



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 2

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

OFFICIAL REPORT

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 3 p.m.

MR. H.R.V. EARLE: I wish to rise on a point of personal privilege. My remarks are in contradiction of a statement made by the Premier the opening day of this hon. House - that was on Wednesday, February 18 -

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): Too late I think. You should have done it on opening day, it is too late to do it today.

MR. SPEAKER: Referring to that - a point of privilege been raised at the very earliest point in time, that it is possible to do so, it should be done. But we have ^{had} this question of points of privilege many times, and I have given explanations - I have talked about it on a number of occasions, as to what can constitute the points of privilege. If hon. members - so we will not have this happening again - if they could turn to Page 96 in Beauschene, they would see that a dispute arising between two hon. members, as to allegations of fact, hardly fulfills the conditions of privilege of a privileged question. If you want to go a little further than that, and go to Page 102 - The citation 113 - You will see this - Members often raise so-called questions of privilege on matters which should be dealt with as personal explanation, or correction - either in the debate, or the proceedings of the House.

The question of privilege should rarely come before the House, and if it does come, it should be dealt with by a motion to deal with the matter, either in reparations or to impose a penalty. So questions of personal explanation - questions of different statements of fact which one member says, I believe this to be true - another one says, I do not believe it to be true, is not in my opinion, a question of privilege, and it should be raised in some other manner, rather than as privilege. Because as I said before, a question of privilege is a breaching of privilege either of the House, or of an individual. And there is usually a penalty imposed, and it should be done by way of motion, plus the fact that it should be raised immediately it occurs.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, as you know I am not as familiar with the rules of the House as I should be, but is it permissible for an hon. member on either side of the House to make statements which are a direct defamation of the character of another person, without having it reputed?

MR. SPEAKER: Well this is a hypothetical question that the hon. member is asking. The Speaker is not permitted to answer that one either. But if the question arises where somebody accuses somebody else in certain conducts just as you described - if the actual words cited are said, well then, the

matter will be taken into consideration, as to whether it is a privilege
or not. May we continue? I have said what I had to say about it. I think
we should move on to the next order of business.

MR. C. WELLS: It is a matter of personal privilege and it affects not only myself, but it affects three other colleagues sitting on this side of the House. As your Honour is aware, I have written to your Honour requesting space accommodation and your Honour and all other members will remember the last session of the House of Assembly, when the question was raised on many an occasion concerning accommodation for myself and I believe the hon. member for Labrador West.

MR. SPEAKER: Once again may I interrupt the hon. member by saying this again. I have just stated what I think is a matter of privilege of this House. I do not think that accommodation for a member is a matter of personal privilege. It is a matter to be dealt with by the Internal Economy Commission in conjunction with the Department of Public Works. It is not a matter, in my opinion, of privilege either a breach of privilege of the House or a breach of privilege of an individual to bring this question. If the House says it is a breach of privilege, then I will be guided accordingly, but I give it as my opinion that it is not a breach of privilege.

MR. C. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, if I may with respect, Sir, I submit to your Honour that a place for all hon. members to hang their hat, to speak to constituents, to speak to anybody else.

MR. SPEAKER: I have given my ruling and I have said that in my opinion this is not a breach of privilege. I can be overruled, if the members of the House wish to state so or state the question to the House, but I have given what is my opinion of whether it is a breach of privilege or not. I say in my opinion I do not consider it a breach of privilege and I will be guided by the House if I am incorrect.

MR. C. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I with respect challenge your ruling, Sir, and request the opinion of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House and this is not debatable is that the ruling of the Chair be sustained. Those in favour of the motion, "aye." Those against it, "nay." It is in my opinion that the ruling of the Chair is sustained. We will have a count if you so desire.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. WILLIAM R. SMALLWOOD (Green Bay): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a 44

petition from the voters of Brighton Island. The prayer of the petition, Sir, is for a road connection from Triton Island which is presently connected to the mainland of Newfoundland out to Brighton Island which is separated from Triton Island by a short channel.

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petitioners and ask that this petition be received by the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: We move and second it that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates. Carried.

Report of the committee - the appoint of the Address and Reply is now before the House.

HON. HAROLD STARKES: Mr. Speaker I wish to table a report of snowclearing regulations, under the Highway Traffic Act during the year 1969.

NOTICE OF MOTION

HON. LESLIE R. CURTIS: (PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL) Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce three Bills. Entitled as follows;
" A Bill, An Act Respecting The Names of Mechanics And Others",
A Bill, " An Act Further To Amend The Securities Act",
A Bill, " An Act Further To Amend The Trustee Act".

HON. STEPHEN A. NEARY: (MINISTER OF WELFARE): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce two Bills, one "An Act Further To Amend The Child Welfare Act, 1964",

And An Act Further to Amend The Department of Public Welfare Act, 1965".

HON. WILLIAM J. CALLAHAN: (MINISTER OF MINES, AGRICULTURE AND RESOURCES) Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce three Bills;
An Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Forest Fires Act",
"An Act Further To Amend The Dog Act",
" An Act Further to Amend The Wildlife Act".

HON. FRED ROWE: (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce A Bill, "An Act To Consolidate And Amend The Law Relating To Raising Of Local Taxes For Schools".

HON. AIDEN MALONEY: (MINISTER OF FISHERIES) Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce-A Bill, An Act Respecting The Payment of Bounties and The Construction of Fishing Ships".

HON. JOHN NOLAN: (MINISTER OF SUPPLY): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Printing And Stationery Act"

HON. HAROLD STARKES: (MINISTER OF HIGHWAYS:) Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, An Act Further To Amend The Department Of Highways Act, 1966".

MR. JOHN C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave that I will on tomorrow move the following Resolution:

WHEREAS there is a great deal of uncertainty as to the exact status of the project to construct a Core Chemical Plant for the manufacture of petroleum products at Come-by-Chance under that Agreement made as at the 23rd day of January, 1968, entered into between the Minister of Economic Development and Newfoundland Refining Company Limited, et al as ratified by the Government-Newfoundland Refining Company Limited (Agreement) Act, 1968, being Act No. 86 of the Statutes of Newfoundland, 1968, AND WHEREAS the Government has lent or caused to be lent to the building company involved in the project an amount not exceeding the sum of Five Million Dollars for purposes of interim financing of the project AND WHEREAS it appears that the Government of Canada is not satisfied that it has received sufficient information to decide whether or not to expend an amount of approximately Twelve Million Dollars in the construction of harbour and dock facilities at Come-by-Chance and has indicated that it would like to see a much greater percentage of the capital needed for the project invested by Shaheen Natural Resources Inc., AND WHEREAS it is desirable that members of this Honourable House of Assembly and the public of Newfoundland be fully informed of the position with reference to the Come-by-Chance Project,

BE IT RESOLVED that this House direct His Honour the Speaker to appoint a Select Committee of the Members of this House to inquire into and to report back to the House with respect to the status of this Project and progress to date including a report as to the amount of moneys spent to date on the Project, details of the expenditure of the amount of Five Million Dollars interim financing for the Project advanced by the Government to the building company and expended by it on the Project, on the progress to date of Newfoundland Refining Company Limited with respect to meeting the conditions precedent outlined in Clause 5 of the said Agreement made as of the 23rd day of January, 1968 and to report with respect to the position taken by the Government of Canada relative to the construction of harbour, dock and water supply facilities at Come-by-Chance in connection with the Project, such Select Committee to have all necessary powers to carry out its duties properly and to report back to this Honourable House during the present Session.

47

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I would like to direct to the Minister of Public Works, namely has the Minister yet been able to provide adequate accomodation for myself and the other three hon. members opposite?

MR. SPEAKER: The correct time for the question is after we have finished with the answers to questions, and before we call the Orders of the Day.

HON. J.R.SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, question number 2, on todays Order Paper asked by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. The answer to number one is that the amount is as shown in the public accounts. The answer to two is none. The answer to three is no, no interest. The answer to four is none. The answer to five is all the shares of the company. The answer to the second part of five is that there is no market value, the shares are not tradeable, and the answer to number six, is that the figures are as shown in the public accounts.

MR. J.C.CROSBIE: How can the amount be shown in the public accounts for December 31st. 1969, in the public accounts and tabled for that period?

MR. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): I repeat my answer Mr. Speaker. Question number six.....

MR. CROSBIE: That is not an answer Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): The hon. gentleman will take it as an answer, he has no choice, but to take it as an answer

MR. CROSBIE: It is a supplementary question

MR. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): He has his answer, the hon. gentleman has his answer

MR. CROSBIE: It is no answer

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, the rules are quite clear

MR. CROSBIE: It is no answer

MR. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): The hon. gentleman has his answer

MR. SPEAKER: The rule is quite clear, the member can ask a supplementary question, but he cannot demand that an answer be given.

MR. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): The point is Mr. Speaker, that an answer was given. I have answered the question fully. The information is contained in the public accounts. It is contained, not was, it is contained in the public accounts, it is as it was published. There is no change, it is as published. 48

MR. CROSBIE: Much fuller eh?

MR. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): It is not a bit fuller, it is as given in the

public accounts. That is what I said, and that is what I repeat and I have not amplified that.

MR. CROSSIE: The answer is now that it was down in the public accounts last year.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no debate, the rule is still quite clear, there is to be no debate on answers to questions. The answer is given, it is accepted or if there is no answer given then that is accepted, but there is no debate on answers to questions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, question number six, asked by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. My answer is that I recollect none, I have no recollection of any. Question number nine, again from the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Answer to the first part of it, number one is that there is no department, no department in particular. Number two, there are no votes for salaries or other expenses unless they be the votes of the Vocational - the College of Technology, and the answer to number three is the same and the situation Mr. Speaker is simply this that a small room on the ground floor, on the main floor of this building is used as a private dining room by the Premier of this Province. And such colleagues of his as he invites to dine with him, and such citizens having business with the Government as he invites to dine with him, to lunch with him rather in that dining room. The Premier and any ministers who lunch there pay the full cost out of their pocket. That is not paid for by the Government. Anyone invited to talk public business by the Premier the Government pays for, and anyone who is invited there to discuss politics, the Liberal party pays for, but the Government pays only for citizens who are invited to lunch with me when I am too busy during the day to meet them in the forenoon or the afternoon. It is not convenient for them to come to my home at night, I invite them to lunch and I usually have in the course of a week, in the five days I usually have two or three or four people who visit me and lunch with me. The Government pays for them if it is on public business.

HON. ANTHONY J. MURPHY (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): May I ask a question on that one, the Premier has intimated that there are people that attend the private dining room in Confederation Building to discuss politics as such.

MR. SMALLWOOD: (PREMIER): Yes, quite extraordinary, most amazing

MR. MURPHY: Yes, I wonder how much it is worth.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: (Premier): People also come into my office to talk politics. They come to this Chamber to talk politics, they talk politics to me in the

Sir Robert Bond auditorium, and in the main lobby, and on the front steps,
and on the street, and in my home, and in the car, and wherever I go people
have the extraordinary habit of talking politics.

MR. HICKEY: That is understandable

MR. SMALLWOOD (Premier): But not in

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: But not in the Leader of the Opposition's office I am sure, no one ever talks about it. Question No. 13 again the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, answer to the first part is yes. The answer to the second part is the hon. member for Trinity South, the answer to the third part is \$6500 a year, the answer to the fourth part I am afraid I cannot give I do not understand the question. I just do not understand the question. I have tried to understand it and I cannot do it. I do not know what this means, Is this position considered a full or part-time job apart from the appointee's normal duties as a Member of the House of Assembly? What that means I do not know, so I cannot answer it. I do not know, if, I am anxious to answer it. In case this is what the hon. gentleman is trying to find out it is not a full-time twelve month job. It is a job that is carried out primarily while the House of Assembly is opened during the session of the House. It is not a full-time job throughout the year. It is not an executive job, it is a parliamentary job, in other words, it exists while Parliament is in session.

Question No. 17, the hon member for St. John's East Extern, the answer to no. 1 is, that the building is provided for a nominal rental one dollar a year something of that nature, on the care and maintenance basis, the tenant must of course maintain the building in good condition. The answer to the second part is none. No financial assistance.

Question No. 19 the hon member for St. John's East Extern, the answer to the first part is No, an answer to part 2 therefore does not arise. The answer to No 3 is I do not know, I forgot to check that, \$7200 a year. The answer to no. 4 is Yes, the answer to no. 5 is the Liberal Association of Newfoundland which he served loyally and faithfully. I may say very loyally, very competently. The answer to No. 6 is No. The answer to no. 7 is \$1500, approximately \$1500. The answer to no 8 is Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, Department of Public Works, Department of Highways, Department of Health, Department of Economic Development, Department of Municipal Affairs, and there may be one or two other departments from time to time. The answer to no. 9 is No.

MR. HICKEY: The position was not advertised, I do not know why. Would it be customary to advertise for such a position? To fill such a position.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: It is not customary because there never was such a position as that before. That is not the only reason, it was not advertised.

Question No. 21, the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, the answer to the first part is No.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD: The answer to the first part is, "No". The answer to the second part is that it does not arise. The answer the third part is that it is not presently known. The answer the fourth part is that it does not arise, and the answer to the fifth part is, "No".

Question No. 24, the hon. member for St. John's East Extern. The answer to the first part of the question is that - the answer is, "No". The fuller answer is that the insurance is put on and carried by the operator of the hotels with the benefits payable to the Government. I do not know the answer to No. 2 because the Government did not put this insurance in effect.

Question No. 29, the hon. member for Gander. The answer to the first part is, "Yes". The answer to the second part is as follows: Chairman, Mr. Clarence Powell; members, Mr. F. Ross Young, Mr. Wilfred Reid, and Mr. Clifford Russell.

What did I say?

SOME HON. MEMBER: Wallace Reid.

MR. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): Wallace, Mr. Wallace Reid, the Deputy Chairman of the Power Commission. Mr. F. Ross Young is the member of the Fisheries Development Authority. Mr. Clifford Russell is Chairman, I think, of the Fisheries Loan Board.

The answer to No. 3 is that there is no advisory board, and the answer to No. 4 is, "No".

Question No. 33, the hon. member for Gander. The answer to the first part is, "None", and as to the second part, I do not understand the question. I quite sincerely do not understand the question, "What agreements have been made?" If it went on to say by whom - made by this, that, or the other - or what agreements have been made with the original owners and / or operators, table such agreements. If the hon. gentleman will table another question, to give notice of another question, I will endeavour to get the answer for him, but I frankly do not understand the question as it appears.

Question No. 37, from the hon. the member for Gander. The answer to the first part is that Hotel Buildings Limited is a Crown co-operation. It is a non-commercial body. It pays no taxes and is not expected to pay taxes: for which reason depreciation would be meaningless. The second question is

purely hypothetical and in any case, I do not know the answer, if it were not hypothetical. If it did concern us, I would have to go and get an answer, but as it is a purely hypothetical question, I have not bothered to get the answer, It does not count. It does not matter anyway.

Question No. 41, the hon. the member for Humber East. The answer to the first part of one is, "Yes". The amount is 25,962 sq. ft., 25,962 sq. ft. The period is five years. The rent is \$5.49 sq. ft. each year, which is a monthly rental of \$11,899.00 - \$11,899.. The answer to the second part is the space was 16,380 sq. ft. No rent is paid because it is a building owned by the Government of the Province, but lamentably, too small. They have to move out of it.

Question No. 43, the hon. the member for St. John's West. The answer to the first part is, "Yes". The answer to the second part is that this is privileged information, that it has never been the practise - I doubt that it ever will be the practise in any Government - to say what documents are or are not circulated in Cabinet.

Question no. 44

Answer to part three is No.

The answer to the fourth part is that the matter does not arise.

The answer to part five is No.

Question no. 45, February 23rd., 1970 asked by the hon member for St. John's West.

Answer is No.

MR. JOHN C. CROSBIE: Does the no apply to both parts of the question? There have been no amendments and no agreement to make amendments.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: That is right.

Question no 46, February 23rd., 1970, asked by the hon member for St. John's West.

Answer (1) No.

Answer (2) Yes, by courtesy we received it.

Answer (3) " "

Answer (4) The same as the answer to No (2) in Question 43; namely that this is privileged information. It is not and never has been and no doubt ever will be the practice to say what documents are or are not circulated to the members of the Government.

Answer (5) My impression up to the moment I came in this Chamber was that the answer would be nothing, but I have received a note since arriving in the Chamber that suggests that the Government of Newfoundland might have made a payment. I will check further on this and give the information when I get it.

Answer (6) No.

MR. JOHN C. CROSBIE: The answer to part (2) of the question. The hon. Premier said that the interim report had been received, but he did not give the date when it was received. The last part of the question asked. On what date was it received?

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: I do not recall that and I can look it up. I can find out.

Question no 50, February 23rd., 1970 asked by the hon member for St. John's West.

Answer: I have to say in reply to this whole question that important negotiations, very important negotiations are presently going on with regard to all the matters or just about all the matters contained in the four parts of this question and that it would be very much against the public interest to give this information at this present time. It may be quite in the public interest before this session is over

MR. SMALLWOOD (Premier): Question (14) ought I think really to be addressed to the Minister of Finance. Question No. (14). But if the hon. gentleman insists, I will be glad to get the information, but really I think it ought to be addressed to the hon. the Minister of Finance.

Now there are several questions, and I ought really to point out that - I could answer them all by a simple answer "no". For example - No. (3) - asked by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. What dividends had been received so and so --- I could answer, "none". Then Question no. (5) I could answer with one word, "none". There are other questions here along the same line - Question No. (25) - I could answer that question with one word - "none". There are several of those questions - and I could answer none, because of the word that is entered I think, mistakenly in all those questions - and that is the word "dividend". But if the hon. gentlemen had asked what payments had been made to the Government, it would make an intelligible and even an intelligent question. And so I am going to answer the question, assuming that what the hon. gentlemen who asked the questions meant, was not dividend, but payment. What payments have the Government received? I will be glad to table those questions as soon as I receive them - table those answers.

HON. LESLIE R. CURTIS (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, Question No. (53) is addressed to me by the hon. member for Bonavista North - as the hon. member knows, this question should be addressed to the hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. JOHN C. CROSBIE: Is not the Minister of Justice responsible for the Constabulary? Does not the Department of Justice have information showing -

HON. ERIC N. DAWE (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to Question No. (54) on today's Order Paper, asked by the hon. member for Bonavista North.

Part 1 of the question - Harbour Grace - nil. Gander - twenty. Bishop's Falls - nil. Windsor - nil. Grand Falls - nil.

Part 2 of the question - Gander - twelve - eight to be completed in a day or two.

Part 3 of the question - This part of the question is not clear to me, as I would have no indication what Units would be available in the whole town of Clarendville.

Part 4 - This question again is not clear to me, as I would have no

2

indication as to the number of Units available in all of the town of Marystown.

No. 5 - Again this question is not clear to me, as I would have no indication of the number of Units available in the Town of Harbour Grace.

But I would like to say Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would like to redirect his question, and refer to houses under the control of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, I would ^{be} glad to supply the answers.

HON. JAMES R. CHALKER (Minister of Public Works): Answer to Question No. (23) on the Order Paper of February 23rd. asked by the hon. member of St. John's East Extern.

(a) Land exchange between Bowater - the Federal Government, and the Provincial Government.

(b) \$2,491,920

(c) \$140,000.

Part two - 83,980 square feet.

Part three - 61,440 square feet.

Part four - None.

Part five - Approximately eighty-four.

Part six - \$130,000.

Part seven - None.

Part eight - We have been assessed by the City of Corner Brook for \$7,834,000 but the Government does not pay taxes to any municipalities where we have any buildings.

Part nine - The Premier and the executive council, Finance, Health, Justice, Mines, Agriculture and Resources, Welfare, Public Works - and of course the large library contained in the same building.

In answer to (39) Mr. Speaker, asked by my hon. friend from Humber East -

Part one - November, 1968 - Part two - no date set as yet. Part 3 - \$1,376,578. I will give you the answer to No. (39) now Mr. Speaker. It is actually the addition of two and three to the reply already made in Question (23) As a matter of fact, the total of \$2,631,920.

57

HON. J.R.CHALKER (Minister of Public Works): I am repeating the answers to question fourty asked by the hon. member from Humber East. November 1968 -
(2) No date set. (3) \$1,376,578.00 that is our estimated cost.

HON. W.J.CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources): MR. Speaker, the answer to question number eleven asked by the hon. member for St. John's centre. The answer to the first part is "no", the answer to the second part is - The Government expressed it's preference that tabling of documents be deferred until the completion of nego^{tia}tions in respect of matters that are now under negotiations. As to number nineteen, the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern which was answered - which was asked to the hon. the Premier and to me - was answered in part by the hon. the Premier. Number seven, the information given the hon. the Premier I can make more precise Mr. Speaker, in that the number of applications processed in 1968, is 1,257, and in 1969, 1,286. The additional departments and agencies to which applications may be referred include the various municipalities, town councils, city councils, community councils, local improvements, the wild life division of forest service, the division of Agriculture, the provincial park service, the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission, the Department of Highways, the water authority, the Department of Community and Social Development, Fisheries, the Department of Public Works of Canada, and the reason for such reference is to enable these departments and agencies to comment upon the advisability of the granting of application in the light of their particular statutory and other responsibilities.

Question number thirty-two, asked by the hon. the member for Gander, which is in fourteen parts. In answer to the first part 377. The second part the answer is none. The third part the answer is the 22nd. of July 1969. The fourth part the answer is twenty - first August 1969. The fifth part the Mines Branch Laboratory and Mines Branch personnel. The sixth part the answer is, all. The seventh part, approximately twenty per week or approximately four per day. The eighth part, in order to determine the silica and alumina content. The ninth part, the final report is nearing completion. The tenth part, (a) the answer is eleven. The tenth part (b) the answer is four. The eleventh part, approximately \$65,000. The twelfth part, is unknown. The thirteenth part, is unknown, and the answer to the fourteenth part is - the Crown. Question 58
number fourty-two, asked by the hon. the member for St. Barbe South, which is in four parts - the first part the answer is "no", the second part the answer is - still under negotiation. The third part, the answer is that the hon. members question refers to proposed boundaries, and in view of that it might

not be wise at this time to speculate. and the fourth part the answer is actual unknown, estimates range up to \$3 million

HON. F.W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the question number seven on today's Order Paper asked by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. These questions, one question in five parts actually relate to the internal administration of the university, and it would not be proper for me to answer those questions even if I had the information. I can only suggest that my hon. friend is anxious to acquire this information, then he should direct his questions to the administration at the university. Perhaps Mr. Speaker, while I am on that may I say that in order to avoid the future misunderstanding I have no desire of course at all to hold back any information that would be proper for me to give relating to the university or to any other aspect of education, but I will not answer any questions here in this House, even if I have the information relating to the administration of the university, for the very simple reason that it would not be proper for me to do so. There are some aspect of our connections with the university that it would be proper for me to answer, and I would be very happy to do so, but for example student aid which is administered by the Department of Education, teacher indentures at the university, and the Canada Student Loan Fund, all of which are administered by the Department of Education. I would be glad to answer any questions relating to those aspect of it, as for the other - this House makes block votes to the university and we do not require the university to give an item by item account of the expenditure. That is why we have an administration, and a board of regents, and a senate. I would therefore not be able to answer any detailed questions relating to either external expenditure or other aspects of university administration.

