

VOL. 3

NO. 85 *6*

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1978

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Government House Leader could tell us whether the Premier is coming into the House today? I saw the hon. gentleman go by the curtain there a few moments ago. Is the hon. the Premier going to be in his seat for the Question Period, can the hon. gentleman tell us?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: As far as I know the hon. Premier is. And if the hon. gentleman has seen -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: - the hon. the Premier within the confines of this hon. House, I would assume that he will be in his seat as soon as he realizes -

MR. NEARY: Well, maybe I will start off with the hon. gentleman then on the line of questioning that I want to get on, Sir, and it has to do with the NBC not allowing a certain television programme that was videotaped by the Premier to go on the air. Has the minister checked out or can he now tell us who the legal advisor to the Premier is in this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, that would not be in my purview.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is -

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary?

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir. This is a matter involving the taxpayers of this Province. My understanding is, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is the legal advisor to the Premier and to the Crown.

MR. HICKMAN: To the Crown.

MR. NEARY: To the Crown, And in this case, Sir, it involves public business, so we are told; if the taxpayers are paying the bill then it has to be public business. Has the Minister of Justice been

Mr. Neary: consulted on this matter, and if so, what is the minister's advice in this particular case?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I had been consulted by the hon. the Premier in my capacity as the Crown's first law officer, then the legal advice I would furnish the Crown would certainly be totally and absolutely confidential. But I do not think that this is a matter that falls within the purview of the first law officer of the Crown.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Now that the hon. gentleman, Sir, has returned to his seat, could the hon. gentleman tell us from whom he is taking legal advice, from whom the hon. gentleman is taking legal advice in connection with a videotaped programme that was supposed to be aired last Thursday night that could not be carried on provincial wide television because of the language and the libelous and slanderous accusations and charges that were made in that programme?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is none of the member's business.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, well perhaps -

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: - the hon. gentleman can tell me if this is any of our business, who is paying the expenses of having this programme videotaped, and the legal expenses and so forth involved? Are the taxpayers of the Province paying for it, or is it being paid for by the Tory Party?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: That remains to be seen exactly what the issue is, Sir.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. the Premier be prepared to table the contract that was signed by Mr. Gary Callahan, on behalf of the taxpayers of this Province, and NBC Television? Would the Premier table that contract, so we can all have a look at it and see what it is?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I did not know there was a contract signed, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: No, no!

PREMIER MOORES: - but as there was no programme I assume that the contract is not very relevant.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Even though there was no programme, Sir, there were, I am told, legal expenses involved, and also expenses involved in having the programme videotaped. Would the hon. gentleman inform the House who is paying these expenses? Is it the Tory party of the taxpayers of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: When the time comes, Mr. Speaker, for that bill to be paid, whoever will pay it, if it is the people's money, of course, this House will be advised. I might say that the libel action that is being taken by me against several people are personal matters and not the business of this House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman answer this question, or the Minister of Justice if he is in a position, Sir. Would not such charges and accusations and slanderous statements and libelous statements made in the fifteen minute programme, would they not constitute slander, Sir, even though the programme was not shown? The fact that it was videotaped and people saw the videotape, would that not constitute, Sir, a breach of the privilege of this House? Or a violation of the Criminal Code, inasmuch as the Premier had videotaped this - it had been shown to other people - and charges of slander can be laid against the hon. gentleman?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I might say right now that even though it was not aired on CJON, the fact is that the content,

PREMIER MOORES: plus other material, will be made public outside this House and not inside this House, seeking the immunity of it, and if anyone thinks they are libelled I welcome the case.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: In view of the fact that very serious charges and allegations and slanders and libellous statements have been made in this programme, would the Premier not agree that this type of statement, whether it is made inside or outside the House, would interfere or prejudice any police investigation that might be going on at the present time into this whole matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I certainly would not think so, Mr. Speaker, certainly not as much so as some of the other statements being made by the hon. member in this House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not parliamentary.

A supplementary, Sir. Now would the hon. gentleman, Sir, give us some indication - the hon. gentleman said that the information will be made available - well would the hon. gentleman who is going to pay for this political information? Will it be paid for by the taxpayers of this Province or will it be paid for by the Tory Party?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly clear on the question. I think I answered it once before. The one thing I will say is that as far as the slanderous statements are concerned and libel is concerned, I am sure the hon. member will have plenty of opportunity on the witness stand to back up the statements he has made in this House with immunity.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, then the hon. gentleman for St. John's West.

MR. NEARY: I must say for the benefit of the hon. gentleman, Sir, I would be very happy to avail of that opportunity. The hon. gentleman, Sir, made a ministerial statement in this House a couple of weeks ago that he had instructed his lawyer and it was urgent, it was going to be done that day, that libel charges be taken against a Mr. Davidson. I would like to ask the Premier if these libel charges have yet been laid?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if the writ has been issued or not because there is some difficulty in locating Mr. Davidson, and with some of the hon. member's other colleagues.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in case the hon. member is not aware of it, Sir -

PREMIER MOORES: Order, please! I think I had indicated I would recognize the hon. gentleman from St. John's West next.

The hon. member for St. John's West.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed towards the Premier, in view of the fact that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is not present. It has been reported that this government proposes to support a proposal that would increase the rents of people in subsidized housing by as much as fifty per cent in the next four or five years and that this is the official position of the government of this Province and that the Minister of Municipal Affairs has gone to Toronto to support this position. Could the Premier confirm or deny, or elucidate to us what is the position of this Province with respect to increases in subsidized rentals in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, there has been no decision taken on this matter. There has been a federal-provincial conference that has discussed this and many other proposals for quite some time now.

PREMIER MOORES: The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is in Toronto to discuss it, but there definitely has not been any decision or position taken as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour and Manpower. In view of the fact that the ILO, International Labour Organization, soon to be convened in convention at Geneva will be asked to consider a resolution calling for a total ban on the mining and use of asbestos fibres, and requesting that a substitute be sought for asbestos, could the minister tell the House what position this Province has taken on this resolution?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may know that the position will be taken by the federal government. We have been invited as an observer and we have no status as yet. Any information we have on that I will undertake to table for the hon. member within the next day or two.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, as the minister said, I know that Canada will be represented at this ILO Convention by the federal government. I want to ask the minister whether the minister's department has made any sort of representation on this important matter to the government of Canada which would tend to reflect the position of this Province and the position that this Province would like to see Canada as a country take on this particular resolution?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, our concern, of course, is with the points that the hon. member raises in respect to asbestosis and the problems arising from the mining of asbestos. Whether it has been conveyed officially or not I cannot recall. I will undertake to delve out any correspondence we have, if any. If

June 12, 1978

Tape No. 4223

MM - 4

MR. ROUSSEAU: not certainly I think the federal government should be aware of the position we have taken. I have communicated with Mr. Munro on the question of occupational health and safety, whether we have an official position or not, or an unofficial position, I will have to undertake to find out for the member.



MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, obviously occupational health and safety is not to be confused with the mining of asbestos, it is just one of the many issues that you would be concerned about with occupational health and safety. But I wonder if the minister could tell me whether or not the Government of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has conferred with any of the other provincial governments of Canada which could tend to be defined as producing provinces, like Quebec and Ontario and Newfoundland - those are three that come to mind - British Columbia would be four, so that some sort of co-operative representation could be made to federal authorities with the hope that the federal position reflected at the ILO Convention would be reflecting of the position of the Newfoundland Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, we have, Mr. Speaker. There have been meetings going on for quite some time now on the whole question of occupational health and safety and specific points in it. It has been done, unfortunately from the point of the question, at the officials' level for the most part. We had a meeting last January, I believe it was, with Labour ministers; at that point the AIB was the focus of attention. Unfortunately we did not have an opportunity to talk as Labour ministers about the questions of occupational health and safety, which we should have had the opportunity to do. But, like I said, it has been done at the officials' level in a number of meetings, and I will undertake to get the position as enunciated by the officials who represented the ministers at these meetings as soon as I can get them.

MR. RIDEOUT: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for undertaking to get some information for us. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether the Provincial Government has given any thought to, or whether they plan to take any action whatsoever to help counteract any such move by an international group to have a particular mineral banned?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We certainly would have to take every consideration of it. I would like to be at the meeting, but obviously if you go to a meeting in Geneva everybody thinks you are off on a holiday. I never had one in my four years as minister. I would like to because, I think, these and other points that are discussed may not be relevant to the Province of Newfoundland, within the context of Canada, within the context of the International Labour Organization. I think, they are very important meetings. I have had an invitation as minister to observe at the meeting. Every year the federal government, who are the official spokesman, I think, invite two ministers rotating across Canada to actually sit with a delegation. I have been invited, in the next week or ten days the meetings are actually being held, to represent the Province as an observer; unfortunately I am not going to be able to do so.

But we would certainly want to give consideration to the banning of any particular mining ingredient of the mining industry of this Province, indeed, in this country. And I would think all ministers would share, all across this country, that concern. And we will certainly undertake to check it out, like I say, for the hon. member in the next couple of days with the officials on the agenda for the meetings and the position taken by the federal government who we would hope would reflect the feelings of the provinces as well. I will undertake to get the position and give it to the member in the next few days.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Eagle River followed by Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. STRACHAN: Now since the Minister of Mines and Energy is not here, a question to the Premier. I wonder if the Premier could update us on any negotiations or status of negotiations concerning the Gull Island development due to the whole economic depression, the depressed area around Goose Bay and Happy Valley, and also the whole Province? I wonder what the situation is concerning any possibility of starting work on any part of the development, including the woodcutting, and the woodclearing or any development of any part of it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, not a great deal more than, I think, it was last week we discussed here in the House. The situation is that negotiations are going on with LCDC, the federal government, regarding the Lower Churchill Development Corporation. The Hydro officials have been meeting with them and those meetings have been going quite well. Equally there are the two other groups set up, one to look at the industrialization and industrial usage of power from the site to be used in Labrador and on the Island. And the other discussions that will have to take place fairly shortly as well are with Quebec to get their attitude regarding the situation. In the immediate short-term basically, the clear-cutting is as of much concern to us as it is to anybody, and we have been in touch with Mr. Jamieson regarding the possibility of trying to get the cost-sharing of that project up to 50-50.

Now what happened on that particular project was that there was so much per man job, and I think the maximum figure was \$10,000, but that did not take into consideration - actually that would not have been half of the year's earnings of the people in that circumstance. What it did not take into consideration was the cost of setting up camps, all the other costs of material and that sort of thing. What it boiled down to was there would be a \$4 million federal government input of a \$14 million cost over two years, and that would be \$2 million a year.

PREMIER MOORES:

Now regarding that, that was the same as the federal Department of Manpower would provide for just about any job creation activity of its type; therefore, we did not think there was anything very special about it. We have since gone back through Mr. Jamieson and directly to DREE asking if they could participate in some of the funding to bring it up to a 50-50 basis and as soon as we have an inclination in that regard we will go ahead.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the Premier inform us of the current status of negotiations on the situation concerning the Quebec/Newfoundland and Labrador agreements or discussions and talks on the whole hydro question in Labrador? We have not heard anything more since a number of months ago when Premier Levesque was down here, and everything has been very quiet. I wonder what the present state of negotiations is?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The state of negotiations: we have been in touch with Mr. Levesque, or I have, Mr. Speaker, to the effect that as soon as we have worked out a proposal from the federal government on the Lower Churchill Development Corporation then we will be going back to see the Quebec Government and not before.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the Premier indicate, in any negotiations up to now and discussions with Mr. Levesque, whether there is continued talk about joint development of the rivers? Since we regard this very much as a leverage for other developments to go ahead, could he

MR. STRACHAN: tell us exactly whether there has been talk on these lines or whether we have decided to have a firm position on the joint development and exactly how does he envisage using this as a lever in his talks with Mr. Levesque?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: It is a bit early to say exactly how it will be used, but obviously, Sir, this is one that the Quebec Government is very interested in. They do not plan to develop those rivers until sometime starting in the mid 1980's to initiate the development of those three rivers really, of significance and there are five rivers there.

We have already advised Quebec that we would not be interested in negotiating any agreement regarding the flooding of the headwaters without renegotiating the whole energy picture in Labrador, and that would include not only the reopening of the Upper Churchill contract but also participating in at least the sales if necessary of Muskrat, Gull Island, Lobstick. It also would include such things as the Romaine diversion being put back through the present system in Upper Churchill. But they have been told that those three rivers will not be part of negotiations until we look at the whole energy policy of Labrador as a total package.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated I will recognize next the hon. gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, followed by the hon. gentlemen from Terra Nova, Conception Bay South and LaPoile.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question or so for the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Morgan). I have here the accommodation guide which his department has published, I believe, in the last few days. Perhaps as a preliminary,

MR. SIMMONS: the minister would indicate to the House since the publication itself does not, where this was printed and more particularly, who designed the pamphlet, because I have some questions to follow on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure where they were printed. I know the road maps were done this year for the first time in Newfoundland by Robinson Blackmore. I am not too sure, but I am also of the opinion that these brochures were done as well by a local firm, but I can undertake to get the information. I am not sure myself.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: My real question relates to the content of this publication, and I suggest all members have a look at the maps in particular, because they are very, very very misleading, and an amateur job would be putting it mildly. I say to the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) that you would never know he had a district. There is no road through it. There is no road to St. Lawrence, no road to Isle aux Morts and Rose Blanche, for example, and I could go on. But the one that concerns me, of course, is that there is no highway shown into Bay d'Espoir at all, no route South of Grand Falls at all into Bay d'Espoir or into the Harbour Breton area, and if it were just an isolated area where one road were left out one could understand, but I say to the Minister of Fisheries, the St. Mary's area, around Branch, for example, and so on is not shown on the map, but also a number of major areas, Mr. Speaker. This is in the accommodation guide.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the title of the map?

MR. SIMMONS: Well, the title of the map is Newfoundland and Labrador.

June 12, 1978

Tape 4225

EC - 4

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) of the publication?

MR. SIMMONS: The Newfoundland Accommodations Guide - 1978 put out by the Department of Tourism. And the mistake, I say to the minister, is repeated again in the sectional maps. You have a map for various parts of the Province and the mistakes are inevitably repeated throughout there. The first question to the minister obviously is whether he is aware of that and, more importantly, whether he will consider

MR. SIMMONS:

withdrawing this publication? Because it is extremely misleading, Mr. Speaker, and it is not a case of an isolated error. It is crammed full of very serious omissions and distortions and when I say distortions, Mr. Speaker, I refer the minister to page twenty of the map where they made an effort to put in the Bay d'Espoir road, but it wound up somewhere over in Fortune Bay. It started in Grand Falls but it ended up somewhere down in Fortune Bay, a good forty or fifty miles east of the Head of Bay d'Espoir. Now understand what we are dealing with here, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a guide which cites various route numbers for people to find their way to various hotels and so on and so forth. And if the route is in there, for example 320, and then the fellow goes to look for 320 on the map and cannot find it, well, the document is not only useless, Mr. Speaker, it is worse than useless, it is misleading. It is going to be very frustrating to the people concerned. And I ask the minister, one, whether he was aware before now but, more importantly, whether he will undertake to withdraw the publication and to replace it with a correct publication or nothing at all for that matter? It would be better to have nothing out. The minister must be looking at last year's -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) question (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, but I am talking about this year's now.

MR. MORGAN: You are after asking a question.  
What are you doing? You are asking a question?

MR. SIMMONS: I am asking if the minister is aware of these errors? He need not get his back up, Mr. Speaker. He probably did not design it. It is a misleading publication. Is



MR. SIMMONS: the minister prepared to have the publication withdrawn and replaced by a corrected publication?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is confused, because this is last year's '77, and the new one this year, which I do not have a copy of right now, is updating the places to stay in the Province. It is no indication at all it is going to be used as an official road map. The official road map is a separate publication altogether from any leaflet as to where to stay in the Province. Actually the road itself, last year and again this year, is primarily to show the TCH from Port aux Basques to St. John's and it is not a road map of the Province. But in regards to saying that it is information that is misleading, that is not correct because the information is improved over last year and shows additional places to stay in the Province. And that is the main purpose of that brochure, where to stay in Newfoundland, not showing how to get to where to stay but places where to stay. The road map itself is the guideline, which is a separate publication.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the publication is subtitled, Your Guide to Hotels, Motels, etc. If I understand the word 'guide' it would tell you how to get there. Look, the minister did not understand me. I am aware that there is an official road map. It is right here. And I am aware that in a small publication, a small size like this, a small page like this, you cannot put everything. But the minister's submission that only the TCH and so on is show of course is not true because a number of the secondary and tertiary roads are shown. For instance, great care was taken to show all the roads on the Bonavista Peninsula, Mr. Speaker, which the TCH, I submit, does not

MR. SIMMONS: go to, although the member does represent that particular part of the Province.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Well some of them on the Burin Peninsula. Mr. Speaker, look I am representing in this case a number of thousand of people in Bay d'Espoir. My colleague represents several other thousand on the Connaigre Peninsula and these are the ones I am addressing myself to. We are talking about a major highway down there and I could be making my comments about Bonavista North or others, but I am asking about this one in particular, and the minister cannot dismiss it but some quick reference to the highways map. I say again, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I must point out that it is necessary during this period for submissions to be questions and answers and not debate, and only such information as is necessary should prefix the question.

The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

But I refer the minister again to page twenty of this year's publication which has a road, I suppose the Bay d'Espoir Highway, except it is in the wrong place. It winds up about forty or fifty miles east of where it should. It winds up on the West side of Fortune Bay, instead of in Bay d'Espoir. Now that is misleading information. And I ask the minister, in view of the fact that this is rifled through with a lot of misleading information, will he undertake to have the information corrected, probably by withdrawing the publication altogether and having a new publication put out with the correct information in it. That is the question I am asking the minister; will he do that? I am aware of the road map and all that, but will he undertake to withdraw this misleading information before it does any further damage?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker, because there is actually no misleading information.

MR. SIMONS: I have just shown you there is.

MR. MORGAN: The fact that the brochure happened to contain a map of Newfoundland, this brochure, Where to Stay, because of the size of the brochure itself, it will clearly point out you cannot list each and every place and small road around the Province, that is the reason why there is a separate road map. When this brochure is issued to tourists, it is issued with other information as well.

MR. MORGAN:

In fact, it is a tourist information kit, and in that kit is an official road map with this information. Now if there is, for example, lack of information regarding places to stay in certain areas like Bay d'Espoir and in other areas of the Province not mentioned here, well, that we can update maybe, but not in regards to a road map within the leaflet itself showing all roads, because the purpose is not to have a road showing where to get to a certain place - that is the road map's role. The main role of this brochure is places listed and where they are located, but not guides to get to them. But if there are places not listed in this brochure which are now available to tourists, I will be only too pleased to take the information and pass it along and look at the possibility of updating this leaflet. But unless that is lacking now there is no need to either withdraw or to update.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the minister obviously does not understand the purpose of this booklet or what it sets out to do. I refer him, for example, to page 20, the map of the Avalon, and I checked it against the official road map and it seems to me every single road - I do not mean street - but every single secondary and tertiary and primary road is listed there and it seems to me that the intent of those ten or so insert maps is to do the very thing the minister is saying they are not supposed to do, that is, give direction to the tourist.

Now my real question, Mr. Speaker, while it is done for most areas of the Province, it is done very inaccurately for two or three areas and the one that

June 12, 1978

Tape 4227

EC - 2

MR. SIMMONS: I am concerned about affects my own district, but I could refer him to Bonavista North, for example, where on the sectional map, I say to the member, there is no reference to any road around from Gander up through Indian Bay and up around Wesleyville and that area, no map at all. And I am asking the minister if, in view of the very misleading nature of this, will he undertake - he can call it 'update', whatever words he wants to use I am not concerned - but will he undertake in the interests of those people who operate motels up in Indian Bay and Musgrave Harbour and Wesleyville and up around that Loop Road and in Bay d'Espoir and Harbour Breton, will he for the sake of those people put out a new publication or update this one, as he wishes, so that the tourists and other people travelling in the Province have the correct information which they do not have in this publication?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, of course it is always of the utmost importance for tourists to get all the information they possibly can. It may be a bit - well, I would not say a bit, I would say totally impossible to have the brochures changed now because they are all printed and they were arranged over the past Winter and last Fall, but I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman and others who may be concerned about this, if the drawings of maps and areas shown are not giving the full details with regard to roads leading to where, I can make note of the fact that this year for the first time that all major intersections in fact, practically all intersections because we are calling tenders in the very near future for eight information plazas and these information plazas are separate from information chalets; they will be like a large

MR. MORGAN: billboard, like a road map on the highway where a tourist can drive up to the intersection of the T.C.H., places like the Bonavista North area and Bay d'Espoir, and they can see on these information plazas road maps showing where the road leads from the T.C.H. and the communities mentioned as well on these roads and places to stay accordingly. So whether or not the brochure is overlooking some information regarding detailed road inlets to Bay d'Espoir, I am confident of one thing, that all places to stay in Bay d'Espoir are listed in this directory, but if there are some details with regard to road maps in the booklet itself, the road map can be referred to. It is too late to change these information booklets now, this year anyway and also the fact that by the end of the summer we will have these information plazas along the T.C.H. on locations leading off the T.C.H., intersections -

MR. SIMMONS: You will be surprised, 'Jim'. People will not stop by the side of the road to read these signs.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman can draw his own conclusions. Wait until one is built first.

MR. SIMMONS: They are two pieces of plywood.

MR. MORGAN: How do you know? There is none built yet.

MR. SIMMONS: I have been told by your deputy minister.

MR. MORGAN: There is none built yet.

Mr. Speaker, these information plazas is a programme that is being sponsored and assisted by the federal government and we will be building eight of these this year on the -

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible)

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, could I answer the question without being interrupted?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

June 12, 1978

Tape 4227

EC - 4

MR. MORGAN: I am trying to give the House some information. It is important to all members to know what is going on with regard to Tourism.

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible). Sit down.

MR. MORGAN: I knew that 'jackal' could not keep quiet.

MR. S. NEARY: 'Jackal' is not parliamentary.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, these information plazas will assist substantially the traveller on the T.C.H. and the tourist will be obtaining additional information over and above -

MR. S. NEARY: Yahoo!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It has come to my attention, or at least I am informed the hon. gentleman called another hon. gentleman a yahoo!

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker, a jackal.

MR. SPEAKER: A jackal. Well,perhaps it may be just as well to put jackal in the same category -

MR. MORGAN: A jackal makes more noise than a yahoo.

MR. SPEAKER: I meant by putting it in the same category not from the point of view of designating the amount of noise it makes,but from the point of view of withdrawing it.

MR.W. ROWE: I withdraw, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HICKMAN: Order I.

MR. SPEAKER: Order I,the adjourned debate on the sub-amendment to the Address in Reply.

The hon. member for Fogo adjourned the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the subject before the House at the present time and dealing with the Speech from the Throne,I feel as if I am somewhat out of date because when we recall that speech was made on March 6th, a long time has elapsed before we have had an opportunity to really have a discussion or a debate on that important document. It is a great pity, Mr. Speaker, that this is so because I think this is the time or in the area where every member, each member of this House,would want to speak because it is the only opportunity which gives the latitude to deal with many of the problems which effect each member's district. I would be very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, if we did not hear from every member of the House regarding what the speech did and did not contain. But, Sir, as is customary I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder to the Address in Reply. The mover,the hon. member for Ferryland (Mr.Power),was very glowing in his terms and took great pride in telling the House of the great things which have happened in that district over the past few years .ButI suppose, Mr. Speaker, this is the consequence of having two or three or four by-elections in the one district within the past two years and all the goodies that were possible to pass out,of course,were handed out in that district.



CAPT. WINSOR:                However, I think the hon. member deserves a bit of credit. He fought in that district many times and failed once or twice. I believe he is the only member that I can think of that can confirm what Sir Winston Churchill once said to Mr. Fishman, I believe, who wrote a book entitled Darling Clementine. Darling Clementine, of course, was Sir Winston's wife. They were discussing politics and Sir Winston said, "My darling, politics is somewhat like war and it is exciting, but it can be just as dangerous. Although in war one can get killed only once but in politics one can get killed many times." Now the hon. member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) I think suffered political defeat on more than one occasion, but he had the nerve and the audacity to get back and fight those elections up there until he finally won a legitimate seat in the House of Assembly.

MR. RIDEOUT:                He had to fight his own party.

CAPT. WINSOR:                That is part of the fight and that is part of the war. However, the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) I think must have mustered all of the courage that one could muster to stand on his feet and speak in glowing terms of that document. Because, Sir, he, unlike the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) has certainly not shared the prosperity and the activity and the spending of the money of government which his colleague did,

Capt. E. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, because that hon. member has had one of the most depressing districts within this Province, within this past five years, a people who had their hopes built on great things found the whole foundation shattered and foundered—the cancellation of the woods operation, the inactivity of the Lower Churchill followed by, of course, the closing out of the Bases. There is no district that I can think of, and I know that district very well; there is no district that I can think of which has had so much discouragement, disillusionment and disappointment as the district of Naskaupi.

Sir, it is not a healthy situation. And I was quite concerned the other day when the hon. member spoke in, I do not know whether it was in this debate or some other any way, when he stated that 25 percent of the people in that district are now unemployed. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very serious and discouraging thing to find within a small district, 25 per cent, and you must exclude Churchill Falls from that, and you are thinking of the radius of Happy Valley to North West River, Mud Lake and North West River, and in that small area to find that there are 25 per cent of the people unemployed is a very serious matter.

But, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the Throne Speech, and I have here a copy of the Throne Speech and of the Budget Speech, two very important documents, the Throne Speech, of course, outlines the government's policy of what it is going to do in the ensuing year. And while I have the utmost respect for the office from which the Speech comes, I cannot at the same time refrain from stating that it was a very disappointing Speech. And I will assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not critical for the sake of being critical, nor am I critical because I am in Opposition. I am critical because the government has failed to come up with or it has failed in its ability to provide the country or this Province with any genuine policies dealing with the very serious problems which face this Province today.

Now, Sir, the other document, the Budget Speech, of course, contains the information and points out to us the financial

Capt. E. Winsor: state of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CAPT. E. WINSOR: And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that a vast majority of the people of this Province find themselves very disappointed. They are very critical of the document. They are critical because of the contents of that document. And as one walks and talks and goes around this Province, it is easy to get from the people their comments relating the state of confusion, disillusionment, discouragement, and disappointment. When we find, Mr. Speaker, a Province with the heaviest taxes in all of Canada today, we find in that document another increase in the sales tax bringing it to 11 per cent. Thanks to the graciousness of our federal government it is now down to 8 per cent. But can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, in a Province like Newfoundland we are paying 11 per cent sales tax, 11 per cent sales tax! Mr. Speaker, that is quite a substantial tax, especially on the wage earners of this Province.

CAPTAIN WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker, when we on this side of the House were in power we were continuously being criticised by the P.C.'s at that time. I do not know how many members are over there now but I think - yes, there is the hon. member for St. John's Centre (Mr. A. Murphy) and -

AN HON. MEMBER:

There are three over there.

CAPTAIN WINSOR:

There are three over there, I am excluding the hon. the Speaker. However, we were continuously being criticised because that previous administration had put this Province close to \$1 billion in debt, \$1 billion in debt when the present administration took over. That was an alarming debt as far as the Opposition of that day was concerned. However, Mr. Speaker, we find today after a little more than six years of administration by the present government, we find ourselves \$2.5 billion in debt, two and a half times as much as the previous government and what have we to show for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just let us do a little comparison to see what the former administration did with that \$1 billion in comparison to what this present government has done with \$2.5 billion. As I travel around this Province I am certainly not ashamed or do I hold my head low when I go around this Province today and see the things that we of that administration had accomplished with so little money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

CAPTAIN WINSOR:

We, the administration of that day, Mr. Speaker, broke the curse of isolation in this Province, provided roads to almost every community within the Province, linking up roads where no roads had existed. providing electricity where nothing but darkness and kerosene oil lamps were there before -

MR. S. NEARY:

Building fish plants.

CAPTAIN WINSOR:

- fish plants -

MR. NEARY:

Schools and hospitals.

CAPTAIN WINSOR:

- schools and hospitals.

You name it, Mr. Speaker, and as you go around the Province today you can pinpoint them all but there are very few that you can say were constructed or provided by the present government. So what monuments are the present government's? What monuments are they going to leave?

MR. NEARY:

Padlocks on the doors.

CAPTAIN WINSOR:

We see a lot of industries closed down. Closed, no work, workers laid off, no one seems to care too much, but, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province are beginning to take note.

One time in 1972/1973, after the change of government, it was almost embarrassing for someone like myself who had served in that former administration to go around and see so many of your friends - whom you thought were good solid Liberals - no, they used to shy away from you. It was embarrassing to meet them, they had turned P.C., they had gone now for a government who was going to do the things that we could not do.

MR. S. NEARY:

Not instant coffee, instant P.C.'s.

CAPTAIN WINSOR:

Instant P.C.'s. But, Mr. Speaker, the scene has changed today. You travel through this country today and it is almost as embarrassing the other way - people who had once come to you and said, "Boy, we were sorry we could not follow the Liberals any longer," they are coming back to you now and saying "Oh, what a mistake we made, what a mistake we made."

MR. S. NEARY:

Tory times are hard times.

CAPTAIN WINSOR:

Oh, yes, without a doubt Tory times are hard times, always have been, all down through Newfoundland's political history. Unfortunately that has been so.

June 12, 1978

Tape 4230

DW - 3

CAPTAIN WINSOR:

However, Mr. Speaker, the serious problems we have today are among the most important ones and the one outstanding to me is unemployment. Unemployment has a very pshychological effect on people.

Capt. Winsor: and, Mr. Speaker, I am sure I, like other members of the Opposition and perhaps of the whole House, it is very disturbing to me to get telephone calls from people looking for work, get letters day after day, 'Can you help me get work?' I had a call over the weekend from a father of three children, one in university, the first time in twenty-three years, he said, without work. He has one son getting out of university, no work. Now what a disaster within that household! What a psychological affect it is going to have on that student, on that father, Mr. Speaker, and on the mother, because they are faced today with what they have never been faced with before. And it was interesting to note the other day when the member for the Strait of Belle Island (Mr. Roberts) compared the unemployment percentage from 1971, 1972, to 9 per cent at the maximum, to today's unemployment rate of 17 per cent and over, and in one district we have 25 per cent. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that will destroy a person's will to live like idleness, and the government does not seem to be too much concerned. At least, they are not concerned enough to create any real employment. I am surprised that the Minister of Manpower has not been on his feet in this session and having a full-scaled debate on unemployment. But no, Mr. Speaker; we sit quietly by and expect tomorrow will bring a better day. But, Sir, that will not come unless there are plans, and there must be plans to create employment in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: They do not care.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Because, Sir, it is tearing the life out of a lot of our people. I have had calls from people, from parents who have had their son or daughter leaving the university, out lying around the house, no work, demoralizing. They are leaving all of the schools and the trade colleges, and the university, Mr. Speaker, you know, some times it is difficult, it is difficult to give an answer. As a matter of fact, that is the toughest job I have had since I have been in politics, and it is more pronounced this year than I have seen it in my twenty-two-odd years serving in this hon. House.

Capt. E. WINSOR: Now, Sir, I am going to make a suggestion, unfortunately the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications is not in his seat, but I am going to make a suggestion to him to try and create a little employment, especially for the students who are coming out of the university because, Sir, they are the hardest hit, they have bills to pay, no work, and no hope of getting any. So I would say to that minister, and to the minister through this House that he should now start a gigantic source of work around, and it is easy to come by. Let one take a look at the ghastly roadbeds, roadsides all through the Province where we have had new construction, new road construction, the sides of the road and the banks of the road almost everywhere are very ugly.

Now, Sir, the contractors went in there and they plowed through virgin territory and devastated the site, all the beautiful scenery, trees are down by the roadside, the contractors walked out and left it.

MR. MURPHY: Why not perhaps try a new contractor?

CAPT. WINSOR: New contracts maybe, but I am not thinking of new contract, that remains to be seen, but the old contracts.

Now, Sir, I would say to the Minister of Transportation it would be a very wise suggestion on his part if he would start to engage people who are unemployed, the students especially, and get them out there because there is work enough for not one year or two years, but I would say there is work enough to employ a great number of those students for five or six years.



CAPTAIN WINSOR: If we are going to attract the tourists, and if we are going to leave some impression with the tourists, then certainly we must make our areas presentable or otherwise, Sir, they will go away leaving this Province with a bad taste in their mouth. So there is one area where I think the Minister of Transportation and the Premier should make an all-out effort to have this work done. It will certainly have a psychological effect on the students, it will have a psychological effect on the parent, because, Sir, one can imagine a parent day after day with her son or daughter coming home, lying around, waiting, most of them, for the sun to set in the cloud, the darkness to come in so they can get out of the House, get out of the aggravation, somewhere to hide away until the next morning they rise again.

So, Sir, this will not only provide them with the badly needed jobs, it will create a moral stability, something which they will feel proud of. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to destroy a person's will when he or she are idle continuously.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that I was disturbed when the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) compared the percentages of unemployment back when we were the administration to what it is today. And if it were not for the Government of Canada, how bad would it be. It appears to me as I travel around, the only work in existence today is work created by the federal government. There is very little activity showing any signs of the provincial government, small jobs here and there hidden, not visible, but no great number of people employed. So those are the things, Mr. Speaker, that we have to contend with.

I said let us compare some of the achievements of the past administration to the present one. I mentioned the roads. I mentioned electricity. Look at that great Memorial

CAPTAIN WINSOR: University over there, and Mr. Speaker, if the government continues on its present path and continuously cuts back in education two or three things will happen over there. One will certainly be a cutback in registration, I think that is pretty evident, and the other is going to be the tuitions will be raised to a point where we will get back to where we were twenty-five or thirty years ago when only the sons and daughters of people with means will be able to afford to send their son or daughter to school, and perhaps more so the people who are fortunate enough to live in the city close by that university.

So, Mr. Speaker, what a difference, what a difference between this administration and the one previous. We can say all we like and criticize but, Mr. Speaker, all of that criticism has produced nothing, produced absolutely nothing. And this Province today is in a very confused state and if something is not done and done quickly, Sir, the children unborn will be the sufferers. Now, Mr. Speaker, how are we going to accomplish some of those things. Well the first thing is we must get our priorities in order. We certainly must make an effort to cut back on unnecessary expenditures and it is pretty obvious that there are a great many of them. We get criticized over here for being negative. We get criticized over here for making slanderous remarks and bringing in reports of scandal. But, Mr. Speaker, if we have a finance committee and that committee detects that there is some misgivings, they find misgivings that there is some wrongdoings within the confines of the government, it is their duty to bring it to the House. They would be shirking their responsibility if they did not bring those matters to the House.

