do not think they should have to enter into a very important decision, on a very important bill.

I appeal once again to the minister sponsoring the bill, and to the Premier to make it possible for us to vote for this bill. Not with an if. I am sick and tired, Mr. Speaker, of ifs from the Premier. He is the best offer in this whole world, in this whole country certainly, the best offer of them all. If ifs were realities we would be in Paradise, if the Premier's ifs were realities.

Mr. Speaker, yes, what they would like me most of all to do, for partisan political reasons over there, is vote against this bill. Mr. Speaker, I will make my decision once I see the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: final form of this bill after the committee stage. If there are amendments, and perhaps the Premier will yet yield some more to the urgings of his own colleagues, and those on this side of the House, and will see fit to introduce the kind of legislation he is talking about now, or in committee. Then when we see the bill as amended, I hope, I will make my decision about whether I vote for it or against it. I do not want to vote against it, Mr. Speaker, because there are principles in that bill that I believe strongly in. But, Mr. Speaker, those principles should be set against the other one which I am very strongly against. I am against delegating four or five men in the cabinet. The awesome responsibility of -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I am talking about four or five men who make the effective decisions in a larger cabinet, Mr. Speaker. That is what I am talking about. The Minister of Social Services would not know, he is not one of the four or five, Mr. Speaker. So he does not know much

about it. He is one of the rubber stampers in cabinet, Mr. Speaker. He would not know.

MR. MURPHY: The brain from Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: I am talking about the others, Mr. Speaker, who will make the effective decision. And it is wrong to place the awesome responsibility of putting this country, of increasing its capital debt.

MR. MORGAN: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: The Member for Bonavista South has had his opportunity, his contribution was limited mind you, but that is beside the point here.

Mr. Speaker, it is wrong - wrong - I do not care how you put it, it is wrong. Even the Minister of Municipal Affairs in talking slipped out the word about revolting clauses. I wanted to put a question to him but I did not get the opportunity, as to whether he thought personally that the clauses were revolting or not? Knowing him as I do personally, I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that he must have had to scratch his head a lot of times before he could bring himself to support these clauses, even if he can support them now, Mr. Speaker. Because I know his particular views as to the role of the House of Assembly, and the fact that it should have control, certainly financial control.

These clauses in their present form, Mr. Speaker, concern me very deeply, and I can only hope, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I did not mean to, Sir. I can only hope that the government will see fit to bring in the kind of legislation that the Premier is talking about at the committee stage, bring it in as an amendment. If they would do that, they can certainly have my support for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this particular debate, of course, has proven a number of things

that in addition to the stand which each member takes on the legislation before us, has proven a number of things. One of the things that has come home to me, as an observer here and as a participant is that some of the great programmes that were advocated by this party in opposition are coming to naught, that some of the loudest advocates of Good Tory programmes are being frozen out of positions of influence. It is coming home to me more and more that there is no room in the Tory Party for Tories and that was certainly the case the other night as I watched that tremendous spectacle on television with the Tory trio.

Mr. Speaker, on that subject I ask if this is such a wonderful bill, if this is the greatest thing under heaven, as we have been told by the Premier and some other speakers. If this is so good, Mr. Speaker, if this is such a wonderful document, why did not the Minister of Mines, why did not the Premier in caucus sell it to his own crowd?

MR. BARRY: It was sold about three times.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, it did not seem that way, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Mines says it was sold three times.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A misunderstanding.

MR. SIMMONS: Ah ha, a misunderstanding. A big black and white misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, which occurs a half dozen times in the bill. Misunderstanding! Why could they not sell it to their own honourable crowd if it was such a wonderful bill? No room in the Tory Party for Tories anymore.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Ah, yes. Well, they got their comeuppance last night, Mr. Speaker. Nobody lost their license plates last night, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair fails to see the relevancy of those remarks to the principle of this bill.