HON. S.J. NEARY (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I want to table the answer to question number twenty-seven asked by the hon. member for St. John's East Extern, and also table the answer to question number fifty-one, asked by the hon. member for Bonavista North.

HON. E.N. JONES (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question number fifteen asked by the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition which is in five parts. I have to reply that the information requested in this question will be provided in the Budget. Question number twenty-six asked by the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern, the answer to the first part of the question is not available for the simple reason that we do not charge out bills for collection to each particular job. The answer to the second part, what

57

enforcement and check measures are taken in collections? In all of our collections Mr. Sneaker, we are governed by the provisions of the various Acts governing the Department of Finance. The answer to question number forty-four asked by the hon. the member for St. John's West, here again as in answer to a previous question Mr. Sneaker, the information will be provided in the budget. The answer to question number forty-nine by the hon.....

MR. CROSBIE: Do I understand from the hon. the Minister's answer, that any questions we ask on the financial matters and details, the operation of the Government you are going to answer will be provided in the budget? Is that what you are saying?

MR. JONES: No Mr. Sneaker, I am just making an answer to one particular question.

MR. CROSBIE: Do I understand the hon. minister then is going to undertake in the budget to show us, give us all information that is asked in this question? What these bankroll drafts are, temporary borrowings and the rest of it?

MR. JONES: I have nothing further to add Mr. Sneaker.

MR. CROSBIE: In other words you will not give us this information

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: We will be watching the budget when it comes

MR. SPEAKER: Are there further answers to questions?

MR. JONES: Mr. Speaker, the answer to question forty-nine asked by the hon. the member for Bonavista North. This information is not readily available. I understand that it is in a computer and we would have to program a computer and it may take some months for us to be able to extract it in the form that the question has been asked. The answer to question number fifty-five, asked by the hon. the member for Bonavista North, again Mr. Sneaker, this information is not readily available, and it will take some considerable time for me to be able to extract the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Further answers to questions

MR. CROSBIE: Do I understand that the hon. minister is saying that he will obtain the information but it will take some time, is that the position?

MR. JONES: That is exactly the position Mr. Sneaker.

HON. E.M.ROBERTS (Minister of Health): Mr. Sneaker, with reference to question number forty-eight on today's Order Paper asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. Had the Government had carried out a survey of positions and salaries in all hospitals in the Province, and if so is that survey now completed. The survey is underway Mr. Sneaker, it is expected that the completed report of the survey will be in the hands of the Government by approximately the middle of May.

It is being carried out in conjunction with the managements of these hospitals so they will be in possession of the information before that as will the employees. The second part Mr. Speaker, the survey is being carried out by the Personnel Administration Division of the Government with the help of the Personnel Administrations Services Incorporated - a firm from - I am sorry Mr. Speaker, Public Administration Services, a firm from Chicago in the United States, Mr. Speaker, I am told that it is a non-profit organization in any event my colleague the Minister of Finance retained them, and it is my colleague the Minister of Finance to whom the question must be addressed as to the cost. There has been no charges made against any votes for which I am responsible.

SOME HON. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary.....

65

MR. H.R.V. EARLE: question. May I ask the Minister, if it is not correct that the salary classifications were completed some months ago, and why the further delay?

HON. EDWARD ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is not correct that I have said, if the hon. gentleman wishes to cast his mind back the most that has been done Sir, is to complete the surveys in respect to the public service generally, the question on the order paper, if the hon. gentleman wishes to look at it Mr. Speaker, is addressed to positions in all hospitals in the Province, Sir, and is the question to which I made the reply.

HON. ANTHONY J. MURPHY: (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, before you call Orders of the Day may I at this time, request and urge the Government to reconsider the decision that was announced by the Honourable the Premier on Opening Day.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: To a point of Order. It is a little premature there is other business before the Orders of the Day. And if the hon. gentleman will just restrain himself, he will have the opportunity to say at the right moment, what he is about to say now.

MR. A. MURPHY: Will I carry on, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: No, we have not gone into Orders of the Day, yet.

Answers to Questions is the next item on the Order Paper, then of course is Orders of the Day.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Yes, well Mr. Speaker, I was going to call motion, so we could dispose of the motions and then revert to Orders of the Day. And before your Honour calls Orders of the Day, the Leader of the Opposition of course can make his point.

I do not know, it is not to give, it is to deal with the motions that are on the Order Paper.

MR. CLYDE WELLS: Before, we do that I do have a question - is it now in order for me to ask?

SOME HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. C. WELLS: I do have a verbal question now, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Under heading Orders of the Day, we have the Address and Reply the debate and the Address and Reply. It would be wrong to go forward with the Address and Reply to debate on that address and reply before we deal with the legislation, the first readings, which are under the heading of motion. Now, what I am asking the House to do is to deal with the motion, then revert to

62

Orders of the Day, before your Honour calls Order of the Day, then the hon. gentleman opposite can raise the point that he wishes to raise that are proper to raise, just before Orders of the Day are called.

MR. SPEAKER: We are now to the point where we are calling Orders of the Day, and at this particular point, we have a verbal questions, explanations, and what have you - now the motion 1, 2, 3, etc. right on down through no. 15 are part of the Orders of Today, and they are called in the order in which the Government decided this being Monday. We can now submit this question.

MR. A. MURPHY: That is the point that I would like to make.

MR. SPEAKER: No motion before the Chair.

MR. A. MURPHY: No Motion before the Chair. So, it is just a point that I would like to ask, a large Government to reconsider suggestion that was put forward by the Hon. the Premier on Opening Day, with reference to this House of Assembly meeting afternoon and night. I think it is absolutely unnecessary, I believe, it is going to have an adverse affect on the business in this House. The Premier states we only work three hours a day, but I believe, and I think we must agree that we.....

SOME HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. A. MURPHY: We cannot have a debate - I am making a statement Sir. Well, the question is I urge, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the Government to reconsider the decision as outlined by the Premier to open this House afternoon and night I think it is absolutely unnecessary at this time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. C. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, before you call Orders of the Day, may I now ask a question? My question is directed to the Minister of Public Works and I would ask him if he would advise the House whether or not he has found office accommodation on the ninth or tenth floor of this building for myself and three other colleagues who sit with me in the House?

HON. JAMES R. CHAULKER:(MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows quite well I will certainly find a place for him to hang his hat, I have proven that since last year. My hon friend from Labrador and I feel quite sure, Sir, that we will find ample space for the hon. gentlemen concerned.

MR. C. WELLS: When Mr. Speaker?

MR. J.R. CHAULKER: Shortly.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Not on the ninth and tenth floor. The question was.....? 65

MR. J.R. CHAULKER: Oh! I am sorry.

MR. H.R.V. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, when Orders of the Day are called, I understand here from Beauchesne's Chapter 11, page 79 - Section 85. If I had the opportunity to make the correction in the Premier's remarks on Opening Day. May I read the section referred to: When the Orders of the Day are called by the Speaker, and before they are read by the Clerk Assistant, it is the practice, sanctioned, by using but not by any positive rule for members to make personal explanation or ask questions to the Government in reference to inaccurate reporting of speeches in the official record or in newspapers or in denial of certain charges made against them in the public press or in reference to certain remarks which had been misunderstood on a previous occasion and which they had not before had an opportunity of explaining, or in search of delays in obtaining returns, the incompleteness of certain returns brought down before the Order of the House or relative to the state of public services or other matters of public interest. But these remarks should be brief as they are only tolerated there being no question before the Chair when they are made. And no discussion should be allowed, when the Minister has replied to a question. Or after a member has made his personal explanation. In asking a question a member must not attack the conduct of the Government. If a member wishes to make personal explanation in reference to remarks which have fallen from another member the latter ought to be in his place.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. H.R.V. EARLE: Have I permission to make the correction, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:the right time to do it, as he has already stated, as he has already read from the Rules of the House.

MR. H.R.V. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, the correction and explanation which I wish to make has reference to the remarks of the Premier as contained in his address on Opening Day, and I quote from the unedited proceedings of the House, which I received today, this may not be correct I understand, because it is not edited. But these particular words which I take exception are these Tape 9, page 3, and the hon. gentleman nods, this sinking tub that he fought so desperately to stay aboard. That he left with the only sinking was his heart. His heart sank when he left it, and he fought and scabed and scrawbed - that lovely Newfoundland word, he scratched and scrawbed to hold on to his job in this sinking tub and Mr. Speaker, we will not bother - there is uncertain there which does not appear, actually as they missed my word, I called out, "who begged me to stay on".
1.4
Apparently that was missed. Look we may be provoked, but I am personally, - and

I am the one most likely to be provoked, but I am the one that you cannot provoke.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: What the hon. gentleman quite clearly wants to do is now have a debate. He will have ample opportunity in the debate in the Address and Reply - ample opportunity, ample scope to comment on any accusations or charges of scabbing or scraping this to hold on to his job. You have lots of opportunities, this is not the occasion on Orders of the Day. It is a misuse.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: One at a time. It is a misuse of the privilege, that the rules could allow, it is a violation of privilege, it is not privilege, it is entering into a debate. It was not an attack on a man's character. It was not an accusation, it was a statement made in debate and it can be answered in debate. That is the time and place to do it, not on orders of the day.

MR. SPEAKER: One said, I did. And some other hon. member said I did not. It is strictly as I see it there, there is no question of privilege in relation to this. I did not believe there was a question of privilege. If one hon. member makes a statement, the other says, it is not true. It is not a question of privilege, he has made his explanation, and he says these were remarks that were made by the hon the Premier were not true, and I think that the matter is closed there but, I would still point out that there is opportunity in the address and reply to clear the air in relation to any statement that was made. There was no breach of privilege, therefore the hon. member was not taking it as a breach of privilege. He is giving an explanation that is all, what the hon. the Premier said, was incorrect.

MR. H.R.V. EARLE: Mr. Speaker: I just wish to repeat that the statement is false and I will take the first opportunity to correct it.

MR. SPEAKER: But, that is the correct procedure, but not at this time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

65

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SMALLWOOD(Premier): Mr. Speaker, motions 1 to 15, Motion no. 1. the hon. Minister of Justice, to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Fire Prevention Act, 1954," read a first time,, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The hon. Minister of Justice to ask leave to introduce a Bill,"An Act Respecting Private Investigators And Security Guards," read a first , ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The hon. the Minister of Justice to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Prisons Act, 1969," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The hon. the Minister of Public Works to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend The Expropriation Act, 1964," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The hon. the Minister of Education, to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Department of Education Act,, 1968, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The hon. the Minister of Education, to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Memorial University,Act, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The hon. the Minister of Education, to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act, 1962, read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The hon. the Minister of Education to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Public Libraries Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The hon. the Minister of Education to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Education (Teacher Training) Act, 1968, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The hon. the Minister of Education to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Teachers' Loan Act, 1957," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The hon. Minister of Highways, to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Highway Traffic Act, 1962," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The hon. Minister of Public Welfare to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1962," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The hon. Minister of Public Welfare, to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act

Further To Amend The Welfare Of Children Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On Motion of the Minister of Supply to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Provide For The Appointment Of A Parliamentary Commissioner To Investigate Administrative Decisions And Acts Of Officials Of The Government Of The Province And Its Agencies And To Define The Parliamentary Commissioner's Powers, Duties And Functions" read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On Motion of the Minister of Supply to ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Department Of Supply Act, 1966-67." read a first time, ordered a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Item one. Address in Reply.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, let me with my colleagues on this side of the House congratulate the hon. members from Trinity North and St. Mary's for moving and seconding the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Sir, I would say that it came as no surprise to me, certainly as no surprise to the people of Newfoundland nor might I suggest to the Premier that both of those hon. gentlemen abide with one another and went out of their way in their praise of the Premier and the Government of today. Before getting into the criticisms, if you will, I would like, Sir, to welcome the hon. members from Burin and the hon. member from Fortune Bay. I would like to welcome them in our caucus on this side of the House. I think the Premier mentioned sometime ago that they were nudging over and we were nudging away. Anyone who has ever spent any time in a boat by a wharf must realize what nudging means where the boat nudges by the wharf. The wharf is not all that strong and it nudges away, of course, but in this particular case, I think those people really nudged over, and they came all the way. For the hon. members who are still nudging, I hope that they, too, will get the benefit of some heavy swell some day soon and they will find themselves nudged all the way as well.

Now, Sir, Speeches from the Throne are frequently criticized for being vague statements of intention. I am sure that this is not always a valid criticism, because no sensible person can expect the Speech from the Throne to give detailed information on all of the proposed legislation which might be brought before this House. However, the Speech from the Throne which we heard last Wednesday must certainly take first prize in any competition of empty, meaningless and vague

documents. Not only, Sir, has this Government run out of ideas and lost its sense of direction, but it has even run out of words and for this administration to run out of words is certainly to run out of its major asset.

Certainly we do not maintain that the length of a document indicates its merit. It is apparent, however, that the present administration is no longer able to stoke its repository of ideas and programs with its customary verbosity. It is customary, Sir, for the speaker leading off for the Opposition to deal at some length with the Speech from the Throne and I might say that this puts me in a very difficult position for two reasons. (1) I have been suffering from the flu this past three or four days and I am not over it yet and (2) I find very little in the Speech to really get one's teeth in. What can one say about such an ambiguous document which certainly lacks imagination and correction.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, we saw an administration which was already high on L.S.D. suddenly go on a salt and silica kick. This year in the Throne Speech we are to witness an administration to go on a shell kick. In one breath or out of one side of their mouth, they tell us that we are to become less and less dependent on Ottawa. Then in the next moment out of the other side of the mouth, we are told that the solution to all our problems is in DREE which is supposedly coming from Ottawa. What kind of double talk, Sir, is this? The Newfoundland people I am afraid and certainly a goodly number of members of this hon. House can only regard this Speech as another put-off.

Now, Sir, I want to make it clear that in my criticism of the Speech and after all that is one of our responsibilities, in my criticism of the Speech I want to be fair. I want to be objective and hopefully I will not exaggerate too much. I was a little annoyed, however, on looking over the first page of the document and on reading it quickly one would almost think that the courage and the intelligence and the patriotism of the Newfoundlander is in question. In my opinion, Sir, neither of these qualities must be questioned. I am sure that I speak for all hon. members of this House, when I say that our Newfoundland people possesses all of those qualities to a very high degree, and the only thing lacking is the driving force of leadership to channel those qualities in the

67

proper direction.

What does the Government mean, when it says given courage? Does it mean support for the Premier's "Develop or Perish Program." When reference is made to intelligence and patriotism, does that mean that Newfoundlanders are being called upon to give blind allegiance to the Liberal party and the Liberal Government? It is evident to me, Sir, and evident to a lot of people that this is a latent attempt to play upon the emotions of the Newfoundland people.

In the Speech from the Throne once again, we are advised that monetary inflation is now evident in the United States and in Canada. We are no doubt supposed to draw the inference that the financial mess that this Government has concocted results from Viet Nam and other world wide events. We are all well aware, Sir, of the world monetary situation and the high cost of money due to international circumstances, but does this Government really believe that the people of Newfoundland will accept any suggestion that our \$700 million debt and our whole financial situation can be attributed to international affairs. This Government must accept a large share of the blame for the fiscal mismanagement which has gone on.

Mr. Speaker, we in Newfoundland have grown accustomed to seeing our national leaders on television, sprouting forth their eloquence at Federal and Federal/Provincial conferences, sometimes preempting better television shows. We all recognize the importance of constitutional change which might be necessary so that all Canadians feel completely at home. We cannot however but grow somewhat impatient at the continuing theoretical talk on the constitutional changes while the fact of regional disparity within the nation merits nothing but sanctimonious lip service. While people talk about regional disparity, the gap broadens or widens. The saying goes, "we twiddle our thumbs, the country gets worse." We all know what the election promises were in the last Federal election and the Premier and the Liberal party of this Province were a party to them. They certainly supported the promise that the Federal Government would do away with regional disparity once and for all. In a few years such advances would be made that there would be no difference in the standard of living

7

for Newfoundlanders living in the coves or in the cities than people living in other parts of Canada. We all know how wrong this has been: We all know how false it has been and we all know, as I have said before, the gap has continued to widen.

I remember last summer, Mr. Speaker, when I toured Newfoundland. I believe it was in Placentia Bay somewhere that this old gentleman said to me, "what about this regional disparity bit which the Liberals promised to us?" I said, "what do you think of it?" He said, "as far as I am concerned, they have sent it all down here." I would say that that just about sums up what the Government is doing about regional disparity.

MR. HAROLD COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, mention is also made in the Speech of a conference to be called of persons and organizations, to whom the economic future of our Province, is of particular interest and concern. It is said that this conference will be held in St. John's in the near future, and will be the forerunner of the introduction of the Regional and Economic Expansion program.

While we recognize this step as being one of our proposals, and it was one of our proposals - we will not whine about that of course, and we will certainly support the idea. However, we cannot be blamed at this late stage, if we are less than enthusiastic about it. We have seen many large conferences before, staged on Television - the charts and maps and so on. And I would say that if the Premier really intends to let those people speak, and then listen to what they have to say - adopt some of the ideas and suggestions which they will bring forth - then the conference will be worthwhile. But I am afraid if it goes the way other conferences have gone, then it will be just another exercise and futility.

I am amazed Mr. Speaker, that all the talk emanating from the Government, about the DREE program - and I do not like the term DREE Program - however, it has been talked about as much now that we will go along with that. So much talk about the DREE program - I cannot understand why in the name of the world, the Government did not call together, municipal leaders, leaders in education, Chamber of Commerce, Community Council - all of the organizations, the Development Associations, and many of them exist across the Island, on the Northwest Coast, in Green Bay, in Gander and various places in Central Newfoundland. Why those people were not called together before - and come up with their plans - and naturally some of them might not have great work, but some of them certainly would - come up with their plans and formulate a policy, formulate a program for submission to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of confusion here. We are told that the first stage of the program is ready to be signed by April 1st. If there is a program or an agreement ready to be signed by April 1st. what in the name of goodness, is the point in bringing people in from all over Newfoundland, to offer ideas and suggestions for that. Obviously that program has been designed now, and awaits signature. We are also told that shortly after that, another agreement will be signed, a five year agreement - and evidently this

74

is the one which they hope to draw upon the wisdom of those organizations, and come up with some information which they might be able to use.

However, I would say that the whole program Sir - it is rather late to start asking people for suggestions if we really intend to listen to them, and as far as I am concerned, something should have been done long before. And we should have come up with a realistic program, taking into account, the need for rural, and well as urban development - a realistic program - presented it to Ottawa, and got on with the job.

Mr. Speaker, I have travelled this Island extensively, and it is heart-breaking when one talks with some of the people who are living now in the bays and coves, and the islands around Newfoundland - with the confusion which exists, they do not know whether the Government have plans to move them out tomorrow, or next week, or next year - To hear them relate the news from friends and relatives who have already moved to so-called growth centers - to hear them relate the difficulties which they have run into, in terms of housing, lack of housing, lack of employment and so on and so forth. It is really heartbreaking Sir, to hear so many people, so confused and so concerned over the future which is in store for them.

I think it might be worth mentioning here, that just a few days ago, we heard a release from the Mayor of Botwood, indicating his concern, regarding the number of families who are moving into that particular town, from areas around Green Bay. People who are coming in, going on welfare - very, very poor housing facilities. People who did not know why they moved, or what moved, one might say. This is indicative Sir, of the Government's resettlement program, and what I would like to see, and I am sure that hon. members on this side of the House, and many hon. members on the other side of the House, would like to see more planning going into this. Certainly, there is a lot to be said for relocating people, and certainly Sir, there is a lot to be said, for leaving a lot of people where they are - and bringing some services, and some industry if possible, to them, in those places.

As an example for instance, in the town of Gander, a part of the district which I have the honour to represent. The town of Gander, and many people down through the years have worked in Gander, and lived in Gambo - worked in Gander, and lived in Glenwood - worked in Gander, and lived in Clarendville, and Musgrave Harbour. And the same applies in Grand Falls and St. John's,

whereas people work in the larger towns, and commute back and forth to their homes where they can live cheaper, where they can live with their friends and relatives. And where they also can tend to their gardens and so on and so forth.

There is a lot to be said for this, and I am afraid that the Government has forgotten this altogether, and has taken the position that all the people must be moved to St. John's, to Corner Brook, to Gander. And then of course, you have the Federal Government, on the other hand, who have decided evidently that we are not going to keep them in St. John's either - they are going to move them to Halifax or Toronto, or Montreal.

I would say Sir, that the sooner people get their minds together, and find out what the people want, and so on and so forth - the better it will be for us all.

Sir, we are told that before this Session closes, we will be made aware of what the agreement consists of - the agreement which is to be signed, and the DREE program. And I would hope Mr. Speaker, that certainly consideration will be given to the educational needs of the Province. We certainly need, in my opinion, and I am sure all hon. members will agree - we certainly need a great amount of money to improve our elementary school system. We have, I would say, a reasonably good job ^{done} ~~than~~ our high school system, but certainly the elementary school system needs a lot of attention. And if this is not successful, of course, then the high school and University systems cannot be successful. I believe also

I believe also, sir, that much work must be done in co-ordinating the efforts of Vocational and Elementary Schools and High Schools. I believe we must forget, perish the thought forever, that all Newfoundlanders are going to go to University. I do not know what the Canadian average is, but I suspect it is in the order of maybe twenty - twenty-five percent of the students who graduate from High School go through University. Certainly, in Newfoundland it would be lower, and there is a great need for co-ordination of Vocational and High School methods at the High School level, because just as sure as day follows night, the great majority of our Newfoundland students will not be going to University. They will have to face the very competitive world in terms of finding jobs and we will certainly have to equip them with the skills so that they can take advantage of the various trades which are offering.