But, Sir, we do not take any great pride

Capt. E. Winsor: in having to stand here and support motion after motion, support accusations that there is wrongdoings, that is not my style, Mr. Speaker, it is not my type. And I have to do it because I feel on many occasions when the Chairman of that Committee can produce evidence which would indicate to us that there are wrongdoings. So, therefore, we have no choice, Mr. Speaker, so we should not be criticized for that. The people of this Province, I think, would criticize it if we did not do it. So, therefore, we are doing our duty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said when we increased the number of members in this hon. House to fifty-one, I said at that time that the number is too great. We certainly do not need fifty-one members in this House to look after this small Province with a little more than half a million people, because, Sir, in the days when we had no roads, and the members of that day had to travel back and forth by water or by other means, they could look after this Province with twenty-five and thirty, and it got up to thirty-six members, today we have fifty-one. Now, Mr. Speaker, no reflection on the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) or any other member for St. John's, But surely St. John's do not need, you know, eleven members is it? Ten or eleven members.

MR. MURPHY: Well, I suppose ten within the City.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Well, ten within the radius of the City. You know, work can be done within any day. You can almost get in contact with your member, you know, at any given time by telephone. So here is where we could cut back on a few dollars, And a few dollars here and a few dollars there will enable many dollars to be spent in the right direction, this is my point. You know, are we spending what dollars we have to spare in the right direction? I think there is room for improvement in that direction, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Sir, I have said the Speech from The Throne allows the latitude for a member to deal with matters pertaining to his district, and I have to get into that because I do not know how much time I have left, but certainly I should have a few more minutes

Capt. E. Winsor: left yet, but I want to bring to the attention of the House some of the problems, some of the problems which exist in Fogo district. And, Sir, as we all know Fogo district is a fishing district. There is no other employment, no other source of employment but the fishery. And the fishery this past few years has been very good. People are doing extremely well with the fish and the high price, of course, is making it a very prosperous district in certain areas. I would say, and the Minister of Social Assistance can back me up and I am sure he is delighted with this, I would say on Fogo Island, perhaps there are less recipients of social assistance on Fogo Island than perhaps in any other district, apart from the industrial districts. That is something which has happened within this past two or three years. And the hon. minister coming from that area certainly must take great pride in the accomplishment by a determined people, independent people, self-reliant people. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CAPT. E. WINSOR: - but Mr. Speaker, I agree, friendly and hospitable -

MR. BRETT: Determined not to be resettled.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Well now, the resettlement; there is a bit of confusion: every once in a while, this is what I said, now I am surprised at the hon. member - I am surprised that the hon. minister should fall into that trap because, you know, that is so far-fetched from the actual fact that someone or the present government wanted to resettle Fogo Island.

MR. MURPHY: Is that a fact?

CAPT. WINSOR: No, no, it is not a fact.  
As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there is no

June 12, 1978

Tape 4234

EC - 1

CAPT. E. WINSOR: community that was forced to  
resettle during the present administration, no settlement.

MR. MURPHY: It all depends on how you define the word "forcing."

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Well, by force I mean where  
certain facilities may not be provided, schools, for  
instance, hospitals, for instance, you know, a facility  
that people must have in order to be happy and contented.  
However, Sir, it is a fishing district, but what is going  
on on Fogo Island is certainly no - I do not think the  
government can take great pride in what is going on down  
there, because, Sir, if you were going to develop a fishing  
community, a fishing area, then the government must provide  
facilities to go with the industry, facilities such as  
cultural, educational, social, and when you live in an area  
like Fogo Island - the community of Fogo, Joe Batt's Arm,  
Barred Island, Tilting - where there is no water or sewer,  
where there are no paved roads, where people are going  
from well to well to try to get a drop of decent water to  
drink, you know, if we are going to develop the fishery  
then that only can be developed side by side with the  
improvements and the modern facilities. People today are  
not satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with the ways that we had to  
work when I was growing up. I did not mind taking my  
buckets and hoop and going for a quarter of a mile and bring  
water but that was the order of the day. But it is not  
the order of today, because those people are mobile. They  
know what is happening in Gander, they know what is happening  
in other communities, so they are very discontented and  
unhappy with the way the government are treating them in  
this respect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to get to the  
Department of Fisheries. But before I do I would like to

CAPT. E. WINSOR: say we have a community of Musgrave Harbour where for the past three years there has been a water and sewer system partly completed. One part of the town or community is living in the twentieth century and the other part of the town is away back in the eighteenth and nineteenth. That, Mr. Speaker, is brought about by the government not taking the initiative, not treating fairly that community - another fishing community, a prosperous community, an independent people. So how do you expect people to be happy and develop the fishery as it should be developed if their social life cannot be developed with it? And then, of course, we have Carmanville and all over the Fogo district, Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent need for a good source of drinking water. One of the chief items today is a source of good drinking water. We cannot get it, and in many areas the cost of one or two or three wells would be the answer, but, Mr. Speaker, we come pleading with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, to him through his Water Services Committee, and it is utterly impossible to get any quick action. In the district of Fogo as far as I know this year there may be one water system completed, and that is certainly not a water and sewer, but there may be one community provided with the means to supply a half decent source of drinking water.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is an area where something must be done. We cannot expect our people to continue living the way our fathers and forefathers did. They are living in the twentieth century, they are living in a modern age, and this is

June 12, 1978

Tape 4234

EC - 3

CAPT. E. WINSOR:

the sort of thing that we need.

On Fogo Island, Mr. Speaker,  
the previous government had a contract for nine miles or  
ten miles of upgrading and paving of the road which was  
carried out, but when the contractor completed that in  
1973, I think it was, the contract was no longer available  
and the equipment was taken off and left the Island of  
Fogo with a partly paved road and the people are saying,  
'Well, why is it that Fogo can be paved, Seldom to Fogo  
cannot be paved,

CAPT. WINSOR:

Joe Batt's Arm cannot be paved, Stag Harbour Road cannot be paved' and now we find of course - and here we must give credit where credit is due - the Loop Road will be finished this year thanks to, of course, Mr. Ottawa, thanks to DREE. And this is the matter which concerns me, why the provincial government has not requested that Fogo Island be included in the DREE agreement. It has not been included in the DREE agreements, which is an utter disgrace. It is discrimination of the worst order to exclude an island fifteen miles out in the Atlantic, exclude them from any DREE financing. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is disgraceful, it is shameful and it is a matter which I am sure the people of Fogo Island will never forgive this government for. I would say forget the idea of ever running a candidate down there and expect him to be elected, because, Sir, they will hold that in their minds for many, many years to come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, within the Department of Fisheries we all know that there are certain areas of responsibility which come under the jurisdiction of the federal government. But the providing the means whereby the fishermen can catch the fish and the facilities to cure it, the facilities to take care of the fish, freeze it, clean it, etc., that responsibility lies on the shoulders of the provincial government. The provincial government cannot shirk its responsibility in that direction. The fishery, Mr. Speaker, and I might quote a few lines here from the Weekend Telegram which was given at the Fishery College on Saturday by Dr. Blackwood. Dr. Blackwood, Director General of the Industry Service Directorate of the Federal Department of Fisheries told the graduating class of the Fisheries and Navigation Marine Engineers, "The industry must discipline themselves to increase the earning of those involved whilst keeping costs down and markets growing. We must not embark on unnecessary expansion." Mr. Speaker, that speech was one of the finest speeches I have ever heard - not heard but read, in dealing with our fishery.

Now, Sir, I am going to suggest to the Minister of Fisheries -



CAPT. WINSOR:

the provincial Minister of Fisheries is paying a half per cent per pound subsidy to take care of the gear loss. - well I am going to suggest to the Minister of Fisheries now that the provincial government in paying a half per cent per pound on quality fish to help cover gear losses or damages to equipment, that it be changed. And this is the way I would like to see it changed. Fishermen do not always get the benefit of that half cent per pound when it comes to replacing the gear. Some of it is spent. Some fishermen have damage when there is no fish to catch.

So what I would like to see the present government do is to set up a catch insurance and a retirement investment policy whereby a half a cent per pound will be collected from the fishermen themselves. I do not believe that a fishermen would argue against that. Today the price of fish is such that it would enable a fisherman to contribute towards an insurance, a retirement insurance or a catch failure insurance. And the provincial government would pay a half per cent. The fishermen themselves would pay half per cent and the federal -

MR. MURPHY: A half cent per pound.

CAPT. WINSOR: A half cent per pound. Now I heard today where the federal government is going to cancel the 2 per cent subsidy. Let them take half of that 2 per cent, 1 per cent, let the federal government contribute one per cent.

MR. MURPHY: One cent.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: One cent is right. One cent per pound and of course the buyer a half a cent per pound. Then I think, Mr. Speaker, we would have a good insurance policy, a good insurance scheme. Any gear losses or equipment losses would be paid for by this fund to the limit of fishermen's equity in the fund. This would control possible abuses, something which has not been done up until now, and would alleviate any further claims on government short of a national disaster.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should go over that again. The scheme that I suggest is in conjunction with my hon. colleague from Fortune-Hermitage. Last year we were quite disturbed about this and he and I got together and we tried to come up with a better system than what the present minister is offering the fishermen today. So that policy would be half a cent per pound from the fishermen, half a cent per pound from the buyer and one cent per pound from the Federal Government and there we would have quite a contributing policy whereby the fishermen would feel independent. They would be independent of the government. They would not have to be running to the government in case of damage caused to their gear by ice. It would take care of the gear replacement and it would also provide a retiring pension because that fund can really amount to quite a few dollars over a period of years with the price of fish and the way the fishing industry is progressing today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have made two suggestions in this brief talk: one to the Minister of Transportation and Communications to create employment by getting students out to clear up the ghastly sights along the road banks; and one to the Minister of Fisheries to inaugurate this gear loss and retirement investment. If we do that then I feel we will have accomplished something in this session.

Thank you!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Placentia.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I may say that I was very much impressed there with the remarks made by my good friend, Captain Winsor. He was doing fine with his suggestions with regard to the cleaning up the road banks and make work programmes. I am all for that, I can go along with that one hundred per cent. That is quite right and I think that when the Department of Highways let contracts for road work it should be stipulated in the contract that the gravel taken for the road be taken from probably four or five hundred feet back from the center of the road and a row of trees left to protect it. Now what I do not agree with and what I am very much upset over, and of course it is a long ways back now and there is nothing can be done to correct it, but the member for Fogo said that in the resettlement programme the people were not forced from their homes. Now, I challenge any man on this side of the House, in the galleries, outside of the House or any place in Newfoundland that -

MR. CANNING: They forced them out of Placentia Bay.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Forced, driven out of Merasheen, out of South East Bight, out of Red Island, out of Paradise, Little Paradise -

MR. NEARY: That is not true.

MR. A.J. MURPHY: Okay, go ahead.

MR. W. PATTERSON: It is human true. It is true.

MR. NEARY: Nobody was forced out.

MR. W. PATTERSON: They were forced out through various means, by withdrawing the teachers.

MR. NEARY: That is the school board.

MR. W. PATTERSON: I did not mention who forced them out. So if you want to be technical, Patterson can be technical. They were forced out. There was the carrot and a stick method.

MR. NEARY: Could they get teachers to go there?

MR. W. PATTERSON: Yes, they could get teachers to go there. Yes, to a beautiful place such as Merasheen I am sure there would be hundreds of teachers want to go there.

June 12, 1978

Tape No. 4236

JM - 3

MR. H. COLLINS: The hon. gentleman should be heard in silence.  
MR. A. J. MURPHY: (Inaudible) very quietly there, Mr. Speaker.

Can the gentleman not have silence?

MR. PATTERSON: No, that is quite alright. I am -

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

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order before the Chair.

MR. NEARY: Well, I will raise a point of order, Sir. The hon. gentleman has been in this House, Sir, long enough to know that you do not speak unless you are sitting in your own seat. The hon. gentleman is not in his own seat so he should be seen and not heard.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Placentia.

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I see no point of order before the Chair.

MR. NEARY: The point of order is, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is speaking and not in his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: The only hon. member recognized by the Chair is the hon. member for Placentia.

MR. NEARY: Well, a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I distinctly heard, and I believe Your Honour heard the hon.

June 12, 1978

Tape No. 4237

RT-1

MR. S. NEARY: member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy), Sir, speaking; as a matter of fact, stood up in somebody else's place and spoke in this hon. House. That is against the rules of the House, Sir, and I ask Your Honour to enforce the rules. If the hon. gentleman is going to sit in that seat he should be seen and not heard.

MR. SPEAKER (COLLINS): Order, please!

My understanding of the rules is that if an hon. member is to be recognized by the Chair he must rise in his own place uncovered, and if he is recognized by the Chair he then can speak. It is my understanding that interjections do not come into that category or that stipulation. Interjections strictly speaking are always out of order although they have been allowed to go by as long as the House does not get unruly. Up to this point in time the only member who has been recognized by the Chair, and he is standing in his own place, the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson).

The hon. member.

Has the hon. member complete his remarks?

MR. W. PATTERSON: No, I was just waiting for you to make a ruling on that.

MR. SPEAKER (COLLINS): Hon. member.

MR. W. PATTERSON: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of interpretation what is forced out and what is driven out, and what is the carrot and the stick method. But I can assure you that the carrot and stick method was used to get the people out of Merasheen, out of Red Island, out of Little Paradise, Great Paradise, Southeast Bight, Woody Island, in Placentia Bay. I recall being introduced to the chief executioner, I have his picture here before me, I think it was Sametz, the man who was brought into this country to execute the resettlement program.

MR. W. ROWE: You are living in the past.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Never mind living in the past.

MR. W. ROWE: Think of the future.

June 12, 1978

Tape No. 4237

RT-2

MR. W. PATTERSON: We will get to the future. I was introduced to him by the hon. Dr. Frecker, and he said, "Patterson, Patterson, that name rings a bell". He said, "You do a lot of writing in the press and you are critical of the resettlement program", and I said, "Yes". He looked at me for a while as though I were a cross between a parrot and an eel, and he said, "You know, I am responsible for that program". Well I said, "I am certainly glad to meet you because for awhile I thought there was no-one responsible for it".

Now if the hon. gentlemen opposite want to say that they were not forced out, would they tell me that the people were treated justly?

MR. CALLAN: That is still going on. I can give you the same argument and say there are people down in Southwest Arm who are trying to get paved roads and cannot get them, and ice-making machines and cannot get them are being forced out of there.

MR. W. PATTERSON: No, I do not think so. You are splitting hairs there. When the people arrived at Southern Harbour, which was designated as a relocation reception centre, at Little Harbour, no water, no sewerage, and a family of three were given but \$2,100. Now can you imagine landing in Placentia with \$2,100 and to try to buy a house there? Houses were selling for \$8,000 and \$10,000 at the time so the people had to go in debt.

MR. S. NEARY: What you are saying is that there is nothing wrong with resettlement, it is the method that was used. That is what you are saying.

MR. W. PATTERSON: I will get to that later.

So they had to go ahead and raise \$8,000, and \$10,000 and \$15,000 in many cases and this money had to be raised from the banks and the finance companies.

MR. S. NEARY: If they had gotten \$50,000 it would have been all right with you.

MR. W. PATTERSON: I will get to that, you are bordering on it. So they had to go in debt to the banks and finance companies, so in other words they financed their own destruction.

MR. S. NEARY: It is the amount of money you are really concerned with.

MR. W. PATTERSON: No, not so much that.

Now several small places in the Bay - I would say if they had resettled Merasheen or brought the people up to there where they had good wharves, electricity, and had everything.

MR. S. NEARY: Why did they not go there?

MR. W. PATTERSON: Well, something went wrong.

I would say that there would be no problem to get teachers to go to these islands even yet and the fishermen are going back there today to fish. And the islands are going to be resettled again, make no bones about that, they are going to be resettled.

And from those islands came great men, men who distinguished themselves in every field of endeavour. So we always had good teachers out there, The hon. member over them, a good friend of mine -

MR. S. NEARY: As a matter of fact, the principal of the school I went to was from Ped Island.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Right.

MR. S. NEARY: But he did not resettle, he left there years ago. He had to leave there to go to Bell Island to make a living.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Well, I would say he had the capability, he brought something to Bell Island with him which was an industrial centre and you had to be more or less a professional, or a semi-professional man to work there.

MR. S. NEARY: He must have been a genius to put me through Grade XI.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Well -

AN HON. MEMBER: We agree on that.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Well that is all I have to say about Captain Winsor's remarks. The resettlement program was cruel, it was heartless,

June 12, 1978

Tape 4238

DW - 1

MR. PATTERSON:

it was uncalled for.

MR. CANNING:

(Inaudible) where they had  
electricity and fish plants and everything they wanted.

MR. PATTERSON:

But the government encouraged  
the CN to take off the boats.

MR. CANNING:

Oh, no (inaudible) the teachers

MR. PATTERSON:

They did so. And the school  
boards and the church were as much involved as government. Once  
they got in. If you had twenty families on an island, possibly  
eight or ten could not care less where they lived, they would like  
to get into Placentia and that influenced them.

AN HON. MEMBER:

But you let them.

MR. PATTERSON:

And then the merchant left.

MR. CANNING:

(Inaudible) but the priest and  
the merchant.

MR. PATTERSON:

Well, they condoned the actions  
of the bishops and the priests and the merchants.

MR. S. NEARY:

Oh, I see (inaudible) tidal wave  
back in the 1920s.

MR. PATTERSON:

No, it was not a tidal wave back  
in the 1920s. This all happened and hon. gentlemen opposite  
would like to forget about it. But anyhow -

MR. MORGAN:

They were in power.

MR. PATTERSON:

Right.

MR. CANNING:

(Inaudible) about that, the  
merchant would discourage the teachers.

MR. PATTERSON:

Yes, they discouraged everything  
with regard to Placentia Bay. They encouraged the Canadian National  
to apply to the Board of Transport Commissioners to abandon the  
port of Argentia.

MR. NEARY:

(Inaudible) Second World War too.



MR. PATTERSON: Now the government did that and I have it right here from the previous administration where they agreed with the Minister of Transport in Ottawa and they said to them, 'Look, you go ahead, abandon the port of Argentia, transfer it all into St. John's, we will not say a word about it providing you will do one thing.'

MR. S. NEARY: Do you have proof? Can you back it up?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, I can back that up, Sir.

MR. S. NEARY: Let us see the document tabled.

MR. PATTERSON: I will table the document for the hon. gentleman if he wants it. It says, "Insofar as the application for abandonment is concerned, it is being undertaken principally on an understanding reached with the government of Newfoundland when the federal undertook to pay the full cost of building a modern highway from Argentia to the Trans-Canada Highway." Incidentally, they never did finish that job and there is three miles to be done through Dunville.

MR. MORGAN: The Newfoundland Government agreed with abolishing the railway down to Argentia for the sake of a road.

MR. PATTERSON: "At that time the Provincial Government agreed that it offer no objection to the abandonment of the railway -

MR. S. NEARY: What are you quoting from now?

MR. PATTERSON: - after the highway had been opened. Without such assurance the federal government would not have undertaken this very substantial expenditure which will result both in greatly improved transport services and in a smaller burden on the federal treasury."

AN HON. MEMBER: Signed by?

MR. PATTERSON: Now as soon as I heard that we went to work and we hired a lawyer here in St. John's.

MR. CALLAN: What year was that?

MR. PATTERSON: 1967. And he then immediately prepared a brief and that brief is to be presented to the Canadian National whatever time the hearing comes up. It may be this year and it may be next year but that is all stopped that.

MR. MORGAN: That was signed by what then minister?

MR. PATTERSON: That was the Minister of Transport.

MR. MORGAN: Paul Hellier, was it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Jack Pickersgill.

MR. PATTERSON: That was the hon. John Pickersgill. Now this was a bit of underhanded work, there is no doubt at all about that. There were fifty or sixty men working in Argentina then and they certainly did not want the port of Argentina service transferred to St. John's.

MR. CANNING: What did that have to do with (inaudible) in Placentia Bay, for God's sake.

MR. PATTERSON: I am off that subject. Now I am prepared to debate that with the hon. gentleman outside this House or -

MR. CANNING: (Inaudible) nearly enough.

MR. PATTERSON: Well that is your opinion; it is a matter of opinion. But, Mr. Speaker, Placentia, Jerseyside, and Dunville, Freshwater grew and prospered with the coming of the Americans there in 1941. They have now reached the population of 7,000. It was because of the presence of the American bases that the people moved from Red Island and from Trinity Bay and Conception Bay to work on the construction projects.

June 12, 1978

Tape 4238

DW - 4

MR. S. NEARY: I moved down there myself.  
my son. I worked on the (inaudible).

MR. PATTERSON: Well, you came down here  
and got a woman. I do not see why you probably should not  
go back there.

AN HON. MEMBER: He went down there to get  
a woman, did he?

MR. PATTERSON: He knew where to go for a  
good woman.

AN HON. MEMBER: He married a woman from down  
there? He married a girl from out there?

MR. NEARY: I did not meet her then. I was  
working on the base down there in 1944 and 1945.

MR. PATTERSON: I suppose if there is an  
area in Newfoundland -

AN HON. MEMBER: Could you call me (inaudible)  
or resettled (inaudible)

MR. PATTERSON: We could possibly consider  
that with accepting you as a citizen if you buck up a little.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: There is not an area in  
Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, that regional government should  
apply to more so than Placentia. We have four towns and a  
population of 7,000. We have four mayors, I think about  
thirty-three counsellors, four town halls, four fire trucks,  
and everything is just not functioning. Now if the residents  
in there and the mayors do not go for the amalgamation of the  
towns, I think the government should take the bull by the horns  
and lay their cards on the table and point out to them that  
consolidation would be the better form of government.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman advocating  
that the government should force amalgamation on those towns?

MR. PATTERSON: Well, if the government is footing the bill and picking up deficits, I think, you know, government should have a say.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman is in favour of that, is he?

MR. PATTERSON: Oh, yes, I am in favour of amalgamation -

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. PATTERSON: - and I possibly lost five elections down there because of the position I took on amalgamation. And I think all hon. gentleman and ladies would agree, Why have four mayors and thirty-three councillors for 7,000?

MR. NEARY: Do you not agree that there should be a referendum down there to decide?

MR. PATTERSON: Oh, certainly. Yes, I would certainly agree to a referendum.

MR. NEARY: Right, and the sooner the better.

MR. PATTERSON: And, you know, let the people decide, but if they are not going to decide, well, then they are going to have to increase their taxes so the government will not have to pay a deficit.

MR. STRACHAN: Should the Minister of Municipal Affairs appoint a regional government?

MR. PATTERSON: No, I would not say that they should appoint it, but what they should do is create the climate for it, probably take the mayors in and sit down and have a chat with them and look over their balance sheets and their budgets, you know.

MR. STRACHAN: They are appointed in St. John's,

MR. STRACHAN: are they not?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes. I suppose that is the reason why they want three or four on the boards there.

MR. STRACHAN: (Inaudible) so they can do it all.

MR. NEARY: Which is the most democratic way to do it now, appoint them or have a referendum?

MR. PATTERSON: Well, the most democratic way to do it would be to hold a referendum -

MR. NEARY: Right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: - put it on the ballot paper -

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. PATTERSON: - and then let the people decide if they want it. But if you have an area where you have four or five councils and they are not functioning, they are operating at a deficit, they have to be subsidized by the government, I think that has to be wiped out. It is not healthy and it is not a good form of local government.

MR. CANNING: Right. A good point, much better than your first one.

MR. PATTERSON: Pardon?

MR. CANNING: A good point that is. You made a mess of the first one.

MR. NEARY: He is making a mess of this one, too.

MR. PATTERSON: I would think that in a year or probably two or three years down the road, all this may happen because the schools are consolidated, the police are consolidated.

MR. NEARY: But they are moving the school back to Freshwater now. Have they moved it back this year or moving it back next year?

June 12, 1978

Tape 4239

EC - 3

MR. PATTERSON: No, they have built a new school at Dunville and I doubt if there will be any change.

MR. NEARY: Well, I was in the church there one Sunday and I heard the priest say they are going to move the kids back to Freshwater again.

MR. PATTERSON: Well, there was some talk of it, but -

MR. NEARY: He believed in the smaller schools schools.

MR. PATTERSON: - I doubt if that will happen.

MR. NEARY: Well, now, they have changed the priest there since that.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, it may and it may not.  
But the chief source of employment up there, Mr. Speaker - ERCO Industries, U.S. Navy, Department of Transport, trade school and the other schools of various denominations, finance companies and the bank. Now I cannot speak in such glowing terms as my friend, the hon. the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) spoke the other day about his district. Listening to him there I thought for sure we were going to have a pollution problem up in Placentia with the prevailing Southerly winds that could take the fumes from the Southern Shore and dump them in there, but -

MR. NEARY: How many are employed on the U.S. Base?

MR. PATTERSON: About 113.

MR. NEARY: They are the biggest employer in there.

MR. PATTERSON: Biggest employer? No, ERCO Industries, 400.

MR. NEARY: ERCO.

June 12, 1978

Tape 4239

EC - 4

MR. PATTERSON: Well, ERCO Industries possibly would have 100 from Dunville.

AN HON. MEMBER: ERCO at Long Harbour.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, ERCO at Long Harbour.

The fisheries are certainly beginning to stabilize the economy out there, and we have the hospital there; it is an old hospital, it was built in 1941 when the former hospital was moved from Argenticia to make room for the base. Now we need a new hospital.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) of Newfoundland.

MR. PATTERSON: I would not say that it is not getting

MR. PATTERSON:

all the attention it deserves. It could stand a little more attention. But this is coming along well. The hospital has made it there.

MR. MORGAN: They ignored it for years.

MR. PATTERSON: Oh yes, yes, yes.

MR. NEARY: Whatever they got they got with the help of the former administration. All they got out of the present administration was the sewer line which cost \$1 million and it does not work. There has not been one toilet flushed through it yet. \$1 million and you cannot flush a toilet in it yet.

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

Of course, when an hon. member is speaking, as I mentioned a little earlier, interjections strictly speaking are out of order but these are not ruled upon, at least the Chair does not intervene unless an hon. member requests protection when intervention is immediate. But if the interjections do become such, even though an hon. member does not ask for protection, they become such that the hon. member cannot make his remarks I think the Chair does have a duty here. I think we are approaching that stage now.

The hon. member.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the slot machines.

MR. PATTERSON: Well we can get around to the slot machines later. I think the hon. gentleman is well versed in the operation. I do not know how many jack pots he has hit, but I would say he has a knowledge of slot machines.

MR. NEARY: I like the older machines better than the new ones.

MR. PATTERSON: Oh yes. They pay a little better.

MR. NEARY: I have cracked more cherries than anybody else in that area.

MR. PATTERSON: Well, there are usually three to a row. You know, that is a sixty dollar jack pot.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how well publicized the fact is that last year there they unveiled a plaque to Sir Winston Churchill.



MR. PATTERSON:

That is out at Ship Harbour Point. That is where the Prince of Wales was anchored when the Atlantic Charter was negotiated. Now I am very sad to say that out to that historic site today there is nothing but a mud road, a river of mud. Of course, that is the responsibility of historic sites and monuments.

MR. NEARY: That is out towards Fox Harbour, is it?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes. The road leading to there passes through Fox Harbour and then on to Ship Harbour. So there is an area there of about six miles of gravel road and that road is now being upgraded in preparation for paving.

The real problem up there that fishermen are having, as well as fishermen all over Newfoundland, I suppose, is with the inshore druggers that are coming in at night and doing considerable damage to the fish stocks as well as to the nets. This has been brought to the attention of the federal fisheries and they always come up with the excuse, "How can we patrol Placentia Bay? How can we manage boats from going in there at night." To which I say, you know, how in the hell are you going to patrol the Grand Banks, the Georges Banks and wherever you have to patrol. So these boats are doing a lot of damage there. The herring seiners operate in there possibly for two weeks out of a year and they take half the quota, which leaves about 600 tons for the inshore fishermen to take with purse seines and ring seines. That is really no good. At six cents a pound and there are six boats geared up for it, they make probably \$6,000 each.

So I feel that the mobile fleet, which are the big seiners, should be barred from St. Mary's Bay, Placentia Bay and all bays for that matter where they operate in Newfoundland. That would give the herring a chance to move in around the bays and in turn the cod fish would chase the herring and both would be caught. It is not so now. The grounds are being destroyed and the herring are being taken by the big seiners. And it is really not worthwhile

MR. PATTERSON:

for the small operator to be in there.

Placentia Bay has a great potential there for a crab fishery but the crabs are in the deep water, in 600 feet of water and that is the tanker route leading up to Come By Chance. So you know fishermen have been doing real well there now since the tankers stopped moving, since the tankers discontinued. If the refinery is to open again, strict precautions are going to have to be taken to protect the fishery. I think that what we are going to have to get is a 200 mile limit on tankers unless they are of a certain construction, double bottoms and safe with radar -

MR. CANNING: You are not getting back that communications system (inaudible)

MR. PATTERSON: No, I doubt if the communication system will go back. But while that communication system was there several

MR. W. PATTERSON:

accidents were prevented. We have had some very close calls up there with CN boats, phosphorus ships, fishermen crisscrossing the bay and possibly if that radar site had been left at Cuslett we may know more about what happened to the dragger out of Burgeo. Because I feel, I am certainly sure that parts of the boat drifted ashore on St. Brides. And possibly the boat went down close to Cape St. Mary's as it turned to go into Marystown. If that radar station had been left there and not moved out to Port aux Basques, that accident possibly could have been averted.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That construction company put in that system and what did it cost?

MR. PATTERSON: \$5 million.

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN: What does it cost to operate it?

MR. PATTERSON: Oh, operating costs, about ten men.

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN: That is all.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes. They had a main station at Argentinia and a satellite station at Cuslett and one at Arnolds Cove. So when the tankers came in the bay, came in from the Atlantic, they were picked up at Cuslett, relayed to Argentinia and then relayed to Arnolds Cove.

Mr. Speaker, Southern Harbour is a small community with a population of 700 and that had a population prior to resettlement to possibly 250. So that town is fairly well serviced now. There is a small fish plant there and they fish for lobster, herring and cod.

AN HON. MEMBER: All Federal money spent there.

MR. PATTERSON: Not as much as Provincial. The Provincial Government put \$1 million into the lift there, not syncrolift, travellift, and they put \$1 million into water and sewerage, they paved the road and they put - oh my good God, \$300,000 or \$400,00 into the recreation facilities there. The small wharf is from the Federal Government, nothing big. The Federal Government, the Federal Department they are certainly neglecting the fishermen operating out of Merasheen - I notice the hon. member is starting to perk up over there now:

AN HON. MEMBER: How many fishermen over to Merasheen this year?

MR. CANNING: That is your look out now.

MR. PATTERSON: I do not know if it is my look out or not but I have been looking after it since I came in here, I will guarantee you that, and the Provincial Government rebuilt a stage there and put in heat and lights.

MR. CANNING: They did not put a wharf there (inaudible)

MR. PATTERSON: The wharf started there. I interceded with the Federal Department and we got a wharf off the ground and the company building the wharf went broke. I have been out there three or four times.

MR. CANNING: A.B. Walsh went broke.

MR. PATTERSON: I do not know the principals in the company but I do know out at Red Island we -

MR. NEARY: The Premier's buddy, Mr. Walsh.

MR. PATTERSON: I do know that on Red Island, the Area Development Association in Placentia built a wharf at -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman.

MR. PATTERSON: The Area Development in Placentia built a wharf at Red Island and put a nice shed on it with lights in it. The fishermen there are nice and comfortable.. They had to go back there and live in old rat infested shacks, rats that length used to come up through the floor in the fish plant at Merasheen. And when I was elected I went out there, the first two weeks I was elected and I came to the minister here and we had the lights put in, a heater put in and bins for salting their fish. They are quite comfortable, but now the wharf, that is a mess I must say.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did they kill the rats?

MR. PATTERSON: I do not know what they did there to tell you the truth. Put poison there, I suppose. The Federal Department of Public Works are neglecting the islands out there. Four years ago over at Davises Cove the CN took away the wharf and they refused to rebuild that wharf. So now we have to go after the Area Development

June 12, 1978

Tape No. 4241

JM - 3

MR. PATTERSON: Association again to put in an application to Canada Works and we will get a few dollars out of Small Crafts down here and hopefully we will get a few bucks out of the Minister of Fisheries and we will get a new wharf there. So in some ways the Federal Fisheries - I will relate one story to you. Last summer a fisherman up at one of the harbours there he went out to his

MR. PATTERSON: herring net and he had one lobster in his boat coming in, he took it out of the net. And he was taken to court for having this lobster and he was fined \$25. and Magistrate Corbett at Placentia he marked on his summons that no further action be taken on this. A year later, the commencement of this season's fishery, he received notice from the federal fisheries down here that he was taken out of the fishery for fourteen days for having one lobster.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is unbelievable.

MR. PATTERSON: It is unbelievable but that man lost an average of \$200 a day. So he lost \$2,800 plus the \$25. Now I have written Fisheries on this back and forth but there is no way. They are not going to yield to me. But they should have produced that evidence in court. They were trying to say he took the lobsters from his pot.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you know he did not?

MR. PATTERSON: Am I sure he did not? Who am I to judge?

MR. CANNING: I never heard anything about it.

MR. PATTERSON: Well if you knew who he was it would not make any difference, you know. Who he is, that does not make any difference where he got it. But over at Little Harbour, that is another area where constituents from the hon. member's district, well-looked after since the Conservatives took office, not before that; not enough water up there to baptize a youngster until I got elected. They used to have to bring the water there for baptisms. And now they have a nice stage there, 200 feet long, two story, a nice little fish plant operating there. It is leased to private enterprise.

MR. NEARY: Is that O'Brien's out there.

MR. PATTERSON: No, Kevin Wadman. And he is doing a real good job there, an excellent job. They have a new wharf there by the provincial fisheries, and Canada Works put up so much money last year and there is a new water line going in there.

MR. CANNING: Little Harbour.

MR. PATTERSON: Little Harbour, yes.

MR. PATTERSON: Oh there was a tiny little plant that burned about - I do not know, five or six or seven or eight years ago. So there is a water line going in there now through Canada Works and provincial involvement and the road is being rebuilt in there, reconstructed and the road will be paved. So all in all most of the communities in the district now are serviced with water and sewerage; if not before, another two years hopefully it will all be done.

To get back to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), he has been needing me once in a while on the water and sewerage at Placentia. Yes, that was a blunder. There is no doubt at all about that. \$500,000 buried.

MR. NEARY: \$1 million.

MR. PATTERSON: No, \$500,000.

MR. NEARY: \$1 million.

MR. PATTERSON: \$500,000; company gone up the spout, case in court, started in 1974, and the case went to court about two months ago.

MR. NEARY: Did they call the bond?

MR. PATTERSON: Yes. Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: As good a job as the one Crosbie got from (inaudible)

MR. PATTERSON: I do not recall Mr. Crosbie ever getting one for him. I recall Mr. Patterson getting one for him. Although he was a very close colleague of mine. This was all provincial money, no federal money involved, and the loan.

MR. CANNING: Provincial.

MR. PATTERSON: Provincial.

MR. CANNING: (Inaudible) by-election.

MR. PATTERSON: No. No. 1974.

MR. CANNING: But he never moved up there (inaudible).

MR. PATTERSON: That is the ex-mayor, a very fine gentleman, a man who devoted twenty-five years of his life to being mayor of Placentia. Any man who gives twenty-five years of his service to a community certainly -

AN HON. MEMBER: No pay.