MR. SIMMONS: So do I, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have covered that point. We will leave

that in the interests of getting home to supper and all that.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Premier with particular interest this afternoon as he went on about what a great thing this was and how everything we had said were non-issues. What a way not to have to reckon with a particular argument or a particular point of view, to just brush it aside and say, "Ah, it does not matter. It is a non-issue." If the Premier would listen more, Mr. Speaker, he would learn more. That is part of his problem for all of us, Mr. Speaker, perhaps his own colleagues. Perhaps the three members who sit in the backbenches could teach him a few things if he would listen long enough. They may be non-issues to him, Mr. Speaker, because perhaps he does not understand what is involved here, but they are issues to the people who have raised them, Mr. Speaker, and section twenty-six is a very important issue and the other three or four issues that have been raised are crucial issues.

He may not agree with them, Mr. Speaker. To stand and brush them aside as being non-issues, as not being of any importance - we will borrow \$1.6 million. What has that got to do with it all? It is an non-issue. The arrogance!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: \$1.6 billion.

MR. SIMMONS: And then \$1.6 billion. Yes, exactly.

Then he talks about the red herring, to detract from the magnificent energy record of this government. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, he thinks it is magnificent. At least he has some comfort, Mr. Speaker. I do not think it is very magnificent. Most of the people in this province do not think it is very magnificent, either. Mr. Speaker, what is not cannot be magnificent. Where is the record of this government insofar as energy is concerned? They have talked long and hard, Mr. Speaker. They made a lot of speeches. They made some record speeches. If that is the record the Premier is talking about, it is magnificent for its length, Mr. Speaker. Magnificent for its length, I agree.

If I were the Premier in respect of this issue, I would certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that people would drag in some red herring so our record

would get cast aside of it so they would not notice how bad the record is. I wish for red herrings. I pray for them, Mr. Speaker. What a magnificent record. What a hoax, to stand here and look as if he is believing himself as he says it and tell us about a magnificent record in energy.

Here we are in the middle of 1975, We have heard lots of speeches, lots of speeches, lots of press releases. We still do not know - and the Premier gave us all kinds of facts about how many jobs there were going to be. Good Lord! I can tell you how many jobs there are going to be on any project you want to name. You give me enough research assistance to figure it out for you. You tell me what it is you want to build and I will go off and find how many people it is going to take to build it. I can tell you how much it is going to cost, but does that make me so smart. That is not the real problem, Mr. Speaker. Nobody is in doubt about the fact that it is going to create a lot of jobs. Nobody is in doubt about where the tunnel is going to go or how deep it is going to be or how big it is going to be or where the power is going to go and that kind of thing. That is not where the doubts are, Mr. Speaker.

The two big doubts which the Premier never talked about are two great big doubts called customers and money. The Premier in all his statistics, in all the great parading of figures this afternoon about jobs and tunnels and everything else, never once bothered to tell us where he was going to get the money or what kind of success he was having getting it or if he has even tried to get it. He did not talk to us, Mr. Speaker, at all about customers or where he hopes to get them or what the chances are of getting them. The two big issues, Mr. Speaker, and there will be no jobs, there will be no tunnel, unless we have the money to do the job and the customers.

If you want to talk about red herring, Mr. Speaker, much of what the Premier and the others speaking for government have said on this subject has been one great big red herring, one red herring which begs the real question, Mr. Speaker, not whether we should have legislation. Of course we should have legislation to make this possible. That is not the issue, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the clear issues are whether this is

financially possible, where the money will come from and, Mr. Speaker, where the power will go, the power of course, that we do not need. We on this side of the House are firmly in a position, firmly of the position that the power that we export should only be what is in surplus to what we need here in the Province for our own needs. When I talk about customers, I am talking about customers for any excess, any surplus of power we may have.

Mr. Speaker, being nearly six o'clock, I would like to move the adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been noted that the honourable Member for Hermitage has adjourned the debate.

MR. CROSBIE: We will just have to endure some more of this bile on Monday, Mr. Speaker.

I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Sit down. Be quiet when I am trying to adjourn the House. What is the matter with you? - do stand deferred and that this House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Monday, March 10, 1975,

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: That is right. I cannot remember this formula. - at eleven o'clock in the forenoon and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, March 10, 1975, at 11:00 a.m.