We all know, sir, that we are living in a technological age. Today when High School graduates graduate from school and go to a Vocational School, and qualify himself for one of the trades and hope to settle down and work in this trade for his lifetime. That day is gone. AS the experts tell us, that in the future, we can expect that a man who is qualified for a trade today might be able to work, possibly in that trade for three or four years. At that point he will have to be prepared to upgrade himself and certainly if he is required to upgrade himself, then he is going to have to get the background from his High School and Vocation School training to enable him to do that.

Mr. Speaker, we see in the Throne Speech an attempt by the present, by the Liberal Government, to take full credit for the establishment of the Saltfish Marketing Board. All hon. members know that the legislation has presently required a House of Commons which will, when passed, permit the setting out of the saltcod marketing board. We, on this side of the House, have been screaming for this for years, and so has the fisherman, and I would say, sir, that the six noisy Tories who went to Ottawa last year, certainly had a great influence on pressuring the federal government to finally seeing the light and finally setting up this board which should prove to be very beneficial to all of our fishermen.

We have some doubts, of course, about the effectiveness of the Board. We will not, now, until the Board is established and we see some of the things which they plan to do. I am sure that the hon. Minister of Fisheries will agree with me that one of the primary crises of the Board, one of the first things that must be done, is we must try and preserve some space in our inland waters for our fishermen, for inshore fisherman. Maybe that will not be a function of the Board, but certainly if the Board is going to be effective, then we must have some fishery preserves for our inshore fishermen.

Secondly, I would say, sir, that for the fishery to be successful, to make a comeback, then we are going to have to equip our fishermen better. We are certainly going to have to educate them and to, in the merits of producing a quality product as opposed to quantity. This will be a very difficult problem, no doubt, but unless we do a lot of work on this and come up with a better product, then the whole thing might have been for nought.

No doubt the Minister of Fisheries has got some ideas of his own, but I would suggest that certainly we must think in terms of the fisherman as being the man who goes down to the sea in ships, as it were, who goes in the boat and catches the fish, brings them back to shore, and then the fish is taken over by some processors, whatever you might call them, and the fish, processed under sanitary conditions, under conditions which are conducive to protecting the product, and producing a good edible and marketable product. There is much work to be done here, and only by producing a quality product can we ever hope regain the markets which we have lost down through the years.

Sir, the Speech also makes mention of off-shore mineral rights and the fact that the Government has engaged a legal authority to advise them of this matter. Naturally, we are almost interested in this type of development and, of course, we are all gravely concerned about the possibility of pollution. There is no need for us, at this time, to mention the sad thing which happened in Placentia Bay last year. It certainly is indicative to all of us that where industry is permitted to establish, then every possible precaution must be taken to make sure that none of the waters or the air or the soil is polluted. There was too much confusion, Mr. Speaker, in our opinion. There was too much confusion over that particular issue. There were months and months and months before the Provincial Government or the Federal Government

178

moved. I suppose the Provincial Government took the position that it was a Federal Government responsibility. But, sir, whose responsibility it is does not matter. It certainly does not matter as far as I am concerned because if we are living in Newfoundland, then we have a responsibility to Newfoundlanders. If it is the jurisdictional responsibility of level of government, certainly the Provincial Government has the responsibility to make sure that they know what is going and that they take steps to eliminate any pollution such as we saw in Placentia Bay.

Mr. Speaker, in view of what has happened off the coast of Nova Scotia the past couple of weeks, and in view of the reports which are emanating from the Buring Peninsula in regard to oil pollution, makes us all wonder where we are going. The fact that we have a refinery at Holyrood, certainly should make us aware of the distinct, the very distinct possibility of pollution in that particular area, if something should happen to one of the tankers coming in.

Looking ahead to Come-by-Chance and the refinery there, certainly with the large tankers coming we should be very much concerned. And I would hope that before this session of this hon. House is over with that the minister responsible would be able to table this House--the information of all members, just what precautions the Provincial Government has taken and what they plan to do in co-operation with the Federal Government to make sure that never again will we have a Placentia Bay and Nova Scotia and the condition that we have on the Burin Peninsula right now.

So much for pollution of the sea.

We have all heard of the pollution of the Exploit's River. We know that there is a certain amount of pollution in all the rivers. We do not know possibly what is causing it. We certainly do not know yet how to remedy it. At least, I have not seen the Government come up with anything.

I believe, sir, that the time has not only come, the time has passed, when serious consideration must be given to this, because in our opinion, it is necessary to close the plants down, and close them down for some time, and certainly that has got to be done if the sources of pollution in our inland waters and other waters and soil is to be prevented.

We all must take heart from the efforts which are being made in the United States as defined by President Nixon in his State of the Union address some time ago. They made a terrible number of bad mistakes in the states in years gone by in their mad dash for industrialisation. We should have learned from their errors then. We certainly should have learned in recent years, but if we did not learn from that, well, then let us certainly learn from what they are doing now to try and prevent further pollution and what they are doing in their efforts to eliminate existing pollution.

MR. COLLINS: Sir, mention is made of inflation, and the Government plans to fight and curb inflation. I think it is generally agreed that the Federal and Provincial Governments policy to fight inflation has been a colossal failure. The first effects of the pollution which they have adopted us to, is to create more unemployment. I do not know what the unemployment rate is in Newfoundland today the figures which are provided by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics are confusing and surely not broken down to the extent where we can determine just what the picture is in Newfoundland, but I would say that it is in the order of 20 to 30%. I remember just a little while ago taking a little drive from Gander down around what we call the loop, to Gander Bay to Carmanville, Straight Shore, Musgrave Harbour, Ladle Cove, Lumsden the peninsula Wesleyville, Valleyfield, up Bonavista Bay to Centreville Hare Bay, Gambo. Mr. Speaker it is very difficult to find a person who is working. It is not very difficult to find many many people praying to you to want to see if a job can be found in Churchill Falls or some other place.

I suspect that this is similar to conditions which obtain in other sections of the Province. Certainly the unemployment rate is very high and certainly the government policy to fight inflation, to curb inflation is creating more unemployment. This is done, I suppose for two effects, one, is to cut back in government expenditures which is fine in Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to cut back in government expenditures in Newfoundland this year or for a godd many years to come.

We have all seen and heard a great deal about the prices and income commission which has been established or resurrected in Ottawa. We all saw the meeting which took place in Ottawa a while ago, staged on Television. There was a committee of business leaders and government leaders from across Canada, all of those were very much concerned about the inflationary pressures which now exist. Mr. Speaker, it struck me, as being a rather poor exhibition on behalf of our government leaders and our business leaders. They seem to, certainly the business people seem to have come to the conclusion that there was a need to hold prices keep prices where they were, where they are now. And if the government agrees that this would be a good step. But, Sir, for big business, and when I say big business I mean big business, the big business houses in Canada, who marketed food, package the foods, and so on and so forth. For those people to agree to price restraint and hold the line, possibly beginning the first of May or the first of April does not mean too much. Because it is only for them to raise their prices here and there a little between now and then and they can buy enough whereby they can certainly hold them for one year. Many people have called me during the past two or three weeks, when

when I say many, Mr. Speaker, I mean many people dozens and dozens of people, indicating to me that the price of beef has increased as much as ten and fifteen cents in one week. Then last week it went again about another four or five cents there is every indication from the big packing houses and the wholesalers that the price of beef, I am using beef as one instance, as one commodity, has every indication /that it is going to go higher which means that beef will probably be selling around the first of April by a \$1.75 and \$1.80 a pound. So it is certainly not much of a burden on the big business houses to hold the price beginning April the first, because the price has already been up there. It was said at that conference that for the methods which they agreed to adopt for it to be effective in holding prices and in fighting inflation then it would also be necessary for labour to hold the line in terms of their demands on government and on business.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how we can hold the line on old age pensioners any longer. I certainly do not know how we can hold the line on welfare people and I certainly do not know how we can hold the line as far as the minimum wage is concerned. Most of our people have been receiving increases in their pay during the past year and two years, and certainly we cannot afford to expect people to work for \$1.25 an hour for another ten years. I am hopeful before this session is over that the provincial government will see fit to raise the minimum wage and certainly make it equal pay for equal work. What I mean by that is women should be paid equal pay with men if they are doing similar type of work as the men do.

On page four and five, on pages four and five, the Government while admitting the falling off in economic activity say that they are quite confident that 1970 will bring a distinct improvement in economic conditions and they list the following reasons. It will be a better year for salt fish producers. I do not know what they mean by this. Another summer like we had in Labrador last year there will be no fish produced. Exports of herring will be out. More employment at Churchill Falls, and we go on with more employment opportunities in Come by Chance and Stephenville and Hawkes Bay and what have you. We are hopeful, Mr. Speaker, those plans come to pass, we are certainly hopeful that Come by Chance will become a reality the establishment of the mill and the other refinery there. We certainly hope that Stephenville will get going and that the great sawmill and lumber complex at Hawkes Bay will get going and we are also hopeful that we will find other integrated sawmill and pulp mill operations established in areas in Newfoundland such as Botwood and Cander and other sections where we have unlimited supply of

80

raw material. Mr. Speaker, just about all of page 5 is devoted to housing. The Government is concerned over the lack of adequate housing and now tells us that the solution to the problem is shell housing. Last year Sir, I think it was last year, or the year before, recently anyway, all of our housing problems were to be solved by the establishment of two factories, one at Bay Roberts and one at Stephenville. We did not believe that at the time, we, naturally hope that this would be the case, but we also knew that it was not to be the case, and I think that time has shown that the establishment of these two factories while they have been doing a considerable amount of work they have not been successful in solving the housing problem of the Newfoundland people.

However, the suggestion of shell housing if we can get Central Mortgage and Housing money lenders to go along with the idea of a person living in his house and completing it afterwards it is a very fine concept, it is nothing new, it has been done in Newfoundland for years, and we would hope the Government really makes a strong and determined effort in this direction and hopefully that housing will be supplied to the people who need it. I would say also that there is certainly a need for review of the rents which are being charged to people who are occupying subsidized rental units. A person for instance today making \$500 a month is certainly not in a position to be able to erect a house under the national housing act standard. He has not got the money, he finds it difficult to get enough for a down payment and were he to have a down payment he is not making enough to carry on his payments over the months and over the years but still they expect that man if he occupies a subsidized rental unit to pay the Government a \$150 a month. I would say, Sir, and in fact I would strongly suggest right now and request the Government to take a good hard look at this and bring those rates down to more realistic level to provide people in the lower and middle income groups can take advantage of that type of housing.

Mr. Speaker, there is very little said in the speech about transportation policy, or of tourism. All Newfoundlanders I am sure are greatly concerned about what is obviously a move by Canadian National to curtail all operations in this Province. It is noted that the Minister of Transport for instance, has established a commission to study and report to him on transportation problems on the South Coast. Of course, that happens to be the Minister of Transport's district. I would like to see, and I would like this House to go on record as requesting the Minister of Transport to have a thorough study of transportation done all over Newfoundland.

MR. H. COLLINS: Not only in terms of what Canadian National are providing or what they are not providing, or what they propose to do, but in all aspects of transportation because if this Province is going to develop, if we are going to develop our tourist business and so on and so forth then the key very likely lies in good transportation facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I touched just now on pollution in our rivers. I remember, and why I remember it was only a few days ago that I read it an article in Sports Illustrated concerning the North Atlantic salmon. All of the members will remember that last year when the Tourist Developments report was tabled in this House it was indicated that sports fishing industry in Newfoundland brought between three and four millions of dollars to the economy of this Province. That was for 1968 I suspect Sir, that the figure for 1969 will certainly be as great as that and possibly greater. I do not know how many hon. members are aware of the fact that the North Atlantic salmon, the salmon which come into our rivers and spawn and go back to sea again - this is the fish which is bringing many of the sports fishermen to Newfoundland. We do a fairly good job of promoting it in the States, and Europe and the mainland of Canada, and of those \$3 or \$4 million which did come in it was mainly by people who came here to catch North Atlantic salmon in our rivers.

This Government operates a cabin on the Gander River which is in my district, where they quite rightly I suppose entertain prospective people who might be enticed to come to Newfoundland and invest money. Certainly people who would come in here and have some fishing and go back and give a good report. It will be noted, I do not know if the appropriate department kept records or not, but it will be noted that last year the heaviest fish caught on Gander River was seven pounds. I doubt if very many fishermen on the river ever caught their limit. Now Sir, I can remember about five or six years ago when salmon on that river, and other small streams in that area were caught weighing in the order of twenty-eight and thirty pounds, and it was no problem at all to catch ones limit.

Some research is being done on salmon, not as much as we would like to see. Certainly very little research is being done by Newfoundland, and possibly we are not in a position to do so but, we should certainly be pressuring the Canadian Government into doing more research than they are to establish just what is happening to our North Atlantic salmon. I suspect Sir, that the reason for the smallness in size, and the reduction in numbers

82

is due to several reasons possibly pollution, certainly partly due to inadequate protection, and while I agree that the Federal Government has responsibility for protection, certainly if the rivers and the salmon mean so much to us then the Newfoundland Government has responsibilities to insure that proper protection is afforded the fish when they enter the streams.

Certainly there is a need for hatcheries to produce the spawn for restocking our rivers. We found that in Maine in the United States, and all parts of Canada restocking has been taking place over the years. We have made no move in this direction. I think the time has certainly come, if not long past when we should be making a move in that direction. However, supposing we were doing all we could in this respect, it seems to me and according to this report that possibly there are more salmon destroyed, or not destroyed but caught in the waters off Greenland, and the Danish fishermen are catching more salmon and having a greater effect on the poor quality, poor size and small numbers of salmon returning than anything else.

Now I realize that this would be a problem for international discussion, and international agreement, but certainly we cannot sit idly by and hope that the Canadian Government will be doing everything for us. I think we should make sure that the Canadian Government will be doing all in their power and if that Government cannot find that they can reach some solution, some agreement with the Danish Government then possibly economic sanction should be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in my duties if I did not make some reference to the district of Gander, the district which I have the honour to represent in this House. However, my remarks will be short because hopefully during the session in discussing legislation, and in the Budget debate I will be able to deal more extensively with some of the problems which we face. I suppose that ^{not} unlike the rest of Newfoundland some of the main problems, certainly Botwood is the need for industry of some sort to provide jobs. I am hopeful that the minister responsible is making every effort still to revitalize the port, take advantage of the facilities which have been provided there in terms of docking and warehousing. We all must be very much aware of the dilemma in Bishops Falls. The possibility of the phase out of the railway and I am sure that the people of Bishops Falls are hopeful, and certainly I am, and certainly our member of Parliament is that the Premier's meeting recently with railway officials will bear some fruit and certainly will mean something to the

continuance of the railway operations in the town of Bishops Falls.

In Glenwood we are very fortunate in that we have a very successful woods operation going there. However, many of the workers, and I am sure all Newfoundlanders are concerned about the progress which is being made in terms of automation - buying new types of equipment which is doing away with the need for employing men. I do not know if there is much we can do with this, but certainly it is necessary that Government and industry take a look at this because, there is not much point Mr. Speaker, in us rapping all of our natural resources by machinery if none of our people are to gain any benefit from it.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many people in Newfoundland have been disappointed with what the speech did not contain. Certainly there was not much there to give much encouragement to the Newfoundland Constabulary. Certainly there was very little to give any encouragement to the hospital workers in Newfoundland. We have been told that this will be taken care of as the session progresses - I can only say that I hope that is true.

Mr. Speaker, that just about sums up my few remarks on the Address and Reply and I now have the pleasure to move, seconded by the hon. member for Fortune Bay that the following words be added to the Address and Reply - that this House recognizes the failure of the present Government to deal with the financial and economic problems which exist in Newfoundland and Labrador today, and consequently no longer has confidence in the present Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The question being before the House is that the Address and Reply be amended by adding the words as follows; That this Houses recognizes the failure of the present Government to deal with the financial and economic problems which exist in Newfoundland and Labrador today, and consequently no longer has confidence in the present Government.

Is the House ready for the question on the amendment? Shall the amendment carry? Those in favour "aye," contrary "nay." It is my opinion that the "nay's" have it.

MR. H.R.V. EARLE: With regard to the amendment I wish to make these few remarks, is it too late?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Too late, too late

MR. SPEAKER: I waited, I think considerable length, ^{of time} maybe I was surprised but there was no debate on the amendment, but I did certainly hesitate and wait, and I asked was the House ready for the question, I received no word so consequently I put the question and the matter is now closed.

MR. CALLAHAN: (Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I hope I will not take too much of the time of the House Sir, but there are a number of things that I should like to refer to in respect to the Speech from the Throne, in respect to some of the observations that have been made concerning the Speech and items in it. Before I do that, I should like to make reference in the beginning Mr. Speaker, to the mover and seconder of the motion that a committee be appointed to draft the address in reply. These two hon. members, the hon. member for Trinity North and the hon. member for St. Mary's, are two of the finest persons I know, and I should also like to say that as the successor in office to the hon. the member for Trinity North I find it hard to find words adequately to express my gratitude for his many kindnesses to me

HON. WILLIAM N. CALLAHAN (Mines, Agriculture & Resources): The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, said it was unusual, I think that was the term he used, that two former members of the administration, should move and second the Address in Reply. And he went on to give his deduced reason for it.

I think Mr. Speaker, that it is not precisely unusual - the unusual nature of the procedure - the participation of those two hon. members that actually caught the attention of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I think he probably was surprised, and not too pleasantly surprised at that. Here are two hon. gentlemen, with fine records of public service - obviously, neither spineless nor mindless, Mr. Speaker. His very presence on this side not alone their fine speeches on Wednesday, and what those speeches contained - two hon. gentlemen, whose very presence on this side, flings back across the House, I think, the allegations, the fear and the frustration, and domination that have been heard.

Mr. Speaker, I hope these actions of these two hon. gentlemen on Wednesday, have in fact, put to rest, the myth and the lie that has been put about to that effect. I would further say, Mr. Speaker, that we have heard quite enough of that kind of thing. I suggest that a man's integrity, his courage, or his honesty, and his independence, and the measure of them, are matters for each man's own conscience in this House. And I would hope seriously, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of the House, and the dignity of the House, and the dignity of hon. members of the House, that we have in fact heard just about all that we are going to hear of that kind of silly and stupid charge.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Humber East says, "not yet" - and that may be a measure of his appreciation of the House. But I will say this Sir, that no member of this House should have to defend his character, or his virtue, against any other member of the House. And the kind of thing Sir, that we heard on many occasions recently, in respect of, and including opening day. In respect of the motives or intentions, or the character, or the courage of members, I think, is out of place. As I say, I hope we will not hear of it again.

Now Mr. Speaker, there is another comment that I would like to make at this point, because I had some small responsibility for it last year. And

that is to say to the Editor of Hansard and his staff, that the first result of their work in this Session, in my opinion, is quite excellent. The publication of Hansard in this form was begun last year, in the interest of a better and more up-to-date record of the House - for the information of news media, for the information ultimately of the public. And in the interest of accuracy, and I must say that the first product of this Session is quite excellent document, and I think the House will agree that a word of commendation to the Editor and his staff is quite in place.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am bit appalled at the pessimism of the Leader of the Opposition. He took to reading long sections from the Amulree Report. I suggest that he could have come upon a much lighter document in point of time. He perhaps could be considered the spiritual descendant of a gentleman who once sat on this side of the House, who some twenty years ago, voiced, almost precisely, the same fears, the same apprehensions, that the Leader of the Opposition voiced here on opening day, using the Amulree Report to bolster his case.

I think I have said this before Mr. Speaker, but perhaps bears repetition, that you either are convinced of the future of this Province, or you are not. And if - and I hope it does not - but if the degree of pessimism I hear from certain quarters, from time to time, is a valid indication of the deep-seated feeling of the closely held feelings of certain people, then I wonder if they really in fact, feel that we do have a future.

The Government certainly have Mr. Speaker, I would be very quick to agree with that. But seriously, I have to say Mr. Speaker, that if one does not believe - Let me go back. We either stand still or try to hold on to what we have, relatively speaking, or we try to improve them. We have already lost the best part of a hundred years, in relation to other Provinces in Canada. We are that far behind. I do not think I need to hammer home the argument, that unless we catch up, our people will find more desirable places to live.

But we either attempt to catch up, and do in fact, catch up - and believe that we can catch up, or we do not believe it. And that may be a very useful separation, Mr. Speaker, of the sheep from the goats. And pessimism at this point in time, aside from being totally unfounded Mr. Speaker, because it certainly the position the Amulree Commission found, has no more relationship

to the position as it is today, than black is white. I have read it, Mr. Speaker. And those were the days of half-pay for the Civil Service - those were the days, when the Government had roughly, thirty cents on the dollar left of its revenue, to spend. The position today, is in the area, I would think, about seventy, or seventy-five percent. The Civil Service are certainly not anticipating, nor do they need to anticipate, may I say, a cut in pay - The Civil Service is growing - it is being up-graded, the Speech says. And the Civil Service indeed Mr. Speaker, can look forward to a situation that in relation to the situation in the 1930's, when the Royal Commission sat, is indescribable.

Now there is no basis Mr. Speaker, for the kind of approach that the Leader of the Opposition has taken, except perhaps a purely partisan, and political basis. And I would say to the people of this Province, that what was said here the other day, in such pessimistic terms, should be regarded in that light.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech makes reference to the problem at Argentia, quite properly so. And I have noticed one or two comments - there has not been very much said here, but there has been comments about the Argentia situation. And the editor of the Evening Telegram took it upon himself to observe that if the Government had applied itself to the problem at Stephenville, and was going to apply itself in the same manner, to the problem of Argentia, then - and I quote the words "The Argentia people will need more assurance than that performance".

Now maybe Mr. Speaker, that the writer of that editorial, is not very well informed, and has not been on the West Coast recently. Or if he has, I have to wonder whether in fact, he was portraying the situation as it is - Indeed he was not. And Mr. Speaker, in order to indicate to the people of Argentia, who certainly need some encouragement at this point, and in order to dispel the kind of discouragement that arises from that kind of comment.

I should like Mr. Speaker, quickly and not in detail, and not completely, but in a general sense, just list some of the activities that have occurred, and have come about at Stephenville, in the three years - it was officially three years on the 31st. of September, since the property was turned over by the American Airforce. The hon. gentleman opposite Mr. Speaker, is crying in the wilderness, and I will be glad to discuss Atlantic Brewery, any day

now when it becomes a quite viable industry - and begins again, as it is going to do - to employ people in my district at Port-au-Port.

Mr. Speaker, rather than get side-tracked, let me say this. The first move the Government made, was to appoint a corporation - the Harmon Corporation, to care for and maintain the property, and to deal with perspective industry.

The Government activated the hospital, which is one of the finest hospitals we have in this Province. It was located at Stephenville, but was badly needed, and now the facilities became available at no cost - and made it possible to have a depot for the Department of Highways, for that whole area - for maintenance and operative work.