MR. PATTERSON: - deserves recognition. And I would say Mr. Miller was instrumental in getting that line through.

MR. CANNING: He went to the Liberal authorities -

MR. PATTERSON: He was the first Tory member after Confederation. He was elected as a Tory member and then he became a Liberal, and then he saw the light and he got out.

He only had two flicks at it.

But anyhow a very fine gentleman and he gave a lot of his time to the community up there. He spent twenty-five years.

I think the area, Mr. Speaker, has a great future. There is no doubt at all about that. I can see that Argentina is going to be developed. There is no doubt about that. It has wonderful potential, wonderful potential out there and I think you will see industrialists moving in there. I think when the Sullivan Commission, the report it out, you will find that Argentina will be recommended



June 12, 1978

Tape No. 4243

RT-1

MR. W. PATTERSON:

for a year-round service to North Sydney. I do not say that now to needle my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) because he has taken care of his end of it out there and that is natural for him to try to block things there.

MR. NEARY: You should get the freight moving down there, freight that is destined for Port-aux-Basques move it out of there.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Pardon?

MR. CANNING: You could promote a good fishing port for Argentina, an ideal port for that.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Yes. Well that it being looked at now; in fact, we have three major companies, three of the big ones. I had a group in there last week and within three weeks I will have another group in there, and in August another group. So, hopefully, there will be a dragger operation out of Argentina that would employ 300 or 400 people.

But all in all the future looks bright out there and that is what it would take now, about 300 jobs to stabilize the economy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. gentleman takes his seat, would the hon. gentleman care to tell us what is happening on the northeast side there, the abandoned naval base? Is the member getting any co-operation now from DREE to try to attract industry into that area? What is happening in connection with that part of the base that is abandoned? Could the member give us a rundown on it and give up a rundown on Castle Hill? What is happening there?

MR. W. PATTERSON: As I mentioned before, I believe, you asked me a question one night here on Argentina, the big stumbling block with development in there is with DREE, is with Cashin and McGonegal

MR. S. NEARY: What is the problem?

MR. W. PATTERSON: Well, I do not know. The problem is that they have to go. My son, they just have to go, they have to move.

MR. W. PATTERSON: A development corporation or a development officer has to be established in there and they should dig out a good man, not a political hack, a man who would be prepared to work, and give him a year's contract, or a two year's contract, and say, "Here, boy, look, there is the budget and you go to work and at the end of the year you come back with something", or the end of the two years.

MR. S. NEARY: Have the facilities been turned over to the Province now?

MR. W. PATTERSON: The Americans have agreed, the Newfoundland Government has agreed, External Affairs has agreed, and it is just a matter of a signature from the Minister of External Affairs. Am I right in that?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Secretary of State for External Affairs.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Yes, but everything else has been agreed and the lands have been surveyed and apportioned for the Federal and apportioned for the Provincial.

But Argentinia will never be developed as long as it is left in slings as it is in right now.

A friend of mine who applied to set up a plant in there, a small plant, he would have employed about eighty men and he is given the runaround, down to McGonegal, Cashin, Industrial Development, who helped him, the Minister of Fisheries here helped, but that is where he stopped. He could be employing eighty men in there which means I would only have 220 people out of work.

MR. S. NEARY: What business is that?

AN HON. MEMBER: Fishing.

MR. W. PATTERSON: A fish plant. Yes.

MR. S. NEARY: What about the refrigeration there now, the cold storage?

MR. W. PATTERSON: Cold storages now are being rebuilt at a cost of \$1,000,000 Provincial money and I think they should be completed within six months. That will give an additional nine to ten million

June 12, 1978

Tape No. 4243

RT-3

MR. W. PATTERSON:

pounds capacity.

MR. S. NEARY:

Who will use that? What will it be used for?

MR. W. PATTERSON:

Well, I do not think that has really been decided. I would think that if one of the big companies take over the complete warehouse which is a three-storey building, concrete, with twelve-ton elevators, then that possibly may tie in with that particular company or companies, or they in turn may set up their own cold storage facilities on the top floor. But I do not think that we are doing all we should be doing. I do not blame it on Government and I think it is on ourselves. We are exporting too much fish in the raw state. Two months ago I mentioned here in this House that I went over to New Brunswick and took a look at the operations there, and there are one hundred smoke-houses in New Brunswick. One hundred. A family business, a small investment, \$20,000, and they are smoking their herring with natural wood, it is not artificial smoke, and that gives it a better flavour. An investment of \$20,000 would build a smokehouse and put in the vats for the herring. Now they transport their herring over there different than we do. They buy the herring from the fishermen and then they have a tank truck like you see around St. John's for gasoline, and that is full of brine and the herring are put in immediately. We leave herring around to lie in the sun in the back of an old truck for two or three days, or on a wharf, and

June 12, 1978

Tape 4244

EC - 1

MR. PATTERSON: that is bad news, But they have markets down in the West Indies and down in Uganda, I believe. And they tell me that they have unlimited markets for mackerel. And Placentia Bay and other bays in Newfoundland with millions and millions of tons of mackerel and the mackerel are not being processed yet. So I think we can get a market down there in the West Indies for mackerel.

But to get back to the Argentina thing there, the green light has been given for industry to move in there.

MR. NEARY: But the signature is not on the official document yet.

MR. PATTERSON: That is right, but the green light has been given and I wish that Mr. Jamieson would move on that. I think he should move on it and now that the federal election is down the road, a year, possibly, I doubt if he would hold off that long

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like, as is the tradition, and I would gladly do it, to congratulate the mover and seconder of the debate in the Speech from the Throne. It is rather appropriate, because in this particular year Her Majesty the Queen will be a guest of ours in this Province for a little while and I believe it is going to happen this month or next month if I am not mistaken. Maybe the House Leader opposite -

MR. HICKMAN: July.

MR. NOLAN: - in July. And all I hope is that during Her Majesty's visit, whether it is here on the Avalon or wherever it is, that some of the ordinary people of the Province will get an opportunity to meet Her Majesty.

MR. NOLAN: I am thinking about the young school children particularly, senior citizens and others. What I am talking about is those who under normal circumstances have no chance in God's world of coming into a direct presence with Her Majesty, I would hope will be given the opportunity while she is visiting here to meet with or at least get somewhere close to Her Majesty, allowing always, of course, for the proper security procedures that are so necessary, and I hope that we would not merely have the usual 500 who have an opportunity to sit and have a belt of the grape at public expense

MR. McNEIL: As is the case. She has only fifteen minutes in Bay St. George, in and out.

MR. NOLAN: Well, the thing is, I realize -

MR. NEARY: The ordinary people will have to queue up. All the big shots will be invited to the cocktail party.

MR. NOLAN: Well, I only mention it now as I start my very few remarks in the hope that the ordinary people of this Province will be given an opportunity to do so. As a matter of fact, I do not know if it would be considered a discourtesy - I hope not - I am wondering if perhaps those people who may have had the opportunity before might be willing to give way and let some of the people who have never been close to Her Majesty the Queen in their lives have an opportunity to meet her, a once in a lifetime opportunity; ordinary people, men and women, young boys and girls, those from the various senior citizens' homes - now I know she cannot meet them all, but at least let us give some consideration to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to just for a very few moments take a moment or two to

MR. NOLAN: talk about a number of things in a district that I represent, namely, Conception Bay South, which I think in terms of real numbers, in terms of voters and so on, is probably, in fact is, the largest provincial district in Newfoundland in terms of real numbers of citizens present or living in the district. It must be a big district and I will tell you why. I understand the Minister of Justice may be involved in bringing in an election reform bill or some such thing in the Fall or whenever - I do not know exactly when - but in the last election in 1975, the night before the election I had a call telling me there was another polling booth that we had not been informed about at all, not at all. I went there the next morning and they were set up, a number of ladies there fulfilling their official functions, and they were supposed to stay there until 8:00 or 9:00 or 10:00 or 11:00 that night. There was no heat in the place, no place to put on the kettle to boil a cup of tea, nothing at all; last minute, hove together and, in fact, I had to arrange with someone to go and try to get a bit of heating in there for them. Is this the way elections are run in this Province? Is this the way it was planned? Is this what any man or woman who is running in any district in Newfoundland deserves? No matter what party they run for, it is a scandal to have that type of thing happen, But it happened to me, and I believe it was one of the rottenest tricks ever pulled by any group ever in Newfoundland, rotten to the core.

I would like also to say, and I am sorry the Minister of Tourism -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NOLAN: Pardon?

MR. NOLAN: Oh, you are up 11,000 or 12,000 more. I think my friend from Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) also has a very, very large district, probably second or third I think in terms of numbers. But, see, the thing is with this particular area that I am talking about, you have the registered voters my friend refers to. But it is growing all the time. I mean the growth, and some of the growth is restricted in some ways because of the lack of the essential services which my friend is certainly familiar with. But I do not suppose there is any place that I can think of off hand where there is a greater demand for to build and so on. I mean, I am in the unfortunate position in some ways where - and this is not only me in the surrounding area - where you actually have citizens with five acres of land and they are not allowed to build, or three or four acres of land. They are not allowed to build.

Imagine! Can any member in this House of Assembly picture himself if his parents were in a position to give a young couple three acres of land with the price of land the way it is today, and then being told that you are not allowed to build. Some of it is designated as farm land, but some of the farm land they have designated as such I swear on my honour you will grow more potatoes right here on this desk. You cannot grow potatoes on rocks that I am aware of. And that is the kind of thing that sometimes we get so far removed from and which causes so much aggravation and torment for people. How can they expect, how can some lady who is in a position, or gentleman, to give their son, for example, or daughter three or four acres of land feeling that they are much better off than most people who in their lifetime are quite content to get a normal building lot, and they are told that they cannot build. It is frightening what happens in some instances.

This is why you are going to have, I suggest to you, enormous trouble, not only in this House but without, on Bill 50 that my friends opposite intend to bring in in the current session of the House of Assembly. Now along this shore, the Conception Bay Shore, I am thinking

MR. NOLAN:

in terms of my own provincial jurisdiction where you have a divided jurisdiction, in my case at St. Phillip's, where my provincial responsibility is shared with the hon. member for Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor). And here is an area from St. Phillip's right on up that shore that has possibilities that have never really been explored. Fantastic! Because when you think of tourism, conventions and so on, many of them come in here to the city of St. John's primarily because this is where a lot of the accommodation is centered, or on the West Coast, in Central Newfoundland, in the Grand Falls and/or Corner Brook areas. But here you have such a great, fantastic, untapped tourist resource that is absolutely staggering beyond belief. If we would only attempt to take advantage of the opportunity it is there.

All too often we are too close to the forest to see the trees. We are too close to it. We take things for granted in this Province, so many things. Here you have a situation where you have people come into this Province who never lived the way we do, near so much water, particularly a bay such as Conception Bay, never dream of it. Yet here we have it there and only the few, normally, the very, very few get an opportunity to take advantage of it. I think my friend from Fogo (Capt. Winsor) mentioned something about those glass or plastic lined boats that I think he referred to. You see them in places like Amsterdam, on the River Seine in Paris and other places as well. But there are so many areas here that should be explored, one as a tourist attraction for so many others and plus the opportunity that is out there for so many to go fishing or whatever they want to do.

But we also have to provide facilities. The opportunities are there beyond belief. And when you talking about tourist dollars, you are talking about new dollars coming into this Province, not taking in each other washing and so on, new dollars that we need so badly in this Province. And it is enough to make you cry when I drive along that beautiful shore from St. Phillip's up through St. Thomas along the whole Conception Bay Road. I am thinking, of course, of



June 12, 1978

Tape 4245

IB-3

MR. NOLAN:

Paradise, Topsail, Chamberlains, going in through Manuels, Long Pond, Foxtrap, Kelligrews and on up to Seal Cove and extending of ocourse into Holyrood and so on. I mean here is something that we have. Here is something, I maintain, that with a minimum of investment we can get a good return on in any number of ways.

MR. J. NOLAN: And yet it is there, it is lying on our doorstep, and I submit that we are not, or do not want, or through stupidity or something we are doing very little of anything with it. In fact, all too often those who are prepared, perhaps, to lay out some personal money by going into business for tourism, or fishing, or whatever it is, can find very little sympathy in tax relief in this regard.

Now I say again that here is a shore that has not been tapped and I beg those opposite, those who are supposed to be governing, in the name of God, take a good hard look at it and see the potential that is there. I am not saying it is the only bay that should be developed touristically in this Province, I did not say that, but I am saying you have such an influx of visitors who naturally in many instances come in here because it is the capital, because we have so much - not enough, perhaps - but so much accommodation and so on here, and I tell you now that here is a whole shore that really has not been tapped. I believe there are many dollars and I know there would be great credit to Newfoundland from those who have the opportunity to enjoy it if we ever give them the chance.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is the oldest city.

MR. J. NOLAN: And the oldest city, as the hon. member say.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to mention just briefly, as other members have, the great burden, and I say the great burden that any member shares in this House of Assembly today is one of unemployment. It is nice to catcall back and forth across the House, to say something about me because I am a Liberal, or you because you are PC, and so on, but the fact is that if you accept the fact that I live in the largest populated district in this Province then you also, I think, would have to accept the fact that because there are more people there, there are more young people there, and so so, that they are crying out, young people, right now they are out of high school, they are coming out of university - and I might say adults, fathers, and so on, and women as well - who are desperately looking for jobs, desperately looking for employment. Although it has been said in this House and treated somewhat

MR. J. NOLAN:                   sarcastically that they are going to Alberta, they are going to New Brunswick, they are going to Iran, or wherever, the fact is you can laugh all you like, it is happening. It is not enough for me, I cannot tell the young people in my district, wait two or three years. Only an idiot would say it. You know, we will wait, we will get rid of the Tories and everything will be all right. It is not that simple. They are not prepared to take answers like that anymore, nor should they, incidentally.

  Here are people now - I mean, are we all so old that we forget what it was like when we were seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, twenty? Do we not remember? You had to get a job. You had to find some direction in your life. You were led through school believing that when you finished Grade XI, or your finished your course at the university, or trade school, you would almost automatically come out and go into a job somewhere; somehow there would be a position for you. But now, I have actually had mothers and fathers crying on the telephone - I have been in their houses. I am not bluffing, I am telling you the truth - crying because the boy or the girl that stayed there for one month, two months, three months, a year and longer. The parents do not want them to go to Alberta, they do not want them to go to Iran, they do not want them to go anywhere; they want to have the right for them to go if they want to but they do not want them forced out. We are forcing people out of this Province. Now what has gone wrong?

  In 1971 the hon. gentlemen opposite came to power - I would like to think that many that I know personally and I have known them, not only because of my association in politics but also in broadcasting over the years gave me in some respects a closer relationship with many than others may have had. - I believe with the best of intentions. I believe they had the will, I believe that they had the desire. Unfortunately, I am not sure they knew sometimes what they wanted to do and this has been the problem; the leadership in this Province; it has been leaderless, just leaderless.

June 12, 1978

Tape No. 4246

RT-3

MR. J. NOLAN: Look at what happened. On taking over in 1971 when you had an amount of money that has been referred to already in this House of something like, I believe, \$44,000,000 to service the Provincial debt. Now look at it, in a very short time \$160,000,000 to \$164,000,000, only since 1971. Can you blame the Liberals for that? Is that all their fault?

MR. NOLAN: It is not enough to continue telling people that it is the former administration, that it is Joey Smallwood, that it is the federal government: if you are elected to govern, you must govern. You must accept some responsibility for something. You cannot go on forever and a day always blaming the other guy. And this is where it went wrong.

Now let us look at some of the things that happened. The hon. the Premier led his party, won the leadership and eventually won the election in this Province leading the P.C. Party, <sup>But</sup> did he win? Following 1971, and without getting into specific references of appointments or anything else, or names, if you will examine the appointments to various boards and this, that and the other thing that your administration, the P.C. administration, the Moores administration made in this Province, I tell you that most of these were to satisfy the political debts as accrued in the Liberal leadership in 1969 by Mr. Crosbie, and you gentlemen opposite have paid the price and are continuing to do so. Not only were you satisfied to let him lead you by the nose in that regard, you went even further. It was Mr. Crosbie who was responsible perhaps more than any other man, although all ministers in the government must accept some responsibility, obviously, for the purchase of Brinco, which is now costing us over \$25 million a year in interest alone. What expensive appetites we have! And yet we are told privately - we are not all legislative savages in here. We talk privately back and forth with all hon. members, most of them. We know what went on. It is nice to talk about Joey being the great dictator and so on, marvellous to say it, but what happened? So you elect a man as Premier

MR. NOLAN: of the Province and he just refuses to lead, simple as that: Let the Minister of Justice say this and let the minister of this do that and so on. It is okay to have discussion and debate, it should be encouraged in fact on every side, but one of those days the chips are down and someone has to make a decision and the trouble in this Province is no good social decisions were made that people were crying out for. Vote for the P.C.s and go to the new economic Jerusalem. Some Jerusalem! My God almighty! I mean, I know of gentlemen opposite, if they had their time back they would cut off their tongues rather than let certain things go on in the government that has happened in the last seven years, and they know it. The Minister of Tourism (Mr. Morgan) is an example. Every now and then he starts off and says something that he feels deeply. I may not agree with him but he believes in it and he does not strictly toe the party line, and then he gets more dirty looks than Dracula on a bad night - just shocking! And threatened, you know, he is going to get the heave-ho - imagine! - because he speaks out on the spruce budworm or something of that nature. I mean, he does have an opinion and he has expressed it from time to time. But it is very sad to see a group of men who seem to feel that if we could only get rid of those lousy Liberals - if 'lousy' is parliamentary, Mr. Speaker, if we could only get rid of them. That was the great national pastime in this Province - get rid of them. But then it is like getting the instrument and not knowing what to do with it, because they spent so much time haggling and fighting that they forgot their cause for being elected by the

June 12, 1978

Tape 4247

EC - 3

MR. NOLAN: people, and the cause was to provide employment, to give the young people of this Province hope, to provide opportunity - that is what was called for - opportunity, not to merely engage them within the Civil Service, but to give small businesses the feeling insofar as the provincial government were capable of doing within their jurisdiction, to give them the feeling that, By golly, we are being recognized here, that we can grow and prosper. Now some of this has been done, but the real problem, of course, is this, that as long as under the Rural Development scheme - for example, supposing the minister tomorrow stood up and said, 'Look, we have created 4,000 jobs; we will not give the names of the firms and so on to the members of the House of Assembly.' Well, alright, forget the members of the House of Assembly, although that is a shameful thing to do to even suggest it.

MR. NOLAN: How about the press of the Province? If a minister stands up and says we have created 4,000 jobs, do not the press of this Province have the right and in fact the duty to say to the minister, where are the jobs? Did they last for one week, two days? Are they in existence now or not? Do not the press have a right to that information? Is that so secret? Or if it is, and it is, should it be? By the way, while I am making reference just briefly to the press here, I notice there have been some remarks from time to time about members of the press. As one who was associated with the press for a good chunk of my life, may I say that it is easy to take a shot at the press whenever it may be convenient, but I can tell you this as one who served for sometime within the press in the electronic media in Newfoundland, if I were to quote everything told to me privately by Ministers of Government, former ministers, former governments and other people in responsible positions, man on man, someone would be in trouble. Someone would be in trouble but I always felt that the nature of my being able to get information and public information and so on was at least having some modicum of integrity. If I phoned a man or a woman in a responsible position, whether it was in banking or government or church or whatever, they had a feeling now, this is on the record and this is off. Now it is always very dangerous, and you have to be careful of it, but what I do not like and never did is that the press are great whenever they play your tune, and whenever they do not hop to that particular tune then they are devils, then they are rebels, then they are discriminatory, then they are every miserable thing that can be said about them in the book. But they have a duty to do and in most instances where I believe they have been given an opportunity by the proprietors, and I say that advisably, because if you know about the deadline schedules you know that they have a very great task and I tell you now that their task is not always the easiest. Sometimes they may not have the instruments or the time to do the job as well as they would like to, like investigative reporting, as an example.

But I mention it here only to say that many of the



MR. NOLAN: people whom I have known and have had an opportunity to work with have fulfilled their role I believe as admirably as anyone in any profession. They are not perfect and I am not saying they should not be criticized. I have never looked upon the press of this Province as being sacrosanct and above criticism and so on, of course. But let us not try to downgrade the whole works because I tell you now that there are men and women presently serving in the press and have served in the past who have exercised discretion, I do not mean favouritism towards any political party, any business group and so on, but they have, for the benefit of background on stories which they have cultivated over the years, have had an opportunity to sit down privately and publicly and talk to people in all walks of life and they have enjoyed this kind of rapport only because they were honourable men and women who believed first that they had a duty to the Province or the people that they served and also had a great sense of responsibility of knowing when certain information was given, which was given to them as background and without which they would not be able down through the weeks and months and years, in some instances, that I know about to do a good job, a good reporting job on the matters mentioned. So I will leave it at that but I felt that it should be mentioned.

Just one other thing: there has been some talk and some criticism about radio and television being in this House and I believe it should be, without hesitation I believe it should be. What the members might want to consider, if they do not want tv in right away, put radio in, but start somewhere and do it because unless you are prepared to do it I believe that to some extent you are discriminating against those who are in the print media or are in the electronic media rather, and I think that this session, if we are going to have a fall session of the House of Assembly I would hope that in the meantime that maybe some people will care enough to appoint a committee now in the House and let them meet over the summer if necessary and bring in some kind of electronic reporting directly from this House of Assembly. You may want to start with radio but you cannot deny tv forever. It is coming in and if that means all those who are opposed to it in this House

MR. NOLAN:

have to be defeated or flung out, well that is going to happen. But it is going to happen and there is no question about that at all.

Mr. Speaker, now that I have the Minister of Tourism in the House, I made some reference earlier to the potential that is there in Conception Bay. I am thinking about Portugal Cove, although that is not in my district, but in my hon. friend, the member for Mount Scio's district, and all up from St. Phillips and so on, I plead with him, plead with him on bended knees if necessary, to take a good, hard look at Conception Bay. Please, go that shore. I am sure he has seen it already, but take a new look because the potential there is absolutely amazing.

Now I am not saying to the minister that he has to fork out the money out of the public till in every instance. But I believe with the proper leadership, and the proper facilities there that would normally be perhaps the responsibility of federal or provincial jurisdictions, that I believe he can help to provide a playground and so on that has not really been tapped yet for the tourists to come in here. When I say tourists I am also thinking about the people who live in the area.

MR. MORGAN:

Topsail beach area.

MR. NOLAN:

Yes, not just Topsail beach. I am thinking about St. Phillips, Portugal Cove, all the way up that shore. I guarantee the minister that there is a source there that could provide many new dollars in this Province. And I strongly urge him to take a good hard look at it and to sit down and talk to various people who are interested in developing tourist facilities. By the way, while I have him on the Topsail beach business, may I remind the hon. minister, and I do not accuse him of this, that seven or eight years ago - seven years ago, six years ago - people in Topsail and

MR. NOLAN: other areas, who have been crucified in there over the years, as he knows, were promised a park. Now I think it is time for us to produce something in there, to give the people a feeling that they were not being fooled, cheated, used, abused and so on, a nice little park down there, not a big one but at least controlled. And you have an opportunity there to have a nice little park that I believe would be of substantial benefit to those people in the area who have, in my opinion, been molested in every possible way by some of the things that have gone on there over the last few years which I know the minister has heard me talk about.

Now there has been a commitment by this administration, or members of this administration to the people there, and others as well, that a park would be put there. I ask the Minister of Tourism, when was the last time anyone in his administration, called the radio stations or TV just to assure the people in Topsail that they were not used, that the planning - where is it? What is being done? Has the land been expropriated? If so, when is the work going to commence? Let me also make a suggestion here now that has been a bit of a pet thing for me for many, many years. Let me be honest about it. I suggested it to my colleagues or some of my former colleagues, I think, without being too harsh, maybe they turned a bit of a deaf ear to it, I will try it again. I suggested in this House a long while ago that within the Avalon area, within the urban area, if you like, of St. John's, with all the ponds and streams and so on we have in this Province, is it not possible for the Minister of Tourism and the Minister of Forestry or whoever is involved, to take one pond, stock it with trout, do whatever is necessary, and make it available. Be strict about it. You may be criticized for it too. Make it available to senior citizens and crippled children. Think about it. One pond, stocked with fish, available so that these people who cannot go as far as we can go,

MR. NOLAN: who cannot do the things always that we can do, give them that chance. Who would dare rise up and criticize the minister if he were to set them out on a project like that? I even feel that the members for St. John's may support it; those who are my opposite numbers in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: They may.

MR. NOLAN: Well they may. But at least they may make a contribution. I am sure they would. It is not a bad idea. We have more bodies of water in some ways than anyone on God's earth. Could we not take one, just one, and make it a real spot for people?

MR. MORGAN: Keep others from fishing as well.

MR. NOLAN: That is right. That is right. Keeping others from fishing it. You would have to provide the necessary security and, may I say, who knows? You may get some great assistance or help from

MR. NOLAN:

some of the various service clubs and so on. I am not suggesting that the minister must carry the whole load himself, but I am saying that idea must be nurtured and started from him or from within the administration. But what a chance! Imagine! And the first boob that raises and screams and shouts and bawls about it, you are cutting us off, let him point to him, get him a map and show him the other 2,000 lakes in Newfoundland or whatever it is around here. Take a look at them because it is something that is very important.

Now, you might want to extend it to other groups other than what I have mentioned. All I am saying is that I mentioned it in the House one time before, some years ago and I do not think it ever got a rise. It may not now. But I am a stubborn individual so I will try it again with you fellows. Maybe you will pay more attention than my own crowd did at the time. Maybe that might even inspire you to do it, I do not know. But no matter how, as long as it is done I think it would be a great thing.

This House is going to see in a short while a bill brought in, it has been tabled already, bill 50, and what it is going to do, of course, is to attempt to set up regional government here on the Avalon Peninsula, the Northeast Avalon. It is rather unfortunate, in some ways, that this was not brought about in a different way because the closer you are to St. John's, as I mentioned privately to a member opposite today, the closer you are to St. John's the less municipal political maturity you have in terms of years of service and incorporation, if you know what I mean. Let me try to point out a few instances for you.

Kilbride is not incorporated as such. It is within the St. John's Metro Board, it is true. Conception Bay South for that matter is very, very young in terms of incorporation, not very old at all. The same is true of Paradise. St. Thomas only had an election last month, only the other day. St. Phillip's just had a municipal

MR. NOLAN:

election, first time, the other day and the same is true say of Torbay, Pouch Cove, all of the areas around St. John's. The Goulds, the council there would only be a few years old, not very, very old.

Why I say this is that there has to be a better way than the way we are doing it now. I suggest to hon. members opposite, respectfully, that you are going to run into one enormous backlash. St John's Metro Board was established in order to curtail certain unplanned developments that were going in around St. John's. Many homes were being built with no regard in many instances for, say, sewage running into the neighbor's well and the like of that. This is why the Metro Board was there. Metro Board also had some responsibility for planning. But right now if you appoint, as apparently you intend to if you get this bill through, the chairman and the four councillors or members of the regional board you will notice in the bill that you have about a six month period before the minister is to call an election to fill the other positions. Now what protection do the people of this area have in that interim period? Those five people can do apparently, within the law, just what they want according to the regulations that the minister or the government are going to give them.

The fact is that the further away from St. John's you are then the greater, sometimes, association with municipal government there is. Windsor, of course, being very, very old in terms of municipal government in this Province at least, even in Labrador up in the North, in St. Anthony and so on, but around St. John's the history of municipal government is also insignificant in terms of years of service thus far. So this is why when you attempt to move into regional government here it should be - I certainly would not be opposed to regional co-operation that should have been. In fact, I believe that members, perhaps, of those councils that are there already should have been on the Metro Board and then you would have had the type of development and maturity in this matter that I believe was needed. But to go the route that is presently envisaged in the bill is going

MR. NOLAN:

to be a stick to beat you own backs if you attempt to push this through as I fear you might, in its present form. And I think that it is wrong. This is not the way to do it. And you are going to make one awful mistake.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard, I believe in this session of the House a statement by the hon. the Premier - was there not? - something about 40,000 jobs. Well, now, I wonder would the Premier or some member of the administration or someone take

MR. NOLAN:

my phone calls for me about the 40,000 jobs? Some of them feel that 'Frank' got them in his vest pocket because I have not. But there are people out there now who are crying for jobs. I do not have to convince anybody who lives around here, who talks to anybody at all about what I am talking about. We are looking at people who brought their children up believing that they would find employment in this Province. In 1971 and 1972 and in 1975 nobody opposite gave anybody in this Province a reason to question that belief. In fact, they encouraged them. Gull Island was blasting, it looked like the 4th. of July, Come by Chance was expanding, everything was going great guns, now somebody has to answer for it. Now you can, if you wish, continue your old tirade. blame the former administration, blame the federal government, blame everybody. What is the Minister of Fisheries for? The Minister of Fisheries is there to provide policies and programs, to provide the necessary facility services and jobs for fishermen. Right? Right. And this is true of every other minister. If it were not for unemployment insurance and welfare there would be people marching in the streets in this Province right now. Marching in the streets. That is no exaggeration, believe me. You have a serious situation, you have people now parents, students and so on who are doubting the words of those who are involved in the political process in this Province, doubting them very much. Sometimes, I will grant you, there are people who will elect a member and maybe they expect too much but there are certain basic things they are looking for where they feel you should provide the opportunities. Not take them by the hand, not to hire them yourself, necessarily, but to provide opportunity for good education, for a position that can satisfy their skills and so on in life, or certain alternatives so they can make a living, half decent housing, reasonably priced food and so on.



MR. NOLAN: We cannot answer all of these problems but we can answer some of them. Now I am afraid the people feel that they have been badly used, that they have been deceived, that they have been misled, and all they have to do is read what was said in the press, on radio, television and newspaper prior to the last election. That is all you have to do, and once you see that then you will know.

One of the other things, by the way, with the setting up of this - what do you call it? - the Action Group - if any hon. member had called, say, the Department of Rural Development two months prior to the setting up of the Action Group and they had applied for to set up a little business and it went through the normal investigative procedures and routine and so on, and supposing it was rejected, how would the setting up of the Action Group three months later have changed that? They have no money other than \$2 million apparently, gone for public relations, they can only refer them back to the same group, can they not? So what is different about it? Let me tell you what has happened; I am sorry to say the grandiose announcement setting up the Action Group encouraged a lot of people to phone and to make inquiries, but it also encouraged malcontents, some of whom were after the government for a fast buck to set up some fly-by-night outfit. They encouraged them too. So now you have them going around saying that they have been deceived and cheated and all the rest. They may not have been. I suggest they were not, some of them. But there are many others who feel again that here was an announcement that warranted - what was it? - fifteen minutes on television or half an hour?

DR. KITCHEN: Half an hour.

June 12, 1978

Tape 4251

EC - 3

MR. NOLAN:

Half an hour.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not quite as important -

yes, more important than the one he was going to make last Saturday night.

MR. NOLAN:

I see.

So there you go, Mr. Speaker.

Here is a situation you have now - and by the way, I am sure the Minister of Fisheries must be encouraged by some of the remarks he must hear from some people around from time to time - it does my heart good in some instances - people who are complaining about some of the high money being made by ordinary fishermen nowadays - Imagine! - The gall of them! - fishermen, who are in many cases that I know of, making a good living, making \$20,000 or \$30,000 a year, some of them,

June 12, 1976

Tape No. 4252

PT-1

MR. J. NOLAN: and some of the brighter lights in St. John's think it is a scandal, you know. Only the ruling classes are fit to govern.

MR. S. NEARY: They do not tell us how much the fish merchants make, they cannot do it.

MR. J. NOLAN: That is right. You are so right.

MR. S. NEARY: They do not tell us how much the fish merchants make.

MR. J. NOLAN: No. That is right.

MR. S. NEARY: While all statistics are down, the earnings are up. You never hear much talk about that.

MR. J. NOLAN: Just a few things, if I may make reference to them Mr. Speaker. One of the great, great traffic problems in this Province - now, apart from conditions such as in Labrador and other roads that I can think of in the Province where no matter if it is only ten, or fifteen, or twenty, or a hundred cars going over it, if there is dust and ruts and all, it is a problem, but surely the greatest, most travelled traffic artery has to be Topsail Road coming in through Conception Bay. And if you drive it every morning as I do, winter and summer, it is unbelievable.

MR. S. NEARY: That is not by Big Mac's is it?

MR. J. NOLAN: No, no! That is another. I will come to that. That is true, too, though. But I am talking about the Conception Bay Highway. Here is a road that was built originally for the horse and buggy days. The only difference in it now is that it was paved over the years and even that, by the way, is in a desperate condition once again but you do not have that much widening, and so on. Now in the last number of years you have had a great build-up in traffic, cars, trucks, commercial vehicles of all kinds and numbers, and the road is just not equipped to take it. It cannot take it! Out there on Topsail Hill, get any kind of ice or slippery conditions in the winter and I will guarantee you that in most instances people who are working in this building, or anywhere else, are at least a half an hour or an hour late. At least! The traffic just cannot move. So there are plans now

MR. J. NOLAN: as members know, to widen that area from the overpass out to the Mount Pearl area generally, which will help to alleviate the situation. And also, another very trying spot, of course, is the Kenmount Road right here. Every morning, every evening, you will find them bumper to bumper, and this goes on all the time. I would not be bellyaching about this if it only happened occasionally, but it happens almost daily. It is amazing! And in the Winter it is enough to drive you nuts. Now, of course, there are plans, with the federal government's help, to widen to four lanes that area from approximately the post office into the overpass where, by the way, I understand they are going to do some work on the loops there because I believe in some of the design work that was originally brought about, what is there now is certainly not satisfactory. And by the way, I know that for the most part the provincial government does not get into putting up traffic lights but if anybody has driven from, say, St. John's out towards the overpass on a foggy night, unless you know exactly where it is you will pass it completely, completely! Or coming East for that matter. So I would strongly urge, - now being a former member of Treasury Board I know the danger of attempting to recommend something new for the government to get into because once it is done in one area everybody else - well maybe not everybody, but many others will have a good case to present and so on so they will have established a precedent and government sometimes have to be weary of getting into new programmes, but may I suggest - you may want to go another route - I would think that perhaps you will find that it is either within the Paradise area or it is within the St. John's Metropolitan Board area and you may very well want to look at providing some funds for such an organization to provide the kind of light that is necessary there.

There is another area for widening on the Trans-Canada which is in the planning, I understand, and that is the

MR. J. NOLAN: four lanes in front of, approximately, the overpass, or the Fort Motel rather, out to the Foxtrap Access Road, where again you have had loss of life, many serious accidents. It is a wretched spot out there for traffic, wretched, and deadly and it must be done.