An agreement was made with Air Canada, whereby the Airline agreed to continue for at least five years to use Stephenville Airport. And I might say that the agreement was necessary at that time, because people had an impression - not unlike the impression perhaps people have now, of Argentina - that everybody would move out - the place would become a ghost town. And I can assure you Mr. Speaker, it never has been, and certainly is not now, a ghost town.

There was established there, a heavy equipment school. This Government put out a million dollars, which was recovered - at least most of it, I understand, from the Government of Canada - and purchased heavy equipment, and set up a school to train heavy equipment operators. You do not hear very much about it Mr. Speaker - You hear that people are not trained - You have so many men that could get jobs, if they were trained. And that little school at Stephenville, has trained in about two years, a little over two years of operations - nearly five hundred men.

and I have the recent report from the school which indicates that between seventy and eighty percent of those men are known at this moment, Sir, to be employed. Very many of them at Churchill Falls and a fair number in jobs on the Island replacing men who have moved to Churchill Falls. I suggest that that is one of the success stories of the recovery of Stephenville and one of the success stories in respect to the training of our men in the Province for useful employment. It is going on, of course.

There also was located there the Stephenville Adult Centre and this is another operation, Mr. Speaker, which I commend to the gentlemen of the news media. They want something worthwhile to write about. They might well take a very close look at what has happened in Stephenville over the past three years. What has happened, Sir, is that growing numbers of people and this year up to, in excess of 1,000 men and women are being fitted either to go into employment or to go into trades' training. In many cases, these are people who have dropped out of school - well some did not get into school. The vast majority with nothing at all in the way of high school education. These people are being made employable and they are being employed. They come from all over this Province and they are being given the opportunity of employment through being able to meet the criteria and the standards.

They are there from Labrador, Mr. Speaker and, of course, the hon. minister has now launched the operation of a school of this nature in Labrador, in addition to those which have been operated as well on Bell Island and on the Avalon Peninsula. This was the start of that program, Mr. Speaker, and as I say it is a fantastic success story, when you consider that out of every ten men in this Province on short-term assistance in any of the past several years, nine of them have no high school whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. Only one according to the statistics, according to the information taken from applicants, when they apply, nine out of ten have no high school.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think anyone has to use his brain very much to realize that a man today without a high school education which is little enough does not have very much chance of being employed.

With the Government's assistance, Mr. Speaker, there was established in the Stephenville area at Aguathuna, the Sea Mining Corporation Plant. There was established the Alcan Wire and Cable Plant which is supplying the cable for Churchill Falls. There was established the International Fisheries Plant, which has been an experimental plant ~~but~~ is now turning out herring for human consumption. There is the Atlantic Design Homes' Plant, which the hon. member from Gander mentioned and with the housing situation the way it has been, there has been a temporary suspension of the operation, but I understand from the management that it will not be long before it is back in operation again. There is the formula feedmill, Mr. Speaker. There is a heavy equipment depot. There is the brewery which my hon. friend mentioned and which we think will be back in operation very soon. There is a co-operative supply depot. There is a community stadium which serves the whole of Cape St. George and I think recreation is certainly part of the community requirement. There is a Newfoundland Forest Products Sawmill, which is a nice tidy operation. There are two dairies. There are sport facilities available. There is an iron works. There is the Mohawk Sports Equipment Plant and, of course, this House at the Government's request has approved a guarantee of \$53 million to get going there one of the biggest linerboard mill in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that this will be or can be duplicated at Argentina. What I am saying is that the next time somebody wishes to consider what this Government may attempt to do with Argentina, when he considers what has been done at Stephenville, he may well feel that it is not by any stretch of the imagination an accurate to say that the Argentina people will need more assurance than they might get from the performance of Stephenville. I think, indeed, that the people of Argentina would be very pleased, Mr. Speaker, as would any community in this Province including St. John's and Corner Brook and the other larger ones to have the infusion of industry and activity that has occurred in that section, in the most important section of Port au Port district.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed something else in the Evening Telegram which in case it might cause some confusion, it might be well to mention here and it again was

with reference to the Speech from the Throne; particularly in reference to the section of the Speech dealing with the possibility of new iron-ore development in Labrador. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the first part of the reference dealt with a particular and rather detailed expansion and then it went on to refer in a general way to a possible additional expansion.

The Evening Telegram went on to speculate that this second reference might be and I am quoting, " to an associated development in nearby Quebec; presumably the Mount Wright Project which is so involved with the proposed Labrador-Quebec road." I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is not to be presumed or assumed that the reference was to an operation in the province of Quebec. Indeed I was rather surprised to find the Throne Speech referring directly to a matter about to occur in the province of Quebec. I suppose it could happen. It certainly would not be usual.

Now the hon. member for Labrador West said something. I did not quite catch it. I take it that his reference had to be to the matter of the Labrador - the proposed Labrador highway. Let me say three things. I think I know what the hon. gentleman said, Mr. Speaker. I would like to say three things about it. One thing is this. Perhaps there are four things I would like to say. One thing is this: that the officials in the Quebec government whom I know and who have some responsibilities in that area have estimated what that road would cost and our Department of Highways have confirmed as a rough estimate and the money we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, is in the neighbourhood of \$60 million. The second thing that has to be said and it is in relation to that is that, if any government, this Government or any government of this Province were to set out to spend that kind of money in another province, they should be thrown out. Yet this is what was proposed to be done at the beginning, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier has told this House on several occasions of his discussions with the Prime Minister of Quebec. I think he has made it clear that a proposal could be arrived at and considered bringing in the Government of Canada. The Minister of Highways and the Minister responsible for Transportation to my recollection made this very proposal many months ago to the Transportation Commission, when they visited St. John's. The Transportation Committee in the House of Common, I believe. Is that right? Now that committee have recommended

that proposal. Now that is one thing, Mr. Speaker, and we are very happy about it. We have played a part in it too. Not in the reckless and unrealistic suggestion that we should go and build a road, Mr. Speaker, in Quebec, but in the proposal that perhaps something should be done and could be done, if the Province of Quebec are willing, because if they are not, then there is no future in it. If the Government of Canada are not willing, there is certainly no future in it, Mr. Speaker, because the idea would be that they would pay most of the cost.

SOME HON. MEMBER: The hon. gentleman..

MR. W. R. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman will have his turn. Essentially unless it is a joint proposal, there does not appear to be much that can be done about it at this time.

Now the second question that arises has to do with the plans of the Quebec Cartier Mining Company in Quebec, so the House will be clear on it, Mr. Speaker. In the month of November the Quebec Cartier Mining applied to this Government through the crown lands division of my department for a one year permit to use a right-of-way over some twelve miles of our territory so that they could get easily across the Quebec border to Mount Wright wherefore the next year and this was in November, they would be doing some exploration work and feasibility studies to determine whether there is at Mount Wright a good reserve of iron-ore and whether it is feasible to attempt to extract it.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that we agreed quite readily. We issued the permit and Quebec Cartier Mining Company are in fact using Labrador City at this point in time as a base or headquarters in respect of their explorations and their feasibility studies at Mount Wright. That is what that particular matter is all about, Mr. Speaker, and I hope it is clearly understood because all they are doing is putting and I suppose they have done is used parts of and added to an effective bush road in order to get access over the Quebec border to Mount Wright with equipment and men and materials.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to deal very much with the regional development program, the Dree Plan, because my hon. friend the Minister of Community and Social Development will be fully informing this House, Sir, in this Session in that regard.

But, I did hear a couple of days ago, and I am sorry he is gone, because perhaps, I misunderstood him, and it would be better perhaps, if he were here, he might be able to stir the matter up. But, I am almost certain, Mr. Speaker, unless my ears absolutely deceive me, that I heard the hon. the member for Fortune a couple of days ago on the radio say that he was fed up with Arda, and with Fred, and with Dree, and he went through some pain to ensure that everybody understood how fed up he was.

And we have also, of course, had the suggestion from time to time, ARDA as such, has not done anything in this Province. I would simply like to say, in fairness, that the effect of the program into the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, that two particular programs in this Province, which have been invaluable to this Province, and will be for many years to come, exist because of the ARDA Agreement. Perhaps, the hon. gentleman opposite is not well informed, I do not know. But, the fact is that our Provincial Parks are built and constructed on the basis of a cost shared Arda Agreement, from which the Government of Canada puts in fifty percent of the Capital Cost. And I suggest that no hon. member here in view of representations, I have and I think, I can judge from them Mr. Speaker for new parks and various parks - no hon. member here will denigrate the Provincial Parks or attempt in anyway to play down their value both to the Tourist Industry, as is referred to by the hon. member for Gander and in terms of pure recreational for our own people. Last Summer, Mr. Speaker, we had 1,200,000 on our thirty-eight Provincial Parks, and we would have had many more had the parks been bigger, and there been more facilities, had there been more parks obviously. And we are now expanding nine ~~xxx~~ parks, and building one new one near Port Aux Basques, at the Codroy Estuary in order to take care of the visitor overflow there. So, we are not completely unaware, Mr. Speaker, of the Tourist Industry.

These, parks in fact are the underpinning as the Tourist Industry, along with our Wildlife, these two elements, I think, demonstrably are the essential elements - and the Tourist Industry we have in this Province today.

The other program, Mr. Speaker, of which I am told - and I have seen quite a number of those who benefited in this year, in various parts of the Province. But perhaps the single most beneficial program in agriculture, that we have in Newfoundland, is the Community Pastures Program. I think the House should know, if it does not know already, and hon. members will realize that. Here again this is an ARDA Program, a program under ARDA where we have twenty-two parks operating and we have others planned. My hope is that we can get an extension to the agreement, which is due to run out, I believe, fairly soon, in order to keep putting in the extremely valuable pastures, which would not exist, I suggest, certainly not in their numbers, if we had to pay one hundred percent of the cost.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits are obvious, I think, the benefits to communities where we do not have the problems of roaming animals; the benefits to farmers who really do not have the land nor the where-with-all to have their own winter feed. They can pasture their animals for a very small fee, with full insurance, with full protection, with veterinarian services and all the services which go with it - from May until October, eating, as we could say, our grass, and then putting them on their own land or out to slaughter or whatever their choice, or feeding them on their own cut grass during the winter and possibly supplementing it.

I have been asked a question, Mr. Speaker, as to what the fees are. The fee for full-grown cattle, adult cattle, is five dollars for the season and for calves one dollar, for sheep a dollar. Mr. Speaker we estimate that the feed value for a steer in a season is about seventy-five dollars for which (in addition to all the protection I have mentioned) the farmer pays five dollars. So it is a very valuable program. I think, if we are to have any future in agriculture, this is one of the essential elements in it.

So that when the hon. gentleman says that he is fed up with ARDA, fed up with FRED and fed up with everything else, I just wonder again if it is not just another bit of pessimism or petulance which, on the basis of the facts, is not too well justified.

Mr. Speaker, the question has been raised on off-shore mineral rights and the attendant problem of pollution due to oil spills and that kind of thing. Let me say in respect to off-shore mineral rights that we have been dealing in two areas. We have been dealing with the Government of Canada and we have been dealing with the five Eastern Provinces and with the Joint Mineral Resources Agreement which was signed in 1964, initially between the four Atlantic Provinces and then

95-A

the Province of Quebec joined in for obvious reasons. And under this agreement Mr. Speaker, the ministers of the five Provinces, long prior to the Federal Government proposal over a year and a quarter ago, were preparing ground rules, if you like, in respect of the division, the establishment of boundaries, to turning points in the division of off-shore areas which might be ~~completely~~ contiguous to one province to another.

Into this situation came the Prime Minister's proposal in December 1968, wherein the Government of Canada in the first instance assumed jurisdiction of our off-shore waters, and in the second place, drew around the coastal lines of provinces, particularly around the coastline of Newfoundland, and the coastline of Labrador, what we refer to as Resource Administration Lines. And the offer and it was well publicized at the time, the offer was that within these lines, whatever was there, whatever might be found would be one hundred percent provincial revenue. And of course, a hundred percent provincial administration. Outside the lines it was proposed that it would be totally federal jurisdiction and administration, and that in addition to that, any resources, any monies, any revenues accruing would go fifty percent to the Government of Canada, and fifty percent into an national pool to be divided up among the various provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I think, no province prescribed to that because all provinces have been considering their positions. We have been considering ours. We have commitments to our partners in regard to mineral resources agreements. One thing the province did do was that at a very early time in relation to the Prime Minister's proposal we went to the joint General Resources Committee and said that we will not discuss this matter further unless this happens - that we separate the two questions, the question of jurisdiction and the question of administration. Jurisdiction may go on for fifty years in the courts - we do not know, and it is an important issue as everybody concedes.

On the administrative side because we are so involved with our coastlines, with the problems of pollution, with all the other problems we wish to have a say in administration. So to bring the House up-to-date, Mr. Speaker, the jurisdictional question is separate, and as the speech says, will be taken up as a legal question, with the best advice possible.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question?

February 23rd. 1970 Tape # 28

MR. W. CALLAHAN: I think, the hon. gentleman will have his turn, Mr. Speaker,

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: I know, I will have my turn. But, will the hon. the Minister permit a question - that is all I am asking?

MR. W. CALLAHAN: Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Did not the hon. the Premier announce that he received Mr. Trudeau's Proposals?

MR. W. CALLAHAN: The Premier announces, Mr. Speaker, that we have obtained good legal advice, we think the best legal advice available. And Mr. Speaker, we are proceeding in the meantime with the jurisdictional or the administrative side, while the jurisdictional side will be handled in a legal way as it should.

When we come to, Mr. Speaker, to the other side of the problem that has been raised, the problem of pollution, and certainly it is a very frightening problem, everywhere we look today, you can pick up the newspaper, or look at the television, we are advised today not to eat peanuts, we are told not to drink coffee, do not drink beverages, do not eat this, and do not touch that, and it is getting to be a jungle, in many respects. In this particular one, Mr. Speaker, let me say this, that we have been very much concerned with this problem for a number of months - which does not get advice. And the best advice we have and it was the basis for proposal last week at the Federal Provincial Conference, is that the first step that must be taken is some kind of national preparedness plan that will locate all the experts and all the expertees, the knowledge, the equipment, the technical know-how available, so that as soon as something happens, this can all be brought together at the seams.

MR. CALLAHAN: And even granting that Mr. Speaker, there is still the question, that nobody really knows how to deal with this kind of problem. And so the second position we have taken is that there must be mounted a major research effort. And because it affects off-shore areas, where at least in respect of navigation, and fisheries - the Government of Canada have a very major responsibility. We have proposed to them that this be a national research effort.

And quite frankly Mr. Speaker, because we are the Province with the longest seacoast of any jurisdiction in Canada - because we are an Island Province, to a large degree. Because the tanker fleets of the world sail by our coast, and we are stuck out in the middle of the Atlantic, way out in comparison to the rest of the country. And there is no way that you can stop bulk carriers from roaming the seas - so it is kind of useless to do what the hon. member for Gander seemed to be about suggest - he made a great brave approach. He said we may have to close down the plants - or maybe we will have to close down plants. We had to close down one last year, and I will say more about that in a minute. But that is not the answer. The answer Mr. Speaker, is not to close oil refineries, or bar bulk carriers from the sea, or any of these things. The answer is that there must be research - there must be methods - there must be safe architecture, naval architecture. There must be safe navigation - there must be the development of better methods and better technologies than we now have to prevent these things. And also better methods of coping with them, when they nonetheless happen -

SOME HON. MEMBER: Will the hon. the Minister permit a question?

MR. CALLAHAN: And this involves - this involves as well - I would really like to finish Mr. Speaker. If I answered all the questions, I would not get done, and I prefer to finish before six o'clock.

But the third point Mr. Speaker, is because the international fleets are international - because we do not have any control and Canada basically, does not have control - steps have to be taken in an international sense, to try to get some agreement on principles in respect to these things.

Now the hon. member for Gander mentioned, as I recall, Long Harbour. He said there was pollution in Long Harbour, which is so. I again have to say that I cringe a little, when I hear people say that Placentia Bay was polluted. Placentia Bay Mr. Speaker, is the biggest bay we have in Newfoundland,

9
98

and it is simply an untruth, maybe a careless utterance, to say that Placentia Bay was polluted. The fact is, that a section of Long Harbour, absolutely was polluted, and more of Long Harbour was certainly affected. It is not true that months and months and months went by, before anybody did anything. And it is not true that it does not matter whose responsibility it is.

Now let me say this Mr. Speaker, that before that plant went in operation, this Government refused to agree to its going into operation, until the best experts, and the best advice were available, indicating that it was safe. Now I will say it again Mr. Speaker, so that it does not get garbled. That before that plant went into operation, this Government declined, and I think I can say, refused to agree to its starting up, until the best experts and the best advice, told this Government, that it was safe to agree to the start.

Mr. Speaker, one can say what one likes - one can say what one likes. I have many letters Mr. Speaker. I have many letters, and they are in a very safe place, that I suspect that copies of them will be tabled within a very few days, in the House of Commons at Ottawa. And they will be tabled here, Mr. Speaker. But not before they are tabled in Ottawa. It is a matter of courtesy since the correspondence to a large degree is between the Government of this Province, and the Government of Canada. That is quite correct, Mr. Speaker.

The question is responsible, and I am trying to find the exact words, the hon. member used Mr. Speaker. "Were that perhaps the Province took the position that the Federal Government were responsible, and therefore, did nothing.' Now obviously there is so much you can do, there is so much that is required to be done. And in this case, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government were into this thing quite early. They have the experts, and they have the responsibility, and at least momentarily, the jurisdiction. And there is nothing short of setting up some kind of major research establishment, and quickly hiring on experts and scientists, and all the other people who would be required - and assuming jurisdiction and administration, which is already invested in the Government of Canada - there is no way that this Government could have done more, than be in very close communication of both the Company, and the Government of Canada. And this certainly was done.

Another comment the hon. member for Gander made Mr. Speaker, is that, and I am quoting him, I think, correctly. We will see tomorrow. That there

J.F.

is pollution in all our rivers. And that again Sir, simply is not true. It is said, we hear it very often - it seems to get great prominence on the broadcast media, and in the newspapers - but it is not so.

Now, when I say that, I do not mean to say that we do not have any problems. We have had a problem since 1909 on the Exploits River, which was made worse when the Buchans mine started. We have had a problem in Corner Brook, since the mill started up in 1925 - In any event, it is a long time Mr. Speaker.

Now these problems have been there all that time, and now suddenly they have been discovered. But they are not recent problems. And the answer is not necessarily, I say again to the hon. member for Gander, to close the plants down - there are other methods. And these methods must be enforced, and this precisely is why Mr. Speaker, we have - and this goes back to something else the hon. member said, that I have just referred to. We have taken the position that in respect to the Canada Water Act, which some provinces say, is unconstitutional. Some provinces, if I pun one's water down - some provinces feel that it is completely unnecessary. We have said to the Government of Canada, and said quite publicly - that the Canada Water Act is welcome, that we will meet it - we will mesh with it. We will co-operate with the Government of Canada in its implementation in every possible way, that can benefit this Province - and we intend to do that.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of water. The hon. gentleman again mentioned, Atlantic salmon. Here again it is not just a question of the technicality of jurisdiction. We do not have the establishment to do the things that perhaps we could do better than Canada could do them, I do not know. But again it is not true to say, I think it is public knowledge, quite public knowledge, and has been for some years - the Government of Canada have been transplanting specific salmon in our rivers. It is quite public knowledge, and everybody should know that the Danes are fishing in an area off the Greenland coast, which is their national territory, and presumably, by extension, their national waters. I am not suggesting that they should clean out the Atlantic salmon resource, but I do say that this is within their waters, and all we have to do, to realize what it means, is to suppose the Atlantic salmon resource were in our waters, and our fishermen were fishing there. And then you would

JCD

get an idea of the magnitude of the problem for another country to change them. This is the situation.

So Mr. Speaker, efforts that can be made, in that regard, are being made. I think quite recently, there was some agreement on principles, and there may indeed be a convention in respect to Atlantic salmon. There may be an agreement - I hope there will be. But it is not the kind of thing that this Government certainly can do very much about, and it is something that is very difficult to handle, because it does lie by extension within national waters of the country that is mostly being blamed.

In respect to Atlantic salmon generally. Of course there is some pollution effect. There are other things that we are luckier about - there are some countries, and I hope it does not spread here, but right now, in Europe, and for the past two years, particularly in Ireland - there has been a very serious disease outbreak among Atlantic salmon. And I do not know what the result might be - we cannot find anything here, but it is not impossible. In all the Irish rivers Mr. Speaker, and it appears at the moment, the best advice is that perhaps, it is something that is in the water - it is a fungus - causes all kinds of disfiguration in the fish. Our hope is that it is a local problem, and that it is not transmittable to Atlantic salmon stock. But it is there. Research is being done on it, as it is on so many other problems of this kind.

But essentially Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for fisheries, is a responsibility of the Government of Canada, and we do make very frequent approaches to the Government of Canada - we talk on an official level all the time. We are concerned about the question of protection - we are concerned about the business of re-stocking, although so far in this Province, at least, it has not been a very attractive venture economically. But we do continue to try Mr. Speaker, and I should like to assure the House of that.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly. Briefly Mr. Speaker, a word about my district, and I expect I will have more to say, and more time to say it later on. But I think there is no question Mr. Speaker, that that district has made a very substantial recovery. I think it can only improve the start of construction - in a sense, it has already started - on the Melville - linerboard mill - will almost double, I think, the numbers of people employed by perhaps, the end of this year, over the number employed, when the American base closed.

[02

So that Mr. Squeaker, in economic terms, is certainly progress.

We have like every other district, one or two problems. The hon. the Minister of Highways, has been with me and in the district to see them, and I hope he will be able to do something about that in the present year - present calendar year. The hon. the Minister of Health - the colleague is aware that ^{we} have a particular medical need, and I hope something will be done about that this year.

And finally, the one thing Mr. Speaker, that I have been harping on for two or three years here, the question of communications - telephones - It appears we now finally are getting some progress in that regard. So I have left these things for last - but Mr. Squeaker, aside from the general problems, that I suppose every district has, and that every hon. member could complain about - perhaps we are a bit fortunate, more fortunate than some - in some particular respects, not as fortunate in some others. But by and large Sir, we look forward to the continuing industrialization of Stephenville, and to the development of the Port-au-Port peninsula - as I think it can be developed. It is the bread basket for the Stephenville industrial area.

These two things together complimentary - will provide I think, an excellent future for the people of the Port-au-Port district, and by inference, by spili-over for many many people, generally on the West Coast.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

APPLAUSE:

MR. STEPHEN NEARY (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, may I join with the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply, to the most gracious and inspiring Speech from the Throne, heap upon them, praise for the forthright manner in which they have summed up the merits of that excellent blueprint, of the Government's intentions for the days ahead.

Perhaps Mr. Speaker, the greatest compliment to Her Majesty's Speech, that came implicitly, if not expressed in so many words, from the hon. Leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition himself. Possibly Mr. Speaker, he was rather dazzled by the vast importance of the post, to which he points out himself, that he inherited. I am a little bit dumbfounded by the wide ranging scope and importance of the concepts he just heard from the Speaker's chair. He found himself unable to find a single flaw in that fine Speech. But since he found himself left on his feet, in the picturesque game of musical chairs, that seems to characterize the current search for a leadership moses of his

102

party. Since he was the one that was left on his feet, Mr. Speaker - he felt that he must say something - anything. And he launched into the usual incoherent, unsubstantiated nonsense about personal abuse, spoils, welfare recipients, and even my own hard-hit district of Bell Island.

It being now 6 o'clock, Mr. Speaker left the Chair until 8 P.M.

109



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 3

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

HON. S. NEARY (Minister of Welfare):

Having disposed of the Opposition I shall not in the interest of time retrace my steps but will simply carry on as though the recess did not occur. There is one point however, Mr. Speaker, that I want to refer to very briefly. This seems to be an annual thing with the Opposition. They keep harping on welfare recipients and the hon. Leader of the Opposition on opening day could not resist the temptation of his predecessors. Just to set the record straight Mr. Speaker, -I want to point out to my hon. friend that only one fifth of the budget of my department is spent on short-term social assistance or what used to be known as able bodied relief.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Does that include the long term as well?

MR. NEARY: No, that does not, this is short-term social assistance. Long term recipients of social assistance of course are widows and orphans, the sick, the disabled, the handicapped and so on.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Roughly twenty percent

MR. NEARY: Roughly twenty percent.

SOME HON. MEMBER: What is the other eighty?

MR. NEARY: The other eighty, well I am just coming to that Mr. Speaker, what my hon. friend omitted to point out was that this department looks after homes for the aged, school for the deaf, blind children, the childrens home on Water Street West, for severely mentally retarded and physically handicapped children, the boy's home and training school at Pleasantville, the boy's home and training school at Whitbourne, the girl's training school at Waterford Bridge, unmarried mothers, widows, orphans, foster children, neglected children, the unemployed, adult probation services, juvenile probation services, norther Labrador service which looks after our native population, missing persons, and also miscellaneous counselling and rehabilitation services.

What my hon. friend has failed to comprehend Mr. Speaker, is that we cannot turn back the hands of technological change. Yet, when more and more people become unemployed through automation and new technology, become unemployed through no fault of their own, my hon. friends seem to begrudge them the bare essentials we are able to provide to them in the way of food, clothing and shelter, and in this Province, heat out of the slender funds that are available to my department for this purpose.

Now Mr. Speaker, in commenting upon the motion that is presently before this House, I would not attempt to guild a lily which needs no gilding.

but would confine myself to three of the wide range of subjects treated in that speech delivered to us last Wednesday afternoon by Her Majesty's fine new representative.

First Mr. Speaker, there is the promise of a vast conference, a mobilization of brain power of this Province to make certain that we round up in the interest of our people at the very beginning of this eight decade of the twentieth century every idea, every thought and every plan to strengthen our utilization of the opportunities afforded by the new Federal Department of Regional and Economic Expansion. Surely Mr. Speaker, this search for two way communications, this all Province approach to an all Province problem gives the lie to those who talk about dictatorship in the present Government of this Province. Coming at this time Mr. Speaker, this great conference - this rubbing together of the best minds of our Province will produce sparks that will light the way for us throughout the whole decade ahead.

MR. J.C. CROSSIE: Sparks, you will need

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we know the kind of sparks that the hon. gentleman can stir up. We saw him in action last November.

MR. CROSSIE: And you are going to see him again.

MR. NEARY: Out of this conference Mr. Speaker,

MR. SMALLWOOD (Premier): And he licked every time, again, and again,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend may be sitting on the side legally, but I am sure he has a moral obligation to his constituents and I do not think he sought the authorization of those who voted for him when he ran under the liberal banner to sit on the opposite side of the House. Now Mr. Speaker, out of this conference can come directives and how we can step up our gross Provincial product so that there will be more for all of us in this Province to share. Out of it can come clues as to how we may increase employment on this island against the tide of production technology advance, which sees unemployment increasing elsewhere.

Out of it also Mr. Speaker, can come clues as to how we can live up to the opportunities provided by the salt fish marketing board and improved methods of fishery. Of processing fish, of transporting and distributing our product. Another glorious chance to provide thousands of jobs for thousands of hands in one of the few remaining industries where the relatively unskilled can still earn a decent livelihood once the obstructive cork of marketing failure has been removed from the industries bottle neck.

105

Secondly Mr. Speaker, as one who has been deeply involved in trade union activities, and as one with whom the wheel of labour is still consuming deep personal interest, I would applaud the promise to remove from our legislation the stigma imposed some years back on one particular international union. This I welcome Mr. Speaker, as an indication of this government's sincere intention to establish and maintain in dialogue with the representatives of organized labour so important to the good industrial relations in this Province of ours where such large numbers are already mobilized into unions, and so many more will be in the years to come.

Finally Mr. Speaker, my third point I would like to speak on, in my present responsibility for the administration of social assistance I see wonderful and healthful changes to be wrought through the new type housing program that our Province has been able to sell to the Federal Government. As matters stand at present Mr. Speaker, few young people can afford to buy homes at present usurious mortgage charges. Their only alternative is to rent from millionaire landlords, such as doctors, lawyers, and a few unethical business men who hide behind.....

SOME HON. MEMBER: Do not look at me now

MR. NEARY: My hon friend obviously takes accention to the lawyers again Mr. Speaker, but I say that the only alternative for these young people is to rent from millionaire landlords, doctors, lawyers, and a few unethical businessmen who hide behind tax evading corporate names to torture every red-cent possible from their unfortunate victims. Canada's most productive Province... Did I hear a voice crying in the wilderness over there?

MR. HICKEY: Would the hon. minister permit a question

MR. NEARY: The hon. minister will permit a question

MR. HICKEY: On the subject of housing, I wonder would he inform the House as to who inspects welfare housing at the moment. Does his department inspect it, or just who does the inspection.

MR. NEARY: Obviously Mr. Speaker, since we sat in this hon. House last the hon. member for St. John's East Extern has become an expert on real estate, and I am sure Mr. Speaker, that he knows the answer to that question. If he is referring to houses within the city of St. John's my hon. friend knows full well that it is the city council that is responsible for inspection, not only houses that are occupied by recipients of social assistance, but for all the houses within the boundaries of the city of St. John's.

MR. HICKEY: But Mr. Speaker, what I meant was on behalf of the department. 106

MR. NEARY: Now Mr. Speaker, if I may carry on

MR. HICKEY: He is evading the issue

MR. NEARY: And my hon. friend also knows Mr. Speaker who goes to see these houses before they are occupied by recipients of social assistance.

MR. HICKEY: I think I do

MR. NEARY: The only difference is now Mr. Speaker, since my hon. friend was a social worker, that now we have trained social workers:

SOME HON. MEMBER: Take that, is that not really something eh?

MR. HICKEY: Where do they get all the training?

MR. NEARY: You see Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of years, in the short time that my hon. friend has left us there has been a lot of changes made, and we are getting more trained people all the time.

As I started to say Mr. Speaker, when I was so rudely interrupted Canada's most productive Province has recently brought in legislation to curb the activities of these modern shylocks with their exorbitant rents, their advanced deposits on rentals, even on door keys and every possible excuse for exacting a pound of flesh from the all too spare bones of the working poor. Even Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend

MR. HICKEY: Sure that is a poor excuse. Tell us more. Do you know any more jokes like that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to carry on. I am sure, Mr. Speaker that the small print larceny in their wretched leases that I spoke about is hitting at a real sore spot with my hon. friend from St. John's East (Extern) and my hon. friends from Humber West and St. John's West and my hon. friend who represents the district of Burin.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Not Humber West.

MR. NEARY: Humber East (Laughter).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously my friends are beginning to have pangs of conscience so if I may be permitted to carry on. Under this new special housing program, Mr. Speaker, I hope that there will be scope to deal with my own constituents on Bell Island who are so dreadfully handicapped on the local mainland by the high cost of even the ferry commuter rates. Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that those of my constituents who wish to do so, who wish to move to their jobs instead of having to make an expensive double trip across the Tickle every day will be enabled either to move their present homes to sites on the local mainland or will be given special consideration as buyers of the new type housing which will get its start in legislation to be presented in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, with the challenge of the agenda listed in the most excellent Speech that we have in front of us, who on the floor of this House could chicken out on the proposal to double from three to six hours set aside for debate. On this matter, Mr. Speaker, of housing alone this recognition in our Province of the urgency of providing for all our citizens the means to satisfying one of the basic physiological needs at the bottom of national's ladder, the need for decent shelter - which one of us on either side of this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, would hesitate to buckle down to working a mere extra three hours a day to alleviate the stress among the working poor condemned at present to a futile eight hour thread mill and an impossible uphill battle for the universally declared human right to adequate shelter. (Applause).

MR. A. WORNELL: Mr. Speaker, I hope I do not let this hon. House down after that welcome. Mr. Speaker, I first must congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion to draft an Address in Reply to the gracious Speech from the Throne.

Anyone looking at this Speech from the Throne and anyone reading it must certainly agree with some aspects of it, some paragraphs of it. I was particularly struck with this sentence: "the two decades, the last two decades have been incomparably the best in Newfoundland's long history." I cannot see how the Opposition could disagree with that and I am sure that anyone with any sense at all must say that intelligent and indefatigable effort will have to be exerted to shape the character of our Province's social and economic status in the next decade.

Sir, like many others I feel that the challenge is formidable and it will certainly demand the best brains and ability, the most self-sacrifice and determination of Newfoundlanders in all walks of life. The next decade will bring forth many problems, social and economic and everyone will have to do his utmost to wrestle with these problems.

Now mention is made of the great problem facing the western world, the problem of inflation. Now inflation is something which is very difficult to define and very few people will understand its implications. I certainly cannot define it. I am not satisfied to take the old cliché that inflation is too much money chasing too few goods because in the western world today, we see that there is a lot of money in certain places. There are some millionaires in Newfoundland, I understand. If we go down on Water Street and browse around, if we go into the Avalon Mall, we will see all kinds of goods and services. So, therefore, I say that the old cliché of too much money chasing too few goods will not hold water in our present type of inflation.

However, reference has been made to the great battle which is now plaguing the western world and I am inclined to agree with the Premier's assessment of it insofar as it is gravely affecting our Province's economy. Even though Newfoundland did not bring about this great problem, we the innocent have to suffer for the guilty and those of us who remember the old days of castor oil, it was always very painful to take and I am afraid that the stringent economy enforced upon our Government is something like the castor oil to us young school children.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Sulphur and molasses.

MR. WORNELL: Sulphur and molasses my hon. friend from Trinity North has said.

//

It is good to know though, Mr. Speaker, that these adverse factors are now expected to subside-substantially in the coming months. Now the coming months could be eternity. But let us hope that these adverse conditions will subside in the not too distant future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I for one am happy to note that it is the Government's intention to convene what might be described as a great economic conference. Now this could be sneered at by the impeccable cynics on the Opposition. It is the easiest thing in the world as I said before, Mr. Speaker, for one to criticize, but I have found in my few years that the easiest way to take the smile of a cynic's face is to give him responsibility. I am sure that every hon. member in this House must realize that when we stand here or sit here, we have grave responsibilities and this is not a place where we have to show our wit. It is nice to have wit every now and then, but it is not a battle of wits. We should be here to try and do the best we can for the good of the country and I feel, Sir, that this conference will be participatory democracy at its finest. What is the sense of giving lip service to an idea, if you do not put that idea into practice. Many hands make light work and the conference of this sort shares the load of responsible government with responsible people and with knowledgeable people, with citizens who have some contribution to offer toward a possible solution to some of our social, economic problems.

I feel sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that the upcoming conference is necessary and most commendable regardless of what the critics might think. We have to make the best use of the best brains in this Province and the power of positive thinking is capable of removing many insurmountable objects.

It was only the other day that I saw an adage quoted by the hon. James Monroe, the Minister of Health in Ottawa and he said that, "he who attempts the impossible sometimes achieves success." I think that is a very good thing to remember, Mr. Speaker.

Now my hon. friend the minister for Dosco, I am not going to waste time in spelling out the department which he administers. My hon. friend has talked quite a lot about Welfare and I would say that he is in a better position to know more about Welfare than I do, but I would like to offer my personal opinion that this

///

affluent society of the western world through overselling and easy credit has probably created a fool's paradise.

The governments of the United States and Canada must take their full share of the blame, Sir, because in their desire to share the wealth that is to distribute the taxes which we taxpayers contribute to the cause, they have created what I would describe as a vampire of Welfare and Social services. Perhaps a vampire of state charity. When I say this that does not mean that I do not subscribe to the concept of Welfare. I certainly subscribe to the concept of Christian Welfare. I cannot understand, Sir, why people who want to work and who want to be independent in the respectable and decent sense of the word, why such people cannot be put to work and I think it is the responsibility of the Provincial and national government to try and find work for these people.

I can think of resource projects such as; forestation or reforestation, parks, community farms, ditching, stump clearing, seeding, etc., pollution clean up and control on the roads, rivers and ponds. Now I think everyone in this hon. House will give the hon. the Premier credit for trying to impress this idea on the Federal authorities, but

But so far, Mr. Speaker, I understand that he has done so without much success. But I feel that we should keep hammering at their heads until this idea hits the right spot.

It took six years, Mr. Speaker, for the idea of the Salt Codfish Marketing Board to fructify, and perhaps we can make the wheels of those federal gods grind a little more swiftly in the future.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): Allow me. The six years were not six years delay. It was not caused by any disinclination on the part of the Government of Canada to proceed with this programme of the Salt Codfish Marketing Board. The delay was caused by opposition to the idea in certain other Provinces, and it was only when that opposition was withdrawn in those Provinces, in particularly one Province, was the Parliament of Canada and the Government of Canada really free or felt themselves to be free to adopt and proceed with this idea. I am sure the hon. gentleman knows that.

MR. A. WERNELL: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yes, I thank the hon. the Premier for clarifying that fact. I was not altogether too clear on the matter, Mr. Speaker, but I used it as an analogy that sometimes we find good ideas emanating from the Provincial Government, Provincial members, and sometimes from the Opposition. Sure, why not? I will be charitable enough. All the brains are not over here. I will not admit that.

We find that some of them lose their way when they go on the opposite side. However, getting back to my trend of thought, I think that it is time that the federal authorities get together, get their heads together, and see if they cannot try to restore some of the dignity, some of the self-respect of Newfoundlanders who have not the proper trade and find it very difficult to fit themselves into some employment slot.

I think that the authorities should lose no opportunity to expect and exact some compensatory work for its welfare and social assistance payments.

Now, I also think, Mr. Speaker, that many of the people who are on welfare, many people who are sound of mind and limb, many people who have honestly tried to obtain work but could not, the many such people would prefer to work on a Government sponsored project if the choice were theirs, and I think, sir, that this is a matter which should not be forgotten too long.

/s

Now, I am glad to note, on page four of this Throne Speech that there is a note of optimism for 1970. My ministers, the Throne Speech says, are quite confident that 1970 will be a year of distinctly improved economic conditions compared with last year. I am glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure every hon. member welcomes that prognostication.

Now, much has been said about pollution, and in the last two or three days, we in Newfoundland, have had a taste of the problems of pollution. Recent news reports of the spread of pollution is a shocking realisation of the scientific threat to, not only plant life, not only animal life, but to man's existence.

Those of you who remember Byron's poem on the sea, will remember that he said, "Man marks the earth with ruin, but his control stops with the sea". That was in Byron's time. Were he writing that today, sir, he would have to change that poem, for the pollution of the ocean has begun with terrifying consequences--detergents, oil, DDT and other pesticides, garbage and sewage--all taking the tragic toll of the sea birds around the coast, the fish and the plankton, and it seems obvious, sir, that the engineers and the marine architects will have to try to design some super tankers with containerized type holds, or something like that which will be able to float of their own buoyancy should they become grounded.

Now, I am not altogether a pessimist. I know that the mind of man can build almost anything it conceives, and I am sure that this problem will be overcome in due time. But, thank God, mankind always gets warning, and as you know the old adage is, "Forwarned is forarmed".

Now, if something is not done, sir, the problems of oil trans-shipment by sea and pollution, if something is not done to these problems, to eradicate these problems, I am afraid that our children and grandchildren will inherit a tragic legacy of desolation and destruction.

Now, apart from the oil pollution and apart from the ocean pollution, we see today many other scientific monsters stalking the pastoral scenes as well, and besides replacing much human labour, sir, they are adding insult to injury by destroying or polluting the good earth, the life sustaining properties of our earth, and turning it into unproductive wildernesses of asphalt and concrete. Truly, sir, man may be erecting monuments to his own pride and folly.

114

I think we have said enough about that, except to say before anyone starts to get unduly morose and despondent, let me here say that I am not half the prophet you might think I am, and I do not pretend to possess any divine gift of prophecy, nor am I qualified of myself or of my scientific knowledge to scare the wits out of anyone. So, let us all hope for the best and have trust in our scientists that they will come up with the answers to all these problems.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I will ask the hon. members to consider for a few moments the vulnerability of this Province and its dependence on transportation. I think someone mentioned the transportation system, my hon. friend from Gander, there this afternoon. I agree with him. I think it is time that the transportation system of the whole Island should be looked into. It is true that the CNR has curtailed its steamship systems and programs--what do you call them--anyway their system, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that the whole North American distribution is becoming extremely vulnerable to traffic snarls and disruptions.

We have only to think of the bottle necks which have occurred in North Sydney and Port aux Basques, and not to mention the ever present sort of "Damocles" which is hanging above our heads in the form of a longshoreman's strike or a seaman's strike.

And truly, I think that the distribution transportation, distribution and transportation, is probably the "Achilles heel" of Newfoundland trade and commerce. Transportation by road, rail, and water is the chief means of survival for our population of a half million souls.

A strike by the Transport and Allied workers in one or two of the chief centres of distribution on the mainland, not to mention acts of God or atomic attack anywhere in Eastern and Central Canada, such a thing, sir, could be disastrous for Newfoundland, and we do not have to be in the target area to receive the chaotic impact of such a disruption of our distribution system.

Just think of it. How long do you think that this Province would survive on its own natural resources, and the warehouse foods normally carried in stock? I have given some thought to it and I feel that a free port or a transshipment depot could be the answer to this transportation dilemma. In case of a national emergency, we would then be masters in our own tight little Island. Such a distribution centre should be anttidewater

115

and be close to the centre of population or the centres of population. It would have to be, naturally, on the south coast to have ice-free, year round harbours. It would have to be on a good trunk road, leading to the Trans-Canada. It would have to be central.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought that my hon. friend across the way there would have more imagination than to think that Port aux Basques was central Newfoundland.

The port that I have in mind, sir, is in the central section of the south coast, and Bay D'Espoir was made for it. This hon. House does not have to take my word for it, sir. It is all here in this brown book, "Project Planning Associates of Toronto", and I intend excerpting two or three passages from that as I go along.

Now, I must say that I am partial to the Bay D'Espoir people because I know that no other people in Newfoundland has been so patient for progress and I hope, sir, that their destiny will be fulfilled before too long.

Like I said, Mr. Speaker, the hon. House does not have to take my word for it. For the feasibility of this site of Bay D'Espoir is amply illustrated and most accurately summed up in these pages, and I do not wish to bore the hon. House by taking long-winded sentences or long-winded passages from this book.

I will say that fair recommendations included among many others - this one here on page twenty-five - that steps should be taken to explore the natural resources in the south coast region and if these are going to cause exploitation, that the Government will follow a policy of preserving natural and scenic quantities of Bay D'Espoir, that steps be taken to encourage industries to be established in Bay D'Espoir, and then it goes on to speak of a national port and most of Newfoundland ---

1/6

MR. A. WORNELL: Newfoundland's cities and towns are located in the transportation corridors, formed by the Canadian National Railway and the Trans-Canada Highway, at the closest point near Grand Falls, these two important transportation lines are seventy miles from Bay D'Espoir.

And then they sum it up very well here in this passage, an important vocational aspect of the north end of Bay D'Espoir is that it is the closest link between the economically important Grand Falls Buchans, Bay Verde Region and the World's Shipping Lanes via its year round ice-free harbour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I commend this book to any of my hon. members for their perusal and for their enlightenment. And I think, it is time that some action was taken on that report.

SOME HON. MEMBER: I wonder if the hon. gentleman will permit a question?

MR. T. A. HICKMAN: Will the hon. member for the enlightenment of the House advise for whom that report was prepared? and the date it was prepared? We are in the dark we never heard of it.

MR. A. WORNELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the report was prepared for the Province of Newfoundland. I only know what I read on the front of these here - prepared for the Government of the Province of Newfoundland by Project Planning Associates Limited, Toronto, Ontario. May 1965.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, that report encompasses more than a dream. It is a dream alright. But, I think, it is a feasible one, it is a reasonable one. And it will never be realized unless and until the Provincial and Federal Governments see the validity of it. And get on with the job of making that dream come true.

Now, in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, as we know Newfoundland is suffering from unemployment. And I maintain that apart all together from the big industrial drive in the urban and the heavily populated areas, the Government should see that the inshore fisheries, that is all type of fishing, not just for cod, but all types of inshore fishing are developed to their greatest potential. That farming and fruit growing are prosecuted to the greatest extent to which our soils and climate will permit. And that people are encouraged to spent more time at handicraft, now here is an industry, a very, very modest industry, an occupation which we hear very little about these days, but which I am sure every hon. member knows here - not every hon. member but most of the older hon. members know that it put many a sack of flour in the outport pantries in the days gone by.

I feel, Sir, that there is room for expansion in that neglected, though a modern industry. It is a case of doing your own things, Mr. Speaker.

///

And doing your own thing in those days, could mean building your own boat, painting your own home, erecting your own fence, growing your own vegetables, knitting your own sweaters, socks and gloves, and making your own bread for that matter. I doubt if too many of our modern housewives make their own bread any more.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. A. WORNELL: Good, fine, glad to know that some hon. gentleman are getting vitamins.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

Laughter.