Now I could go on and ask the Minister of Transportation if he were here to please do something this year about the people who live in Foxtrap and Seal Cove, those down in St. Phillips that we referred to in our earlier petition, to do a little paving there because some of the people are living in conditions that you would not expect and yet they have not complained they have been tolerant about it, they have not made any great, great public fuss but I will tell you that the feeling is mounting there. Their property is being damaged. Their cars are broken up and it is a matter of sheer neglect in many instances. Now these are areas that are at the moment

MR. NOLAN:

outside of direct municipal jurisdiction. Foxtrap, for example, has no council, and the same way for most of Seal Cove and so on. So I would ask the minister if he were here, and I will ask him again when he is, to please take a good hard look at some of these things.

There has been a great deal of discussion in the House and also outside the House about the tenor, the accomplishments, or non accomplishments of what has happened in this current session of House. All you have in this House are men and women who are ordinary individuals who are elected in districts - whether they should have been elected or not is another matter. It is only the people who can answer for that. But what they do is oftentimes when you see people flare up, as you do on both sides, and when you talk to some people privately and they express some of the fears and worries and concerns they have, many times what it is, it is a culmination of the frustration and anger and torment that is coming from within the district, coming from families, coming from people out of work, coming from people who cannot get decent housing -

MR. NEARY: Inaction on the part of the government because the government calls the order of business of the House. They determine the whole debate of the House; not the Opposition, the government.

MR. NOLAN: The government has not. We should have been here this time discussing various policies that are going to provide jobs for the people in my district,

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NOLAN: - and in the hon. member's district, and every other district.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NOLAN: That is what we should be talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Electrical rates.

MR. NEARY: They have no solutions.

MR. NOLAN: Right in the St. John's area, for example, around the Avalon, again with construction down as it is very seriously this year, I ask members opposite where are the men and the women going to get the necessary stamps that they would normally depend on that for unemployment insurance next Winter? Where is it coming from? Out in my district many people have backhoes and dozers and so on that normally where they were always employed for at least a part of the year, I mean, this year you would probably have a greater degree of heavy equipment for sale in this Province than ever before in our history. There are people who are really hurting, and this is not political propaganda I am getting on with. Talk to your own people in your own districts and you will know exactly what I am talking about.

There are certain challenges, it seems to me, that we are faced with in this House of Assembly, and the government itself cannot slough off their responsibility. Is anyone going to tell me that all of the hon. members and backbenchers opposite are not concerned, or not as concerned as I am? Of course they are!

AN HON. MEMBER: They produced the exclusives - we only make suggestions. We are not, Mr. Speaker (inaudible).

MR. NOLAN: Well, they have to provide the -

MR. WOODROW: How much was given out (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. WOODROW: How much was given out in UIC benefits?

MR. NEARY: UIC benefits?

AN HON. MEMBER: About \$3 million.

MR. NEARY: About \$247 million.

MR. WOODROW: They should start up there.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) the hon. gentleman is (inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: I see.

MR. NOLAN: But again it is interesting to me that here we are, and I do not think we have really - we have touched on some things in fisheries, of course, obviously, and well we should - but the fact is -

MR. NEARY: Excuse me, 'John'. \$215 million in 1977.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

MR. NOLAN: The time has expired?

Well, if I may in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe that many people out there feel, many people of all political persuasion, that almost every family I know somewhere along the line now has someone looking for a job. There is almost no family you know who has not got their brother's son out of work, or their daughter or the husband or a wife or someone, but almost every single family has an employment problem.

MR. NEARY: Carry on by leave?

AN HON. MEMBER: All right then.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, well I do not mean to take advantage, but thank you very much. All I am saying is that if we have addressed it, and I suggest we have not properly, then the people have missed it altogether. And I tell you now that all of us are being questioned, but it is not enough to continually, continually, people are not interested any more in my saying it is all the fault of the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and he coming back at me with some remark and I back at him and so on. But remember this, when you were elected to govern that means something. It means that you have gone on a platform, and a programme or programmes where you have a policy, you have a serious of programmes for social development, economic development, education, for housing, for municipal development and so on; you have a programme that the people will find more acceptable perhaps than the other fellow. Well now, when you win on that you are expected to produce. And I am telling you now that this government has not produced. In some ways they followed into some very bad tracks, I think that with all respect if Premier Moores had his time back he would cut his tongue off rather than say and do some of the things. He was misled.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NOLAN: He was misled, not by the Liberals, but from within his own group.



AN HON. MEMBER: Too greedy, boy!

MR. NOLAN: Sometimes by those that he trusted most, unfortunately. He turned it over to them and he was not willing to say, "By golly, here we have our programme. We discussed it and all the rest and now here is the direction in which we are going to go." He would fail at some things. Of course he would. So what? He is not infallible. He is only a man like the rest of us. But far be it for me, on this side of the House, to attempt to defend the Premier of the Province. After all, I am of an opposite political party and so on. But I say to you that that man was misled.

MR. NEARY: No, he was too green.

MR. NOLAN: No, he was misled. Misled, deceived from within his own group. Look, let us be honest about it. We are the obvious political enemy. You should be able to size us up. You should be able to criticize us, run against us and so on. We are the enemy, you know, political enemy. This is the way our system is. But let me suggest something to you. The Premier of this Province was not led down the garden path by Liberals.

MR. NEARY: No, he cannot trust them that far.

MR. NOLAN: I guarantee you that, or if he was they were Liberal reject.

MR. NEARY: He cannot trust them.

MR. NOLAN: That is pretty sad.

MR. RIDEOUT: Of which he has a number.

MR. NOLAN: The PC Party historically is a proud party, a great history, a great history. And I believe they deserve better. I mean, I am a Newfoundlander. Do you think I care whether the person is a PC or a Liberal if he is out of a job in my district, a young man with a young family?

MR. NEARY: The NDP will take over from them the next time. You will have a Liberal Government, NDP Opposition. The Tories will be wiped out.

MR. MORGAN: Keep on dreaming.

MR. NEARY: What happened in St. John's West? We got a Liberal in there. We will get a Liberal in the next time in the federal election.

MR. MORGAN: Your hon. colleague is speaking -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! The hon. member is speaking by leave.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, I am and I am about to quit, Mr. Speaker, because I am here -

MR. NEARY: No, carry on.

MR. NOLAN: No. No. I am here by the good graces of the House and I appreciate it. But I would like to say, and I know an hon. friend opposite, I believe, wants to speak following me. May I say that this has not been a productive session of the House of Assembly in terms of policies, programmes, development, hope for the future, for people not only in Conception Bay South but in Bonavista North and St. John's East.

MR. NEARY: Harbour Grace.

MR. NOLAN: Harbour Grace and St. John's West, Burgeo, Trinity - Bay de Verde and so on.

MR. NEARY: Grand Bruit.

MR. NOLAN: It is not a session of the House of Assembly and a Throne Speech that outlined the programme for development that would give people, particularly young people but others as well, a feeling that here is my home and here there is a future for me and my family, here is where I want to be. We have certain basic natural resources, skills, we have the drive and energy. My God there is no - just the other day I was talking to someone, the praise for Newfoundland workers in New York, in Toronto, in Alberta. They are appreciated everywhere else but here, apparently. Now let us give them the programmes and policies that are necessary. Do not, if you are a member of government, continue to always pass it off on the other fellow. Do not do it because nobody is going to

MR. NOLAN: accept it, particularly the people I might say, in your own Party. And I believe if there is any group of people who are disappointed, sadly let down in this Province today, and God knows we need more people to be interested in politics, whatever political party they follow, there is no political group that is more disappointed and saddened than the PC members of this Province, the PC followers who were loyal, supported the PC Party for years and years and years when they were in the political wilderness; no one feels more saddened than they because they too feel that they have been betrayed and that is sorry, a sorrowful thing.

MR. NEARY: NDP.

MR. NOLAN: So, Mr. Speaker, I will not impose upon the good nature of the members of the House any further other than to say that I hope the Minister of Tourism might consider a couple of the things that I have said. Unfortunately the Minister of Industrial Development is not here. I would like to hear the programme for this year on new industry, what jobs are available. I would like to hear these things and so would thousands of others, and if we do not do that and outline these things before this House closes, which it may shortly, well then you are going to see an upheaval of some kind in this Province because you are seeing families broken up, being torn assunder by a terrible economic situation that exists that is not of their own doing. We must take

MR. NOLAN: some responsibility if we are going to continue to participate in the political life and programming and so on in this Province.

Now I believe I might have delayed the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) a little because I am sure he had it timed to start at a certain time. I do thank the hon. members very, very much for their indulgence and I hope that I will have another opportunity to take a crack at a few more things here as I will in the later debates in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before commencing my remarks may I state that I congratulate the member for Conception Bay South, particularly on his suggestion with respect to the reservation of a pond or a lake for the purpose of - reserved completely to be stocked with fish and reserved completely for the older senior citizens and for crippled children. I think it is a splendid, constructive suggestion and one which I hope the government will look into, and look into very quickly. I do note, however, that there will be a certain involvement, and I do not expect there will be any problem with it, in getting the federal Fisheries Department to agree to the stocking of ponds, and if one is being considered I cannot think of any better than, say, Kent's Pond or Long Pond within the immediate environs of this building, but before this is done they will have to tackle the problem of the pollution that occurs in those areas. But I thought it was really a good, constructive suggestion and one certainly that

MR. MARSHALL: I support, and I hope that the government takes heed of it.

The hon. member also talked about one of the necessities in our deliberations here is consider the provision of jobs, and it is exactly that that I would like to turn my remarks to in my speech here on the Address in Reply, because, Mr. Speaker, one of the most startling happenings or occurrences that has arisen in this Province for some period of time occurred recently when from a very limited number of licences available for shrimp fishing off coastal Labrador and Northeastern Newfoundland, six were issued by the federal government to Mainland concerns. And I think that that particular action by the federal government is one that requires the in-depth consideration of this House, and the wonder to me is that it has not apparently caused a great hue and cry from one end of this Province to the other that this particular action has been taken. This act itself by Mr. LeBlanc, the federal Minister of Fisheries, has very deep and far-reaching consequences and implications extending far beyond the specific act itself, as serious, indeed, as this specific act is, because it involves really the question of the capacity of our government, the provincial government, to direct and initiate economic and social development in this Province. It is one, as we have seen, that has already resulted in a planned plant in the St. Anthony area having to be foregone because the fisheries licences were given elsewhere, and, as I say, I cannot understand, I do not know whether because of the social welfare system in which we have operated in Newfoundland since 1949, whether

MR. MARSHALL: the good is completely reamed out of us or all fish: is reamed out of us or what have you, but the fact of the matter is, it is amazing to me that this particular action has not caused a great hue and cry from the extreme East Coast of Newfoundland to the Western extremities of the Province in Labrador.

Serious questions, very, very serious questions arise as a result of this, Mr. Speaker. First of all, has, in fact, the federal government the right to confer upon persons outside the Province the right to exploit natural resources lying within the Province itself? And this has undeniably been done in this instance. Fisheries licences have been given to concerns in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec in traditional fishing areas that have been available to the people of this Province four centuries prior to our entry into Confederation itself, and it is about time we recognized this fact and it is about time that we turned our minds to exactly what, in effect, we can and should do about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: If we accept this action by the federal government, what does this mean? Can not we expect further incursions by the federal government? Can we look perhaps in the future to see licences given for cod fisheries on the Northeast Coast and on the South Coast of this Province to

MR. MARSHALL: concerns outside of this Province? If so, it is directly contrary to the policy of the federal government's with respect to the shores off those provinces themselves. For example, in the Bay of Fundy, off New Brunswick, there are no licences issued to Newfoundland fishermen to catch herring in the Bay of Fundy. That stock of herring is reserved solely, as it should be, for New Brunswick fishermen. In the same way, we respect the rights of Nova Scotian fishermen to the harvest of scallops on the Georgian Bank off their coastal waters. And so it should be here in this Province.

Then again another question arises: Does not this action clearly show, through its policy of issuing fishery licences, the federal government can simply by denying to one group and issuing to another, determine the social structure of this Province? If so is this desirable? I say no, the answer is no, a thousand times no. It is evident because by using this medium, the central power, which does not understand the sensitivity of the people of this Province any more than you would expect them to understand fully the sensitivity of the people in British Columbia. That is for the British Columbian Government itself.

Through this type of policy the federal government could easily bring back the resettlement programmes of the 1950s and 1960s and operate them no matter what the desires of this Province were.

Now another question is: with such powers how can we as a Province, and this is the main question, have any effective influence whatsoever upon the economic and social development of our people? Without these powers, giving them to the federal government, this is a government that has based its policy upon fisheries and rural development, and leaving the licencing

MR. MARSHALL: to the federal government, seriously impedes our ability to respond and if anyone doubted that, if anyone doubts that statement, all you need do is look to the example of the conferring of shrimp fishing licences on concerns outside the Province which has prevented a much needed development in the St. Anthony area.

Now there is a need, Mr. Speaker, there is an obvious need then for this government to assume greater authority over fishery development. And this need was sharply drawn to public attention in 1974 in a report which was given to the government, a report of the Committee on Fisheries Licencing Policy and its implications for the Newfoundland fisheries which was given in March of 1974 and is now, I believe, a public document. The report had been commissioned by this government. It was prepared by a group at Memorial under the co-chairmanship of Dr. Storey and Dr. Alexander. Anyone who has taken the trouble to read this report would realize it for what it is, an excellent perceptive and relevant report with very practical observations. Some of these observations are very practical, I might say, and pertinent to the question right before us right now as being presented by Mr. LeBlanc's actions and giving away our natural resources to persons outside the Province.

Those of us who are apt, and we all are from time to time, to question the contribution of Memorial University, would do well to read it because it is a real, effective contribution, I think, and, as I say, very relevant. Reports of this nature, in my opinion, should be assessed and acted upon and not forgotten and allowed to gather dust in some government office. The wonder to me is that it was not subject to widespread and wide ranging debate before.



June 12, 1978

Tape No. 4256

NM - 3

MR. MARSHALL: Now the first observation which is very pertinent to my concern about the shrimp fishing licence was contained in the covering letter of submission to the Premier of this Province dated March 25th., 1974 and I am going to read it.

Mr. Marshall: "The first observation arising from this report was," and I quote, "The first is our general sense that Newfoundland has not exercised any thing like the authority over its fisheries development that might be expected of a Province even within the overlapping jurisdictions of a federal system. We feel strongly that this needs to be redressed if we are to gain control of the resource and ensure that it is utilized in accordance with Newfoundland's broad economic and social policies. This may mean the preparedness to implement programmes regards of federal participation and the recovery of certain fisheries jurisdictions surrendered to the federal authorities or agencies." I draw the House's particular attention to the statements and the conclusion that Newfoundland has not exercised anything like the authority over its fisheries development that it ought to, and that it ought to move to recover certain of the fisheries jurisdictions surrendered to the federal authorities or agencies. And the actions, I say, by Mr. LeBlanc recently underlines and underscores and makes very real this observation, because I think that this Province must move now and must move as quickly as it possibly can to regain the rights on fishery authority and fishery development which is necessary in order to develop this Province.

Now how do we exercise this authority? How do we exercise this authority in the present context? Now certainly I can concur and congratulate our Minister of Fisheries for the stand that he took in his telegram on June 7, 1978 which was read to this House and tabled. I think every Newfoundlander can endorse his stand.

MR. NEARY: But that was after the fact. What did he do before the fact?

MR. MARSHALL: I think every Newfoundlander can endorse his stand and, as I say, the wonder of it is that there has not been a hue and cry over this action by the federal government. I have to ask what was Newfoundland's representative in the federal Cabinet doing to allow this at the time? I think that question certainly has to be asked. It is very perplexing to me that we are supposed to have a representative in the federal Cabinet, and to have allowed this type of action by the

Mr. Marshall: federal government I think really is a scandalous action, and one that no true blooded Newfoundlander ought to concur in no matter what the political considerations may be.

The reaction of the Opposition here, Mr. Speaker, was pathetic. All it could do was challenge the minister and say, What did he do after the fact? He did it after the fact. That he did not send letters before. He did not make representations before. Well, surely to heavens Mr. LeBlanc does not need to be told where Newfoundland and Labrador are to be located. Surely Mr. LeBlanc knows that Newfoundland and Labrador have for centuries been prosecuting the fisheries in this Province.

MR. W. CARTER: (Inaudible) Fishery Products plant (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Surely he knew - and as the minister indicates he knew about the Fisheries Products plant in St. Anthony which has now been scapped as a result of this particular decision. So I wholeheartedly concur with the reaction of the Minister of Fisheries, but I say that we do need more than sabre rattling. We must take actions ourselves. And I think that this - you know, I come back to this report and the whole thing, because in that report itself is described a means of action that can be implemented, and this is where I say there is not much point in getting reports done, and particularly reports that come in of the calibre of that particular report, if it is not going to be constantly kept in mind and acted upon where necessary.

MR. MARSHALL: Now this report questions the right of the federal government, Mr. Speaker, this is the first thing, I would say, to issue licences itself. Now, you know, when somebody gets up with any legal training or makes any statements about legality, there is a tendency from time to time of persons to say, 'Let us not talk in legal technicalities,' but these are very realistic observations. I point out they are not made by lawyers, they are made by distinguished people, practical people. This is not just an academic report, and some of the reports that come from the university are very academic, but this is one that is quite practical and quite feasible. In addition to Dr. Story and Dr. Alexander, you have people like Stratford Canning who had input into it, Dr. Williamson, head of the Community Development Division, Geoffrey Stiles, Professor Vadel in Norway, who spent a fair amount of time here, Mr. P. J. Antle, Mr. Garth Cochrane, Mr. Richard Crewe, a whole host of people anyway; their names are here.

But anyway, to get back to the action that must be taken. This report questions the right of the federal government to issue fisheries licences per se and that is the point I would like to draw to the attention of this House. On page 23 and 24 of that report - and I am going to read excerpts from it because it is very important - it goes into the legal implications of licencing and the report says, "There is finally the legal, if not the moral question, of denying to a people a traditional right of access to a common resource on which the following notes should be directed to the attention of appropriate authorities." Certainly there is a moral question here, denying to the people of the Province the right of access

MR. MARSHALL: to a common resource that has been used by them and their forefathers for centuries.

The report goes on to say, "It is our understanding that the power of the federal government to regulate seacoast and inland fisheries is only legislative and does not create proprietary interest. This was decided in 1898 in the B.C. fisheries reference case, and whatever proprietary rights existed in fisheries prior to Confederation remain with the provinces." And then it goes on to talk about Sections 91 and 92 of the Act, which I do not think we want to get in here because we do not want to get too legalistic, but it goes on to say, and I quote, "Newfoundland's particular historical record prior to Confederation can therefore be closely examined to ascertain if, in fact, the cases cited above foreclose the Province from instituting its own licencing scheme awarding proprietary rights, granting exclusive fishing rights subject to general regulatory federal power. If this exception does not lie, it seems sure that although the Province is barred from infringing upon the public right of fishing, certainly the federal government is also, except insofar as incidental to the exclusion of its regulatory function. Each scheme should be examined on its particular facts to ascertain whether or not it goes beyond regulation of fisheries creating property rights. The element of excluding certain of the public from exercise of their right to fish may in itself be fatal. Certainly, most licencing systems are aimed at limited entry and are creating property rights of a type." And it goes on to conclude, "There is a good chance that the courts would say that any federal tampering with the public right at fishing is ultra vires." That means outside

June 12, 1978

Tape 4258

EC - 3

MR. MARSHALL:

the powers of the federal government.

Now I think that these comments are quite logical and that they should be pursued and they can be pursued by this government. We, unfortunately, have never learned, to my mind, to operate properly within the framework of the Confederation itself. It has been tantamount to heresy in this Province to do other than to render great praises for the bountiful blessings of Confederation. We have become content to a large extent as a result of this with handouts and meanwhile the rest of Canada feeds upon our natural resources in a way that would be intolerable and unacceptable and just would not happen in Ontario or Alberta or in any other province. Confederation in the past fifty years, Mr. Speaker, particularly, has witnessed a struggle for legislative authority between federal and provincial and it is into this particular struggle that we must now plunge ourselves. Other provinces resist, but we, thanks to the philosophy which has been imbued upon us

Mr. Marshall: resist, but we, thanks to the philosophy which is being imbued upon us, have been content to accept, as I say, handouts without regard to the real vital issues. We do not want handouts from Ottawa; we want the right to be able to forge our own livelihood through our own resources. Other provinces would not take, Mr. Speaker, such a situation line down. In 1930, for example, the federal government tried to take control of fish canneries by requiring a licence, and the British Columbian government challenged this in court and won. Consequently, as a result of this the provinces have the right to licence fish processors, and this is a well recognized and vested right now. But, you see, we have not even come to grips with this particular problem with which we are faced because, as I say, we have not really operated within the framework of Confederation. And I think it is vitally important right now that this particular action by Mr. LeBlanc, apart from the protests that are made that it must be challenged, I think, in a very realistic way. And the way to do it, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest -

MR. NEARY: Do you think the provinces (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: I beg your pardon?

MR. NEARY: Do you really think that all the provinces should have the right to issue licences? Do you really believe it?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, I certainly cannot speak about all the provinces, Mr. Speaker, but I can say this, that the basic resource of this Province is the fishery, that the future of this Province depends upon the fishery, and in order to develop the Province in the way in which it ought to be developed, I think that our Provincial Government ought to have control of licencing, complete control of the fishery to be able to develop it.

MR. NEARY: Are you saying the federal government should withdraw from the fishery?

MR. MARSHALL: I am saying that the federal government should - see, I am not really, I am speaking to the hon. member, but then I am not, Mr. Speaker. There are certain areas which the federal government should not withdraw from, such as, you know, the protection of our waters. This

Mr. Marshall: is a part of its duty under the terms and references of Confederation, to prevent foreign -

MR. NEARY: You cannot have your cake and eat it too.

MR. MARSHALL: No, you can have your cake and eat it too.

This is the same philosophy that has got us like we are, going like beggars on horse back to Ottawa all of the time. We have got our rights, and we are entitled to enforce them. The fact of the matter is we are entitled, for instance, to the 200 mile limit, and the enforcement by the federal government, the federal power against outside powers of that 200 mile limit. But at the same time licencing of fisheries is, in my mind, a property right, and one which we should have, not only should we have it for the reasons of the British North America Act, but I say further, we must have it in order to effectively develop this Province. Because if we do not have control over this area, what is going to happen? The hon. member might then be content to see happen what is now happening in the shrimp fishery area where there will be factories and plants established on the Mainland of Canada using the resource which is traditional to our people, which has belonged to our people for centuries itself, while we continue to accept handouts, see our Premiers and ministers go to Ottawa and come back and say, "Oh, how great it is we have got another few million dollars in equalization payments." And that is not the type of future in the framework of Confederation that I would say the majority of the people of this Province would go along with, whether they be Conservative or Liberal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I say this has to be challenged, and I am going to make a suggestion now to the Minister of Fisheries. I suggest that he issue shrimp licences to Newfoundlanders, give the licences, maybe the Newfoundlanders who have already gotten them be given their licences. But of these eleven shrimp licences, I suggest that this government should take the bull by the horns and issue eleven shrimp licences to Newfoundlanders, encourage them to go out and gather fish as a result of it. You can reasonably predict that the federal government will act and try to suspend these licences



Mr. Marshall: and then we can proceed and have the matter out as they did in British Columbia in the 1930s and see who really has the right to issue these licences.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Alternatively, and probably conjunctively, inform those people from outside of the provinces that their licences are invalid and take steps to prevent them from utilizing the licences. As I say this will result in prosecution of the individuals, no doubt by the federal fishery authorities.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, this will result in prosecution of the individuals, no doubt, by the federal fishery authorities and then the Province should stand completely behind those involved, pay all costs involved and have the issue settled once and for all by the highest courts.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) licence.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, apart from advice, I do not even choose to talk to the hon. member in normal discourse.

I think it is vital, Mr. Speaker, that we have, as I say, control of the licencing. The report itself, which is an excellent report, clearly shows that it is not in the best interests for the federal government to have this power.

And I am going to read again from a few pages - page 15, for example; here it says, and I quote, "The minister's affirmation of faith in the Newfoundland inshore fishery is indeed, reassuring, but much more " - by the way, this report, of course, was addressed to the proposal then of the federal government to issue licences with respect to the cod fishery and also it dealt to a large degree with the issue who was a bona fide fisherman and who was not, and the thought of the authors of the report that they were trying to establish an elite group of people who would have vested interest in licences without regard to the historical basis of this Province and the necessity of occupational pluralism, as they use it, which meant that for centuries our people have both been fishermen and loggers, and in recent years construction workers, what have you. But on this issue

MR. MARSHALL: of whether it is a good idea for the federal government to have this power, on page 15, this report says, and I quote, "The minister's affirmation of faith in the Newfoundland inshore fishery is indeed reassuring, but much more than statements of good intentions will be needed to remove the suspicions and confusion felt by fishermen. Many people believe that government's overall aim is to eliminate the inshore fishery and that licencing is simply a more subtle way of stimulating community resettlement." That is what I would like to underline, because the people in Ottawa have in the past had a much different view of the future of this Province than the Newfoundland community has had. They have taken the view that there should be resettlement. Now we can debate resettlement all we want, but I do not think that any members in this House would feel that resettlement, however it comes about, should be forced resettlement. I do not feel that the federal government necessarily, the bureaucrats and the central power, agree and concur with this view. They think that persons should be resettled in areas where their needs are most conveniently looked after by the federal people.

So this was one danger that was seen in this report and I think it is a very, very real danger and one that we see now. St. Anthony, to the people in Ottawa, I suppose, would appear to be a small, rural community, and obviously they did not have too much faith in the future of St. Anthony when they gave off these licences to the Mainland concerns.

Then again, on page 17 - I mean, the whole report, I think, is a report that ought to be read by all hon. members, because I think it is very, very

June 12, 1978

Tape 4260

EC - 3

MR. MARSHALL:                    instructive. By the way, and I digress a bit, it does have an observation on the East Coast marine resources and notes that the state of our present knowledge concerning the extent of the East Coast marine resources leaves a good deal to be desired, and I think that has a great deal of reference to the subject affecting my hon. friend from Harbour Grace and the Nordsee matter. But that is another subject for another time.

                                  Anyway, coming back to the issue again of the best interests, whether it is better for the federal government, the report said, or the provincial. "We do not believe," and I quote, "that centralized authority knows or can know enough to wield a complex licencing policy which would not suffer from one of the two fatal defects, either it would be so loose in general as to miss its goals, or it would be so arbitrary in its application as to create inequities and damage the productive capacity of the rural economy." I say, both of these statements

MR. MARSHALL:

have very real applications to the present situation. I do not see how we can forge really any effective fisheries programme without this right, as I say. I do not see how we can become, and with fishery being so important to this Province, so much more important than to any other province of Canada, in effect what we become to the extent that the federal government exercises the powers that it has been exercising in this area over the number of years, to that extent we become almost like a municipality of Ottawa. Because one of the greatest problems in our development in this Province has to be the co-incidental jurisdiction in fisheries. And where the federal government has appropriated areas that are much better suited to the provincial government, I think that the provincial government would be subject to - well subject to censure really unless it takes action and it takes actions to see that these rights, which after all have been vested in our people for centuries, are retained by us. Our future is really too important, Mr. Speaker, to lie, as far as I am concerned, with political expediency of any federal political party. And this is in effect very likely what has happened in this particular case. We are now coming to an election, let us face it. There are so many shrimp licences available. They are given out - two to Nova Scotia, two to New Brunswick, two to Quebec, six licences given out for persons giving them the right to fish in our own coastal waters, to exploit our own resources at a time immediately before an election. It is a disgrace. I think it requires not just the strongest possible protest, Mr. Speaker, but actions to restore the rights of Newfoundlanders to earn their livelihood from our basic resource as their fathers did four centuries prior to 1949. When we joined Confederation in 1949 we did not give up this particular power, this power that has been usurped and exercised by Ottawa over the years to our detriment and one that I think we have to get back.

MR. MARSHALL: We also have to proceed for the first time into the scheme I think of Confederation where we operate properly within the framework of Confederation. We have got to be prepared to take the steps where steps are necessary. This is not an anti-Canadian treatise either. If the central government, I say, wish to card off their rights, if they want to come and give other people the rights to exploit our resources, I would like to see what would happen if they - you know, would they in turn give Newfoundlanders the right to exploit the resources of other provinces such as Ontario, for instance, and Southern Ontario with its manufacturing base which would involve the federal government of course in providing a transportation system and providing the necessary means whereby we would have access to the central markets in the same way and be given the same advantage as they have because of our location. We do not expect that, it is unrealistic. But at the same time we cannot as Newfoundlanders sit back and see our resources taken by other parts of Canada.

So those are my remarks and my time is fast drawing to an end. There were a couple of other things though that I did want to speak about with respect to the Throne Speech, one of which is by way of re-emphasis which is Labrador and the hydro development of Labrador, because -

AN HON. MEMBER: You can get leave if you want to go on.

MR. MARSHALL: - because the hydro development in Labrador is a matter of some concern to me. At the recent First Ministers' Conference I have to indicate that I had a great deal of alarm over the proposed federal provincial hydro development corporation and the fact that monies were to be put in by the federal government and monies were to be put in by the provincial government and the implication that was given was there was going to be something like a split of the resource and a split of the profits. I am glad to see that that particular, even though it appears in the Throne Speech -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) dirty mind.

June 12, 1978

Tape No. 4261

NM - 3

MR. MARSHALL: - even though it appears in the Throne  
Speech, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have seen the Premier give, when  
when he was

Mr. Marshall:

speaking on the Throne Speech an assurance to the House that this would not occur because we cannot tolerate this. Either we cannot tolerate any more giveaways, 50 per cent or 40 per cent giveaway to my mind while it may not be as big a magnitude, it is a giveaway itself. And, I think, you know, that has to be guarded against at all costs and it cannot be allowed, it cannot be tolerated. If this scheme is viable, as it probably is, as I know it is, what we require, and if bonds can be sold upon it, there is no reason why we as Canadian citizens cannot receive the accommodation, in that sense I mean, the guarantee by the federal government, and why we cannot get all of the profits. As I say, if the federal government are prepared to take 50 per cent of all of the resources in Canada, in Alberta and in Ontario and what have you, then we can be prepared to give them that and not before.

There are other areas, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to touch upon. The Throne Speech talks about strikes in public service, which is probably a touchy matter to discuss now, but I think it is one that has to be dealt with. I would suggest it should be dealt with by some means very, very quickly, particularly with respect to strikes in hospitals. Now let me say first that this administration, Mr. Speaker, never contemplated an unrestricted right to strike. The Public Services Collective Bargaining Act contemplates that only those who are rendering services where the facility could effectively operate without their services for a temporary period of time could be able to strike. And there was a procedure in it that the Labour Relations Board was to determine which services were essential and which were non-essential. The Labour Relations Board proceeded in its enquiry to this end, but was unable to come up with any definition. For reasons that there is probably no need to go into here, it became to them at the time and in the circumstances an impossible task. It is my understanding that up to a little while ago it was only the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro that they managed to segregate the essential from the



Mr. Marshall: non-essential.

But the fact of the matter is, as a result of the Labour Relations Board not being able to go ahead and not being able to make the segregation, that there now exists for hospitals the blanket right to strike in all categories. And I say and I feel that this has in the past from experience resulted in the denial of services to people. Now we have heard medical people and para-medical people speak about, you know, it only has interfered with elective surgery. Well, it might be elective surgery, Mr. Speaker, to medical doctors and it might be elective surgery to para-medicals, but there is no such thing as elective surgery to a patient, and neither is there any such thing as elective surgery to families of people who are in hospitals themselves.

So the situation has to be dealt with. There has to be a balance. It can be done, if it has to be either through legislation here or it can be done by the government directly the Labour Relations Board and finding a new formula to come up with the designation of essential or non-essential services, or it can be done if it must be by the government defining what are essential or what are non-essential services. But despite the rights, and there are certain vested rights which we will all respect of collective bargaining and the right of people to strike, we also have to balance this against the general right itself. And as I say, where you have sick people who require hospitalization it is specious to talk about elective and non-elective surgery. All surgery is essential. There have been in recent times, to my knowledge, persons who have had to have various tests and what have you which maybe to the medical people, I have no doubt, may not have been essential right that day within the twenty-four hours because they had been sent back without it, but to the patient himself who is involved, and you know, you have seriously ill people; you have terminally ill people who have gone down for x-rays and

MR. MARSHALL:

their X-rays have not been able to be taken. I say we have a responsibility if nothing else to ease the plight of people like that, particularly when they are in their last days, and for heaven's sake, we cannot allow a situation where they are even caused a great deal of discomfort. If I have to walk between all of the great rights we talk about from time to time and the right of a very sick or terminally ill or any hospitalized person to normal medical services, I will unhesitatingly opt for the latter. And that is why I say it is a problem that we have to come to grips with. It is one that may not require legislation, but it is certainly one that requires action, and it requires immediate action.

And the final matter I wish to speak on, Mr. Speaker - and there are other items - but the final note here that I want to end on is this: We have legislation here before this House now and I am very alarmed at the tendency which has occurred in this Province for legislation to be enacted conferring unnecessary rights which are being administered by civil servants to which the ordinary citizen has no appeal; and whatever appeal he has, that person usually has to give in before frustration overtakes him and he goes absolutely berserk. There is far too much government regulation as represented in the legislation which is coming before this House today. There is far too much conferring upon directors of various divisions and upon civil servants powers over private citizens which is causing a great deal of unnecessary inconvenience. For instance, I see one here - we will wait until it comes up, and I know there will probably be an explanation of it where if this legislation passes,

MR. MARSHALL: you are going to need a licence to operate a nursery. Now I do not mean a child's nursery, I mean, to grow and sell plants. Now maybe that existed before. I did not check the other Act because at the end it repeals a previous Act. Maybe it did exist before, I do not know, And I do not care whether it existed before or whether it is coming in now, it seems to me utterly specious and there had better be a good reason for it.

I feel the time has come to seriously consider, as I say, a permanent Standing Committee of this House to review all of the legislation that has been passed by various Houses that have gone before us and to examine the rights that have been given to civil servants and with every right that is given or every restriction there is a liability on the citizen, and in many cases it goes far too far. That in itself is impeding the development of this Province because of the frustrations resulting from it. Some business people, for instance, spend their entire time filling out forms between federal, provincial and municipal concerns. So I think it is one that we have to look at.

Those are my few remarks, Mr. Speaker. The main burden of my remarks, though, is towards this granting of the shrimp licences by the federal government, which I regard as a disgrace, which I think is very sadly indicative of the state to which our Province has descended, that there has not been a hue and cry from one end of the Province to the other about it. And I think that this government must, through the issuing of licences if necessary, take the strongest possible steps to restore to the people of this Province the right to earn their livelihood from our basic resources as their fathers have

June 12, 1978

Tape 4263

EC - 3

MR. MARSHALL:

done four centuries prior to

1949. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, I am sure that the only one who was impressed by the hon. gentleman who just took his seat was the Minister of Fisheries who consulted with him before he got up to speak. Sir, with regard to the development of the fisheries in this Province, having heard the hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), Sir, I would suggest that the only disaster that would be greater than the present Provincial Minister of Fisheries for this Province and development of the fisheries would be if the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) became the Minister of Fisheries.