MR. A. WORNELL: Some hon. gentleman gets their hands in too much dough, but the wrong kind.

My hon. friends over there are very good talking about dough, they can not get their minds of dough, I do not know why.

Now there is another thing, Mr. Speaker, that I think this Government should apply its minds too, collective minds, and that is freshwater fishing. I think, that we have sufficient lakes in Newfoundland to be stocked and harvested. Now there was a suggestion last year I think by the hon. the Premier to the effect that he was trying to, ^{get} in first place, I think it was the Minister of the Interiors of the U.S. to report on the feasibility of freshwater fishing in Newfoundland.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: If the hon. member will allow me - I asked my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries to go to the United States and he did go, and he was tremendously impressed by what he saw of the salmon fishery that had been started on the Great Lakes, the American side of the Great Lakes. And we have been gathering materials and data on that, and there is some hope that something may come out of it.

MR. A. WORNELL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. the Premier for that bit of information. I am sure we are all glad to know that we are drafting at every opportunity to try and create jobs for Newfoundlanders.

Now another thing, Mr. Speaker, that I thought of, and I think we should pay some attention to is to create new jobs, I am sure, and that is the feeding of our, I was going to say interminable lands, but that is not quite so, we have a lot of good forest land in Newfoundland, but we do have a lot of bogland as well. And forest feeding, forestation is something which could employ a number of experience woodsmen. And in the Bay D'Espoir area, there must be 200 woodsmen, these people are really woodsmen - they are professional woodsmen, done nothing else, //s

they have been in the woods cutting for Bowaters - and then they feel like a bucket of water, when they cannot get into the woods. So I feel that there is something that we could probably look at.

And I would be interested in probably hearing the hon. minister for natural resources, not here - but I would be certainly interested in knowing, if it is the Government's intention to do any seeding this year?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure this hon. House will forgive me, if I mention a few of the needs of my district. This is about the only time, when one can wander, discourse and ramble at random, so I must take this opportunity to tell the House of some of the urgent needs of the district.

The prime need I would say Sir, is some industrial development for that area which I mentioned before in Bay D'Espoir Area. And then we need a connecting road link from Hermitage to Harbour Breton to the Bay D'Espoir truck road. I understand that a dentist is badly needed for the Hermitage district. We had one, a doctor Kabling at St. Alban's, but he left last year, and he had not been replaced. I understand from the hon. the Minister of Health, that there are two dentists I think coming to Newfoundland this year, that is about all we are able to recruit. And I am very hopeful that one of these will decide to go in the Hermitage area.

Now, we need an out-patients clinic for St. Alban's, we need a public nurse for Harbour Breton, and the surrounding Hermitage Area. We need an improved water supply system for the Town of Harbour Breton, and Rural Electrification for Jersey Harbour, Stone Valley, Furbey's Cove, Rencontre West and Parsons Harbour.

And I am hopeful, Sir, that most of these needs will be supplied this year. And if there is one project that the Government could complete with a grant from the Federal Government, anyone project I say, which would meet with the thanks and shares of the greatest number of my constituents, I think that project is a link up of the Connaigre and Hermitage Peninsulas, with the Trans-Canada Highway. Thank You.

This road would connect with Harbour Breton, Hermitage, Sandyville, Seal Cove, and it would also benefit the other communities of Pass Island, Stone Valley, Jersey Harbour, Furbey's Cove, MacCallum, and the Town of Galtois. Now this road, Mr. Speaker, has been dreamed of for the past twenty years. And it is not only for these good people alone, Sir, because you and the hon. members and another person who owns a car and who would like to go on a sightseeing drive. 119

a tour would certainly benefit by the completion of that road.

And, I say Sir, that these good people of the Hermitage District have waited long enough for this important communications link with their fellow Newfoundlanders.

I, therefore, before I close Sir, I therefore implore that the hon. the Premier and the hon. the Minister of Highways will do their absolutely best to get this vital road link constructed without further delay. And that Sir, is for the welfare, not only of my constituents, but as his Honour the Lieutenant Governor said in his closing words "that for the good, the welfare of our beloved Province".

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Applause

MR SPEAKER (Mr. N. Noel) The motion before the Chair is that the report of the committee to draft the Address in Reply be adopted.

MR. CLYDE WELLS: Mr. Speaker, before we put the motion, Your Honour, there are a few words that I would like to say. On the Throne Speech and on a few other matters.

I sat today in the House and listened to the hon. the Minister of Welfare, the hon. the member for Bell Island - his Speech of the Gracious and inspiring Speech from the Throne. It is incredible how little it takes to inspire something - really it is almost unbelievable. If you take out of the Speech from the Throne the references to Mr. Speaker and members of the House of Assembly, for what else it contains it might well be an article in "Saturday Night" magazine or "Atlantic Monthly" - for what it contains. It includes nothing beyond that.

But that is understandable in our circumstances. In a sense I do not fault the Government on the Speech from the Throne. I can understand it. They are not in a position to do any more. There is more promises made than there is to be lived up to anyway, even though there is practically nothing in it. There is still more than we are capable of living up to financially.

Perhaps, on the other hand all the great announcements are being saved for after the Election Announcement. But, I suspect that the Government is probably at long last much too late coming to realize that there is a bottom in the money pot. And there is not much money covering it. Far, far less than we need. And that this, Mr. Speaker, that the Speech from the Throne as lacking as it is in answering the needs of our people is realistic to that extent, that we

February 23rd. 1970

Tape # 33

do not have the means of providing everything we need - all the hospitals we need throughout this Province, all the roads and schools, and everything else that we need throughout this Province.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is probably one of the first speeches from the Throne that has not contained any references to all of the new hospitals or all the new schools, or the million (I am prone to exaggeration here) let us say hundreds of miles of road that have been built and paved. Perhaps, it is the first one, and it is a good sign, I welcome it. Perhaps, at last

MR. C. WELLS: The members of the government are coming to their senses and realizing that we the people of this small province, the few of us that are here, has to pay back, with interest, every cent that we borrow. And there should be some consideration of our ability to borrow. There should be some consideration of the relationship between what we have to pay back and our ability to raise money. Our ability to raise money in this province is probably more limited than it is in other part of Canada, perhaps any other part of North America, and we we Mr. Speaker, cannot afford to spend lavishly and extravagantly the way we have in the past. So that, perhaps it is strange for a member who sits on the opposite side of the House, albeit a member of the government party, but a member who does not support the government, to complement the government on the Speech From the Throne. And I do, I do not see what else could have gone into that speech if we are being either bit realistic, and recognizing the position that we in Newfoundland find ourselves in today.

There are a number of things in it that I would like to comment upon. We have now it appears, are going to have a great conference of persons and organizations to whom the economic future of our Province is of particular concern. I remind all members that we had a great Royal Commission too, of nine or ten of the most capable men in the province and a great to-do was made about the announcement of that Royal Commission, and those very capable and knowledgeable and experienced men demonstrated their capabilities and their experience and knowledge by hiring dozens of experts to do much of the detailed study for them. And what I think, is really an excellent report was produced. An excellent report, those men did a fine job, and it was produced and laid on the Table of this House, with the comment that it was ninety per cent trash. I do not have to say who said that, or who laid the report on the Table of the House, all hon. members are aware. And now we are going to call a great conference of persons to whom the economic future of our province is of particular concern. What utter nonsense. An absolute bluff. Why, if we do not pay any attention to the advice that we seek from the experts. Why should we waste our time on it, if we are going to label it ninety per cent trash? A complete waste of time. The work has already been done. Done very thoroughly. We in this House have been warned by the Royal Commission that did the report on the economic state and prospects of the Province. We have been told what our situation was and given the guide lines to the future. Told the way we should direct this province in the future. And we have the audacity to call it ninety per cent trash and throw it out and a few months later

115

come in and say now we are going to call a great conference of people concerned in about the economy of our Province. I will not say any more, it really is, it is not worth further comment. It speaks for itself. It is so brazenly wrong that it speaks for itself.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we now say the great conference will be the forerunner to the introduction of the regional economic expansion programme which my government are about to launch. It is not quite the way I understand the so-called Dree programme. I understood this to be primarily a programme of the Government of Canada, yet it said that this Government is about to launch it. Now, I realize the part that it has played and that it is a co-operative effort and that the programme is carried out under the terms of an agreement negotiated and entered into between the two levels of government. But I also realize something else that goes along with that Mr. Speaker, and that is that we have to pay our share. Where are we going to get the money? Look at the estimates that we approved last year, and you will not find a single solitary cent there for it. We just do not have it and no prospects of getting it. In the reasonably near future, none at all. How are we going to launch the Dree programme if the Government of Canada insists that we put up our share like they did with Prince Edward Island? Where are we going to get the money? We do not have it and no prospects of getting it. Unless Mr. Speaker, we stoop so low as to now start taxing one cent jawbreakers we taxed chocolate bars and ice-cream cones and bottles of pop. Maybe we will now impose a cent tax on a bull's-eye. We cannot afford the Dree programme. Not unless the Government of Canada is going to take total financial responsibility. It is a sad fact but it never the less it is a fact, that we do not have the ability to help ourselves we can barely struggle along and continue to pay for the public services. Really we can not even do that, we had to borrow to do that last year, or in this current year we are now in. How are we going to pay our share of the Dree programme that is so grandly announced with such meekness, overwhelming modesty in the Speech From the Throne, that my Government are about to launch.

True to form, for the last few years we have power again, hydro-electric power, more of it, we have got power running out of our ears not doing us a bit of good and costing us a fortune. Economically not doing us any good and wasting us a fortune that we cannot afford, a waste and extravagant. They are spilling water over Bay D'Espoir. In 1970 they spilled a good many million gallons and the year is not two months old yet. Wait till the spring run-off and every gallon of water they spill over that dam is money. Every single gallon, yet, we are spending \$40 to \$50 million out at Holyrood to put in a steam generating plant, and we can not

not use the power that Bay D'Espoir is producing. This island has not the capacity has not the demand to use the power that Bay D'Espoir is producing. Those figures are available. I do not know what we are going to do with all the power, do not know. It is costing us between four and five mills or perhaps more, I do not know we have not been able to get the real figure, we do not know because there is a shortage of information in this House, Mr. Speaker. We have not been able to get the real figure, and we are selling it for two and a quarter cents. I can assure me Mr. Speaker that kind of thing does not inspire me, the minister of Welfare might be inspired by it but it leaves me totally inspired. And now we are going for more. Whose is going to use it or what are we going to do with it. If we had some reasonable prospects, of industry using it at an economic rate, okay, then it makes sense. We have no prospects of industry using it at an economic rate, and very little prospect of industry at all. The prospects keep flying, all the time, and getting dimmer and dimmer. Yet the ever faithful in the Speech from the Throne we are going to have yet more power, that we can not afford. Then we look for the carrot and it is there too that is held out in front of our noses in the noses of every Newfoundlander whose money we are spending.

The vast new iron ore facilities in Labrador a very good possibility of it that will employ approximately 700 workers. In the words of the Speech from the Throne there could be no firm promise admitted. There could be an extension of an iron ore development of Labrador City amounting to as much as ten million tons of additional production of iron ore a year giving employment to an additional 700 workers, and involving an investment of between \$100 and \$200 million. How inspired our people must feel when they hear that. Of course they are inspired. Any reasonable person would be inspired until he stops to think.

On Feb. 23, 1950 twenty years ago today the Premier announced to the House of Assembly that: he anticipated there was a good possibility that we are going to get a third pulp and paper mill for the South West Coast. It is twenty years ago and no mill has produced an ounce of paper since other than the mills at Corner Brook and Grand Falls that have been there since 1910 and 1923. It might shake the hon minister's inspiration if he looks at that and stops to think about it. There could be an extension. It could be that the United Nations will give us the moon and it will be filled with gold in the center too. Our people Mr. Speaker no longer wants or will no longer accept these false hopes and they will give their answers shortly. They will say just what they think of them the time is not too far off when they will let all of us know just what they think of these twenty year unfulfilled promises and these holding out of current possibilities that have

124

no real significant and do more harm mentioning it than they do good. Then Mr. Speaker

HON. E WINSOR(Labrador Affairs): Mr. Speaker, does he not know since that speech was written that the Iron Ore Company of Canada confirms this very thing. It has been confirmed by the I.O.C. of Canada. Only two or three days ago.

MR.WELLS: What's been confirmed, the possibility or the fact?

MR.WINSOR: The definite fact.

MR.WELLS: The definite fact. It has been announced has it? It is definitely going ahead. When is it going to start?

MR.WINSOR: Some time this spring.

MR.WELLS: Twenty years.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman might add to his knowledge by telling him that that paragraph was cleared with the Iron Ore Company of Canada.

MR.WELLS: I am sure the paragraph, the statement made in the House twenty years ago on the 23rd of February 1950 was cleared too. I can assure this House Mr. Speaker that I will not hold my breath, and I would not advise anybody else to. Never fear though all our problems are going to be solved, they are all going to be looked after. A certain gentleman is going to look after everything, an ombudsman. Now I am not opposed to an ombudsman I think it is good. Because of the extent of government and the extent of its involvement and the extent to which it is pentacled reach into all aspects of the every day life of citizens. Government has to surround itself with red tape to survive because it has become so involved in the life of our people. It has to have rules and regulations and inevitably an individual will be done an injustice by the application, strict application of the rules and regulations, inevitably.

106

MR. CLYDE WELLS: Inevitably that would happen. So the need for an ombudsman is rather obvious. The only thing that startles me in the Speech from the Throne, is that it has prospects of becoming just another government lacky.

The Speech says ---"and you will be asked in this Session to adopt legislation, empowering my Government to appoint an ombudsman." I will not be a party to supporting any legislation that allows the Government to appoint the ombudsman. Any ombudsman appointed to be effective, in the very least to be effective, must be appointed by this House - must be answerable directly to this House, not through the Government, and must have a tenure of office that will ensure the security of his position, irrespective of whose toes he treads on.

It would be a complete sham to have it otherwise. The Government appoints the ombudsman, and he fills a nice office, and he holds a nice title. And as soon as something comes up, he goes to a certain minister, or the Premier, or anybody involved, and they say no. And he says, but yes - they say, you are fired. We will appoint another one. Some ombudsman, that is. The members are better ombudsmen than that.

I do not think anybody has been fired yet - two days - I believe one hon. member was fired one time. But it cannot be - it is useless. It is a hollow shell - if the ombudsman is to be answerable to the Government. I do not know - maybe it was a typographical error, perhaps that was not intended. The ombudsman must be answerable to this House. And that is the only way that he can be in the least effective. Even then, because of the Government's majority control of the House, there is some doubt about his effectiveness. And this is why the legislation must provide for the kind of tenure of office, that would give him security, and allow his removal only upon addressed by this House and for the cause. Otherwise, it is a meaningless shell, and not worth wasting our time on.

There is another peculiar announcement, that there is going to be a repeal of the amendment to the Workman's Compensation Act, which allows certain appeals to be made to the Supreme Court.

Now I can only wait to see - I cannot for the life of me imagine what the justification for that could be. I really cannot imagine, what the present legislation does is give a person whose benefit has been assessed by the Board. If he feels that he has been aggrieved by this assessment, or by his dealings with the Board, he can appeal to the Supreme Court.

Now it gives him a right of appeal. It does not give him the absolute right to recover - it gives him a right to appeal on matters of law, I believe., and maybe mixed facts in law as well.

What harm can that conceivably do - and what is the value in repealing? There is no indication in the Speech. I can only ^{wait} until the legislation is introduced, and I have heard some ministers' comments on it.

We are also led to believe that the solution to housing problems has been found. It is part of the answer maybe. It seems like it makes sense. Many of our people are quite capable of finishing off walls and partitions, and putting up the facings, and putting up the gyprock, and plastering it, and painting it and so on. All of this are the things which eat up a great deal of money, when a man is having a house built. So this idea of shell housing seems rather attractive, and it might help solve some of the problems.

There is one basic problem that has to ^{be} overcome first. And I discussed it here in the last session of this House. And that is the cost of land. The absolute minimum that you can buy a service block of land for in the City of Corner Brook today, is \$3,500. The average is \$4,500. But the absolute minimum is \$3,500.

That means that ownership of housing is limited to those few Newfoundlanders who enjoy the happy position of owing nothing, and having an income of about \$8,000 dollars a year. The only person in this Province today, who can afford to buy or build a house.

And that is a pretty sad state of affairs. There are two factors. The high cost of materials and freights and so on, and the high cost of labour. But the first factor that has to be overcome, is the high cost of service land. Now I do not know, I do not have the answers - I look to the experts to provide that. I do not know if there is any answer in reducing the cost of land.

Even Crown Land, like the proposed Elizabeth Street sub-division in Corner Brook. Much of that is Crown-owned land, and costs the Government, not a cent. Some of it had to be obtained from private owners, but very little. Predominantly it was Crown-owned, or owned by Rowaters, who the Government obtained it for, I think perhaps the usual dollar.

But even in that situation, where the basic raw land cost little or

nothing - building lots in that sub-division will cost, if they are sold on an economic basis to recover the cost put into them, will sell for \$5,000 or more. The poor man has not a chance. He is doomed to failure even before he begins. He has not a chance of acquiring his own home.

That is where the problem lies. Now I really do not know what the answer is. I cannot offer any suggestions. Perhaps government's financial involvement is going to have to be in subsidization of the land to allow the individual to acquire the property serviced.

One of the problems with it Mr. Speaker - one of the reasons for this, has happened in the past few years - this high cost. One of the biggest factors in it is this - that prior to this, the City Council here in St. John's or Corner Brook, always ran their own water and sewer lines. And over the forty or fifty years that those lines lasted, they recovered the cost in their water and sewer charges. And they let the people who used them for fifty years, pay for it. Now what they have done, what the municipalities have done, to avoid the burden of having to raise the money to put in these water and sewer lines - they have compelled developers to install them at their expense, and have the whole of it recovered in the sale of the land.

If the City of Corner Brook had the financial ability to run the water and sewer services in that Elizabeth Street sub-division, without including it in the price of the land - that land could be sold with streets put in it, could be sold to the average purchaser for \$1,000 or \$1500 - a farcry from \$5,000. And there is the first hurdle. Before he can stick his shovel in the ground, he has to have the land. And if it \$5,000 a block, he has not got a hope of getting it.

That is the first problem. Shell housing is not the only answer, and it is not going to be the ultimate answer, unless we tackle this other problem. And we have to tackle that.

The Speech of course, as well contains the usual platitude - For example ----"and Newfoundlanders will need to exercise all their courage, and all their patriotism, to keep their Province abreast of the times." ---Abreast of the times. I suggest Mr. Speaker that we might properly substitute the word "afloat" for "abreast of the times". They are going to have to exercise all their ingenuity and courage and skill and patriotism, to keep their Province afloat - let alone abreast of the times.

The Government indicates that it will be displaying openness of mind in our official and private approach, to the problem of finding solutions. Openness of mind in our official and private approach in the problem of finding solutions.

I have not seen that openness of mind displayed yet. The mind is closed tighter than a trap, and lets nothing out nor nothing in. In most cases refuses to accept, and is basically contained in the head of one man. Opens usually for nobody. And Mr. Speaker, I remind members of the House, that I speak from some experience, when I say that.

We witnessed it here in the last Session of the House. We witnessed it today again - openness of mind! There was great openness of mind today, when I wanted to discuss accommodation for the other three hon. members and myself. Tremendous openness of mind.

The office sits vacant up there in the corner. Nobody using it - in name only. The hon. the Minister without Portfolio, the member for Labrador South - Last session when the member for Labrador West and myself needed accommodation and looked all around, and that place was vacant - and asked for it then. All of a sudden, the Minister without Portfolio, that is the member for Labrador South, had a dire urgent need for an office. And there was expensive renovation and repainting and carpeting - a new desk and furniture put in there. I have yet to see that hon. gentleman in the room, and I do not know of anybody else who has. Openness of mind - Tremendous - really impressive.

And the same thing now happens, that happened last year - for whatever reason, and I have my own views on what they are. The Legislative Library downstairs is desecrated, with two little cubicles built in the corner, for the member for Labrador West and myself. Two little tiny cubicles measuring about four by six. And the Minister without Portfolio, nowhere near this office that was so urgently needed. Great openness of mind that is. A waste of public funds, and an arrogance, and a contempt for this House that is almost beyond description. The mind was really open.

I have no doubt why it was done. The Minister did not need the office. The hon. member for Harbour Main has been a Minister without Portfolio for about fifteen years, and he has never needed an office. I was one myself one time, and I never needed an office. I had access to the Government members' Common Room. And all of a sudden there is an urgent need for the Minister without Portfolio, and it has been vacant ever since. And now there are four of us sitting here.

MR. CLYDE WELLS: And we are treated with disdain and contempt that would make some Latin American dictator blush with shame. We are members of this House Mr. Speaker, just as much as the Minister of Welfare or the Minister without portfolio or the hon. the Premier or Mr. Speaker, with respect to your self Sir, just as much and just the same rights as any other man sitting here. And the Premier has the gall to stand up in this House and say "no, you will never get it." The space is provided over there for Government members, and there is a scheme cooked up to give the vacant space to the Minister without portfolio with no justification - no need - no nothing except total disdain and contempt for this House. Open mindedness the Speech from the Throne said, if that is open mindedness I would rather he closed it. I would not want any more of that to get out.

And now Mr. Speaker, we have again this year to ask for accommodations. All but get down on our knees to beg. What are we going to do, take off our coats and drape them over the microphones on our desks because of the bitterness of one man? The room is available and is not being used - and I think Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion that that is a disgusting display of abuse of authority.

Perhaps Mr. Speaker, some members will realize that the room out here what is the clerk's office now - was a room that was constructed to accommodate members of this House who were not members of the Government party or the official Opposition party. That is what it was there for - when there were no longer any such members sitting in this House it was taken for use by the clerk. I can see the value of it - of having the clerk's office so close - of course it has a value, but, Mr. Speaker, I say with all modesty that we who are members of this House, elected by our constituents come first. Before the clerk or before anybody else. The clerks are here to serve us as we carry out our duties. But I must say Mr. Speaker, I have no real desire to upset the convenience of having the clerk's office so close, if that is the only answer fine, O.K., then so be it, but I have no real desire to do that. But, it makes me shrink with disgust that I have to sit here - or stand here - and beg for a place to hang up my hat when that office up stairs is vacant on the pretext that the member for Labrador South needs it. That would disgust any man. And I have no intention, nor do my colleagues Mr. Speaker, of allowing it to go by unchallenged for a single day while this House is in session until the matter is corrected. None whatsoever, and I ask every member that sits over there irrespective of what party you support - or what your feelings are - in

your own heart and soul you know that is wrong - as wrong as wrong could be and based only on bitterness and contempt - which should have no place in this House. I and my colleagues here are as much a member of this House as any other man sitting in it.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Elected to this side

MR. WELLS: As much a member as any other man sitting in it irrespective of where we sit - and entitled to the same rights - enjoyments and privileges, and to be treated in this shame - faced way is disgusting. Nothing short of it. It is not really becoming the Premier of any Province. Not really becoming the Premier of any Province irrespective of his personal feelings.