Now, Sir, does the hon. member for St. John East really believe that Newfoundland and Labrador should have utter and complete control over all aspects of the fisheries in this Province? Does he really believe that, Sir? Because if he does; Sir, I would submit that on the one hand we will be giving up - well, let us look at the Department of Environment for last year; \$47,103,480. That is 254 per cent, Sir, more coming from the Federal Department of Fisheries directly into this Province. That is 254.2 per cent more than our own provincial government is supplying with its \$18 million net in this present budget.

Sir, if you take the input direct and indirect that comes into this Province from such agencies as DREE, and the Department of Public Works, and the actual Federal Department of Fisheries itself, we have come into this Province this current year, Sir, I am told by officials in the Federal Department of Fisheries, I am told that we will be receiving approximately \$500 million coming into Newfoundland and Labrador, directly and indirectly for the development of the fisheries. And this administration, Sir, the administration which, according to the Premier, said that during this session one of the greatest thrusts will be in the area of the development of the fisheries, well Sir, we saw

MR. F. ROWE: what the great thrust was. In terms of monetary input it amounted to a miserable \$18 million for the Department of Fisheries, net, for the development of the fisheries in this Province. Sir, that is one thing that we will be giving up. I do not think, Sir, this Province in its present financial state has the financial capacity to do what they said they want to do, and that is have total and complete jurisdiction. However desirable that may be, this Province simply does not have the financial base to do what they say they want to do and that is have a greater provincial capacity to direct the destiny of our fisheries. That is one expression that was used. There was another expression that was used, more jurisdiction over our provincial fisheries.

Sir, the Province simply does not have the financial capacity. So however desirable or undesirable that statement may be, hon. gentlemen opposite must realize that for a Province that can only come up with \$18 million provincially for the development of fisheries, and with the Canadian Government pumping in \$300 million, how can they have the gall, the reverse logic to say, "We want to run the whole show on matters pertaining to the fisheries." They know full well, Sir, that it is financially impossible for them to do so. Now, Sir, that is only one aspect of it. Let us look at another political, not partisan political, but political in the sense of squabbles and fights and competition amongst the provinces.

AN HON. MEMBER: Federal jurisdiction.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, if you have provincial jurisdiction by Quebec, by PEI, by New Brunswick, by Nova Scotia, and by Newfoundland and Labrador, five separate provinces, if you had no

Mr. F. Rowe:

central control, no central authority, no central jurisdiction, and you had five individual provincial jurisdictions over matters pertaining to the fisheries, Sir, I would submit that you would see a fish war between five provinces on the Eastern Seaboard of Canada. It is as simple as that.

Sir, the Nova Scotians only a few weeks ago were caught in the act, cooking the books, on their total allowable catch, cooking the books to the disadvantage of Newfoundland and to the advantage of Nova Scotia. Sir, if that is happening - and the federal government discovered it -

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

MR. F. ROWE: -and corrected it, rectified it. Sir, I submit what the hon. gentleman just said, it may sound good to the fishermen, it may sound good to the man in the street, but if you study his statement very carefully any Minister of Fisheries Provincially or any member, say, for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who just spoke, who suggests that we should have complete jurisdiction over our fisheries, Sir, is speaking through a straw hat, because, Sir, it is not logical. It would be logical if we had the financial base to do it. It would be logically economically, but it would be very dangerous if five Eastern Provinces, Atlantic Provinces were given their own jurisdiction over the fisheries, because I would submit, Sir, that there would be a fish war between five separate provinces.

Now, Sir, this government has had so many setbacks particularly during this session of the House of Assembly, things like a poll that was done by us, an independent poll that was done by the CBC, and other adverse publicity that this administration has gotten, Sir, their complete lack of action, not just this year, but for the past seven years, Sir, their first strategy was to blame everything on the previous administration, and when that wore off, Sir, let us blame everything on Ottawa, particularly when it comes to the development of the fisheries. And their third strategy, Sir, as articulated by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) there a few weeks ago was

Mr. F. Rowe: blame it on the civil servants. And, Sir, that is the hon. crowd who accused us of attacking civil servants who cannot defend themselves. And the hon. the member for St. John's East gets up in his seat and blames all of our economic ills on the advice that the government is receiving from the civil servants. Sir, it is shameful. And now, Sir, what do we have. We have - let me just before I get into Romeo LeBlanc, Sir, I believe that Romeo LeBlanc is considered - I do not believe, I have my own belief, but I know that the fishing industry in this Province, the fishermen in this Province, the fisheries union in this Province have the greatest respect for most of the actions of Romeo LeBlanc and, in fact, they consider him to be the best Federal Minister of Fisheries that Canada has ever seen.

Now, Sir, having said that I will say, and I happen to believe it, I think most of the things that he is doing absolutely in the best interest of the fishing industry and the fishermen and the fish plant workers in this Province. He was the man, Sir, who without gun-boat diplomacy managed to get the 200 mile limit for this East Coast of Canada. He was the man, Sir, who was instrumental, without any threats, was also, Sir, instrumental in saving fish stocks particularly off the Hamilton Bank complex - or along the Hamilton Bank complex. But, Sir, everything that Romeo LeBlanc does is not 100 per cent correct, and when he is not correct we are only too happy, and I should not say happy, but we are men enough, Sir, to stand up and say when we feel a federal government policy is not in the best interest of this Province.

Sir, as recently there as last week the Minister of Fisheries got up in the House of Assembly through a Ministerial Statement and read off a four page telex to Romeo LeBlanc. Sir, the first paragraph said this, "As Minister of Fisheries for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador a protest of proposed issuance to mainland firms of six shrimp licences valid for shrimp stocks located solely off the Coast of Labrador and Northeast Newfoundland."



MR. F. ROWE:

Sir, my friend and colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) consulted together and I said, 'You go ahead. You are probably a little more familiar with this situation than I am, because it affects your own district, the one that you represent.' And, Sir, as spokesman in this particular instance for the party and for fisheries in this particular instance, the hon. the member for Eagle River got up and agreed with every single word that the Minister of Fisheries said in his protesting to Romeo LeBlanc re the issuing of these six shrimp licences to Mainland firms off the coast of Labrador. And I agreed and we all agreed that that should not be so. And, Sir, subsequently we asked some questions of the hon. the Minister of Fisheries that very day to the effect, Sir, 'What have you done as Minister of Fisheries to insure that the shrimp licences would be saved wholly and solely for Newfoundland? What prior consultation did you have with the Canadian federal Minister of Fisheries?' Sir, the answer from our Minister of Fisheries: 'We have endeavoured at every possible opportunity, we have used every device at our disposal to impress upon Ottawa the need for closer consultation, for more dialogue in the matter of determining the issuance of licences.' I agreed with the minister, Sir, up to that point, but most of these negotiations were between the federal and the provincial fisheries authorities, not between the two ministers necessarily. But most of the negotiations for the issuing of licences in general, a massive amount of it, has gone on. But, Sir, to carry on with the sentence, "especially with respect to that shrimp stock." Okay, another question, 'Who did you make your representations to?' was shouted out across the floor.

MR. F. ROWE: I think the member for LaPoile and myself did it virtually at the same time. The reply from the Minister of Fisheries, Sir, "Naturally, to the minister," presumably Romeo LeBlanc, "we would not go below the minister in this." That is the Minister of Fisheries, Sir. Rowe and Neary: "Table the correspondence."

"I do not have it here, but we have it," says the minister. Now, Sir, I asked the same questions the next day when I went on the Late Show. Sir, I did my homework that night. I contacted officials and I learned, Sir, to my utter amazement - if the minister can table anything, I would say I was wrong based on the evidence that I had. I apologize. The minister did make strong representation to Ottawa. But to my amazement, Sir, and sadness and utter disgust, I discovered that the record shows, my information tells me if the information is correct, that there is no record of any correspondence or telexes or telegrams or telephone calls from our Minister of Fisheries to Mr. Romeo LeBlanc, the federal Minister of Fisheries, pertaining to the issuance of shrimp licences since October, 1977 - eight months before he got up in this House of Assembly and publicly attacked the Minister of Fisheries. Now, Sir, we asked the minister would he please table it, and the minister has not tabled one shred of evidence that he has made personally, strongly, with conviction, that he has tackled Romeo LeBlanc over the last eight months in the matter of issuing those shrimp licences. And, Sir, I get up on the Late Show and I present this before the House, because I did my research. I got this information and I say, 'Will the minister lay the correspondence upon the table of the House, telexes upon the table of the House, proof of telephone calls to Romeo LeBlanc.' And he gets

June 12, 1978

Tape 4266

EC - 3

MR. F. ROWE: up, Sir, and what is the reaction after I said I had caught him flat footed? Sir, obviously, the minister could dish out the attacks but he certainly cannot take them. Because, Sir, the minister got up and he says, "I have an unparliamentary word to describe Mr. Rowe." That is a body blow, Sir. That is laying it upon the table of the House. "Carter" - Sir, I am quoting from The Evening Telegram and it is quite accurate - "Carter even invoked the name of Rowe's father,

MR. F. ROWE:

Senator Fred Rowe, asking how the son of a fine Newfoundlander," presumably I am not a fine Newfoundlander, Sir, "the son of a fine Newfoundlander could question the principle involved."

Now, Sir, let me make one thing quite - and then we had the oratory from the Minister of Tourism. He is a traitor to the Province, the usual kind of garbage. And Sir, just let me look at one phrase here. "Carter even evoked the name of Rowe's father, Senator Rowe, asking how the son of a fine Newfoundlander could question the principle involved."

Sir, let me make this abundantly clear: I was not questioning, and the minister knows this full well, the principle involved with the issuing of these shrimp licences. We are 100 -

Mr. W. CARTER: You did not say that.

MR. F. ROWE: Oh, oh! Carter made reference to the - now he is dragging me off a point and getting me in on another one. I will see if I can get back to the original point. The minister says, quoting from The Evening Telegram, Sir, "Carter made reference to the Opposition's refusal to give the unanimous consent to Carter's stand until the correspondence was tabled saying it is disgusting to see Newfoundlanders acting that way." Well that does not make much sense but what the minister is referring to is this, Sir, I think it was the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) leaps to his feet, to try to get his bit of publicity in the leadership race, and he wants unanimous consent, a motion sent off to Ottawa endorsing the minister's stand, unanimous consent. And, Sir, we very wisely said this, the minister could, not until, not until the minister provides proof positive that he has made the severest kind of representation to Romeo LeBlanc to ensure that these shrimp licences would not go to - these six licences would not go to three other Canadian provinces.

MR. W. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard in silence. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to speak, Sir. I do not have enough time to say what I want to say on this issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: The issue, Sir, is this, that we are 100 per cent behind the non-issuing of these six shrimp licences, 100 per cent behind. But to our utter disgust, the hon. member was not in his seat earlier when I was speaking - and we found out, Sir, that this hon. minister has done nothing in the last eight months directly with Romeo LeBlanc to ensure that those six licences are not issued to other Atlantic Provinces. Neither, Sir, has the hon. minister to my knowledge done anything to assure and ensure that we here have the boats or ships that are capable of fishing these shrimp beds 165 miles off Labrador. Nothing to my knowledge has been done to make sure we have the technology nor the plant capacity for that.

Now the Minister of Fisheries up in Ottawa happens to be the Minister of Fisheries for Canada and he has to make certain decisions. He is not in favour of Newfoundland over Nova Scotia, or over New Brunswick, nor over PEI, nor over British Columbia. He is the Minister of Fisheries for Canada. It is incumbent, Sir, upon this particular minister to make sure that daily when he thinks that Romeo LeBlanc is doing things that are not in the best of interest, that Romeo LeBlanc over the negotiating table gets the biggest body blows that he deserves when he deserves it.

Now, Sir, it is a crime, and I would suggest it is a disservice to the development of the fisheries in this Province, Sir, when this minister sees fit to get up daily, almost daily, I am exaggerating of course, but gets up all too frequently and blasts the federal government in the matters pertaining to the

MR. F. ROWE: fisheries, without prior consultation.

In this particular case we stood 100 per cent behind the Minister of Fisheries on the business of the shrimp deal.

MR. W. CARTER: You had no choice.

MR. F. ROWE: Of course we had no choice because we feel it is wrong. And just because that hon. minister happens to be Liberal, I do not give a tinker's you-know-what. It does not matter. I do not care who is the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa. If the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa is doing something that I feel is not in the best interest of Newfoundland, whether I am a Liberal or a PC Cabinet Minister, I would feel very strongly. I would go up and I would sit down with that hon. minister and I would try, get all my experts, go up and try to convince him that he is doing the wrong thing. But, Sir, I have yet to see the hon. Minister of Fisheries prove that he has done anything in the last eight months

Mr. F. Rowe: that would ensure that Romeo LeBlanc did not do what he did, and that is, - Sir, if the hon. Minister of Fisheries over the last eight months has been quietly negotiating with Romeo LeBlanc and giving him every bit of detail why we should not have these six shrimp licences issued to Ottawa - to the other three -

MR. W. CARTER: You are close enough.

MR. F. ROWE: - provinces.

MR. W. CARTER: Ottawa is right.

MR. F. ROWE: Ottawa. Now play on words. Here we go again, Sir, attacking Ottawa again. If the Minister of Fisheries had had extensive consultation with the Federal Minister of Fisheries pointing out to him why those six shrimp licences should not be - two to Quebec, two to New Brunswick, and two to Nova Scotia, and at the same time had made sure that we had the catching capacity, the technology, and the processing capacity here in this Province, if he could assure us that all of that was in place after eight months of hard work, I would agree he had every right to publicly attack Romeo LeBlanc. But attacking, Sir, after the fact - hogwash, disgusting!

AN HON. MEMBER: Shocking too!

MR. F. ROWE: It is shocking, Sir. It is shocking. And they are so absolutely desperate it is just incredible. Their standing Sir, in this - I met a group in my district there over the weekend who were being visited by, you can call them American tourists now, American tourists, they originally came from a certain section in my district, and they were talking to a group of young fellows there who did not have any employment, and they said, "Boy, how is it going", the American tourists says, "How is it going here?" And the boys said, "Well, boy, it is really rough going. High unemployment. The cost of living is very high. And the American said, "Sure you have got it made, look at the beautiful sea, the open space, the fresh air and what have you." And this fisherman turned around, Sir, and that fisherman, by the way, who cannot get a licence, which you can blame directly on Romeo LeBlanc in this case, if the minister wants to, because it is a salmon licence

Mr. F. Rowe: involved.

MR. W. CARTER: I got no (inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: He is obviously trying to perserve the stock.

But, Sir, the old fisherman returned, and he says, "Boy, Newfoundland and America," he says, "In America you have got Jimmy Carter, Johnny Cash, and Bob Hope." He said, "In Newfoundland, Sir," he said, "We have got Frank Moores, No Cash, and Little Hope."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: And, Sir, I think that sums it up. And, Sir, that is about the size of the government there now, Sir; they take every advantage, they have given up, Sir.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: They have given up. They have given up. They have abdicated their responsibility because they cannot govern this Province any more, and every chance that they get they take a flick at Ottawa.

Now, Sir, just let me go on record on behalf of the Liberal Party once again and say this, that, number one, we agreed with the minister's protest to Romeo LeBlanc to the extent that we thought he had done his homework.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Have you protested it? Have you officially done that?

MR. F. ROWE: What else have you got to do? We got up and supported the minister. What I am saying, Sir, and this is what they do not want to hear, we uncovered the next day the fact that the minister could not prove that he had tried through quiet consultation and negotiations to rectify that particular situation—

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: — Sir, because he is too busy blasting off without consultation. Sir, I have heard this from the industry, from the Fishermen's Union, and from obviously people in Ottawa. How much more of this lipping off, those pictures in The Evening Telegram —

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order,

I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I cannot allow him to make that statement and go unchallenged. He is saying that I cannot



Mr. W. Carter: prove my interest or at least my representation to the minister. That is not correct, Mr. Speaker. I can't... Maybe I elect not to, maybe I elect to think that I should not have to, but I should remind him, Mr. Speaker, that the company that was negotiating with Ottawa -

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, what is the point of order?

MR. W. CARTER: One second now. Mr. Speaker, if I may this is for the record -

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not want a ministerial statement, all I want is a point of privilege, or a point of order.

MR. W. CARTER: - and I think it is necessary.

The company that was negotiating with Ottawa for these licences it did make wide representation, a strong representation -

MR. F. ROWE: What is the point of order?

MR. W. CARTER: - was represented on the Board of Directors by my Deputy Minister was a company as hon. members know at that time I believe 40 per cent owned by the Province.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! I have to interrupt -

MR. W. CARTER: So LeBlanc certainly knew we wanted these licences.

MR. F. ROWE: Look will you hear this?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): I do not feel that there is a point of order that the Chair can enter a judgment on here.

The hon. the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have not questioned the minister's sincerity. It speaks for itself.

Now the minister wants to talk about another subject?

June 12, 1978

Tape 4269

EC - 1

MR. F. ROWE: We shall talk about another subject, Sir. I wonder if the minister - did I finish that point about the shrimp adequately?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Beginning to face that problem (inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, listen to the smart aleck, Sir, from a defunct minister. Sir, the minister wants to change the subject. Sir, there was a certain little time in Twillingate awhile back and the Premier was in there boots and all on, head-on confrontation between the Premier of this Province and the Leader of the Opposition. I do not know whether it was the Minister of Fisheries or the ex-minister of Rural Development or the Premier, but it was clearly promised out there that they were going to establish a branch of the Fisheries College.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Premier said that.

MR. F. ROWE: The Premier said that, I believe, right. A branch of the Fisheries College, Sir, in the old Twillingate hospital. Now, Sir, Your Honour might be interested to know that certain people in Twillingate had made representation to use that building as a senior citizens' home. They were told, 'No, I am sorry, you cannot use it for a senior citizens' home because that building is only fit for demolition.' And the Premier comes out, Sir, and says he is going to put a branch of the Fisheries College in that particular building, a building slated for demolition, and the people there had asked to have it used as a senior citizens' home. Sir, I further checked it out with a number of authorities. Sir, do you know that the directors of the hospital board were not consulted before that promise was made? Does Mr. Speaker know that the council of Twillingate was not consulted before that statement was

June 12, 1978

Tape 4269

EC - 2

MR. F. ROWE: made? Does the Speaker know that the Department of Education was not consulted before that statement was made? Does Mr. Speaker know that the directors of the board of the Fisheries College were not consulted before the Premier goes up and says, 'There is going to be a branch of the Fisheries College established in a building that you were refused because it is not fit to use for a senior citizens' home, it is only fit for demolition '? That is some fisheries policy, Sir.

MR. W. CARTER: (Inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: So the hon. minister wants me to change to another subject. Where is the branch of the Fisheries College? That is some fisheries policy, Sir!

AN HON. MEMBER: We wanted it and they said no.

MR. F. ROWE: They said no, did they?

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. F. ROWE: Lucky for the Premier, because the Premier did not have to put up. This was a case where he did not have to put up, put the money where his mouth was, Sir.

Since it is 6:00 P.M., Sir,  
I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: (Collins) The hon. member moves the adjournment of the debate.

As it is 6:00 P.M., I now leave  
the Chair until 8:00 P.M.

VOL. 3

NO. 87

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

8:00 P.M. - 11:00 P.M.

MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1978

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for Trinity -

Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, there were a number of topics that I was going to get into this afternoon. I understand I only have about fifteen minutes left, if that is correct, and I related to the issuing of shrimp licences this afternoon and got into the branch of the Fisheries College that was offered to Twillingate, Sir. And I was talking about the general ad hocery and the Band-aid kind of a policy that this administration has with respect to the development of the fisheries in Newfoundland, and the danger of suggesting that we do away with any form of centralization as far as federal control over the fisheries is concerned. And I mention that because I feel that with adequate representation from a provincial government, to the Federal Minister of Fisheries, that there can be a very healthy relationship developed and healthy development of policies regarding the fisheries, provided that the Provincial Minister of Fisheries continues to make adequate representation to the Federal Minister and consult with him on a reasonable basis without basically negotiating and consulting through the public air waves, which has been the case with this present Minister of Fisheries and I think he has done damage to the development of the fisheries in this Province.

The point I made this afternoon is that if we do not have central jurisdiction over certain aspects of our fisheries here in this Province, two things are likely to happen, number one, you do not get this great amount of money coming from the Federal Department of the Environment, from DREE and from the Department of Public Works, which goes directly and indirectly into the development of the fisheries in this Province. And I said this afternoon that I was advised by federal public servants that directly and indirectly

This page is missing from the original copy.

MR. F. ZOWE:

Sir, I made some references to the lack of a central overall policy on the part of this administration. One, Sir, only has to look at the whole Nordsee agreement, which I am afraid I am not going to get time to get into tonight, but which we will have an opportunity to get into on Private Members' Day, but the disagreement amongst the various Cabinet ministers and the backbenchers of the administration opposite, gives every indication that this administration and the Premier in general, went off half cocked as far as the whole Nordsee Ocean Harvesters merger is concerned. Sir, we will welcome any kind of investment. But when we were talking about foreign control over our own fishing industry we are getting to very dangerous ground, Sir, and I am told by people in the industry, the fishermen, fishermen's union, and other business people,

MR. F. ROWE: that if you have licences issued to foreigners in the case of the Ocean Harvesters/Nordsee merger that this will only open the floodgates to the issuing of other licences to other foreign countries and other foreign companies, and the next thing you know, not too far down the road you will find that not only in Newfoundland but in the whole Eastern Seaboard of Canada we would have foreign domination and control over our own fishing industry.

Like I said, Sir, I have very little time here tonight to get into the Nordsee agreement. It will be debated on Private Members Day.

Sir, I would like for the Minister of Fisheries at some point - I doubt very much whether it will be during this debate - but I would like for the Minister of Fisheries or the Premier, himself, to indicate to this House what exactly happened to the promise - not even promise, Sir, the announcement that was made again during a little time up in Twillingate, the Twillingate district by-election.

MR. NEARY: You mean the Fisheries College?

MR. F. ROWE: I have already mentioned that. The branch of the Fisheries College, Sir, was mentioned without consultation with the board of directors of the hospital up there in Twillingate, without consultation with the Twillingate council, without consultation with the Department of Education, with consultation with the directors of the Fisheries College themselves. The Premier makes announcements, Sir, without consulting with these four very important bodies. What else did he do, Sir? He announced - not promised, but announced in the middle of the Twillingate election that there would be seventeen cold storage plants established on the Northeast Coast. Now, Sir, I would like to know from the Minister of Fisheries and from the Premier or from anybody else for that matter, just what the status



MR. F. ROWE: of these seventeen cold storage plants is, because to my knowledge I am not aware of this master plan in the area of cold storage being fulfilled at all on the Northeast Coast. And that is certainly where we need it, Sir, because as Your Honour knows, this is where you have a seasonal situation where you can have heavy landing of fish during a certain part of the year and then you can have very little fishery because of the ice conditions during the rest of the year.

Sir, getting off the fisheries for the five or so minutes that I have left at my disposal. The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) mentioned the functioning of the Special Action Group - \$2 million, Sir, of the taxpayers' money recommended to government by McConnell's Advertising Agency for the sole purpose, Mr. Speaker, I submit, of upgrading the image of this present administration.

MR. NEARY: You know McConnell's (inaudible) ripping off education.

MR. F. ROWE: Ripping off everything, Sir.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. F. ROWE: We have a situation, Sir, where day after day you hear on the radio, and you see on the T.V. little advertisements obviously done by McConnell's, supposedly in the name of the Action Group. But what is mentioned after it? - The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. Sir, obviously the only purpose of the Special Action Group, which I submit, is failing, is to try to build up the image of a government whose image is severely tarnished. And my colleague from Terra Nova, Sir, mentioned the other night that that number, 737-3800 had about as much relevancy as  $\pi r^2$ . Now, Sir, I submit that it has a ring - it is symbolic. I do not think the member for Twillingate quite realized the intellectual symbolism of what he is saying. Because  $\pi r^2$ , as everybody knows,

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, just happens to be the formula for a circle. And, Sir, from what I have heard from my constituents and other people around this Province, this is exactly what has happened, the people of this Province have been run around the circle in trying to get assistance - grants, loans - any kind of assistance to try to develop the rural industry base or any other industrial base in this particular Province.

Sir, we asked the Premier on a number of occasions - and this is by no means an attack on the gentleman who happens to be the chairman of that particular group, but as everybody knows, Sir, he is making a very healthy salary. Good for him, Sir! If the gentleman can get a very healthy salary from this particular

Mr. F. Rowe: administration, you cannot criticize them for that.

But, Sir, we asked the Premier if he would mind tabling for this House the length of the contract for the Chairman of the Special Action Group, because we have heard, Sir, that it is a ten year contract. We have heard now, I do not know whether that is true or not, about the only way we will have to know we will find out is if the Premier has the courage to table the contractual arrangement between the Chairman of the Special Action Group and its present administration. Is the Special Action Group going to last ten years with or without this present administration? What is the job description for the Chairman of the Special Action Group? What are the pension rights? What are the life insurance benefits associated with that particular job? If the Special Action Group ceases to exist, what is there in the contract for this gentleman for the next ten years, if indeed a ten year contract exist? And, Sir, I think, it is a reasonable question to ask. What is the salary \$47,000?

MR. NEARY: \$47,500.

MR. F. ROWE: \$47,500. Sir, if a person is taken on by this administration for an annual income of \$47,500, Sir, for a ten year contract that means that almost a half a million of the taxpayers money for a group whose motives I question very, very critically.

MR. NEARY: And that is only part-time.

MR. F. ROWE: And that is only part-time. Not bad, Sir, for a voluntary group, a voluntary group of dedicated civil servants. We were led to believe, Sir, that this Special Action Group was to consist of dedicated civil servants who were volunteering their services to this Special Action Group, and, Sir, they take one of the best men, Mr. Bob Winsor out of a very crucial division, the Crown Lands Division and they put him that Special Action Group. And, Sir,

Mr. F. Rowe: I would submit that Mr. Bob Winsor was doing an excellent job in a very difficult division.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: the Department of Forestry and Agriculture, and that gentleman was yanked out of that job to answer a telephone call, hundreds of telephone calls, Sir, the sort of thing that we already have the system is set up for, we have our MHAs, we have the civil service who can answer the types of inquiries that this so-called Action Group is suppose to be doing. Sir, I submit that it is a complete waste of money. It was suggested to the Premier of this Province by McConnell Agency for the sole purpose of trying to build up the image of a faltering government. And that is a pretty expensive way, Sir, to keep the image of a government shined up, keep it bring and shine.

AN HON. MEMBER: And shore them up.

MR. F. ROWE: And shore them up, Sir. \$2 million. A \$2 million glorified telephone service, an answer line that is all it is. It cannot provide one bit more information than any director in the civil service or what a member of the House of Assembly can do. I have not seen one example, Sir, and probably examples can be given. They keep saying how many phone calls they got.

Well, Sir, I would like for the Premier to give a complete listing of other telephone calls that have been made to the Action Committee, and how many jobs have been created as a result of phoning this Special Action Group. And I would submit, Sir, that -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has a couple of more minutes.

MR. F. ROWE: A couple of more minutes. I would submit, Sir, that the differential between a number of jobs gotten as a result a number of industries started as a result of this Special Action Group, the disproportioned between the number of jobs gotten and the number of phone calls made there is a severe difference, Sir, in that particular listing.

Mr. F. Rowe: Sir, I would like to go on and talk about many other things, I would like to have gotten into the Nordsee deal into more detail, but we will have an opportunity to talk about that.

Now, Sir, I hope that somebody during the Throne Speech, in closing, Sir, will talk about the ability of a MHA to function. Sir, I think, it is time that a special non-partisan committee or commission be set up in order to look into how the functioning of a MHA can be made more efficient. I think

MR. F.B. ROWE: I believe very much so, Sir, that an MHA, for example, that should be a full-time job, a complete, full-time job.

AN HON. MEMBER: You mean, it is not right now?

MR. F.B. ROWE: It is a full-time job. For some people who are not practising, Sir, it is a full-time job. I do not, Sir, agree at all with the method that is being used for the travel allowances and the district allowances because it is unfair to some members serving very rural districts compared to certain other members serving less a rural district, a more urban district. But, Sir, I would like for somebody to get in that because I think an independent commission should be set up to look at the whole electoral process, whether there should be private donations for elections, the whole business of what an MHA should be paid, what kind of a grant he should get for travelling to and from his district, what kind of research staff and secretarial staff. It is incredible that one can go up - I can leave the university with an office, a private office, I can leave an insurance company with a private office and secretary and become an elected member to this hon. House and have neither of these simple things to work with to serve my constituents and my Province.

Sir, now there have been improvements over the last few years but I think, Sir, we have a long, long ways to go and I realize now, Sir, that I am over my time. But I wish that somebody would pick up that particular point, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Harbour Grace.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. H.D. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to waste time in hashing over all that has gone on since March 6th, Sir, because to me hash is Sunday dinner warmed over and out around the bay we call it bubble and squeak. To me, Sir, the Opposition has done a lot of bubbling with envy and squeaking in anger. Sir, the fisheries in the district of Harbour Grace is shaping up to be one of our main industries or the major industry and source of employment. But probably Newfoundland

MR. YOUNG: as a whole, Sir, in depending on the fisheries is putting all our eggs in one basket and hanging our hopes on a single peg in Ottawa. Probably, Sir, that peg is not too strong and Mr. LeBlanc is a rotten one.

The inshore fishery, Sir, is very, very important to the district employment and since 1972 the marine complex has been completed in Harbour Grace and it is a very valuable facility to the fishermen in that area. I am hoping within the year now that the community stage will be completed in Upper Island Cove and that will give another source of facilities to the people. I am a little bit concerned, Sir, about this fish war that is going on and I feel that it will have drastic effects on the fishery in Newfoundland. A 'fish war' is a bad word, I know, over on your side, on the Opposition side, but in the editorial today in the Evening Telegram, if I am permitted, Sir: "For mainlanders in Central Canada the fish war between Canada and the United States must be something of a comic opera. Apart from the frozen fish fingers they buy in the supermarket they know nothing of the fishery, and care less. But for Newfoundland and for other fish catching provinces there is nothing at all funny about the fish war. We may not be directly involved as we do not use the Georges Banks or the West Coast fishery but if United States thinks in terms of reprisals we might be the ones to suffer most. Our economic strength rest so heavily on the fishery that any disruption to it is likely to cause widespread hardship. That is why we hope External Affairs Minister Don Jamieson knows what he is up to in this war. He has carried the need for an agreement beyond negotiation and has forced a showdown. So, if he intends to carry the big stick he should tread softly because the Americans may be just in the mood to teach somebody a lesson and Canada is the nearest irritation right now."

Sir, our tariffs today and our fish stocks going to the States is from

Mr. Young: nothing to two and a half percent, and probably we are reaping great benefits because of the sagging Canadian dollar on that market.

I feel, Sir, that the Opposition missed a great opportunity the other day when the Minister of Fisheries spoke and read his statement to the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa concerning the shrimp licences. The hon. member for Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) was seen to wave and say that they were all in favour. But on that day, Sir, the Opposition would not give wide consent to debate that.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, that is not true.

MR. YOUNG: If the hon. members on the other side feel, Sir, that our Minister of Fisheries is at fault, I am sure, Sir, that it was a more serious debate than the budworm. But, Sir, if the hon. Minister of Fisheries was wrong, Sir, two wrongs do not make a right. And I feel -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: - that it was more of a political thing than for the benefit and the life of our Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: How does the Opposition like that?

MR. YOUNG: I think, Sir, probably the saddest thing about Confederation is when we lost control - or not full control, I know the hon. member for Bay de Verde asked the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) would he like for us to have full control of our fisheries - I am sure that we should not have full control, probably, but we should have more say, we should have more co-operation between the Federal Minister in Ottawa, and our own -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: - members here in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: You are after sinking her now, if you get ahold of the fishery then that would be the end of that too.

MR. YOUNG: Sink her? Yes, Sir! I notice the hon. member, and I would like, probably, since I am not a very fluent speaker, Sir, I would like to probably to be heard in silence and not interrupted by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).



MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SGME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. YOUNG: And I do not want to be side-tracked, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman has asked that his right to speak without interruption be observed, and that is a courtesy, indeed a rule which should be observed.

MR. YOUNG: Sir, as I said before I do not speak very often and I am probably not a great debater, but I request to be heard in silence and not to be disrupted by the hon. for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

Sir, I feel the Newfoundlanders today, or our youth today, and the Newfoundland fishermen over the centuries since probably John Cabot or before that - no, not before John Cabot have been under a yoke. That yoke, Sir, first was the fishing admirals, then was the fish merchants, and now our fishery is under the yoke of the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: I feel we, as Newfoundlanders, should stand up, as Quebec is standing up for their culture in the French language, I feel that Newfoundlanders should stand for our tradition that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: - we have had for 300 years, and that is the right to control our fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: And, Sir, I feel in years to come, and I might be three score and ten at that time, but probably in twenty years time when we celebrate our Fiftieth Anniversary, the younger generation which is coming into the fishery today, who are being educated - I saw it in our papers this week from the Fisheries College - as they get educated into our fisheries, into the ways of fishing, I am sure they will not stand up, and probably when our Fiftieth Anniversary comes around that the young Newfoundlanders who will be the leaders of the day -

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Could we have a quorum call, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: A quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am informed there is a quorum present.

The hon. member for Harbour Grace.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that my old buddy of thirty years has decided to interrupt me. But as I said, Sir, I feel that if our younger generation, our youth of today, if they go on being mistreated and ignored by Ottawa, we will have no fiftieth anniversary to celebrate in twenty years time.

Now, Sir, the fishery has been the lifeblood of Newfoundland. My grandfather - I know nothing about fishing - but my grandfather was a Master Mariner. Both my grandfathers were fishermen on the Labrador coast. My father was a fisherman until going overseas in the First World War. He came back and he started a business. Probably the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) feels that if you go into a business today there is something schemey, or you are doing something wrong; you must be a Water Street lawyer, or something like that, Sir. But I must say that what I have and what some other hon. members here have, we got honestly, squarely and by the sweat of our brows.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG:

It is nothing for me, Sir, to be up twenty-four hours, or forty-eight hours and I am sure the hon. members, if they want to get on in this world, they must also work hard.

MR. H. COLLINS:

And no handouts in your day.

MR. YOUNG:

There were no handouts in my day. Unfortunately, none of us went into the fishery but all of our family are well educated and, I hope and trust, we will be provided with good health so that we can continue on with our business.

MR. YOUNG: Sir, about joint ventures. I know the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F.B. Rowe) is the critic on fisheries, but what interest does he have in the fisheries, Sir? I have been in this House now just about - I have missed one day since March 6, and I doubt if that hon. gentleman has asked one word on the fisheries, and he is the critic on fisheries. Twenty-five hundred questions have been asked and I should say about twelve or fourteen questions have been asked on the fisheries.

I feel, Sir, that the Opposition critic on fisheries instead of worrying about the budworm and things like that, should get to the guts of the matter and ask about fisheries.

DR. KITCHEN: You would not know a punt from a dory.