I suspect that that amongst other things, not that alone, that amongst the many thousands of other things is one of the reasons why the people of this Province will show their equal disdain this time for the Government, next time around. The people out in all of the districts know this and I will make sure they know it in as much detail as I can. All of the districts will know it - and will know every other thing that I can bring to their attention as well. Districts that are largely ignored like my own for example, largely ignored by the Government, almost as though we were a trust territory being administered. A colony being exploited for the money we can turn in to the Province. An incredible lack of public services - an incredible ignoring of a part of this Province. The hospital facilities in Corner Brook - I will only mention them shortly - briefly because I have gone into detail before on it. That hospital in Corner Brook is really unbelievable for this day and age. It is incredible - and only in the last few months - the last year or so - since I have been discussing the matter in this House has the Government paid any attention to it at all. It is supposed to be a regional hospital to serve the entire western half of Newfoundland. That is what it is supposed to be. It is ill-equipped - it does not have specialists available to it, because it is ill-equipped they will not go there and you cannot blame them. There is a waiting list for people to get into the operating room of in excess of one thousand.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh come on

MR. WELLS: That is correct

SOME HON. MEMBER: Come off it, that includes T and A

MR. WELLS: That is right, it included T and A. Immaterial is it, well O.K. I am glad the hon. minister mentioned this because I will relate a little story that will show him just how material it is too.

I have a son

SOME HON. MEMBER: A son, you should be quite proud of it

MR. WELLS: I am quite proud of it - for the last couple of years he has been plagued with sore throats - every time a virus came along he had an infection - he had bad tonsils - they had to come out. For two years we waited and could not get them out, because, we could not get him in the hospital. Could not do it. I could have done it if I had gone to a doctor and said now look - who knows me, and knows who I am - but I refuse to do that, my name goes on the waiting list like every other name.

HON. E.M. ROBERTS (Minister of Health): The hon. gentleman should talk to the board in Corner Brook about it.

MR. WELLS: I would not go to the board and try and use influence to get them to do it because that is not fair.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not suggesting that the hon. gentleman use influence, I am suggesting he talk to the board about it.

MR. WELLS: I have talked to the board, and I have talked to the doctors. So he started school last September so we said to the family doctor " we have to get his tonsils out" Sorry, the waiting list - they are only taking emergencies

MR. ROBERTS: That is not correct any more, they are taking elective surgery twenty to thirty cases a week, and that means

MR. WELLS: They were only taking emergencies let me finish Mr. Minister

MR. ROBERTS: If ever

MR. WELLS: So he called a surgeon in St. John's to remove my sons tonsils. An appointment was made for a Thursday afternoon - it was the advice to my wife that if we could not make it on Thursday - Friday would be all right but be sure and let him know, so she said " we cannot make it on Thursday would you let him know we will be in on Friday." Somewhere there was a snarl up, they did not let him know - we did not show up on Thursday - they thought we were not coming - we walked in off the street on Friday afternoon. He did not know we were near the place. He was in the hospital - we had to wait for him. We told him our problem - he looked at him and he picked up the phone he dialed the hospital and he said "look I would like to get a little boy in from Corner Brook for surgery in the morning - tonsils- can I do it?" "yes doctor" and he hung up the phone.

He picked it up again and dialed and said "look I would like to get a patient, a young boy into the hospital this afternoon can I bring him in right away for a bed - having tonsils taken out in the morning?"

"yes doctor " no more than that. We got into the car and drove him to the hospital, he had his tonsils out eleven o'clock the next morning. And four o'clock the afternoon before they did not even know we were near the place.

MR. ROBERTS: Pretty good service is it not?

MR. WELLS: Right - that is terrific service except

MR. ROBERTS: And M.C.P. paid the bill

MR. WELLS: Do not forget who paid the bill

MR. ROBERTS: M.C.P. - you and I

MR. WELLS: Yes that is right, we all paid it, particularly the taxpayers of Corner Brook too who contribute as well - their equal share and then some to this Province but without complaint. All we are asking is fair consideration.

MR. ROBERTS: My taxpayers in St. Anthony paid it too you know

MR. WELLS: Oh yes, that is right - all we are asking is fair consideration nothing more nor less.

MR. ROBERTS: It is what Corner Brook will get.

MR. WELLS: It has not been getting it so far.

MR. ROBERTS: Cannot speak when the hon. gentleman is a member of the administration

MR. WELLS: It has not been getting it so far

MR. ROBERTS: I have been Minister of Health since June, he should speak to my predecessors they surround him over there

MR. WELLS: I will not hold my breath for the hospital to be built either.

MR. ROBERTS: Do, if you wish

MR. WELLS: No, I have no desire to

Look at what happened to the sanatorium out there. You have a classic example of utter stupidity. We in this Province came very close - we have licked T.B. as a real serious problem and it is now in very manageable proportions of which we should be proud, and all be very pleased about it. So there was an excellent sanatorium - designed and built as a sanatorium in Corner Brook - and there was the old temporary World War two "h" huts up on the Topsail Road being used as a sanatorium here. So we had no need for all of this accomodation - what does the Government do? Instead of putting the Provincial sanatorium in Corner Brook where there was a proper building - designed for that purpose and the weather was drier - instead of doing that they bring everybody into those old beaten down fire traps.

MR. ROBERTS: When the Topsail Road - when was that done?

MR. WELLS: Ages ago

MR. ROBERTS: How many ages ago?

MR. WELLS: Oh five years ago

MR. ROBERTS: Was it five years ago?

MR. WELLS: Yes

MR. ROBERTS: Or less

MR. WELLS: Yes, no five years ago at least

MR. ROBERTS: I would have said it was less. Of course there were medical reasons for it but at a later time the hon. gentleman and I can exchange ideas on that -

MR. WELLS: That is consideration. There is just not any thought to the rest of this Province. There is no direct thought except when they want something. The Government will never be forgiven Mr. Speaker, and never deserve to be forgiven for their total failure in agriculture, which has a very good chance of success in certain parts of the Province. Cormack, Howley, Reedville, Deer Lake area, the Humber Valley, Codroy Valley area, but what is the Government doing? Trying to scrape together enough soil to put on a few rocks on the Avalon Peninsula to have some kind of a farm and ignoring where the farm land is. Totally ignored - paying attention only to pigs and hens. That is all - that is all the Government can see in agriculture. Pigs and hens and bog clearing or bog draining out here - and the farm land out in the Codroy valley and the Humber Valley. Incredible but understandable when you stop to think about it. It is just true to form we are a trust territory being administered.

The Government Mr. Speaker, will never be forgiven for their failure in agriculture - their total absolute failure. We were promised last year - I raised it again for the second year in this House - court reporters. The hon. gentleman who sits there was then Minister of Justice and we were promised court reporting equipment - recording equipment. It is not yet in the magistrates court. That is a year ago - there is no sign of it yet. In the meantime people outside the city of St. John's who end up in magistrates court "tough" We have to worry about court reporters in magistrates court in St. John's not elsewhere. How in God's name, anybody can justify that I will never for the life of me understand. Nor I remind the Government will 500,000 other Newfoundlanders. How it is so essential to have court reporters in magistrates courts in St. John's and none anywhere else. What are we second class citizens? That is the way we are being treated. We can only assume the Government feels that way.

Nothing further on the sitting judge for Corner Brook. A year ago a little over that now - the Law Society passed a resolution requesting the Government to make provision for a sitting Supreme Court judge in Corner Brook and out of the whole Law Society that was there at that meeting there was one negative vote - only one. By queer coincidence the hon. gentleman sits on that side of the House. Only one - we heard nothing further - not a thing. Why are we second class citizens? We are being treated that way. But Mr. Speaker, we will react that way next time around too.

Even the Government is directly encouraging this - to our citizens who have the good fortune to live in Grand Falls or Corner Brook - the Government charges an extra ten cents a bottle for liquor. Now.....

so there is a fair and undiscriminating Government. It treats all citizens alike. Because you live outside St. John's you pay ten cents a bottle more for liquor. Why in God's name? We pay our taxes. If it cost the Government more to get it out from St. John's, then bring it by boat into Corner Brook and it will not cost any more. You treat it differently, if you live outside St. John's, ten cents a bottle more. That is really being fair and not discriminating. Open mindedness that is, boy, real open mindedness and there are thousands of other examples that I have mentioned on numerous occasions here and there are many that I have not.

Mr. Speaker, on opening day last Wednesday you and I, Sir, sat and listened to the Leader of the Opposition read from the 1933 Amulree Report on Newfoundland - when Newfoundland lost her government and went bankrupt. We heard him quote from page forty-three of that report to this effect: "the public debt of the Island accumulated over a century was in twelve years more than doubled." In twelve years more than doubled. Its assets dissipated by improvident administration. The people misled into acceptance of false standards and the country sunk in waste and extravagance. The onset of the world depression found the Island with no reserve. Its primary industry neglected and its credit exhausted. At the first wind of adversity, its elaborate potential collapsed like a house of cards, and we have heard two or three speakers here today criticize the hon. gentleman for comparing the two; notably the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. He hoped that he would hear no more of that. He said almost in tears that he hoped he would hear no more of that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what the Leader of the Opposition was saying was let us be careful. We are near that today. There is where we were in 1933 and he is dead right. This says that the public debt of the Island accumulated over a century was in twelve years more than doubled. In one year, Mr. Speaker, namely from March 31, 1969 to March 31, 1970, the interest on our public debt was increased by more than thirty-five percent. For the year ending March 31, 1968, the interest on our public debt was \$12,281,200. For the next year the year ending March 31, 1969, it was \$17,085 million an increase, Mr. Speaker of forty percent in one year. But there is more, wait. From the next year ending this current March 31, 1970, the year that we are now in, the interest on our public debt as they

appear in the Government's estimates approved by this House last year, \$27.560 million, an increase of sixty percent over the year before. In a two year period from March 31 or April 1, 1968 to March 31, 1970, an increase from \$12.281 million to \$27.560 million, an increase of more than 125 percent.

Those fellows in 1933 were doing all right by our standards. They only doubled it in twelve years. We have increased it by one hundred and twenty-five percent in two years and the minister says he hopes that he hears no more of that. No wonder, he is ashamed of it. Its assets dissipated by improvident administration, the people misled into acceptance of false standards and the country sunk in waste and extravagance. Waste and extravagance - just think of the Expo buildings rusting out in Grand Bank and Gander, \$2 million or \$3 million - waste and extravagance. The hon. minister wants an example, there it is. Think of the Newfoundland Bulletin of which he is so proud and most people in this Province are so disgusted with. Waste and extravagance - students' salaries, mothers' allowance, waste and extravagance as far as this Government is concerned. At the first wind of adversity, its elaborate potentials collapsed like a house of cards. Beware, I say to hon. members before you vote supply on to her Majesty this year. Beware of what you are doing.

We all have to answer to the people of this Province for what we do with their money, and it is very soon. It is not too far away, when we will have to give our answers. We are going to find our people very demanding and justly so, that is their money that we are throwing around, not ours. It is given to us on the sacred trust that we spend it in their best interest.

From page forty-five the Leader of the Opposition quoted. "Loans served the object not merely of enabling the Government of today to liquidate its annual deficit on current account but also of providing with funds with which to embark on costly schemes of capital expenditure." Have we heard anybody say that before? Costly schemes of capital expenditure, any examples of it? The medical school - where are we going to get the \$50 million or \$60 million to build that and the \$10 million or \$15 million that it will take to operate it and to get about fifteen doctors a year for this Province at a price somewhere between \$500,000 and \$1 million for each doctor? I know they are valuable, but they are not that valuable.

137

We can get them elsewhere for a tenth of the cost and then a lot less or a hundredth of the cost.

The Labrador road, Shaheen natural resources, costly schemes of capital expenditure. From page forty-eight, we need not perhaps enter into details of the expenditure in this period a part from noting that it was marked by waste and extravagance on a reckless scale and that adequately describes what we have been doing. Holiday Inn, waste and extravagance on a reckless scale and again on page eighty-seven, the spoil system has for years been in full force in Newfoundland given the conception that it is quite fair while one's party is in power to make what one can for one's self and one's friends. It is natural that in the minds of many people politics should be regarded as simply job farming. Have we ever heard that any where before?

I refer to the speech made in this House last year by the member for Labrador West who was appointed to the Power Commission as a member of the board for the Power Commission. He became unappointed very quickly as soon as he said, "boo." The Premier of this Province without shame or anything else stood in this House and said, "sure he was discharged, because he was no longer loyal to the Government in any other civilized country in the western world that would bring the government toppling down the next day with statements like that. That is not so here. It is taken for granted and not very different from the 1933 report. We heard it again today. Mr. Walter Dalton, three years the organizer for the Liberal party suddenly appointed to a position that did not go through the Civil Service Commission of this Province. It's said without shame, without remorse as though that is the way things are and should be and forever will be. Not if I had anything to do with it. It would not forever be that way.

The Bell Island Ferry Commission, Power Commission, beer and liquor licences and again from page eighty-nine, Mr. Speaker, this continuous process of misgovernment has increased the burden on the fishermen and on the poor members of the community until it is now insupportable. Tax on chocolate bars? We have already done that. Where do we go next? The bull's eyes, the stick of bubble gum that kids like so much? Our taxes now are unbearable. The gasoline tax is the highest in the country, cigarette tax, liquor tax, S. S. A. tax, etc. Again on page ninety, a further aspect of life in Newfoundland which cannot fail to impress the detached observer is the reckless manner in which the resources of the country

138

have been dissipated. I think we have heard that before too. Witness one Doyle, John C. Doyle with his minerals and timber and one John Shaheen with his timber and money. He did not even bother to get resources. He just wanted cash. Five million cold cash out of the pockets of our people derived from taxing chocolate bars. Those people in 1933 were near pikers by comparison with us.

Speaking of Mr. Shaheen, Mr. Speaker, that takes me to Come-by-Chance, the great new oil refinery. Look these things will be marvellous, if we could get them. If we could afford to get them, they would be marvellous. It could create jobs. I am not opposed to jobs, jobs, jobs. I would like to have a part in creating as many as I could the same as any other member of this House. I am opposed to paying \$10,000 a year for a job that pays the recipient only \$5,000 a year. I am opposed to lining the pockets of a man like John Shaheen with \$5 million of our money, the money that we hold in sacred trust for the benefit of the people of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can stand here with some pride, Sir. Perhaps no modesty, but I hope I will be forgiven for that and say that I feel that the hon. member for St. John's West and myself have been totally vindicated on this proposed Come-by-Chance thing with the recent statements of the hon. Mr. Lang, the Federal Minister of Public Works, announcing that the Government of Canada would not build a dock at Come-by-Chance. Why? What about the jobs for Newfoundlanders? The reason why was that the only immediate user is Shaheen's company, the oil refinery, and they have not enough capital in it. They themselves have not enough personal capital in it to warrant the Government of Canada to do it. That is what we stood in this House two years ago May, 1968 - that is what we stood in this House and said and we were laughed at and jeered at and everything else. Perhaps my lack of modesty and pride might be understandable in those circumstances, Sir. Incidentally we saved \$5 million of it. I am proud of that part. It was to have been \$10 million, until we objected to it. It was quite willingly going to be \$10 million, until we said, "no." That is money belonging to the people of this Province and you are not to give it away. It suddenly gets cut down to \$5 million.

We sought information on the financial state, on the state of negotiations and what the Government proposed with these various companies and industries, and we gave them nebulous answers. The total lack of information, massive contempt for the members of this House and contempt for their electors, the people who will vote in the next election. Failure to provide the facts and the people are entitled to know, if their money, the only means they got of asking is through us. Witness the way the questions were answered in this House today. The answer will be provided in the budget, when the Minister of Finance was asked how many dollars were spent on so and so? The answer will be provided in the budget. There is an abandonment of responsibility. There is contempt for the House.

Questions on ERCO have never been answered. They got out of that one nice today by saying that there were further negotiations. No wonder he did not want to answer it. He was ashamed of it, and so he should be. It cost us between \$2 million and \$3 million a year to create about 200 to 300 jobs. Upwards of \$10,000 for every job at ERCO this Government pays ERCO every year. Upwards of \$10,000 for every job. Can we afford to go on with that kind of waste and extravagance? Where is the bottom of the money pit? It has been snacking us in the face for a long time, but we shut our eyes to it.

In the light of that, Mr. Speaker, all I have said not just these recent matters, all I have said - I have no alternative, Sir, but to move seconded by the hon. member for St. John's West that the following words be added to the Address in Reply:

"This House regrets the failure of the Government to provide the public of Newfoundland with the facts concerning the present economic and financial position of the Province and the failure to answer fully and completely, questions tabled in this House by members thereof touching upon the public affairs of the Province and states that it has no confidence in the Government."

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, may I emphasize why

140

Mr. Speaker, may I emphasize why, the primary reason why, I ask for support for the Motion that I have just introduced. By law, by our constitution - by force of law, we are the elected members to represent the people of this Province, and to look after their interest duly elected - responsible to them. And each individual one of us answerable to the collective members of this House.

The Government and every minister in particular, in particular - answerable to the people in this Province through this House. That is our system of government. It is a good one. But like any other, it will be rotten to the core if it is abused. The disdain and contempt with which this House as a whole - and individual members of it - particularly those sitting on this side, are treated by the Government, more particularly the Premier - It is beyond description, but it is obvious - it is obvious to the people - and in the not too distant future, they are going to say so. And I am now asking the hon. members of this House to recognize their responsibility to the people of this Province. And to recognize their sacred trust - and to say to the Government, and particularly the Premier - this is wrong. The House is not to be treated with this kind of contempt. The House is to be given the facts. It is the people's money we are spending, and we are taking from them by force of law.

Instead of doing what we did last year - do that, say that to the Government. Be honest with the people and be loyal not to any one man, be loyal to this Province and to its people. That is where our primary loyalty lies - not to any individual member of this House. Instead of doing what we did last year, and authorizing the borrowing of money to pay interest, and then covering it up by transferring from current to capital, an amount that should be properly in current, and was years before, in current. \$7 $\frac{1}{2}$,000,000. The redemption amount for our public debt, leaving us not enough money to pay the current installments and interest on our public debt - so that we had to borrow for it.

And that is the stage in which we are borrowing to pay our interest. Not when we do not have a penny left, not when we do not have enough left over after the current expenses of government - to repay the interest and the capital portion of our debts due that year. That is when we are borrowing to pay our interest. And we are doing that in this very year. And we here, authorized it

1/11

last year. I am glad my conscience allows me to say I opposed it, and drew the members' attention to it. I feel that I have done my duty, but I feel that it was a rather futile attempt - primarily because of the contempt the Government had for this House. That can only be translated into contempt for the people that the members of this House represent. That is what it gets right back to.

Look at the short term interest last year. On March 31st. 1968 - for the year that ended on March 31st. 1968 - the Government budgeted for \$630,000 to cover the interest on its short term borrowing. It is ninety day treasury bills and day to day overdrafts at the bank.

In two years it went up five hundred percent, to \$3,250,000 -and maybe it was more - that is just what they estimated for it last year. Two years flat - five hundred percent. Those fellows in 1933 could learn a thing or two from us.

I cannot Mr. Speaker, for the life of me - and I say it in all sincerity. I do not say it because I find myself on this side of the House. I am here because of the way I think, for no other - because of what I think about what we have been doing, and the wrongness of it. I had nothing to gain or lose by staying or going. I am here because I think it is the right course. And when I say these things, I say them honestly. I hold those opinions sincerely. I cannot for the life of me see how we meager - five hundred thousand souls can recover from the financial position we are in - if we stay on our present course.

Everybody bemoans tight money and blames all our problems on the war in Vietnam and tight money. I say to every member in this House, the day is not too far off, when every single person in this Province will thank God that we had tight money. And the Government could not borrow what it would have borrowed, if there were not tight money - or if money were not scarce.

We will thank our lucky stars for that day, the only thing that holds out a bit of restraint at all - waste and extravagance and grandiose schemes. I would like for those fellows in 1933 to see us now. - In the light of everything I have said --- and it has not been said out of any personal ill-will towards any man, including the Premier, or the member for Labrador South. No ill-will whatsoever. And I say that with all sincerity. It is just that I am so awfully

156

disgusted, ashamed to admit that I am a member of a House that treats its members that way. And so should every member who sits here and allows it to continue -- he should be totally ashamed of himself - if he is honest, he cannot come to any other conclusion.

For all the reasons that I have given, I ask you in sincerity to support me in my motion.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

APPLAUSE:

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that the Address in Reply be amended by adding the following word : " The House regrets the failure of the Government to provide the public of Newfoundland with the facts concerning the present economic and financial position of the Province, and the failure to answer fully and completely questions tabled in this House by members thereof touching upon the public affairs of the Province and states it has no confidence in the Government.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Speaking for hon. members of the House on this side of the House, I have to say that we reject the amendment, on the grounds that it is absurdly ridiculously premature - on the grounds that it has complained that we have not brought down the Budget yet.

The Budget will describe the financial and economic position of this Province. The House is now approximately one day old, this Session - one day - And before the day is over, we have an amendment to the Address in Reply, complaining that the Government have failed to describe the financial and economic condition of the Province. The right time and place and vehicle for that is the Budget. The Budget - not only the Budget Speech, but the Budget. Meaning the Budget Speech and the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure - and meaning particularly the Budget Speech, which is usually a long document spelling out in very great detail, supplemented by the actual figures in the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure. It is in that document that the Province is normally given, and not only this Province, every Province - and not only every province of Canada, but the Parliament of Canada - and the Government of the United Kingdom - the normal way, the common traditional normal way and time and vehicle, for giving the people the description of the economic and financial state of affairs - is the Budget, and particularly, but not exclusively - the Budget Speech.

I have seen and heard and read many amendments to the Address in Reply in my life. I do not think I have ever heard one so silly as this one. This is one in the very first day of the Session, when so far thirty-six of the fifty-six questions on the Order Paper, have been answered.

I do not think that in the history of this House ever before, was there such a high proportion of questions asked that were answered on the opening day. Thirty-six of the fifty-six questions tabled by the Opposition and Opposition members generally, on that side of the House - were answered here today. They might not in every instance have been answered to their satisfaction. But they are not the judges. Their duty and their right is to ask questions. The Government's duty and the Government's right is to answer them, as the Government sees fit.