MR. F.B. ROWE: You do not know if you are punched or bored.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! On both sides of the House, hon. gentlemen are required to cease intervening. The hon. gentleman has asked for the respecting of his rights and hon. members should comply therewith.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps I should ask the hon. minister a question. A few days ago he outlined the government's position concerning the quotas and the total allowable catch for 1979 as put forward at a meeting underway in Bonn, West Germany, and I wonder if the minister is in a position now to inform the House of Government's position and if it has been accepted with regard to the quotas and what effect it will have in 1979?

Now, Sir, there have been a lot of questions asked about the good and the bad of joint ventures. Last year in Harbour Grace, Ocean Harvesters was involved in a joint venture. Today we are just

June 12, 1978, Tape 4275, Page 3 -- apb

MR. YOUNG:                                  about getting into the glut  
season. I was down on the wharf this morning - we had a  
very enjoyable meal of fish for supper - and

MR. YOUNG:

there are 100 people working there today and we are just about getting into the trap season over there. Last year with joint ventures there were 300 people working. I understand, as the minister said the other day, that a joint venture last year took 6,000 tons of fish this way off the Labrador Coast. This year they have given the Spaniards 5,000 tons with no return, not one cent return to the Province or to the country. And I know, Sir, like I said once before in this House on a fishery debate, that people, two persons in my riding, my district, whose unemployment insurance benefits last Winter past was something in the vicinity of around \$900 a month because, Sir, they were working full time. They were not working part time. Because when the fish was slack they could go back in the cold storage, take out the fish and repossess it from the joint ventures. And if anyone is against joint ventures, I feel they should be ten times more against what has been done for the Spaniards recently.

There has been a lot of talk about Nordsee, and I do not want to go into Nordsee because I hope that I will be able to speak to it Wednesday, but I predict with this cod war that is going on in the States that we will be crying to the Europeans within a very few years to get the markets for fish and so glad that people like Nordsee have ever come in with the markets and the expertise that they are offering. Because once the United States gets on the go they will not be like Canada; probably they will be able to build about two or three draggers a day and the 200 mile limit will only be a joke for these people.

Sir, many charges have been made during this session and it appears that we on this side

MR. YOUNG:

are the culprits and the Opposition are very, very lily white. It was said the other day by a prominent fellow from Upper Island Cove while discussing about the Opposition, sir, he said, look a couple of members on the Opposition have enough skeletons in their closet to start their own cemetery. And I believe, Sir, that is true. that if it was all shaken out of them they would be able to start their own cemetery from the skeletons they have over there.

MR. NEARY: It was not Crowbar that said that, was it?

MR. YOUNG: No, it was not Crowbar but you have lots of them in your closet. Sir, I want to talk about -

MR. NEARY: That is what you think.

MR. YOUNG: I know of you of old.

MR. NEARY: The worst I ever did was buy a bottle of bootlegged rum and over at the (inaudible).

MR. YOUNG: Yes. I never brought a bottle of bootleg rum and if you did, that is not me.

Sir, I would like to speak about something concerning my own district. I was very, very disappointed, I may say, this last Winter with snow clearing operations that were in the district. At times, I do not know if it is the lack of equipment or what, but the snow clearing left to be desired and I trust this Winter we will see much improvement in the district. Since 1971-1972, Sir, when the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) represented that district at that time, Sir, during that October election, there was no water or sewer in the district apart from the town of Harbour Grace. Now, Sir, today I am glad to say that Spaniard's Bay has a very efficient water and sewer system. Upper Island Cove has a sewer system. And I listen sometimes and wonder to myself when petitions

MR. YOUNG:

are presented in this House, what has happened over the years to a community like Upper Island Cove with 2,500 people and no water.

But, Sir, I am glad to say now that during this week I have been glad to announce that some \$700,000 has been earmarked for the regional water system in that area and probably within a year or maybe two the water will be flowing in Upper Island Cove.



MR. H. YOUNG: In the recreation, Sir - yes, the hon. member should have had recreation - we have several swimming pools, ballfields and recreation centres, but one thing that is probably disturbing me mostly, Sir, is everyone is trying to get on a bandwagon for a stadium. Now probably the stadiums could end up like the bowling alleys, or that famous sod-turning ceremony for the hospital in Bay Roberts.

MR. NEARY: In Clarenville.

MR. H. YOUNG: Not Clarenville. You know, it is not only this Government that has been talking about starting hospitals or expanding hospitals. Several years ago there were two or three sod-turning ceremonies for hospitals over around the Bay, and I feel now that the stadium is getting into that - that is the bandwagon they are jumping on now, the members of the Opposition who are leading off these things. And I feel, Sir, if a stadium is built in Carbonear and a stadium built in Bay Roberts, the one in Harbour Grace, or Bay Roberts, or Carbonear, at least two of them would have to close. I suggest to those responsible -

MR. I. STPACHAN: Send one up (inaudible)

MR. H. YOUNG: Where, over in Scotland?

MR. I. STRACHAN: (inaudible)

MR. H. YOUNG: I asked to be heard in silence. I would like that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. H. YOUNG: The stadium in Harbour Grace should be expanded. We should have a double service there and not the facilities that they are demanding in either the Bay Roberts area or the Carbonear area even thought of unless it is a very viable, going concern.

My hon. colleague right in front of me there, I would like for him to get something going on a garbage disposal system in that area. I am sure the hon. member from Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe) knows that we have to cart garbage to Whitbourne now and it is a very, very expensive operation on all the town councils in that

MR. H. YOUNG: area. I am sure, Sir, that from Carbonear up to the hon. member's district, even up to Georgetown would like to see action in the very near future as to the garbage disposal.

Sir, I feel like not wasting any more time in this hon. House and I would like to close, Sir, by keeping up an old tradition of the former hon. member for St. John's West and probably summing up my remarks in a little verse, and I would like to be excused because I know it is not parliamentary to mention a member's name but this is a quote from Shakespeare and I am sure by using these names they will kindly consider.

AN HON. MEMBER: Beauchesne.

MR. H. YOUNG: Beauchesne. This is from Beauchesne, Sir. Now this Session is soon to close,/ We all know Neary has controlled the Poves,/ Neary shivered like a snake in the reeds,/ When I demanded he table the deeds,/ When Davidson heard the news was out,/ He took off like a weasel and headed south,/ The debate has been weary and long,/ With the Opposition charging the Government done wrong,/ These charges are nothing new,/ For all what they said is not true,/ All Newfoundlanders are on their guard,/ For the word of the Liberals is not the word of the Lord,/ I say to them now, just you wait and see,/ The people of Newfoundland will vote PC,/ In closing my remarks on this debate,/ There is one thing I wish to relate,/ The ambition to be premier was uttered before,/ Now that leader is there no more,/ The Speaker at times has been frustrated,/ By listening to the foolishness that was debated,/ And many the time while in the Chair,/ I felt like pulling my own hair,/ Of the three I am only a number,/ But on their behalf, I wish you an enjoyable summer.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, how can we follow an act like that? A few days ago I had occasion to refer to the Budget Speech as having very little in it, and now we come to the Speech from the Throne. With all due respect to whoever wrote it, there is not much in it. I will not quote it.

The problem in this government, and while you cannot produce a Throne Speech or get anything done, in my view the problem with this administration is twofold. First of all they do not know where they are going, Mr. Speaker, and secondly they do not know how to go about doing it. There is nothing in that Throne Speech. Absolutely nothing. The only positive bit of legislation, the only positive bit of information that has come before this House, is the Private Member's Bill that we all supported here on both sides of this House, having to do with Labrador development. And I want to say now that if this House does nothing, nothing else beyond approving that particular resolution, we will have done a good Spring's work.

But it is not enough just to agree on a resolution. It is not just enough to have a broad policy set forth for the development of Labrador, which is our main economic plank in this Province for the next few years. We have got to develop Labrador, without developing Labrador we will get nowhere. And we have got to get on with it. We have got the resolution. We have got the broad outlines of the policy sketched in this session of the House of Assembly, and everybody in this House supported the final resolution. That is good. That is a good sign of co-operation. We should be proud of ourselves for doing it. But I do not think that we should stop there. And this is what frightens me more than anything else, is that having passed this proper resolution, this good resolution, we will now stop and go on about our foolishness. And what we should be doing,

DR. KITCHEN: I believe, is taking steps to implement that resolution, taking steps to do what has to be done. I believe that immediately the government, it has to be the government, has to set up some sort of an action committee or working group to get on with implementing, this is policy now, this is policy set forth by the highest authority in this Province, by the House of Assembly. This is the policy of the Province, to develop that Labrador. And it is therefore a duty of the government, it is the duty of the government, it is their bounden duty to put the implementation in progress and I believe a working committee has to be put together right away to bring about the development of that Labrador, and to make sure that things that happen in Labrador happen in accordance with that policy rather than happening against that policy. We must make sure that what we do is on track. We debated that for two and a half months every Wednesday and debated it thoroughly, many strong points were made, and we are all committed to that goal. And having done that we must now see to it that the policy is carried out.

What bothers me is that I do not see yet any signs that this policy has taken hold, has really taken hold in what is going on. And it is going to take a while to do it. I heard the other day, I heard the Federal Leader of the Conservative Party say that the main aim, that Labrador power had to be developed to export to Nova Scotia. He said that, or I read it in the paper that he said it. Now that is wrong. That is against our concept, the concept which this House developed. That is against our concept. We are developing that Labrador power for use largely within this Province, and perhaps on a short term recallable basis we may export somewhere else. That was what the policy said. But we are not developing that Labrador power to give it to Nova Scotia. That is against our terms. So the National Leader of the Conservative Party quietly or somehow has got to be told.

DR. KITCHEN: where to get off.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

DR. KITCHEN: It could very well be. But the thing is this has got to be brought forth and if other people in other parties in Canada say the wrong thing they too have got to be brought to task. Because we are united. Both sides of the House are united on this resolution now. And it is one of the good things that has happened in this House of Assembly, that we are together on the most important issue facing this Province, and that is a good solid thing. It makes me proud to be a citizen of this Province to know that when the major issues are debated both sides of the House are together.

Now I saw the recently elected President, Chief Executive Officer of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro the other day, this new man, a brand new man, he was on CBC being interviewed, and he says, "We have got to get on to get the Churchill Falls developed to ship the power down here to the Island." That is not the concept either. It has not even trickled out into our own civil service. It has to. There is nobody in charge of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro can go against the policy of the House of Assembly. It cannot be done. So he has got to be brought to line. No boy. This is not the way we are doing it. The House says this, if you cannot follow the directions of the House and the government, then there is no place for you there.

So what I am saying, I am not knocking these individuals, but I am saying that we have to take steps reasonably soon to see that this concept which this House, after months of debate have come up with and we all agree with, has got to be carried out, and we do not want anybody changing our minds, and no bureaucrats, provincially or federally, interfering with that concept.

MR. NEARY: You do not want any slackers.

DR. KITCHEN:

No slackers.

Now I happen to believe, and most of us - I am sure everybody here believes that the power in Labrador is going to be one of the major ingredients in the prosperity of this Province in the centuries ahead, and I say centuries because oil and gas is good but oil and gas will be gone, but power is still there. I want to take issue I think with what the Minister of Mines and Energy said in his speech recently here in the House, when he said that there is no such thing as cheap power anymore. Now he is wrong on that. Because what he meant I suppose was that power rates are going up. I agree with him on that. But cheap is a relative term, cheap in relation to something else. And once you have got Hydro installations in place your power costs are relatively constant, if it is 30 mils it is not going to be 50 mils next year. It is going to be 30, maybe wages will go up a little bit but there is not much labour attached to hydro developments anyway once they are in. And so the fact that things are going up will not effect hydro costs much once the installation is in place.

So relative to oil and gas, and relative to other forms of electricity, other forms of power, I am sure that hydro power will be cheap, cheap means in terms of other sources. Well having said that we must get on with that. There are other things that we must do as far as Labrador development is concerned. It is fruitless I think for us to think that we can pretend that Quebec does not exist. We share 1600 miles of border with Quebec. There is no other two Canadian Provinces that share such a wide common border. No. We are neighbours of Quebec. Destiny has put us side by side and we will be side by side with French speaking peoples forever I suppose, unless they change or we change. And it is just as well for us to realize that our

DR. KITCHEN: neighbours in this Province, the larger part of this Province, three-quarters of our Province, the Northern part of this Province is a neighbour of Quebec and we are going to have to get involved with Quebec. We are going to have to get involved with French Canadians and it is my view that most people in this Province are going to have to become bilingual, otherwise we are going to have to turn our backs on the whole Northern development. So that is I think a major point that has to be made. We cannot turn our backs on Quebec and pretend that they do not exist and that we can live our own lives without respect to them.

The other thing I believe we have to do with respect to Labrador development, this whole concept which we have so properly endorsed here in this House, is that we have to put things in Labrador to bring about this major development. We did not hear much talk about politechnical institutes here yet but we could say quite a bit about it. And I believe it is wrong for us to build a politechnical institute in St. John's. St. John's may have a very good future but the main part of the future of this Province is North, not here. And we have got to move things up there. We have got to move things up so that the whole people in the Province are thinking in terms of Labrador. We have to think Labrador. It is Labrador-Newfoundland, not even Newfoundland and Labrador, it is Labrador and Newfoundland. We are little Newfoundland and big Labrador, geographically, resource wise and everything else. And we have got to start thinking - I believe that ice tank that Memorial put in over there, where are they going to put it? That should be in Labrador, probably in Goose Bay. That is where that should go. I would like for the government to put some pressure on Memorial to get cracking up there.

DR. KITCHEN: I would like for the government to put some pressure on Memorial, to get cracking up there and get going, and all the other parts.

Another thing - and I believe this is - we had to do something dramatic, not only to prove to people who are living in Labrador, but to prove to ourselves, to jump ahead into this great venture of developing this Province. This Province can never be developed by just concentrating on the Island. We have to develop the major part of this Province. And I believe we have to do more thinking, more Labrador thinking. And I do not know how you handle this, but institutions are going to have to revise their way of thinking.

I used to think that we should shift the capital out of St. John's and put it in Gander. That was one time -

AN HON. MEMBER: I remember that.

DR. KITCHEN: You remember that. We used to push for that. Because we are thinking too much in the past and not enough in terms of the future.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

DR. KITCHEN: Perhaps we should have done it. But I am not sure now if that is the move. I am not saying we should move the capital to Labrador, but I believe we should do something like this, just as dramatic and just as honest and just as proper to put the emphasis on both parts of the Province.

We will probably adjourn next week. I hope we adjourn, or whatever we do, stop next week, but I also hope we have a Fall session of this House. But what will prevent that Fall session of this House from taking place, not in this building, but in Labrador? Why do not every single member of this House of Assembly let us have our Fall session there if we have a Fall session?



DR. KITCHEN: And maybe that should become the pattern in this Province, that we have one session in Labrador, one session in St. John's. There is nothing to prevent us from having two capitals from the point of view of the House of Assembly. And this will be a dramatic thing, to put the emphasis on the two parts of the Province. There is not one part of the Province that the tail is wagging the dog, which is what is happening now. Neither do we want to forget our past, our traditions in the city of St. John's - we do not want to forget that either, but what we have to do, though, is perhaps have both. And there is really nothing to prevent our having a Fall session of the House of Assembly, say, in Goose Bay. The resources are there, the people are there, and this would be a good thing for this Province and for everybody in it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: We have taken the first step. We have our Cabinet meetings (inaudible).

DR. KITCHEN: That is good. I believe it is a good thing. And I believe parties should have their conventions in Labrador too. It is harder to arrange that, but things of that nature.

But I believe the most important thing, when this government, when the House of Assembly meets in Labrador, then we will start thinking in terms of how this Province is to be developed. If that can be taken up that will be something that I (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

DR. KITCHEN: Well, I do not know. God knows what will happen if you do something like that. Maybe there will be no need of having an election right away. God knows.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. KITCHEN: But we do not want to dream on

DR. KITCHEN: too much here.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

DR. KITCHEN: Yes. I want to say a few words on the machinery of government, because not only must we do the important things - and I believe Labrador development apart - I am not going to speak on the fishery now, I will not have time for any remarks on that - but apart from development of the fishery with Labrador, and sometimes they are intertwined, those are the two basic economic policies. And there is another major policy too, and that is our relations with Ottawa. And if I get a chance sometime I want to say a few words on that, but I do not plan to get into that tonight. A lot has been said about our relationships with Ottawa and the rest of Canada, and I believe that is another serious problem we have to come up with. And that does not have anything to do with parties, it just has to do with the nature of Canada. I think that is basically what it is. But I want to say a few words about the machinery of government, and perhaps I am a bit out of line here. And the reason I say I may be a bit out of line, I have not been in this House of Assembly long and it may be presumptuous of me to say too much about that, but for what it is worth I am going to say it anyway.

I have been here now listening and saying a few words, mostly listening and observing and trying to figure out what is going on, and I hear people use such words as 'master of our destiny' - 'We are masters of our destiny.' Well, I do not think I have ever felt less master of my destiny than I have being here the last three months. You do not get the feeling of being masters of our destiny here. We should be. This is where the main decisions of Newfoundland should be made, and sometimes the flame starts, you can feel it that something is happening

Dr. Kitchen: But if anyone were to say that we in the House of Assembly were masters of our destiny, the youngsters these days have an expression for it, Big Whow! I think, that is what they say, and I think we would have to go along with them.

Why, why can we not, what can we do, and here these suggestions may be dismissed by people because I am not too sure that I have considered them properly, but it is a serious matter from my point of view. For what it is worth, perhaps we should have longer sessions, I do not mean we should prolong, you know, this business of meeting all day and all night for a month and a half. It is pretty rough. It is pretty rough. I have to say to you perhaps we should space out the House of Assembly more than we do and have more months of the year where people are operating here. We would spread it out.

I have been thinking that I would like to see some standing committees in this House of Assembly, some standing committees other than the Public Accounts Committee. I would like to see a standing committee on energy, this is one of the most important areas of development in this Province. And the Minister of Mines and Energy is dealing about with oil and gas and hydro development, our whole future is tied up there, and we only get to talk about it while the House of Assembly is in session, and then on a very casual basis really. I do not see why we cannot have a standing committee on energy which does various things. A standing committee on the fishery, perhaps a standing committee on Labrador, housing, a number of standing committees where things are brought out and people discuss things not in a bear pit fashion such as we have here, but in a fashion where hon. members on both sides, all sides can get together and think things through in a more calm and reasonable and trusting manner where nothing is at stake politically except the future of the Province, our own personal fighting ability is not on the line. So I think we should give some thought perhaps to the establishment of standing committees of this House which meet during the year.

DR. KITCHEN: I believe that the day of part-time members got to go, I really think that this business of being a member and trying to keep a business going is not doing the Province any good. I think what we have to do is pay our fellows a bit more perhaps and also get more service from them, from us all. I cannot see how this old British concept of the aristocracy coming to the House of Assembly for a month or two a year is any good. That has got to go. I do not think that that can happen. No part-time members. And if anyone cannot hack it full-time, I think, they should seriously consider not being part of it. And there are a number of - I do not want to talk about people who are presently part-time because that is the way the system is now. But if people were full-time at this and had no other permanent activity to take up their time then I believe that their services to this House can be a great deal more.

And what bothers me about it particularly on the government side, because it is not so serious perhaps, well maybe it is, but what has bothered me on the government side is that the Premier, I am not a person who has got a very affinity for the Premier, our quarrelling goes back a number of years, it was not always that way, but it is that way now, and I guess we are on a collision course for a long time. But I sometimes pity the Premier because some of the strong people on his side of the House have not made a full-time commitment. Now I believe we have to make a full-time commitment. And if he puts the finger on a man and says, I want you in my Cabinet then I think that man has got an obligation to say, Yes, here am I Lord, let me serve, and not say, Well boy I have got my business to look after. I think that is wrong. And one of the reasons why this government is not stronger is that too many abled men, too many abled people have cut themselves off from Cabinet because they feel that other things are more important.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: \*Hear, hear!

Dr. Kitchen: I believe that this Province has no time for the part-time politician not in the future. There is too much to be done, too much at stake.

The other point I want to make, and I am not blaming anyone on this because if I did I would have to blame myself as well as anybody else, and that is what name calling, character assassination and that sort of thing that we all indulge in from time to time. I was appalled the other day after I left the House of Assembly and saw that

DR. KITCHEN:

my name was in headlines, for what? Not for anything important that was said, or I said, but because I happened to say to the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs that he lied. That was a very childish thing for me to say. Well what he said was not the way I looked at it. Perhaps I could have said it in another way. But when I realized, this is eight year old behaviour. This is the behaviour you expect from an eight year old, or a seven year old, you know where kids try to put each other down. It is not the sort of thing that you expect from forty year old people, fifty year old people, substantial men and women of the community.

Now I am not blaming any individuals because it is pretty hard not to get involved in that sort of thing. And I do not know what it is about this House of Assembly and other Houses I have seen it, in Ottawa the same thing, why people have got to tear each other down. And so I do not know the answer how you get out of it. But I am not tearing my colleagues or people on the other side of the House either down on this. But how can we avoid it? Is there a way to make a point? Perhaps we should blame the press. I do not think so. Because I think the press are caught up in it. The only way that you can get publicity here is to say something nasty about somebody and then you are on the front page. Now the press has got to share in this. If they are looking for sensationalism, is that all they want in the House of Assembly's - We can all do it. Gosh I can say anything about anybody here and you can anything about anybody over here. If that is the only way we can get headlines - now I do not blame members of the press either because it becomes an atmosphere. After we get going here some days an atmosphere develops that no one individual is responsible for. And I do not know how you do that, how do you get away from it? It is something like a social psychology of the House of Assembly that probably could be studied by some academic and make a very learned fetus. Maybe we should change

DR. KITCHEN: the seating position, perhaps we should have a few people sitting around here. Maybe we should change sides from time to time and perhaps we do not.

But this business of everything that is said over there is wrong to us and everything said over here is wrong to you, is not the way in my view that the people in this Province want the House conducted. And I do not know how to correct it, and I am not blaming any individuals on either side. I do not want to take pot shots at anybody because if I were I would be the first one to shoot myself, because I do it and I find myself doing it more and more too, and it is sickening to me to have to do just do it without really thinking about it.

So I do not know how to do this. Perhaps by setting up committees we might soften the between - I know we have to get at each other before an election, because otherwise the people would have to choose. But I do not know if we need to be fighting elections five years in a row, five years steady, continuously all the time. But part of the problem on our side is that we honestly believe that the government has got to go. And I say for darn good reason. I am going to become a little personal here now. And I believe that changes have to take place not only in the House but in some of the personnel. Just as we cannot have part-time members anymore after - you know we have to get out of that, I do not think that we can have a part-time Premier either. And I am sorry the Premier is not here tonight while I am saying this because I would have liked for him to be here. But that is the problem. That is the problem. He is never here.

I took a tally the first six months I was elected, the Premier turned up one day a week. He was one day a week at his job in the House of Assembly. Now you cannot run a government one day a week. I do not care who you are or what you are, you cannot run a government on one day a week.

DR. KITCHEN:

In 1968 this Premier ran to do a job in Bonavista - Trinity - Conception. His attendance record in the House of Commons, we checked it out once, eight days out of one hundred. Millions of dollars were lost to the riding of Bonavista - Trinity - Conception, because of the fact that he did not do any work.

I believe that in that four years in which he served that riding, there was not a worst representative in the history of Canada. And we have never had a worst representative than we had. And it is my belief that hon. members on the other side can do a great deal for this Province, and I think the President of the Progressive Conservative Party, who happens to be a member here, can do a great thing too by calling a leadership convention and putting in, as leader of that party and Premier until the next election is called, some good hard working person on the other side.

MR. NEARY:

Like the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan).

DR. KITCHEN:

It could be the member for Grand Falls, that is whoever they decide.

This Province is not served and cannot be served by a person who will work one day a week. It cannot be done, no matter how talented or how able the person is one day a week will never do it.



DR. KITCHEN: Another remark I would like to make concerns compassion. I have detected in the public service of this Province and in the public service nationally as well, a hardening of the line against those who need help.

The hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) - he is not here tonight - but he chastised me the other day for bringing out a number of cases of people who were in bad circumstances with respect to housing. He told me I exaggerated. But I did not exaggerate; I could give you worse chapters and verses than that. And a lot of these were not in my district, a lot of them were in the St. John's area. Some were in the district, some were in the St. John's North district, believe it or not. I do not understand why he did not know about those cases. Some were in other members' districts here. But there was no exaggeration. People are in very desperate circumstances as far as housing is concerned in this Province, in this city. And as far as jobs are concerned we are in bad shape too.

But I am worried about the lack of compassion that I detect in many government departments. The Department of Social Services is a pretty hard department to operate, I know, but I have come across this - when someone is down and out and cannot live on the allotment, something happens in their lives and they just cannot live - an attitude like this, 'They will manage, they always do.' It gives me the creeps - you know, the person starves - 'They always manage, they always do.' It is a terrible thing when someone says that - 'The heck with you. 'God will provide,' I suppose, that is the attitude, 'or someone will provide but we do not have to. We are bound by our regulations.' And I have found it in other departments besides the Department of Social Services.

DR. KITCHEN: The federal government indicate this. The federal government brought in a housing policy, an insulation policy where in order to get the insulation grant you had to put up the money in advance, and many people whom I know said, 'If I had the money to put up I would not need the grant.' Now I thought there that rather than turn down the insulation policy what the Province might have done, very profitably perhaps since Ottawa is such a difficult group of people to move for one part of the country unless you move the whole country, might have been to lend the money to the people - lend the \$350 or whatever they needed and then when Ottawa paid them back, collect the money or something like that. I do not know if that would be possible, but that is the sort of thing I think we have to do rather than let federal programmes go by without being taken up, that we have to somehow take advantage of these programmes, enable our people to take advantage of these programmes, and if it means that we will lend them the money until they get it back from Ottawa, so be it.

I have also detected in the Province - and it bothers me - not only in the public service but in many others, the hardening of the line with respect to justice, and I do not think the hon. the Minister of Justice feels this way - I think I have him right, I have not heard him express these views. But it bothers me. It does not bother me when the law is enforced, but it does bother me when I know that the reason that some people cannot make their lives profitable is because they cannot find work, and we have young men and women thrown together without work, without anything useful to do in this city denied access to sports facilities because they cannot pay for them or they do not want to, and they cannot find work. And then when they do other things, nothing else can be done but to throw them in jail.

DR. KITCHEN: I know people should not be bad and they should not be doing things wrong, but the root cause of many of these things is the fact that there is not enough work in this Province, particularly in this city. I have no solution to this problem, but I do know that we have more judges, more lawyers and more police in this Province now than we have ever had, and I sometimes think that we are doing the wrong thing here, that perhaps we should be doing more rehabilitation - that is not the word I want - what I really want is jobs for people so that the devil will not find work for idle hands.

Dr. Kitchen: I see the cost of living going up, and I hope that the Minister for Consumer Affairs will have a few words in the Throne Speech if he gets a chance, because I do not know how you would stop that from going up and whose responsibility it is for getting after the gougers. There is a lot of gouging going on in this Province. There seem to be two kinds of people, those with out and those with lots. And I see a fair amount of gouging. I think it is going on in some of the supermarkets. And I see it going on in other areas as well. And I would like for the Department of Consumer Affairs in this Province if they can take it upon themselves to do some investigating and some prosecution, if there is any law to prosecute them under, and if there is no laws to prosecute them under perhaps we should have some laws in that respect.

There should be no gouging. No gouging on land. There should be laws against land speculation in this Province. But there are no laws against land speculation. There should be. And people who speculate in land should not be rewarded they should be put in jail in my view. That is a crime against the people. Holding on to land which you do not own yourself, buying up tracts of land, going over to Stephenville when Stephenville is down. You know what I heard the other day that prominent people are -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

DR. KITCHEN: But Stephenville is down, people are out of work.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Green is over there now -

DR. KITCHEN: And people are going over there and buying up tracts of land, hopefully that when Stephenville starts up again they will make some money.

MR. NEARY: Apartments -

DR. KITCHEN: Why that should not be. That should not be. They should not be allowed to do that. There should be a law against that

Dr. Kitchen: and the people who are guilty of it should be put down there and kept there. That is crimes against the people.

AN HON. MEMBER: Richard J. Greene.

DR. KITCHEN: And whoever is doing it, and similar things, whoever is involved without getting at anybody in particular, whoever is at it, that is a crime, that is wrong. That is improper. That is hurting people. That is making young people pay when they cannot pay, and it is making old people pay when they cannot pay. It is preventing people from living a full life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. KITCHEN: Just a few miscellaneous remarks before I conclude. I have not detected any function for the Ombudsman yet. I have been looking at three reports. And I have not seen anything in one of reports that I do not do, and I am sure any other hon. member does not do, the only difference between the Ombudsman and us, he gets paid twice as much as we do, and does half as much.

AN HON. MEMBER: We do as much in a week as he does in a year.

DR. KITCHEN: Well I think that this whole business of the Ombudsman should be changed, the institution should be changed or done away with, and we will save \$40, \$50, \$60 whatever it cost, his salary plus his office and the whole thing, and the cost of publishing this whole stuff. Gee Whiz, if we had to publish what we did every day I remember the hon. member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) giving a few testimonies the other day. And if this Province pays the Ombudsman to publish a bunch of testimonials. Do you want to publish testimonials, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan)? Do we want to publish them? Let us public them all, see who has the most.

MR. NEARY: 'Luke' has a couple over there he can publish.

DR. KITCHEN: Yes we will all publish them.

No I think we should look at the public service and where necessary chop them back. I think the Ombudsman is a waste of money myself. It is not a big waste of money, but it is a waste, whatever we spend on it is probably a waste.

Dr. Kitchen: I liked what the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Murphy) said today about the over regulations. I thought that was good. We got too many regulations, it is far too many. I mentioned this before and I say it again, why do we need rabbit licences in this Province? It is not to control the rabbit population.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

DR. KITCHEN: It is a dollar.

MR. NEARY: Blueberry -

DR. KITCHEN: A dollar. Why do we need to pay a dollar for rabbits licence in this Province, when you do not have to make any report. I can see the moose bit. But the rabbit licence bit is not used to keep track of the rabbit population or excess, it is just a little tax on youngsters largely and people who are out of work, a dollar to catch a rabbit or whatever it is.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible). It should not be.

DR. KITCHEN: Pardon. It should not be.

Let us do away with that silly licence, it is a nuisance on people. It is a nuisance. And if we want to employ somebody let us employ in a civil service issuing those rabbits licences let them do it in some more useful fashion.

The hon. member was talking about nursery, growing trees and having a licence. That is how it came up. We have got marriage licences in this Province. I do not know why we have got to get a licence to get married. Gee Whiz, the clergy used to dish them out a few years ago, I suppose, if one did not have a clergymen it would be all right to go somewhere else. But this was unnecessary.

AN HON. MEMBER: He does special work for the Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right. (Inaudible).

DR. KITCHEN: Well let him pay. Let the churches pay if they want to institute marriage licences let them pay for it, why should the government, the people of this Province pay to do their work. It is their problem.

AN HON. MEMBER:

But then you have to pay the priest -

DR. KITCHEN:

The next thing is this blueberry licence that my hon. friend mentioned. What do we need a blueberry licence in this Province for? There are too many silly licences. It seems that everybody in government, every civil servant tries to figure a way to add somebody to his department, and he does it.

MR. W. CARTER: - heard me say it in Trillingate.

DR. KITCHEN: - by issuing a few more licences.

It has gotten to the point now where you spend most of your time working for the government. Just think of how many days every citizen spends working for the government, filling out forms, filling out sales tax forms, filling out unemployment insurance forms, filling out everything, for the federal government, for the provincial government, for the town council, for all sorts of institutions, the school board. Everybody has got those silly regulations, licences and forms, and a certain amount of it is necessary. But there is an awful lot of it that is not necessary and perhaps we can cut out these. So I am very glad to be able to support the member for St. John's East.

(Mr. Marshall) or for him to support me, or whoever supports who on this question of cutting down on the over regulation of people in the Province.

One of the areas in this Province where unemployment hits hardest is this city. We hear - not the only area of unemployment - there are parts of the Province where the fishery is going good, where unemployment is a problem. But it is not as serious a problem as it is in some parts of this city. When a person is unemployed here, what do you do when you are unemployed in the city? What useful thing can you do? Well you can try to get a bit of paint I suppose and paint up your house. What else do you do? Cut the grass.

MR. SIMONS: If you own it.

DR. KITCHEN: If you own it. Well even if you do not you might try to fix it up a bit. Perhaps if you want to do that, if you are allowed to. Any other useful occupation is very difficult. If you are unemployed you cannot go out picking berries because there are no berries growing in the confines of the city unless you happen to have a car. You cannot pick berries. You cannot go in the woods



DR. KITCHEN: and chop down sticks. You cannot go trouting because -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

DR. KITCHEN: No. You cannot go trouting unless you are going to do it in Kents Pond, as the minister said they are going to put trout in Kents Pond. I will go trouting then. That will be great. Or some of the other ponds in the city. That will be good. But there is really no useful way to do something to better yourself economically if you are a man or a woman who is unemployed. And it is harder, it is very hard in this city.

The people who have the greatest life, as far as going out and bottling the moose and things in the city, are the people with jobs, and darn good jobs. They are your teachers and your civil servants who spend a lot of their work hours planning what they are going to be doing to further increase their income when they get off work, and they go out in their cars and they do this. But the person who has not got a job is in a bad way. I believe that the unemployment problem in this city, particularly the unemployment problem faced by not only young people, there is about 1,000 young people mostly in my district who are unemployed, no prospects. Not all of them but virtually no prospects within this city. I do not know how we handle it.

I believe that we are going to have to get Labrador going and get it going quickly. And the problems of unemployment in the city are I think socially much more serious, although I do not want to downgrade the problems of unemployment in other parts of the Province, but they are certainly much more serious than they are in some areas where a person can be unemployed, that is without a job, and still be doing useful things for himself and his family, and adding or at least putting himself in a position where he does not have to pay much. If you are unemployed, in some places you can go in the woods and start getting your sticks for your house.

June 12, 1978

Tape No. 4285

MI - 3

DR. KITCHEN: You can do that by going and chopping them down.

MR. LUSH: Get a permit.

DR. KITCHEN: Get a permit. You can go and you can do all sorts of things in some areas to add to the family income and to your own income. But when you have a single man, thirty or forty years old, who gets \$60 or \$70 from the Department of Social Services, what do you do with \$70 in this city? It is all right if you live with your family. But suppose you do not have a family. What do you do then? You cannot live on it. You cannot do much with it anywhere.

DR. KITCHEN: - but you certainly cannot do much with it in the city, so that, this whole question of unemployment in this city has to be looked at very, very seriously, particularly now that the construction industry this year does not look to be in the best position. It bothers me because we had a bad construction season last year and it was the worst for a number of years but I believe that this year it probably will be at least as bad, and if it is worse that means that next winter is going to be a most desperate time in this city, a most desperate time.

AN HON. MEMBER: The worst is yet to come.

DR. KITCHEN: I do not know what is going to happen. Somebody said on this side today that if it were not for unemployment insurance, Old Age Pensions, and Family Allowances -

AN HON. MEMBER: In 1977 \$215,000,000 was drawn.

DR. KITCHEN: If all this money that is coming in from the Federal Government this year and from other sources - If it were not for these elaborate programmes of helping out we would have revolution in the streets.

MR. H. COLLINS: Who are the people who are unemployed in the city? Certainly, goodness, from a Newfoundland point of view, in the Civil Service, the University, and the business houses and so on there is a fair number of people employed. There are very few carpenters here. Who are the people unemployed?

DR. KITCHEN: Well, some of the people who are unemployed are trained people coming out of the College of Trades with clerk/typing, clerk/accounting: often, these are young women who cannot get work -

AN HON. MEMBER: Here in the city?

DR. KITCHEN: In the city.

AN HON. MEMBER: -- mostly now.

DR. KITCHEN: As far as the men are concerned, you have carpenters, some of them skilled people who cannot get work; plumbers who cannot get work; electricians. All these skilled building trades, there

DR. KITCHEN: are hundreds and hundreds of them who are not working and who cannot get work. It is not that they are no good; they are good. It is just that there is no work. Now, many of them find it difficult to move outside the Province. And it is getting worse. I think it is getting worse and what is getting worse about it is that once you are down, once your resources are gone, once your financial resources are eaten into, once the few dollars that you have saved are gone, the few dollars that you have put away are gone, and once you are beating your head against a stone wall, you start giving up. And I know fellows who have been beating the streets of St. John's now for a year and a half since I have been on the go, and they have been unemployed longer than that. At this stage they do not bother me as much as they did before, they do not come after me. First, they used to be knocking on the door all the time, "Get me a job, get me a job," and I have been unable to get work for many, many people, most people. Sometimes you manage to strike it lucky. But now, these people do not come. They have given up. They do not know what to do to get a job.

Now, you can imagine what is happening. I do not know how many are there. I should take a more accurate census of what people are in what categories. That is what I do not have done properly. I think, perhaps, somebody could make a survey of that. A lot of them do not even bother registering with Manpower anymore. There is no point in it. There is no job. They do what they can but after a while, every week, every week -

MR. H. COLLINS: (inaudible)

I suspect, as good as -

DR. KITCHEN: One of the best places in the Province.

MR. H. COLLINS: But, mainly, the people who are looking for work are young people who are just -

DR. KITCHEN: A lot of them are young but a lot of them are not. A lot of them are people with families. A man came into the

DR. KITCHEN: office two days ago and he has been out of work for five years. He does not have a trade, but he is a labourer and he is a strong labourer, and he cannot get work. Five years without getting a job! It is pretty hard to take. He has several children. It is pretty hard.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say much more. I do want to say this, though, that the Fishery offers great hope to many people in rural Newfoundland, and Labrador offers great hope for the rest. And we must not turn our backs on this magnificent plan, the bold outlines of which we sketched here in this House of Assembly this year. We must not forget this plan, we must do everything we can to implement that plan so that the future of the people who are presently unemployed and their children will be a great one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have not spent many moons getting ready for my few remarks but over a period, I suppose, of years being associated with politics, like the hon. member who just spoke (Dr. Kitchen) either actively in the legislature or behind the scenes or in one way or another one has done a fair amount of thinking. The bit of thinking I have done to put down two or three guidelines which is infrequent for me to do this sort of thing even makes me think that the hon. member who just spoke must have gotten a copy, He must have picked up a sheet that I had underneath and read off some of the headlines because almost precisely with the exception of two or three personal remarks which alluded to political events on this side of the House I must say I found myself very much in tune with the remarks, so much in tune that I regret that he has not found it sort of necessary to speak more frequently this year. I know that the hon. member being a scientific person in a sense or with a rational mind had preferred to sit back and observe and learn and listen and watch and eventually make a more aggressive active presentation in the legislature.

I believe what I have seen here today could be said for quite a number of hon. members in the legislature who basically have not found it necessary to participate. I would just like to say a couple of specific things that I totally agree with the hon. member on. One is regarding Labrador. I think that the recommendation made is so obvious as to be almost - the minute that he mentioned it everybody said "Aha!" I believe that is another 'in' expression - is it not? - today among younger people when they articulate the theory that someone came up with - it is gaining momentum in the U.S. where once someone says something you say "Aha!" You are absolutely certain, it is so obvious that you thought about it, but it never quite came out. I think his recommendation regarding a session in Labrador is precisely on target. I further go on record as saying something in the legislature that I have had a couple of speeches on in the Province in the last four or five weeks or eight or ten weeks

MR. LUNDRIGAN: When I have had a bit more time on my hands and that is regarding the necessity of a better structured committee system for the legislature where we can get members more actively participating. I will say something on that topic under another heading in a few moments.

On the business of the regulations and the business of being over regulated, there is not a member on this side of the House who cannot indicate that that has been my pet concern for quite some years, not only in this particular legislature or of being a member of this particular small 'g' government but in respect to my years of being associated with politics. I think that is one of the most devastating things that you can have in a democracy which is now totally regulated, which is supposed to be a free society, is to have the second class type of system where you pretend to have a free society and then have some bureaucratic group that are not beholding to the public at all, that are not elected, that are not under any scrutiny, that are not hired or fired, to be bringing in systems to impede progress and to hinder people's lives. I think in our own Province we have gone further, quicker than most other parts of the Western civilizations in the last four or five years, to the point that I believe we have stymied enthusiasm on the part of the general public. Last year the blueberry one really got my goat and I had private fights with my colleague. Then I remember hearing the hon. member publicly making some comments on the matter having, I believe, just gotten back from Europe himself. He had picked up a newspaper I understand in the Deer Lake terminal or somewhere along the route and was so aggravated that he made some public comments. That blueberry one is a little example for it brings into focus really some of the ways that we have gone in regulating the people in our Province. I think we have done it too quickly. We have gone from no regulations, relatively speaking, where people could do almost anything, to the point where we have gone too quickly in the opposite direction. What we have done is have a field day for the bureaucracy. So we have gone from a more autocratic system that people were not happy with and a less regulated to a more regulated one that people are basically

MR. LUNDRIGAN: still unhappy with. I think that kind of comment can do nothing but bring into focus the problem and help us resolve it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to sort of classify and generalize about the legislature that I have been a part of this year. I have sat and maybe I have made a few presentations and two or three comments. I have resisted the temptation offered me by hon. members to be an official Opposition for the government. I do not think I could afford to stand in my place on a daily basis and be critical of government on a continuous basis. That is not really under the political system that we have today, it is not the kind of a role that any member of a government or any member of an Opposition can afford to have. I have



MR. LUNDRIGAN: frequently found myself at loggerheads in the last while with government but it is not my role to stand here and be critical of the party that I am a member of. I do not say that in the sense that I have buried myself. I make my views known in my caucus with my colleagues from day to day and that is the extent to which I can be, maybe, terribly provocative.

But as far as I am concerned I have observed this session, something which I think most Newfoundlanders feel, and that is the Legislative Assembly in our Province, the House of Assembly has stalled, is ineffective. We have a system of government here where the government, basically, is stalled. I think every member of government, the sixteen members of Cabinet will agree, that they have been preoccupied with trying to on a daily, daily, daily, daily basis respond to the pressures that have come from a small selected group of the Opposition.

I think the Opposition is stalled because the pressures have come from a small selected group of the Opposition and in a particular selected direction. The Opposition has not been effective. We have on the Opposition side twenty members and I have known most of the members for some time, I know many of them fairly personally. I think many of them are not satisfied with what has taken place with respect to the Opposition this year. I am not satisfied with what has taken place with respect to the government this year. We have had a government that has been almost totally on the defensive, not because of their policies, not because of their programmes, not because of the plans they have for the future of the Province, but because there has been a preoccupation with a particular

MR. LUNDRIGAN: type of issue that I need not elaborate on.

In the House, for four or five months since the House began session you have had no imagination coming from government, you have had very few plans being unveiled from government, you have had very few specific insights, or whatever you might want to call it, or incentives, trying to go in a particular direction, coming from government. The Premier will admit, the members of the Cabinet will admit that they have been preoccupied with what has gone on in the Legislature.

The Opposition have been absolutely preoccupied with it on a full-time basis, to the point where very few of the members of the Opposition have made any significant contribution. I heard one colleague speak today on -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am asking that that member keep quiet for the forty minutes that I have left.

The member spoke today -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - from Fogo district (Capt. Winsor), a member who has been associated with politics for so long that you could almost tell it. When he stood in his place he congratulated the mover and the seconder of the speech, which is parliamentary good manners, and he went on to tell about the good fight fought by my colleague from the Southern Shore and the distinguished record and the ancestry of my colleague from Labrador.

MR. H. COLLINS: I have always called him the Earl of Winsor.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

He went on and made his presentation and made his suggestions and offered his thoughts and so on.

We had the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) here today showing that he has not been contaminated too long with the present political system that we have in our Province. That is what I read by my former colleague whom I have associated with politically for seven or eight years, professionally for twice as long because I have been associated with him since the time he started teaching out in Upper Island Cove. I taught on the faculty of Memorial with him, I was a student on the faculty that he was a student on out in Alberta for a number of years with him and worked closely with him. He stood here today, a lot of thinking has gone into his statement - some of it is a bit radical, some of it is a bit ultra-conservative, some of it is a bit ultra-socialist. It seems to be a mixture that frequently becomes part of the attitude and philosophy of people today who are not in the system long enough to become totally, sort of guilty of having a cholesterol, a political cholesterol of the attitude take part in their thinking.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me just do similar to what the member did, and I had planned to do this, run down on a few topics which to me are paramount topics in the Province that have received limited exposure this present year. There are three major issues in the Province:

One of the major issues relates to another and that is the hydro and it relates to employment and development of our resources. So far this year there has not been a debate on hydro, there has not been a definitive, long statement on hydro talking about the plans, talking about, elaborating on the

MR. LUNDRIGAN: announcements which came out of Ottawa some three months ago regarding the start of the Lower Churchill development. elaborating on the First Ministers' announcement.

There have not been five questions from across the House asking for elaboration, asking for there to be some kind of a statement from day to day from the Opposition on hydro, asking for the problems of Quebec to be talked about. I made a statement on the fact that the biggest problem we have with hydro is not the fact that Ottawa should assist us, or co-operate with us, or help us fund it, or help

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN:

give us a grant on the construction side of the tunnel, or anything of this nature. The biggest problem we have with hydro in Labrador, that is the undeveloped hydro, is the fact that we do not have access to the marketplace. That is the biggest problem. Ever since 1867 the various Canadian provinces have had no rights in debarring the transportation of energy across provincial boundaries. The only time that energy has been debarred from being able to cross provincial boundaries came some eleven or twelve years ago when a final agreement was reached with respect to the transport of the hydro out of this Province. And that was when the Federal Government refused to uphold the right of our Province to export its hydro. The present Premier of the day was forced because of the unemployment of the time, because of the lack of foresight which I guess every member is guilty of - was forced to sign an agreement which meant that we were tied in with Quebec for sixty-five years, no right to export our power.

If we had the right to export our power today across the boundary of Quebec we would have hydro going before Christmas. We would have a site, Mr. Speaker, that would end up being started before Christmas, jobs right now. We could re-start the construction of the lines, cutting the lines. We could continue immediately almost on the tunnels. We could go ahead with lines out of the Province if that is what we want; they are increasing the lines through Quebec. So we get our power into either the Maritimes of the country, or into Central Canada, or into Quebec where they still are going to have a shortfall in their supply of energy, or into the New England states, whichever the case might be. This year so far there has not been a murmur, not a word, on that particular issue in this Legislature. I have gotten up two or three times and talked a bit about it but the only way I am going to get any attention on it is if I get up and accuse the Government. So, consequently, I do not feel like doing that. That is not a very constructive role when

MR. J. LENDRIGAN: I am sitting in a government or on the side of Government and we have an Opposition. There has not been a word about it.

We talk about Fisheries. The hon. gentleman spoke for forty-five minutes this afternoon; the last ten minutes I understood what he was trying to say and I enjoyed what he was trying to say. He tried to argue that the reason the official Opposition could not be more vocal on the business of licensing for shrimp off the coast of Labrador was because the Minister of Fisheries had not, in his opinion, made strong enough representation to the Federal Government in favour of having the shrimp licenses given all to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. That was the reason he said that they could not aggressively support some kind of a resolution, or some kind of a momentum, out of this particular legislation.

Now I find the logic of that unbearable. And I will go beyond that. We talk about the Fisheries. So far this year the only comments I have heard of any significance on the tariff problems that we could have with the United States have come from Ottawa. Is that not amazing? In the last two weeks the only comments I have heard on tariffs, of any significance, came from Ottawa. There has not been a sensible series of questions developed on the European marketplace on tariffs. So far this year we have had a score of meetings carried on at Geneva under an agreement which is being negotiated on tariffs, and do you know why Fisheries has not been singled out? Because it is bogged down with the tariff system that will go on for the next five years, and Fisheries happen to be under that general tariff negotiation instead of being parcelled out. Where all the European companies and most of the countries are looking for reductions because they want the raw materials, we have not been able to pressure Canada to take strong enough initiatives to get that singled out and out of the way like many of the Nordic countries have done, who are not members of the European Economic Community, with respect to some of their agricultural produce, cheese from

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN: Denmark, fish from Norway, and fish from Iceland have gone in under protective tariffs into the EEC. There has not been a question here. And that to me, Mr. Speaker, is one of the most fundamental questions facing this Province in the next number of years, the availability of markets over and above the U.S. and the U.S. today, as most members are aware, because they have geared up for it are becoming more self-sufficient with respect to their fish and their fish products.

When it comes to re-processing we have not heard five questions in the Legislature this year on fish and fish processing. There has not been a comment or a talk about it. One of the major issues where half the value added is being added in the U.S. as it happens today which is the major market for most of our groundfish.

I can go on and talk about it and support the member when he said today about the fish freezing facilities and facilities that are needed to hold our fish and freeze our fish to get us over the glut season and make a longer season.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

That particular question to me was fundamental. I think the Premier and the government should have been put on the spot on that every day until the government finally came up with a programme, negotiated with Ottawa or wherever they got the money to go ahead with some kind of a plan this year to put \$10 million or \$15 million or \$20 million into fish facilities in our Province today.

I could not get out and ask the minister or the Premier but I think if we had had the kinds of momentum and pressure, if that had become an issue in the legislature I am sure it would have been an issue in the Cabinet, I am sure it would have been an issue in the estimates and I am sure it would have been an issue today around the Province with construction jobs. I could talk about that as an example. I have not heard a sound about some of the real issues that the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) alluded to, the Spanish picking up 5,000 tons of our fish with not one string attached. And we had six months of almost animosity develop in this Province because a foreign company planned to buy into a Newfoundland company, six months of animosity. Not a word about the Spanish picking up 5,000 tons. How many people are talking about the Norwegians? One boat down there today. Members might have seen here. She has got the St. John's Harbour filled up picking up 45,000 metric tons of caplin off our coast this year, 45,000 metric tons, the sexiest food item going today.

Norway, by the way, and I was there about five or six years ago, had a complete collapse. I mean the most in - the hon. member, do not get it confused with sex - the most in food today. In Iceland five years ago we had a complete collapse of



MR. LUNDRIGAN:

their herring fishery. They overfished their herring and had a complete collapse. Everywhere you went in Iceland they had great herring plants as the member for Gander (Mr. H. Collins) can remember, all over the place closed down. They began to develop a caplin fishery. Today the contribution from caplin in Iceland is greater than all of the rest of this species combined. And they have become one of the forerunners in the world in developing caplin.

In this Province people come off our coast and fish our resource like the Norwegians are doing right now, not a word about it, not a comment about it because we are too busy talking about this character up in Montreal or down in Bermuda or down in Panama or wherever else it is, too busy talking about some of those fools that are laughing at us from afar, rich and wealthy and getting tanned in the foreign suns. And here we are in this Province preoccupied when all the other important things are going on around us.

Unemployment in this Province, one of the great tragedies. It should be part of the discussion in the United Nations, in world bodies, world conferences. The unemployment in our Province, a disgrace in the Western World, some of which we can take the blame for. There are fifty-one legislators - there are not thirty, do not forget that - there are fifty-one legislators in this body right here. Unemployment, the most critical, the disease in your system that leads to all kinds of problems and all kinds of complications when people are without work, without challenge, degrading, downgrading, debilitating, the thing that destroys a system - I have not heard many comments about unemployment. I do not

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

even feel like getting up talking about it, because you are out of tune if you get up here talking about unemployment and talking to the legislature about unemployment. There is something wrong with it. Fifty per cent of the young people in our Province out of work today. Very little hope for the future.

All of us are raising families or got cousins or children or uncles and aunts or families or relatives and that in this Province. How many of us feel a great feeling about the future for them, about where they are going? We are doing all right. I would say most of us have reached the age where we can paddle our canoe the rest of the distance. But, Mr. Speaker, for the younger generations in this Province who are going through institutions, it is little wonder that the other day we heard that there is a higher dropout rate in our schools today. People, young people, have no feeling and no hope that there is going to be anything major happen in this Province and they might just as well sit back and relax.

Education, dropout rate, I just mentioned. Retention rate, how many times have we stood up and seriously talked about the retention rate. I do not think I am the only one who feels that that is one of the most critical problems in education. Memorial University, it used to be a point of debate. Every other year I heard a lot about Memorial, nothing this year about Memorial University. We have the foundation year over there which I think should properly, the money should be spent on secondary school systems. All that the University did, they were clever enough to encourage the governments, federal and provincial, to spend money on

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

a foundation year. Really it is an excuse for a better secondary school system. Their argument was that the students coming out of Grade XI were not prepared enough for University by and large. So build in something here to be preparatory for University. And then you put in some professors teaching those people who are not prepared enough, who will treat them not as high school students where there has got to be a more close relationship, but they treat them as people who if you do not take it, if you cannot take it, you cannot hack it.

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN:

that is your problem but you cannot afford to have that attitude in high school. MUN's Medical School, talking about education: How many people have asked questions about MUN's Medical School? I have raised a question and I publicly stated in Grand Falls and I am going to state again here now I do not think we can afford to have a medical school in our Province this day. The people were telling me in this legislature that next year we will be educating people for other countries and Newfoundland will be paying for the education of doctors for other countries in the world. That is where we have reached. We have reached a stage now where by the end of this year, I am advised but I might be wrong, that we will produce enough doctors, more than enough doctors to fulfill the medical needs of this Province. What will we be doing after that? How many dollars is it costing this year to operate the medical school? Any member know? How many dollars is it? Last year it was \$7.4 million. I am just going to say it is \$8 million. I did not bother to look up the budget and it might be \$9 million to operate, I cannot recall the university budget but I think it is \$8 million or so to operate the medical school. A fairly significant, important question that needs to be concerned with -

MR. SIMMONS:

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder can I ask that hon. member to keep quiet? After his fifteen or sixteen hours, I have forty minutes or maybe another half an hour left.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The hon. gentleman wishes to speak without interruption.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The provincial debt, Mr. Speaker, I have not heard hon. members raise any significant questions. I heard the hon. former Leader of the Opposition make a fine speech and I wrote him a note on it, on the provincial debt, a thought provoking speech. I have read one or two more speeches on that but from the point of view of questions on it - the interest rates that we are being charged, why we are borrowing in Germany, what is happening to our short-term money now that there has

MR. LUNDRIGAN: been an upward movement in the interest rates, what is happening to the turn over of the - not the turn over, the amortization of our debts that are now on U.S. books because of the interest rates. I have not heard significant questions coming on a daily basis to the Minister of Finance on that type of problem. Reforms - I think it is obvious to most members that our democratic, political institution here called the House of Assembly needs serious reforms. The time of debate, the amount of time we spend on private member's resolutions which I think is a very serious problem. This year so far with a number of important resolutions we have debated one resolution in the legislature. It is fairly obvious that we needed reform. Lack of a committee system; the only move we have made is the one on public accounts and despite all of the sort of uneasiness I think most member realize that there has been a useful job done on public accounts over a period of a couple of years despite some uneasiness because it was an innovative thing to do. It was the first time it was done. I support the member and I have spoken about it frequently internally that we need a structure of committees which is made up basically of maybe a half a dozen committees involving every member of the legislature where, when this House rises in a few days from now, that each of these committees have their role, that the committee chairman have a fair amount of authority, that members are rewarded for their effort which is a five or six month or a three or four month effort which involves a fair amount of travelling throughout our Province, which enables our population and our political system to interact, which enables us to bring back reports to our legislature in the fall - not a regular session with your legislature and the like, your legislative effort but a system where back come your committees, make your reports, your reports are tabled, debated and that type of report can form the basis for Throne Speeches, policy decisions, can help governments, can help Oppositions, it can help the public. I think that is a major form that is absolutely essential if our system is going to work. It will also enable members from both sides to work together because members do not work together. There is too much animosity and too much tension and too

MR. LUNDRICAN: much strife and too much conflict in our legislature. There is no interaction at all and this is one of the reasons the Federal system with all its heavy cut and trust still works much better than ours, because there are a whole number of areas where members interact and interrelate and work together and sit side by side and work out common problems. It does not exist right here. There is more animosity here than you have in some of the African states today.

Transportation; I am not satisfied with the fifty-fifty business but no comments in the House on it. One member kicking up a fuss and found himself instead of being supported by the Opposition they asked for his resignation. That was the present Minister of Tourism. I admire him for speaking out although I did not think he had the right to do it as openly as he should being in Cabinet because that is an essential kind of ingredient. The operation of our systems to our island communities today bothers me -

Mr. Lundrigan: nothing resolved on it yet. It is still being talked about. Is Ottawa going to drop it in our laps, even 25 per cent of the costs? CN Marine having to pay for its - given a mandate to pay its way. That frightens the hell out of me, because I can see us one of those days not being able to afford to live in this Province because of transportation costs. The fact that we have got - there is no cross subsidization in the air routes. There is no cross subsidization in the air routes, we have got to pay the full brunt of getting back and forth to the Mainland of Canada. We should be cross subsidized.

AN HON. MEMBER: What do you mean by cross subsidy?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: When somebody sends in -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: When somebody travels between Ottawa and Montreal, they should be paying higher in an effort to subsidize the route, the longer distance.

MR. ROBERTS: They do. They may not pay any more going to Toronto from St. John's -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The system of Labrador, Mr. Speaker, with the nature of having no road connections, the fact that we have not been able to negotiate a deal with Ottawa, the fact that there is, I can say without, I suppose, being too open about my former knowledge that I have, there has been an effort made to try to come up with some kind of a system to build a road, and to have the marine part of Labrador and the interior of Labrador hooked up, and hopefully going West eventually, if that were necessary, and I do not think there has been any progress on it. That to me is a major problem.

The hospital programme. I resigned my seat in Cabinet because I disagreed with the government, and I could not afford to be publically vocal without really doing the honourable thing in resigning. A year before I edged in that direction, and I remember the former Premier who quite understood the parliamentary system saying I should have resigned. And I should have, a year before I did because I was openly provocative of the government.

Mr. Lundrigan: So far we have read a number of announcements about plans and programmes and all the rest of it for hospital construction. When the Health estimates were being debated here I fully expected a full onslaught on the government on the health programme. I never heard a syllable, not a word, five or six odds and ends, and talked at the estimates, and that was the last I heard. I have watched the Minister of Health from day to day, he got hooked up on the snruce budworm two or three times because there is a bit of political kudoes for the Opposition but nothing when it came to the hospital programme.

Labrador Linerboard. I heard my colleague who is the member stand up once or twice and get a question on; I have not heard any loud, aggressive comments or statements. Three months ago the government said there is going to be an announcement in June 1978, which is now, on the Lab Linerboard. Some companies or company had made some comments and had looked at it and wanted to get involved in it and the like. I have not heard a comment. Not a question from the three or four people who are the official Opposition in this government today.

The oil refinery, every time the minister goes overseas on the oil refinery I hear another comment or a question. That is about the extent of the questions I have read on the oil refinery. These are our two big, at the present moment they are in a stalled position, two big industrial complexes, one of them worth \$300 million in capital cost, the other, I would say, replacement value of a half a billion in capital costs. Not a question. You are talking a billion dollars. Not to forget, of course, the question that we have in Labrador on the money that we invested in the shares of the CFLCo. Terms of Union with Newfoundland and Canada, Federal-Provincial relations, if you want, you can go even beyond terms of union. One of the biggest issues facing our country today. The federal government today feels as easy having Newfoundland in Confederation as they do having Texas as part of



Mr. Lundrigan: the U.S. because it is not an issue, it does not exist. It is not relevant. Ottawa feels no sweat, no pressure, no kinds of momentum coming from our Province because we are too busy fighting ourselves.

I made a resolution here one day suggesting that we would try to find ways and means to re-negotiate Term 29, which in today's value, the value of Term 29, my colleague might have not been familiar with the figures, were \$35 million a year to this Province. We are getting paid the constant \$8 million since 1958, twenty years a constant \$8 million .

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: If we got the \$35 million ,if we got the 1978 value of that particular Term, we would be getting \$35 million. And then we stand up and beat each other to a pulp because we cannot afford those services! There is where we can afford our services. No precedent. Ottawa at the political level has some receptivity to the suggestion that we re-negotiate it. At the bureaucratic level they never had any, they would have thought it was of resettlement some of those characters. And some of them up there like the Deputy Minister of Finance today is interested in keeping his hands on every buck. He is not interested in the problems confronting Newfoundland. I doubt if he has ever been here. And I doubt if he is ever going to visit Tilting Harbour or find his way down to the Baie Verte Peninsula, let alone worry about the Provincial debt in our Province. But at the political level they understand Term 29 and understand what it is about.

Federal-Provincial relationships. The need to look again at the terms of union with our Province, because obviously

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

despite all of the monies that we have had something has gone wrong with Confederation. If we are in such a hell of a mess today as we are in something has gone wrong because we have not done a very good job of paddling our canoe ourselves.

Energy; I have not heard five questions about the deals that we have concluded with some of the companies which I think are excellent. I think the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) deserves a real pat on the back, an outstanding job. And I can speak with a fair amount of knowledge about the work he has put into it because I worked very closely with him on it.

Agriculture; how many comments have we heard this year in this House about agriculture, one of our small, primary, very important industries. But when you look at the fact we are producing I believe only 25 per cent of the pork that we need and consume in our Province, and we have the only disease free pork, then there is something wrong that we are not doing more with agriculture. How many comments have we had? There is no reason for the public service to panic about agriculture and there is no reason for the minister to panic about agriculture. He will never be asked a question on it.

Mines; I hear periodically the minister, usually on the weekends on VOICM, saying they are going to drill again in this place, they are going to drill again in that place. How many questions have we had on mines? How many real big, heavy discussions and conversations have we had on mines? We have had a few questions on Buchans coming from the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). We have had nothing about

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

what is going on in Daniel's Harbour. Are they going to put in a smelter? That was one of the things that was talked about when the mine went in in Daniel's Harbour. Are the reserves strong enough now? Is the company strong enough in its intentions to put in a smelter? Are we, as a government, taking enough initiative to find out if they are going to do it? What about the suggestion by the former Premier about the steel mill in Labrador? Is that interesting? Is it worthwhile pursuing? Should the company be approached? Should the company be drawn into discussions with the Cabinet? Should the Premier report on it? Is it an issue, a steel mill for Labrador? I do not know. It seems to me to be a logical thing to have someone on a hot seat on from day to day.

Paper making happens to be an export value in this Province of \$216 million, more than one quarter of the total exports from the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. The only comments I have heard about paper making, some of the gentlemen on the spruce budworm have suggested that the reason for the spray programme is to satisfy the hungry paper mills. It happens to be two hundred and sixty of less than a billion dollars in shipping exports out of our Province. I have not heard a question. What are the markets like for paper? Are we likely to have a consistent paper industry in the future? Are we likely to have cutbacks in the paper industry? Are they planning to come in here and, you know, start to get involved in a broader utilization of the product? I am trying to do something myself about it quietly and privately. I have not heard it raised.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

What about ERCO renegotiations?

When I was in Industrial Development I struck a committee to get involved in renegotiating the ERCO deal in Long Harbour, not to brow beat them to death, not to beat them over the head because they have got an iron clad contract. But ERCO when they started out were losing millions and tens of millions of dollars. The finished product was worth - I forget and I better not use a figure - but it was worth a fraction of what it is worth today. That company has gone from a very critical loss position, technically weak position as a company, technically weak in terms of the inefficiencies of the plant, to the point where they are technically very strong with new investments they have made. They have done a fair job in becoming environmentally more acceptable to us and they are making money and they are going to make big money down the road. Now, how many questions have we had? I do not even know. I have not asked myself. I have not asked the Premier in the last six or seven weeks. I know what happened until then. I know more than the House knows about what happened up until the last six or seven weeks. How many important, sensible questions have we had about the renegotiations of that particular deal that will cost us, if we carry the contract through until 1992, I believe it is a couple of hundred million. I believe that is what it is. But I am going to throw that out because I cannot quite remember now what it adds up to as you add up your fours and then it gets up to sixteens and twenties and then you look at the fact that you are subsidizing something which you could be taking in and there is an interest accumulation on it as well if you had the money coming in or if you did not have to pay the money out indirectly through a

June 12, 1978

Tape 4293 (Night)

IB-4

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

subsidy. A fortune of money going out to a company that I think has done a fair job. I give them credit and I also give them credit by the way, Mr. Speaker, for being fairly compatible with the thought of renegotiation, of wanting to sit down to the point that they appointed several members on a committee along with several government members to look at renegotiations.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Let us look at the lending institutions in our Province, Mr. Speaker, today, which I feel are some of the biggest drags on the economic development of our Province today. DREE, and I have said this publicly before, that there is room to reconsider the DREE incentives programme, I am not talking about the DREE programmes for roads and infrastructure and the various ongoing agreements with tourism and agriculture and the like. I am talking about the incentives to industrial development where the bureaucratic red tape which takes so much time to negotiate that only competent companies with large competent staffs can interact with them; where if you happen to make one little slip like one company did in the Province, where they pre-ordered equipment that was going to take several months to get in and after the equipment was delivered the DREE people found out about it and cancelled the DREE grant because they were not suppose to make the initiatives before they made the application and the approval and all kinds of matters of this nature; where it has become almost as costly bureaucratically to operate the DREE incentives programme as the incentive is worth to the Province. The banks, where managers have told me, and I am not talking about the managers of the ordinary branches around the bays, if you want, but top management people in this city of St. John's representing the entire Province have told me that they have no mandate to get involved in risk capital, they have no mandate unless it is involved in something where there is a matter of a heavy mortgage an something which is of much more value than the mortgage or something in the housing field or something which is a well defined programme. When it comes to getting involved in business ventures or venture capital or risk capital, the real things that we need in this Province, they have no mandate and they are not involved in it. FBDB, basically the same way. As far as I am concerned the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation has tended to be more conservative than I would like to see the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation, I spell out, and I have said this publicly along with other politicians, the herring barrel in Point Leamington, the herring barrel factory which is unfortunately not going ahead because the Newfoundland and Labrador Development

MR. LUNDRIGAN: got on their high horses - having made an original decision I forced them as the minister to review it and they got on their high horses and the board turned it down again. These institutions, the lending institutions in our Province today are not functioning - the banks, the DREE incentives programmes, the FEDB and the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation - and I do not hear a sound about it.

The insurance companies - recently we had a massive fuss in the Province of Quebec when Sunlight decided to move their headquarters out of the province of Quebec. At that time Mr. Parizeau, the Finance Minister, made some significant comments about the fact that they were a drain in any event and that he was going to force them to reinvest much more of the monies into the province of Quebec. If we think that Quebec has a problem with companies taking monies out and not reinvesting it, the facts and the figures should be laid on the table for this Province. These companies have taken out tens of millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker, and they have ended up practically putting none of it back to this particular Province.

I know the former Minister of Finance, who is the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island, did make overtures, strong overtures and did sit down with several groups and boards and make complaints about the fact that the insurance companies were not putting their dollars back into the Province in an investment fashion. Perhaps the opportunities are not as great here -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And the hon. former minister said, "that is not correct, 'John,'" but what he should recognize, Mr. Speaker, is that many of these insurance companies have a charter which does not permit them to involve themselves in the kinds of venture capital and risk and so on and it comes back to our provincial debt.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. LUNDRIGAN: They put a few dollars back here but when it comes to putting dollars back into the Province in any of those risk areas or areas where there is an opportunity or a loss anticipated they do not get involved. But you just look at any day of the stock market activity and follow that fairly closely, as my colleague understands, and you

MR. LUNDRIGAN: will see many tens of millions of dollars going into all kinds of companies helping them form capital to bring about development but it is not in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to continue on because this is just a list of a few of the areas that I feel very badly about that the legislature has not addressed itself to this present year, this present session. I think it has been a wasted legislative session and I think we have been more demolitionally entered than we have been constructionally entered, beating it down instead of constructing and building it up. Like telling a guy who owns a house and has a leak in the roof, beat it down, but he would have no plan to build it up. I think this is sad indeed because there are fifty-one members here and I would say that the majority of the members on this side of the House are interested in trying to get on with the business of the people and when I



MR. J. LUNDPICAN: hear people day after day where I spend most of my time out sitting, listening, drinking coffee in the back because I just cannot be part of what goes on here, for what that is worth to hon. members if they can believe when I tell them the truth. Members saying to me that they do not want to be part of what goes on here, then I think there is something radically wrong and I do not think it is the entire system. I think it is bogged down this year. I think we have gotten off on the wrong kick. I believe that a few members of the Legislature decided they were going to dominate it and they were going to knock the Government out of bed. They have not been able to do that but in the process they have wasted a session of the Legislature. I hope it is the last session we have wasted and I hope when the Fall Session comes that we can get some reforms and we can get some stability and some difference in the way we debate; and come up with the challenges, because there are members here who can stand on their feet and think, and take their part, and take their place, like the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) did tonight. He might not be able to come up with all of the parliamentary phraseology but he has enough experience and background that he can make his contribution like every other member. That is what I look forward to, and I think the time should be long gone when a few members dominate the Legislature. Question period, two or three members; debate, two or three members; that is a mistake and maybe Mr. Speaker someday should forget to see some of the hon. members who want to take part.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the extent of what I want to say. I did not even intend to say this but I was inspired by my colleague from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): Hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, like the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) I guess I was inspired to say a few words as well. I agree that his inspiration, the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen), is a very justifiable inspiration, and I find myself in the situation where my inspiration is not nearly as inspiring, but provoking to some extent, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, if we took the member for Grand Falls at all seriously. Does he understand the Question Period, Mr. Speaker? Did he read last year's Order Paper, perhaps, by some chance? Did he read last year's Order Paper? Because just about everything he rhymed off there, Mr. Speaker, we asked last year on the Order Paper, which is the proper way and place to ask that kind of question. So that is where we asked them and we got the answers. Now does he want us to go back again and ask the same questions again so that we can prove to him that we do things the way he would like us to do them? We know the answers to these questions he has rhymed off, most of them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Since he is not minister, he does not attend the House.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Does he understand the Question Period, Mr. Speaker, or did he just take last year's Order Paper and read all the questions and then stand up for forty-five minutes and say, why do they not ask this, why do they not ask this. It was a very clever device, Mr. Speaker, because what it did was this: It allowed him to avoid taking a position on anything except the Committee structure. He did take a position on that and I would like to come back to that. But for forty-five minutes he very cleverly avoided taking a position on anything except the Committee structure and what the Opposition should be doing. Well, I have news for him, Mr. Speaker. The last people we are going to look to for advice as to how we should operate the Opposition's role is to a Government member, and I think he is aware of that.

So, Mr. Speaker, all this nonsense about the Question Period is exactly that. But I could not help thinking, Mr. Speaker, as he talked, because he is capable of much more than that and I do not know really what kind of a game he is playing. - I sat there and I listened,

MR. R. SIMMONS: I think, to every word he said and I have never seen a person, Mr. Speaker, who could mouth such a string of half-truths with such authority and muster such authority in doing it, just a string of half-truths.

He tells the House, Mr. Speaker, with a straight face tonight, he tells the House with a straight face that we have asked no questions about the financial position. Well, Mr. Speaker, unless I have flipped completely I remember asking some questions about that myself.

He tells the House he has heard no debate on the subject of the debt of the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has never been here.

MR. E. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I, myself, have spent a fair amount of time on this particular issue as have other members. Now, you just cannot write your version of the truth and expect everybody else to swallow it, hook, line and sinker. The nonsense, the half-truths, that came out of that fellow are just absolutely preposterous. As I said, he must have read last year's question paper at best.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at some of the issues that we are not supposed to have debated in this House, and I do not subscribe, Mr. Speaker, I do not subscribe -

MR. SIMMONS: He will be in here kicking up a fuss, Mr. Speaker, in a minute because I called a quorum and there were 25 in the House and he should be up there vouching that he counted the 25 at the time. Where is he now when we need him to count the House to see if there is 25? Well, we will get a quorum in a minute, Mr. Speaker. If they cannot keep them in the House, we will see that they do keep them in the House. They only kept in nine for the members' speech -

MR. NEARY: They come in and crucify us and then run.

MR. SIMMONS: Yea, exactly. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us be clear of a couple of things about this House. We have discussed, Mr. Speaker, in this session the Labrador issue - a big policy issue. We discussed the fishery to some degree. We have begun the Nordsee motion. We have tried to discuss education. We had to use the petition device to do it. The government has refused to debate that one even. We discussed tourism to some extent. We discussed unemployment using the petition device. We discussed energy and electricity rates and energy generated using the petition route. We discussed the financial position - no mudslinging there, Mr. Speaker, no scandal kick there. These are issues we discussed. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is significant that of those I just listed, only two have been debated in any depth. Your motion, Mr. Speaker, on the Nordsee is beginning to be debated in depth - the Nordsee proposal - we debated in depth over a number of Wednesdays the Labrador resolution. I say only two issues have we debated in depth, and why only two, Mr. Speaker? Very significant - very significant - because on those matters where private members had a chance to put down some issues they put down solid policy issues to be debated, and we have debated only two in the session. Why have we not debated the others to any degree? Because the government will not call the business of the country before the House. The government sat for two months before it even called the budget debate. The government sat for a long time before it called the Throne Speech debate. The real issues of the Province, Mr. Speaker, are not being debated. The question period with a 20-second answer or a filibustering minister who gives a three or four minute answer - that is hardly a debate, Mr. Speaker, I say to the member for Grand Falls (Mr. J. Lundrigan) - hardly a debate; and if he could only understand the House as well as he professes to understand the House, he would realize that the reason we have only debated

MR. SIMMONS: education in petition and he is on the record as saying that is too much, by the way. the only reason we have debated education only in petition and tourism only in petition is because the government will not let us debate it anywhere else until we got into this budget speech and now the Throne Speech, and we have been saying a few things about these subjects. I myself in my extended participation in the budget debate went through the financial position, the debt position, tourism, unemployment, the fishery, forestry - I went through a number of issues, Mr. Speaker, which I will not repeat here now obviously for obvious reasons. But the only two issues outside these debates I mentioned that we have been allowed to debate in any length are two issues that we as private members put down ourselves, because the government will not call the business of the Province. The government will not call it. When did we meet? -

MR. NEARY: They want the spruce budworm and Bill 50 for regional government.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, that is their priorities, Mr. Speaker - another bureaucracy. That is their priority - another bureaucracy in the St. John's-Avalon area - Bill 50 - that is their - where is the legislation - where is the program that we are supposed to be discussing according to the member for Grand Falls? Does he understand, Mr. Speaker, if he is so cozy with his crowd over there? Does he understand that one of the things he should be telling them in caucus is to reorient this House a bit - call it in the Fall instead of the 4th of March. My God, Mr. Speaker, I have been saying that ever since I have been here that we ought to have a fall session, and when did we meet this year - the 4th of March - is that the Opposition's fault as well or the 6th of March or whenever, Mr. Speaker? Let us be clear, Mr. Speaker, that the government sets the programs and on those days when the Opposition or the private members set the programs, we have seen to it that we discuss two substantive policy issues - the whole issue of Labrador development in the first instance, and now, Sir, Mr. Speaker, your proposal on Nordsee. That is the only two substantive policy issues we debate in this House, and it is significant that these two were both put

MR. SIMMONS: down by private members because the government refuses to put down any matters of any substantive nature. The member talks about unemployment. Well, Mr. Speaker, the last debate we were allowed on unemployment, and I remember well my colleague from Lapoile (Mr. S. Neary) last session til he was sick and tired getting up every day almost and moving a standing order 23 that unemployment was so serious in the Province that we ought to have a debate. - we ought to move aside - set aside the regular order of business and talk about unemployment, and we are

MR. SIMMONS: told it was not an urgent matter. We were not allowed to have a debate on it. We requested it almost every day of the week until we were blue in the face and sick and tired of doing so. The last debate, the last mini-debate that we had on unemployment in this House, Mr. Speaker, we had last Spring when I brought in a petition from 800 of my constituents from Bay d'Espoir on the disastrous unemployment situation there. We had seventeen speakers in that debate, Mr. Speaker, if I may call it a mini-debate. We had seventeen speakers - sixteen from this side and one from the government side.

MR. NEARY: That is the crowd who are interested in unemployment.

MR. SIMMONS: So, Mr. Speaker, for those of us who stay in the House or follow the House it is very difficult to take the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) seriously. He cannot mean what he said tonight. We cannot get an unemployment debate. The government will not give us an unemployment debate. And I hope now he will take the transcript of his speech tonight and mimeograph it or photocopy it and give it to every member of the government caucus. Because some of the things he said makes a bit of sense. The only nonsense in it is that we have been saying the same thing here for four or five years and getting nowhere with it, and therefore we will not take the blame for the very things now that he advocates. We have been asking for a debate on unemployment and we would love to have one, Mr. Speaker. Indeed, I am prepared to stop right now if the government will allow us to move a Standing Order No. 23, and let us have a debate on unemployment. In the meantime let us also hear what the government is going to do about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is his leadership speech.

MR. SIMMONS: He will have to do better than

MR. SIMMONS: that for a leadership speech,  
Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member two or three times talked about the direction. I suppose he is talking about the fact that we during Question Period on occasion - on a number of occasions we have been obliged this session - to zero in on the misappropriation of public funds, the abuse of the taxpayers' money. Now, Mr. Speaker, he talks about some people being well-tanned and down South; well, I know of people who may be well-tanned in another sense of the term, and not brown either. They may be well-tanned, but some of them are in this city who are filling their pockets, some of the people we have been asking questions about. One of the issues that came up in the Public Accounts Committee involves people who are not in the sunny South, Mr. Speaker, involves people who wish they were in the sunny South with a government back here who would not even request extradition as they have not requested on Mr. Doyle. They wish they were down there; they wish they had stayed down in Antigua somewhere when they were down there, with a friendly government like this, willing to oblige them by not even asking for extradition. But the people I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, they may be tanned, but not sun-tanned. They are being tanned, they are having their hides tanned in another way these days for getting too greedy. But they are here in this city, Mr. Speaker. And the day when I am told, Mr. Speaker, that it is not my job over here to ask the Department of Public Works how come you blew \$15 million or \$20 million without a Public Tender Act coming into play? - the day when I cannot ask that question, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a sad day for everybody in this Province. I know that is the way the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) and his crowd would like to have it, but I have news for him,



MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker. If his buddies over there whom he can still rub shoulders with are going to condone that kind of thing, then I am going to continue asking questions. He may not find them too pleasant, but I am going to continue asking them, Mr. Speaker - not at the expense, Mr. Speaker, of the other issues that are so important - but how, Mr. Speaker, can I go with a straight face to the people of McCallum or Grey River or Francois or Ramea or Burgeo or St. Veronica's or St. Joseph's or St. Albans or the Head of Bay d'Espoir, Morrisville, Milltown or Conne River - any of these communities in my district? How can I go with a straight face and say, 'The reason you are not getting a water system, the reason there are no jobs down here is because of restraint,' when I know full well that it is not restraint at all but skulduggery in government that got them where they are, skulduggery in government that blew their millions of dollars?

The misuse of public funds, Mr. Speaker, may not have got through to the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) yet, but I say to him in all sincerity, the misuse of public funds has indeed become the overriding issue with this administration. That is the overriding issue, the misuse of public funds, because it has become such a monumental, coolly calculated thing, Mr. Speaker. It permeates every area of government activity from the Special Action Group to the Rural Development Authority to the whole Department of Public Works. The misuse of public funds, I say to the member for Grand Falls, is the overriding issue. It is why we are tied up in economic knots; it is why we have such a slowdown in the economy here even moreso than we have across Canada; it is why the economy is not picking up although it is elsewhere in North America.

June 12, 1978

Tape 4297 (Night)

EC - 4

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

The misuse of public funds,

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SIMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

That is the message.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is why she is stalled.

MR. SIMONS:

We might be berated for saying it but we are going to keep saying it. Because that is the issue. You have a government, Mr. Speaker, that is so preoccupied with lining pockets that they have not got time for unemployment, either as a debating item or as a measure to solve some of the ills of this country. And if I sound preoccupied with the misuse of public funds, Mr. Speaker, it is because I run into it everywhere I turn when I am dealing with this government, everywhere I turn.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) and I of course have agreed on a number of issues over the past and I think we still do and we certainly agree on the committee system for the House of Assembly. I agree with him. As a matter of fact he must have read Hansard. He must have heard what I said, or read what I said on this subject about three or four years ago. The committee system, Mr. Speaker, and I said it again this session, the committee system is the only salvation for this House. We cannot go on like this. Everywhere else they have gone to a committee system. I was in the Nova Scotia House there a few weeks ago and they have in place a committee system. I was in the Saskatchewan House last Spring, they have several committees addressing itself to various areas of government service and the economy.

I think that we must be one of the few Houses with no real committee system in place. Ottawa has a good committee system as he himself has said. We should have one. What do we have here, Mr. Speaker? We have three standing committees of this House in place right now. Two of them headed by chairmen on the government side of the House and one headed by an opposition

MR. SIMMONS:

chairman, which happens to be myself.

The two that have been headed by a government chairman have never met, have never met.

MR. NEARY:

No, and as a matter of fact one of them has an urgent -

MR. SIMMONS:

One is headed by the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) and has been in place now for three and a half years and he has never called it together. The other one was appointed about three weeks ago to deal with an urgent matter remember, Mr. Speaker? To deal with an urgent matter. And the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has not even called the committee together yet. That was three or four weeks ago. That is the two committees, Mr. Speaker, which have government members as chairmen. And we all know what has happened to the committee that has an opposition person as chairman. The government is using its majority to boycott the Committee. We all know that is what is happening.

So do not let a government member lecture me, Mr. Speaker, about the committee system, because unless the government itself is committed to it it will not work, whether you have one committee or ten.

Last year the one committee of this House that was working, the Public Accounts Committee, had eleven meetings, Mr. Speaker, while the House was in session, eleven meetings, usually about three hours in length, eleven meetings from about January up until June. Eleven meetings while the House was in session.

Remember last year, Mr. Speaker, we met more hours in this House than we are meeting this year. Last year we met in the mornings as well. And yet with all that extended time,

MR. SIMONS: with all that extended time in the House, more hours we are meeting this year, three hours more a day on certain days, we were able to find, one - time to meet as members, and two - Hansard was able to find time to get the transcripts ready. Well on the latter point I can put you all at ease, Mr. Speaker, Hansard has told me as late as the last forty-eight or seventy-two hours that they can find time to get the transcripts ready for us. That is not a problem. It may be raised as a problem by some people but it is not a problem.

MR. NEARY: Mount Scio raised it last week.

MR. SIMONS: Hansard can take care of it.

You say the member for Mount Scio.

Yes, well he has mentioned it to me recently and he did not mention it to me mind you a month or so ago when we talked about it. His reason then was that we should get the estimates through the House and then suddenly there was a great compassion for Hansard and so on and so forth. But that is another issue. The point I make to you is that do no anybody in this House, or outside this House, be fooled by this nonsense that somehow we are suddenly too busy to meet, when we had eleven meetings last year although the House is meeting more hours. And that is why I say, Mr. Speaker, without any fear of contradiction, that the Public Accounts meeting, the only committee of this House that has worked this session, the reason it is not working now - and by the way, do not anybody be under the impression it is working, we have said a lot of nice things about it. It used to work. It does work any more. It has not worked for four months. And the reason it has not worked, Mr. Speaker, is that government members are boycotting the Committee, and I say are doing it under instructions.

Now if the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) has such a good, deep, concern about the Committee structure, I ask him to talk first of all to the members of the Public Accounts Committee on that side of the House, but more

June 12, 1978

Tape No. 4293

SM - 4

MR. SIMONS:                      importantly, to his whole caucus,  
because there are three committees so far, two headed by  
government members, neither of which have met, although one  
has been appointed.

Mr. Simmons: for over three years, and the other chaired by an Opposition member which has not met in four months. So the theory of the Committee system is good, and I subscribe to him on it. But unless the Government Caucus, and it is the Government because they have the majority in this House, Mr. Speaker, unless the Government is committed to the same sentiments as the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) we are not going to have a working Committee system.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: ... mandate.

As the member knows (Inaudible) had intended to be sort of an almost formalized things. I saw committees listed out on the wall out here ten years ago where there were several members appointed to committees, but they were not formalized structured committees. What I am talking about will take a fair amount of time to put it together.

AN HON. MEMBER: Our Standing Orders ....

MR. SIMMONS: Well, of course -

MR. NEARY: Go on boy, you are only a big bluff that is all.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I should not I suppose even entertain an interjection from the member because he did not have the courtesy to do so from me when he was speaking about fifteen or twenty minutes ago. But being a fairly reasonable character, Mr. Speaker, which is one of my problems -

MR. NEARY: South. He knows all about Las Vegas.

MR. SIMMONS: - being a fairly reasonable character, Mr. Speaker, I shall point out to the member that the Standing Orders of this House provide for the following committees. It would take no restructuring or great planning by him or anybody else. The Standing Orders already provide for a government services committee, which has never been appointed, a social services committee which has never been appointed, a resource committee which has never been appointed, and a miscellaneous and private bills committee which has never been appointed. There is a good start, if you want a place to start, -

MR. STRACHAN: You can do it.

MR. SIMMONS: while you are doing all of your planning. Haul out the roadbook, Standing Order (84), a, b, c, d, and so on, and they will give you some immediate room to manoeuvre, they will give you four or five committees which will address themselves to resources and services. There is a good place to start. It is in the rule book. All this nonsense about we have got to plan it some more, and it is going to take time is nonsense. It is there, Mr. Speaker. The Government is sitting on it, like they they are sitting on the Public Accounts Committee, like they are sitting on the Committee on Privileges and Election, and like they are sitting on the Standing Orders Committee.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Whether they are appointed or not is not the issue. And all this diatribe tonight again, Mr. Speaker, about how it is all of our fault -

MR. NEARY: Who has the majority in the House? Is it us or them? Who calls the order of business? Who calls what is debated in the House?

MR. SIMMONS: That is so elementary, 'Steve', you know, if they do not know -

MR. NEARY: He even conned the press -

MR. SIMMONS: No he will not. No the press.

MR. NEARY: He said it tonight knowing the difference hoping to be able to con the fellows up over my head here.

MR. SIMMONS: No, no. The press are above being conned by the member for Grand Falls he has tried that before. He has tried that before, but they are above being conned by that particular member, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Committee system can work, should work, but will not work as long as the government continues to be committed to its present route of boycotting the Committee system, and that is not a theory, Mr. Speaker, that I have demonstrated using the Committee that I am associated with, the Public Accounts Committee for four months we have been trying to get a meeting



Mr. Simmons: and we cannot get a meeting, although, Mr. Speaker, I fully expect we will be having one some time later this week, hopefully on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) says, the House is not working. Now I cannot agree with him on that, Mr. Speaker. It certainly is a good line for a government member to be mouthing, that the government is not working, because, you see, the people out in the country he feels automatically run to the conclusion that therefore it must be the Opposition that is not working. I happen to think, Mr. Speaker, the House is working somewhat, it is not working nearly as well as it could, and that is because most members are so anxious to make speeches about how it is not working that they do not have time to try and make it work. All right.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: Now it is working to the degree that the Opposition is keeping the government on its toes about a number of issues relating to the way they are spending the public's money. It is keeping the government on its toes about issues which, regardless of what side you take, issues like the spruce budworm issue, a pertinent issue, a timely issue, and I have used that issue and I have used the issue of the education cutbacks, without the House open we would not be able to zero in on these particular issues. It is working to the extent that the Opposition can make it work. Where it is not working, Mr. Speaker, is that the government is not bringing before the House the programmes and the legislation which are needed to crack up the economy, to improve our financial position, to get Newfoundlanders working again, and to generally improve our way of life. That is why it is not working, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: And related to that, Mr. Speaker, it is not working because the government has become afraid of the House. The Government is afraid of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the sign of a government on the run and it should not have to be like that. This government, Mr. Speaker, should have called this House last Fall or at the very latest

MR. SIMONS: in January. What did it do? He called it in March, in two weeks flat we had a budget. Very unprecedented, Mr. Speaker. Normally you would have time to dispose of your Throne Speech debate first. No, they come in - as a matter of fact they do not get the House cranked up to be called until they have the budget ready. And even when the Premier announced when the House was recalled, he indicated it was being called to deal with the budget.

MR. NEARY: He was going for a short session this time. Open her up, have a budget, close her up as fast as you can.

MR. SIMONS: Well half his plan worked. Opening her up worked. It did not occur to him, not knowing much about the parliamentary procedure, it did not occur to him that oppositions have a say when Houses close.

The government could have called the House together much sooner and of course did not, came in with a budget two weeks after it opened, then would not even debate the budget, Mr. Speaker, put everything backwards as they say, and called the estimates first, and then got on the budget.

Well all know that particular story, Mr. Speaker, and we know the reason it was done. We know the reason it was done. It did not particularly work in the government's favour but we know why it was done. The government will not call the House until it has got to because it is scared of the House, scared of the House. It will not allow the committee system to work, either by letting the present committees meet or by appointing the other committees that our Standing Orders provide for, the Resource Committee in particular, the Services Committee, social services and government services, the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. Speaker, in every other House but this one private bills are a big issue. I was in the Nova Scotia House a few days ago and I asked for - I do not think I have it with me tonight -

MR. SIMMONS: I asked when I came back for a copy of all the private bills listed on their Order Paper. I think there were seventy-two. I am talking about private bills now. Bills submitted by private members. Seventy-two private bills. Why is it not working here, Mr. Speaker? Because the government will not even allow a committee on private bills.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Change of rules.

MR. HICKMAN: I have no idea. I have no idea on that one. I have no idea. I was there. I sat in their gallery for about an hour and I got a copy of the Order Paper and on it was a list of the resolutions and I wrote for them. That is all I know about the Nova Scotia House.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well that sounds like fun. Let us have one of those.

MR. HICKMAN: The point I am making, I think the hon. gentleman would be wise to follow up on, is how many of these private members' bills ever got through.

MR. SIMMONS: I have no idea. I have no idea, Mr. Speaker. And it is a nice clever question, such as can be designed by the member because he does not know the answer but he leaves the impression that perhaps not many, perhaps seventy-one got through. I do not know and he does not know.

MR. HICKMAN: I doubt if any got through.

MR. SIMMONS: A good old legal tactic, ask the question, spread a bit of more doubt. Perhaps seventy-one got through. I do not know. Perhaps all seventy-two got through. I do not know, Mr. Speaker. I do not know. I know that a number - I would say this for the minister - a number of the private members' bills were from government members of the House. I was encouraged

MR. SIMONS: by the number that were put down  
by government members of the House.

MR. HICKMAN: Government backbenchers.

MR. SIMONS: On the government side of the House,  
of course. Yes. Members sitting with the government.

MR. HICKMAN: We should have a look at that  
this Summer.

MR. SIMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, we can - there you  
go, look at it this Summer. Look at it now, Mr. Speaker. Set up  
your Standing Committee on private bills. Set up your committee on  
resources, your committee on government services, your committee on  
social services. They are all there in the little blue book,  
Mr. Speaker, but they will not set them up. So before we get  
another lecture of half truths from the member for Grand Falls  
(Mr. Lundrigan) why does he not give his lecture to his own  
caucus because they are the crowd who are hanging her down. They  
are the crowd who will not let us have these committees. They are  
the crowd who will not let the Public Accounts Committee work. They  
are the crowd who will not call together the Privileges Committee or  
the Standing Orders Committee. So do not tell us your problems  
I say to the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan). I know you  
have them in your own caucus. But sort them out over there first.  
Get after the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), one of the  
part-time members I guess that my colleague for St. John's West  
(Dr. Kitchen) was talking about tonight. Get after him and find  
out if he can get time from his law practice to call the Committee  
on Privileges that he is supposed to have called three weeks ago.  
Do not blame it all on us. Some fellows over there who are hanging  
the dog a bit too I say, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's  
East (Mr. Marshall) and the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells). These  
are a couple of fellows hanging the dog, who will not let the system  
work, the committee system that on paper sounds good, Mr. Speaker, but

MR. SIMONS: if you have people who are setting about to willfully disrupt and obstruct and obfuscate and confuse and delay the committee system, how can it work? How can it work? Particularly, Mr. Speaker, as in the case of the Public Accounts Committee, when you have had a year going full out, Mr. Speaker. You do some things that the House recognizes were worth-while, you do some things that the public recognizes were worth-while, but at the same time things that have proven very embarrassing to the government. What do you do then, Mr. Speaker? What do you do then? You say sweet nothings about what a great committee it is, and

MR. SIMMONS: You are on record as being for motherhood and humanity and all that kind of stuff, and then privately you conspire to see that we do not have this shemozzle again in your terms. You privately conspire to see that the committee does not work, because it just might turn up some more things that might be embarrassing to the government.

Lecture -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Yea, well, what the member said about question period was not particularly new. If you read last year's order paper - if you read the questions we put down on last year's order paper about ERCO and about energy consideration, about the fishery, about health - if you read all those last year, you would have had a pretty good preview of what the member was going to say tonight, because that is how he -

MR. NEARY: questions on the order paper for the minister because you cannot get any answers -

MR. SIMMONS: Well, we got a number of answers last -

MR. NEARY: 93% of them last year. I will let you know tomorrow.

MR. SIMMONS: We have got a number of the questions answered last year, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I say to the member for Grand Falls (Mr. J. Lundrigan) having got them answered one year, of course, we do not need to ask the same questions again, plus the fact that I am not sure the member for Grand Falls understands what the question period is all about. I am not sure he understands what the question period is all about. I am not sure he understands what it is all about and there are a number of questions he suggested are good questions, but they are not question period questions - they are order paper questions or the kind of questions that I get answers to on the phone every day by calling up the appropriate department of the government. Why should I take the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, asking for a routine bit of information as important in significance it may be, I never let a routine bit of information that might take some time to collect - some statistical type information about ERCO as he suggests - I get that kind of thing on the phone every day, Mr. Speaker. We do not work when we are here, we take a spell when we are here. We work when we are down in our offices when we are researching the issues and deciding what one to ask questions

MR. SIMMONS: about. That is when we do our real - our work, Mr. Speaker, and that is when we decide what goes in the question period. We decide it by the way every day in a caucus period. Now, if the member for Grand Falls were there, he might have a -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) have a caucus every day and there is no dissension in our ranks - very united as we are - one big happy family.

MR. SIMMONS: Big happy bunch of kissing cousins - you could not believe it - you could not believe it, Mr. Speaker. We have a caucus every day and we decide on our question period right there and we decide one thing - one thing we decide, Mr. Speaker, is not to clutter it up with the kind of question - and you also decide, Mr. Speaker, I will let the boys here in on a little secret - you also ask yourself now what fellow will take the entire question period if you put this question to him. We know the Minister of Health is a man of few words, so we put a few questions to him. The Minister of Justice if we want an entertaining session, if we are a bit stuck for questions, we throw a few at him because we know he will kill most of the period answering the questions, you see, alright? We want some honest answers we ask the Minister of Transportation. We want to see somebody squirm we ask the Minister of Education, we want to watch somebody squirm. We want to see Ottawa tactfully ask the Minister of Fisheries, alright. We want to get no answer at all we ask the Minister of Environment. We want no answer at all we ask the Minister of Environment, right. We want mothers and welfare people insulted outright we ask the Minister of Social Services. We know everybody over there and we know what questions to ask everybody over there and what kind of answer we are going to get. And we want information - if we want some information there are very few people over there, Mr. Speaker, that we can ask questions of. For instance, I used to think that I could ask the Minister of Education a straight question and get a straight answer. I do not think that anymore - do not think that anymore - do not think that anymore -

AN HON. MEMBER: You never asked two questions this year.

MR. SIMMONS: Two questions - we have asked questions about why

MR. SIMMONS: the minister is cutting back and he is never given us a reason yet. That is a fair question.

AN HON. MEMBER: All that was done was (Inaudible) in a petition.

MR. SIMMONS: What is wrong with it in petition? The minister is against petitions too now, is he? I do not know why we waste our time, Mr. Speaker, they are so stunned - so stunned - so stunned - oh boy, oh boy, oh boy. What a stunned crowd we are dealing with, Mr. Speaker, absolutely stunned crowd. I just realize, Mr. Speaker, I was just looking for something else there, I just realize that .



MR. SIMONS: During the Budget debate and now during the Throne Speech debate we have yet to have any rebuttal from any on the Government side, and I have seen various devices used, some of the devices are fairly personal, but the most clever one was the one tonight when the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) asked forty-five minutes of questions and that avoids having to get on the record on anything. You do not have to say what you stand for on anything. The only thing he told us how he stood was on the committee system. That was fairly safe, a fairly motherhood type thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) How would you like to have a rebuttal with reporters on the scene?

MR. SIMONS: Oh, no, it makes fairly good copy, Mr. Speaker. It makes fairly good copy because he covered such a wide range of questions. Now, if the reporter has to deal where he stood on his questions he is going to have a heck of a time, he is going to be up all night trying to figure out where he stood on any of the issues. But, if he is going to list the items that the member referred to, well he can make up three or four galleys of copy, no problem at all.

Mr. Speaker, I realized as I went to get another item here in my file on the Budget and on the Address in Reply - I realized that all through the Budget debate which has now concluded we never did get a rebuttal. We got the kind of thing we got from the member for Grand Falls tonight and the personal stuff that we got from the member for Mount Scio (Dr. R. Winsor), and I must say, Mr. Speaker, in all sadness, I was extremely disappointed and very taken aback by that particular attack. It was one of the most vicious things that I have ever been exposed to. I do not know who wrote it, I do not think the member wrote it, but, sadly, I have to say this, it was one of the most vicious things ever I have seen, and I just really did not expect it from that hon. member. But, we saw that kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, the very low, vicious, personal attack from him and from the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), but from him you expect it, you know

MR. SIMMONS: what you are going to get from him in advance, when he is here.

But, from nobody, Mr. Speaker -

From nobody did we get on the Government side, not even from the Minister of Finance in clewing up, any rationale, any rebuttal on this whole business of the oppressive measures in the Budget, the 'sock-it-to-them' approach, the high sales tax, we heard nothing on that whatsoever, nothing from beginning to end on the Government's spending practices, nothing at all, nothing on the Special Action group, nothing even on the poison pen practice of the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) for that matter. Nothing at all, Mr. Speaker. But, that is thrown in just for kicks. But, nothing at all on the Government's blueprint, nothing on the Government's five-year transportation programme announced two or three years ago, nothing on the Province's financial position with the exception of the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) on the Government side. Nothing at all about the needs of education in the Province. So, I just say to the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) that this business of reading the list can be done by both sides.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, could we have a big hand for the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: - there is going to be a big hand over -

MR. SIMMONS: We are in the - Is the Premier talking about hands or mouth, now? We are in the custom, Mr. Speaker, of welcoming visitors to the House and I thought it appropriate we should welcome the Premier to the House albeit he does not spend very much time -

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is your Leader?

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, he is out cultivating -

MR. HEARY: Updating -

MR. SIMMONS: But his job, you see, is not to run the Government and some day the Premier will understand that his job is to

MR. SIMONS: run the Government. Some day he might understand it. He should have been here for the speech - He should get the answer in the speech from my colleague from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen), some very good advice, excellent, some very good advice.

MR. NEARY: He is not getting the facts.

MR. SIMONS: Some very good advice.

My colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, is out so that the country will get to know him better, so they will know who it is and what it is they are electing, and if the country knew that about the present Premier when they did the electing they would not have done what they did five, or six, or seven sorry years ago. That is where my Leader is right now, out getting ready to become better known to the people of this Province so that they can elect him with their eyes open this time.

Mr. Speaker, I was hoping in particular tonight that the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) who poses as knowing so much about so many subjects would have given us the benefit of his knowledge on at least one. If he had only taken -

MR. SIMMONS: Since it is the night for giving and receiving advice, I give him a little: If he would only take one of those subjects, any one of them, and just expound on it for fifteen or twenty or twenty-five minutes, let us know what he thinks on this situation. What does he think? What does the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) think should be done about the unemployment situation? Can he tell us that? What does he think, Mr. Speaker, should be done about ERCO? What does he think should be our energy position? What are his concerns about health? Where does he stand now on the hospital issue? - where he says he stood when he got out of Cabinet? Is that the issue?

AN HON. MEMBER: He voted for the Budget.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, the member for Grand Falls says he got out of Cabinet over the Grand Falls hospital, yet he voted for the Budget. Has he changed his mind on these particular issues or was it just convenient for him at the time to get out of Grand Falls because as the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) said, some people find it more lucrative elsewhere?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: The Budget vote was last Tuesday night at 10:30 P.M.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: No, we noted that the member was not here, very conveniently was not here when the Budget was voted on. We noticed that, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: I had the same problem. I am glad he has listened for forty-five minutes, Mr. Speaker, because that means he listened to the last ten minutes of his own speech and did not pick any sense in it. I have only spoken for thirty-five minutes.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Do not get nasty, now. Remember one of your lectures to us, one of your many lectures about dignity. Do you remember that one?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Give him lots of time. I believe, Mr. Speaker, if you give this fellow enough rope he will hang himself, and as a matter of fact, he has done it several times already.

Now where does the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) stand, Mr. Speaker, on the Budget? Does he agree with it? He got out of the House, Mr. Speaker, when the vote was taken on the Budget, because he obviously did not want to vote against it or for it, so he can conveniently say now he did not support it, and yet he was not against it, depending on what group he is talking to when he is giving one of his little homilies, one of his little lectures of half-truths like he gave here tonight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are on the sub-amendment, I believe. If the government does not shut her down too soon, Mr. Speaker, we will have a couple of more opportunities to speak on the main motion, on the amendment and on the Address in Reply itself, and I hope then, Mr. Speaker, sometime later this month or in the middle of July, somewhere along the line, or on the money bills, somewhere along the line in the next three, four, five, six weeks, to -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Regatta Day is a holiday.

MR. SIMMONS: - the last of July - somewhere along the line, Mr. Speaker, I hope to get back to some other issues, but I did not really intend to get up tonight - I got up really because the member for Grand Falls had made such a complete fool of himself and had unloaded on

MR. SIMMONS: the House such a diatribe of half-truths, I was afraid to let the business of the Question Period stand on the record, because if anybody went out of here with that serious notion that somehow the Question Period was for unloading a lot of academic questions to satisfy one's academic curiosity or to prove that one is asking a lot of questions although one has already got the answers to those questions by telephone and on last year's Order Paper and the year before that - I did not want anybody to go out of here with the impression that somehow a Question Period was just to satisfy academic curiosity. A Question Period is to bring the government to account on important crucial issues, and that is what we attempt and have attempted to do. All the members of this caucus over here have attempted to do it quite religiously during this particular session. They have not had a lot of success, Mr. Speaker, because, you see, we can only ask the questions, we cannot frame the answers. And therein lies the problem, and therein lies the different kinds of answers you get from various ministers as I mentioned earlier. If you want some information, you can rely on the Minister of Transportation to give you information; he also gives it with a bit of wit. If you want people who are going to duck the answer, duck the question in every possible way you ask certain other people. If you want no answer you ask certain other people. But there are few, and I say, Mr. Speaker, there are very few over there who will give you a straight answer to the question, and that is another one of the problems that we are faced with over here. The Minister of Health, except sometimes when he is in a bit of a devilish mood, will normally give you a fairly straight answer to the question. The Minister of Labour will normally give you a fair

MR. SIMMONS: straight answer. The Minister of Fisheries, apart from his usual attacks on Ottawa, would give you a nice answer if he had the time but the Question Period is only a half hour long and what can a fellow do in a half hour?

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) feels as sincerely as he indicated about this Question Period, and about the Committee system, is that to me was the thrust of his statements here today, if he is concerned about these I ask him in all sincerity to have a talk to the government caucus about the Committee system. It is the government caucus that has stalled the Committee system, they will not appoint four or five committees all together and the three that are appointed they will not let meet. Two of them are headed up by government chairmen, they have not met, the one headed up by myself as an Opposition Chairman, has not met because the government has obviously given orders to boycott the work of the Committee, so the Committee system is not working.

If the Question Period is not working I will make this undertaking to the member for Grand Falls, we will even have some more intelligent questions, even more intelligent than they have been over here if he can help us with our batting average, if he will guarantee that we will get some kind of answer, even on half the questions. And perhaps when he has nothing else to do he will go through the Hansard record for the Question Period and just have a look at those questions which were taken as notice that have never seen the light of day since. A minister takes a question as notice now as a way of getting himself off the hook and he never does come back to answer the question unless he is reminded somewhere along the road and then he takes it as notice again.

MR. SIMMONS: But I say to the member for Grand Falls that the bulk of questions that have been taken as notice in this House have never seen the light of day since.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I am pretty well out of time so with that I shall clue up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. CROSS: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: - as has been the custom from many of the other speakers, I would certainly like to congratulate the mover or the motion, the hon. the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) and the seconder, the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Clue her up. Call the adjournment. Call it eleven.

MR. CROSS: Yes, well, I will move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has moved the adjournment of the debate.

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I move that the remaining orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at two of the clock and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, June 13, 1978, at 2:00 p.m.