And Mr. Speaker you will support that. There is no principle in British Parliamentary practise - no principle more firmly etched than that. To begin with Mr. Speaker, the Government are not required to answer even one question. Not one. There is no law - there is no rule requiring the Government to answer questions. The Government may refuse to do so. If it refuses, it does so at its own risk - its own peril - because it will have to answer to the people for refusal to answer.

But the form of the answer, the length of the answer is entirely at the discretion of the Queen's ministers. Now of the fifty-six questions that appeared on the Order Paper today, the Government answered thirty-six, leaving twenty still to be answered. A good many of those will be answered tomorrow.

I assume that on the Order Paper tomorrow, there will be questions of which notice was given today. And we will see these questions - the type-written copies may be on my desk now for all I know. But in all probability, tomorrow we will answer another large number of questions.

And so if the Opposition keep asking questions each day until the Budget Speech is brought down - and the Government keep answering questions until the Budget Speech is brought down - and then the Budget is brought down - if the totality of all our answers to questions - the totality of the Budget and the Budget Speech - and the totality of the hundreds of questions, that will be unquestionably be asked in relation to the Budget and the Estimates - at least I presume they will be asked. I counted here one year, the questions asked by the Opposition arising out of the Estimates, and I think it was up

144

around twelve or fourteen hundred questions. Presumably they will do the same - there are more of them now. They will ask perhaps even more questions on the Estimates - on the Budget, then has normally been the case. And so I say Mr. Speaker, the picture of the economic and financial condition of this Province will come out not by partisan, blind partisan hatred that we have heard tonight - not that. That is not the way the facts will come out. They will not come out in the tone and the spirit of a criminal lawyer prosecuting some poor devil

145

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: In court - that is not the way they will come out and the hon. gentleman will find that he cannot get away with that. He will find that out. Either in this House or in this occasion that he referred to so many times tonight. In this House or in this Province, he will find out. He will find out what is what. And it will not be a one-sided haranuge, full of hate and prejudice, bigotry. It will not be that. It will not be that. He will find out what is what.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Ah! the hon. gentleman will find out too. The hon. gentleman may well look forward to it. Because he is going to get it whether he likes it or not.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Whether he likes it or not he is going to get it. And for people who know how to give it.

SOME HON. MEMBER: He will never frighten me, he knows now.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman has tried to frighten me, with conspicuous failure. Because I trimmed him every time, I have licked him, and I have trimmed him, anytime he got up against me. And I will continue to do it.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman is a modest man.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: I am that modest, that I trimmed the hon. gentleman every time he faced me, and that is only half the story - that is only half the story - the other half is, I will continue doing it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please - we have three speaking at the same time.

SOME HON. MEMBER: I wonder what subject were we on now - I understand we are speaking to a motion.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman listens, he will hear.

MR. T. HICKEY: I have been listening.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: If he keeps on listening, and the hon. gentleman may learn.

MR. T. HICKEY: Ah! come on. Get on with it.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in this debate a lot of information will come out. To answer the amendment, the amendment complains that the Government has not described the financial and economic situation or the condition of the Province, perhaps Your Honour could give me the exact words.

MR. SPEAKER: The House regrets the failure of the Government to provide the public of Newfoundland with the facts concerning the present economic financial position of the Province.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: The Amendment complains that the Government in its first day, in the first day of the Session, in the first few hours of a session that may go on for two or three months, complains that we have not done what can be done only (a) in the course of this debate; because I will be speaking in the debate. I am speaking at the moment only on this Amendment. I will be speaking to the main subject - the Address in Reply. Other hon. members on this side will be doing so. And so in this debate, a lot of the information complained of in the amendment will come forward, will be brought to light. Secondly; a lot more will be brought to light by the answers to many questions that will be directed across the floor, from the other side. Thirdly; it will be brought to light, by the budget with the estimates of Revenue and Expenditure. Fourth; it will be brought to light by presumably many hundreds of questions that are asked in committee of Supply; Committee of Ways and Means, where a member may speak a hundred or two hundred times, if he like - where there is no limit on the times any hon. member may speak. There being a limit, of course, informal debate. But, in that informal debate, members may ask hundreds, untold hundreds of questions, and they are always answered. In these four or five ways - this House and through the House, the people of Newfoundland will be given a clear picture of the financial and economic condition of the Province. For this reason, the amendment is a silly amendment. It is as silly as an amendment could be, on the first day the House is opened.

What other opportunity had we had to do this? Could it have been done since three o'clock this afternoon? Three o'clock this afternoon, the House met. On Wednesday last there was a formal opening, the reading of the Speech from the Throne by His Honour the Lieutenant Government. Two or three formal speeches, and the House adjourned, and met again, today at three o'clock. Now what opportunity has there been since three o'clock for a description to be given of the economic and financial condition of this Province?

The hon. gentleman from Humber East gave his description of it. That is an element - that is chopped up good and clear. Others will even put them there, still others will give their interpretation, put it altogether, the Government will give it, I will give it, The Minister of Finance will give it, put it altogether, the estimates will be brought in, the budget will be brought in, put all that there together again, and by the time this session is over, some weeks from now, then presumably there will be a fair opportunity for this House and the people to have a fairly clear picture, and it will not be the jaundice, the hatred, the bigotry,

the intolerance will become modified with the truth.

You go into a court, and you hear one lawyer, in a case present his case, and if he the prosecuting lawyer, you would swear your life that that man in the dock is guilty. Nothing on earth can save him, he is obviously guilty. Why is he so obviously guilty? Because you have listened to the prosecuting lawyer. But, then the defending lawyer comes, and he brings his witnesses, and he makes his speech, and he presents the defence and you are not so sure, that is this a dirty criminal who wants to be put in jail forever. You are not so sure that he should be hanged. You are not so sure that he is guilty. When you have heard both sides, and not hearing only his own side, full of passionate bigotry, hearing only his own side, he asked this House to condemn the Government, before the Government has even an opportunity -

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I will go back to the hon. member's calling my colleague a passionate bigotry.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: That is not a point of Order. The hon. gentleman has no right in the matter. Let the hon. gentleman concerned object.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker is it customary for one person to speak at a time/ I am speaking on a point of Order. And my point of order is that the word "bigotry" has been applied to the speeches made by the learned member for Humber East and it is unparliamentary. There was no bigotry in his speech at all. And I ask that the hon. Premier be directed to those words.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to that point of Order. To say that the remarks of an hon. member as bigoted, intolerant, passionate, prejudice is not unparliamentary. Now, if he ^{not} does/ learn after a while, I will teach him. It takes a lot of doing. I may teach him a little bit about the rules of parliamentary. He will not teach me. The hon. gentleman will not be here after the next election.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: That is right.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: That is right. Not if he runs in St. John's West, he will not.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: You mean you are going to run.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Ah! never mind who is going to run. I will tell the hon. gentleman he is not going to be elected in St. John's West.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Come back to your own district. Come back to it.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: I went to St. John's West, and I took it two to one, which is more than the hon. gentleman did.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Come back and try it this time.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Yes, and go to Fortune and try - go to Gander and try Gander.

I will go to them all, ah!

SOME HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: YES.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: You have not got Term 29 this time to fall back on.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: No, but I have got the hon. gentleman to oppose that is a great help.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Come and try it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, and I will ask you for the last time.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if the session were now three or four or five or six weeks old, and the Government had failed completely to make even an attempt to describe the financial and economic condition of the Province, then perhaps such an amendment or such a motion as the one proposed by the hon. member for Humber East might be sensible, might have genuine significance, and meaning, but within a few hours of the House Opening, to indite the Government for failing to do what it is not going to do, what it is not able to do, what it is incapable of doing for some weeks to come. Cumulating, finally in the budget to indite the Government for every last word in silly nonsense. And I am sure on this side of the House, we will vote against it.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we have heard another vintage, a set of remarks from the hon. the Premier from this motion, which I will first point out is in two parts, or this non-confident motion "that this House regrets the failure of Government to provide the public of Newfoundland with the fact concerning the present economic and financial position of the Province". That is the first section. That has nothing to do with this hon. House. This has to do with the general policy of the present administrative, we regret their failure to provide the public of Newfoundland with the fact concerning the present economic and financial position of the Province. That is the first part, and the failure to answer fully and completely questions tabled in this House by members hereof touching upon the public affairs of the Province, and states it has no confidence in this Government!"

Now I will illustrate in a few minutes time, the contempt with which the question were treated today that were on the Order Paper. To say that thirty-six out of the fifty-six were answered, is non-sensical-answers, yes, gotten up and spoken about, but answered, the facts given, none at all. We are not that green over here. We know something about the information we are asking about. They were not answered. They were spoken too. I will deal with that in detail in a few moments.

Mr. Speaker, when this House last rose, last spring we were all under the happy delusion that the hon. the Premier would be the hon. the X-Premier by this time, this year 1970. This is what he told us, and this is what we understood. And it is too bad that we cannot see him up there in the galleries tonight, smiling down on us benignly as we are doing our work.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: And the hon. gentleman is sitting here. Would not that be dumb.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: And the hon. gentleman or someone else -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: - Would not that be lovely?

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: And there are many things that that should be, but I would be quite prepared to sacrifice, to fight with anyone else.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman has no choice in the matter.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Anyone else.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: He was squashed.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Who would replace the hon. member, of the hon. Premier opposite. We thought we were going to hear from Outer Mongolia, that our travelling reporter reporting from Outer Mongolia or in Economic Development in Nepal, but we discover that the situation has not changed to our regrets. And those things that were said last year, had been reversed. And the hon. the Premier has the gall to say that other people are inconsistent.

We thought we would hear a radio program from Outer Mongolia - Monologs with the Master, rather than conversation with the Premier, that we hear every day now on radio station VOXM. Conversations is not the right title for that program - monologs - the master.

But, we are here in this House to exercise our duty whatever side of it, we are on. And this motion, Mr. Speaker, is a very proper motion. It has nothing to do with today's activities solely. Today's activities are an illustration of the contempt which the hon. the Premier has for the ordinary private members of this House, and the functions of the House of Assembly. And the way that the questions were asked, were treated today. But this motion deals with more than that - it is the failure of the Government to provide the public of Newfoundland, even when the House is not opened, with the facts about our economic and financial position. And we will have more on that. The hon. the Premier said, it is the right time for this, he says, is in the budget and it is such a silly motion. Sure any motion of non-confidence in the hon. Premier's is silly, according to him.

/V-A

February 23rd. 1970

Tape # 39

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: There is a lot of truth in that.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: The right time for this is not in the budget. If hon. members will remember the budget we looked at last year, that tremendous document, that tear-jerker - there was a hundred - I will just check, Mr. Speaker, there was a hundred and thirty-odd pages I believe. A hundred and twenty-one pages. The first ninety-two pages concern themselves with historical comparison over the past twenty years to show the progress, we are supposed to have made, or we have made in Newfoundland.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Describing the conditions of the Province.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: And concerned itself with the general philosophy of the Government.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Describing, describing, the conditions of the Province.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: That is the general philosophy of the hon. the Premier. And went ahead to describe certain supposed policies of the Government with reference to cheap power. Or at least to say the power cheap rates. It was not until page 92, that anything was said about the financial position of the Government. And what was unsaid, was a lot more interesting than what was said.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: The rest was economic and financial both.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: I will come to that in more detail.

The Minister of Education balanced his part of it on a \$400,000,00 typographical error.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Mr. Wells.

MR. CROSBIE: That is insulting. We are not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to wait in faith and trust until the budget is brought down this year to ask our questions and to ask for some - the Government to level with the public and what the facts are about our economic and fiscal position here. We do not think we are going to find it in the budget. We hope we will. We know, we know the normal place for this is in the budget, but this is not a normal Province and this is not a normal Government, and the person who drafts the budget is not a normal budget drafter.

It is the hon. the Premier and he has his own. The hon. member has his own way of drafting budgets and they are drafted for certain purposes and if this year's budget is any different - if this year levels, if this year the budget levels with the members of this House and the public of Newfoundland and gives us their financial position in black and white as it really is, and our economic prospects as they really are, and brings us face to face with reality, then we will apologize to the hon. the Premier and say, "Your practices of the past twenty years led us astray in doubting you at the beginning of this session". When that happens, I will be delighted to stand up in this House or even get down on my knees and apologize. I do not think it is very likely that I am going to have to.

The hon. the Premier says, "It is the duty of a government to answer questions as the government sees fit!" That is quite literally true, and it is an interesting description of the approach he takes to the questions asked in this House. "We will answer your questions as we see fit. You and your fiddling, fiddling, ridiculous questions. Who are you to concern yourselves with how those questions are answered. We will give you the answer. You will accept our answer. Do not doubt our answer. You take what we see fit to give you." That is his attitude. Well, we are not, we do not see fit to accept that attitude. We are not going to accept that attitude.

We are going to ask the questions and if we do not get the questions answered as we think they should, we will press on and ask them again, or put motions down again, because we do not intend to be treated with contempt. We will fight back. We are going to fight back as long as this session is going, in any event.

152

Yes, the hon. the Premier thinks this is quite a silly resolution. "Once this session is over," the hon. Premier says, "we will have a clear picture."

A clear picture of what? We will have a clear picture if we can force that picture out of the hon. the Premier and in no other way.

Now, let us look. Let us look at the wonderful answers we got to the questions today - the members on this side of the House. Let us analyze and examine that.

Mr. Murphy asked Question No. 2, Part One. "What is the amount owed by Newfoundland Transportation Co. Ltd. to the Newfoundland Government as at December 31, 1969?" The answer of the hon. the Premier, "As shown in the Public Accounts".

MR. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): Good answer.

MR. CROSBIE: That was an even answer to say, "Give the answer. He has the answer".

MR. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, may I ask Your Honor's ruling on this.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): Is it proper for a member of this House to ask a question, the answer to which is already available to the member? An for instance, in the Public Accounts? Is it proper for an hon. member to ask the question?

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot - I am not supposed to give an answer to a hypothetical question, but that question has already been answered before and I believe today in announcing presence of most of the members of this House, anyway, to the effect that when a question is answered and the answer is given that it is available somewhere else, that it is equally to one person as it is to another, that is the end of the answer - the end of the question and the end of the answer.

MR. CROSBIE: We know, Mr. Speaker. We are now discussing whether the Government is giving us the information requested in the questions that were tabled in the order placed for today.

SOME HON. MEMBER: December 31, 1969.

MR. CROSBIE: And that question had to do with the situation at December 31, 1969. The Public Accounts are not published for this year yet.

Another question - Question No. 6. Mr. Murphy asked, "Would the Premier table correspondence with any Departments of Government of Canada relative to agreements regarding wages to be paid on any joint cost-shared project?" The answer by the hon. the Premier, "No recollection of any such correspondence."

Well, what does that mean, Mr. Speaker? We have a government and the Government has officials and employees to go through Government files. Surely, when the question is asked, "Is there any correspondence relating to a joint cost-shared project", the answer should be either, "Yes, there is", or, "No, there is not". Not that there is no recollection of any. We know very well the hon. the Premier might not have any recollection of something like this. He might have not even gotten the correspondence.

Next question by Mr. Murphy - 7 - asked of the Minister of Education. He asks about the total anticipated capital cost of Memorial University Buildings at Harlow, England. The hon. the Minister of Education says that he feels it is not proper to answer, since this is internal administration of the University - Memorial University - that Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, in our opinion is not a satisfactory position to take.

Memorial University, particularly for its capital expenditure, has to have its money voted by this House, and last year when there was a dispute between the Government and Memorial University as to the inadequacy or otherwise of what the Government was providing the University in the estimates the University was required to present in budget..

SOME HON. MEMBER: Is he aware that this House was not asked to vote any money to the Harlow Campus?

MR. CROSBIE: I was not aware. I was not aware, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: In that case, he might want to change the comment he just made.

MR. CROSBIE: No. Mr. Speaker, I now want to reinforce my comments. You see that the hon. the Minister today could have gotten up and said that the Government did not vote any money for Harlow - for buildings at Harlow?

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: He did not say it now. He did not say it now.

SOME HON. MEMBER: He did say it.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: He did not say, "Just now". He did not say it anytime.

It is the House that voted the money, not the Government.

MR. CROSBIE: Very good, this is a question of semantics, Mr. Speaker -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Not the Government, the House.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. the Minister could have told you-

The crown prince is joining the king. The crown prince had better relax. Just relax, your time will come. The ex-crown princes are miserable tonight. There are a number of ex-crown princes over here.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: They are feeling miserable? They are going to be much more miserable.

MR. CROSBIE: Crown Prince No. 1, the hon. Minister of Health. Crown Prince, once removed, the hon. Minister of Community and Social Development and there are others, other crown princes. Well, the burdens of anticipating as crown princes are gone from us - so we do not have to worry about it any longer. The hon. the minister, Mr. Speaker, could have given us the information he just gave us at question period today.

Other examples--

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: No good examples yet.

MR. CROSBIE: Other examples, Mr. Speaker.

Question 21, Section 3. The question was about Koch Shoes Ltd., Mr. Speaker. Has the firm Koch Shoes Ltd. permanently closed? Answer, "No".

(3) What amount of additional loans, either direct from Government or guarantee, has been made to Koch Shoes Ltd. since April 1, 1968?

Not presently known is the answer. What kind of an answer is that? A Government that does not presently know whether it has given additional loans to Koch Shoes Ltd. since April 1, 1968, either direct from Government or by Government guarantee. If the Government does not presently know that, when will the Government it, Mr. Speaker? And if the Government knows it cannot stay in :

155

the Government knows it cannot stay in office. Is there a possibility that loans have been made direct or by government guarantee to Koch Shoes Limited, unknown to the Government - but guaranteed by it. Well the answer is nonsensical is it not? Not presently known. That was not one of the Premier's better answers.

Oh there are so many of these choice answers that were given today -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: That is four -

MR. CROSBIE: Oh if you are going to count like that, I am going to go back over this -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Go ahead. Go right through the thirty-six - I challenge the hon. gentleman to go through the thirty-six -

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. CROSBIE: I will -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Go ahead -

MR. CROSBIE: I accept your challenge -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Go ahead -

MR. CROSBIE: Oh mighty Premier -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: This wit is devastating - it is utterly annihilating this wit is -

MR. CROSBIE: Oh I am glad Mr. Speaker, that the Premier enjoys my wit - he does not enjoy much else about me -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: So long as the hon. gentleman stays underneath, where I put him -

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. the Premier is a modest man. He has given me an awful drumming - he has given me an awful licking. He has put me under, he has buried eighteen feet deep. I concede it all. He does not need to say it anymore. He has trimmed me, defeated me, hit me, banged me - put me under, and here I stand -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: I keep reminding him - I keep reminding the hon. gentleman.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, there are false rumours around spread by the hon. the Minister of Community and Social Development on a T.V. program the other day, that I had some personal animosity to the Premier -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Perish the thought - Did you say that? You did not say that -

MR. CROSBIE: All right Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that the hon. the Premier is one of the greatest men that has ever trod the shores of Newfoundland -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: That is sincere. That is a sincere declaration out of the hon. gentleman's own heart, is it not?

MR. CROSBIE: That is right - Oh the hon. the Premier did not think I had a heart - now he has admitted it.

(Laughter)

MR. CROSBIE: Yes Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest men that ever trod our shores. But he has trod them in an office of power too long. That is the only objection I have with respect to the hon. gentleman. I believe that the hon. gentleman is one of the most fascinating personalities I have ever met - one of the greatest speakers, one of the finest conversationalists - admittedly he is a bit one way -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Watch for the daggers -

(Laughter)

MR. CROSBIE: In other words Mr. Speaker, he is a man of many fine parts, and others that are not so fine - we all have our combination. There are some things I do not admire about him, but I have no personal animosity for him -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: No none. Not a bit -

MR. CROSBIE: I disagree Mr. Speaker with his policies, with his administration of the Government. I feel that it is in the interest of this Province, that he should go - but since he might accuse me of being interested, I will leave that point -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Nothing personal -

MR. CROSBIE: Now to come back hon. Premier to question (43). Question (43) Now count up, that is number five. Question (43). I asked this. Now we get back to this Resolution here, we do not want to lose track of the important business of this House. Question (43) - The member for St. John's West and myself, asked the Premier - had he received reports in connection with the power policy of the Government, the Energy Board of Canada, the Power Commission of Newfoundland and Labrador, International Engineers of California, Merz and McClellan of London, England - How these names roll off the lips. The Economics Division of the Department of Finance of the Government of Newfoundland, Engineers from Stone & Webster of New York, officials from the Department of Finance of Canada, the Department of Energy of Canada, or the Department of Regional Economic Expansion of Canada. And his answer was "yes".

A splendid answer. I asked, had these Reports been distributed to members of the Government, that was privileged and I would accept that.

(3) Is it the intention of the Government to make available to members of this House of Assembly copies of these reports and studies.

Answer - "No".

Now Mr. Speaker, I come back to our Resolution - It is not the intention of the Government to give the members of this House copies of these important reports, which have to do with the so-called cheap power policy of the Government. Which is a power policy, but not cheap. It is the policy of the Government to sell hydro-electric power at the sum of two and one half mils per kilowatt hour - And large users, heavy users of electrical energy. And that power Mr. Speaker, as far as we know, never having seen these reports - that power is costing this Province between five and six mils to generate - and certainly to generate and deliver. And this has been the policy of this Government for the past several years.

These studies were commissioned by the Government to give the facts on what this Province could afford. Could the Province afford to continue this policy? Could two and a half mils be continued, or would it have to go to three mils, or three and a half mils per kilowatt hour? Would it be cheaper for us to develop power here by steam, oil-fired steam boilers, or would it be cheaper to bring power from Labrador across the Straits and down through Newfoundland. That is what these studies were commissioned to report on. What could be more important for the future of this Province than these reports? Is it economically feasible for our Government to be selling power at two and a half or three, or three and a half mils to attract industry in Newfoundland, or not? Will it possibly bankrupt us? How are the costs as compared to the benefits that we will get from the power coming here - the job that might be created and the rest of it.

That is what these studies were commissioned for. Can we get power in this Island, hydro-power from Labrador by way of the straits and down through Newfoundland or not? Could anything - could the answer to any question be of more importance to this Province? And yet the members of this House are told, that it is the decision of the Government, not to make available to us copies of those reports and studies, so that we are in the dark. The backbenchers of Government are in the dark unless they are given them - the members of the Governme:

as to what is a sensible policy with respect to power here in Newfoundland. That is why, that is one of the reasons why we have moved this vote of non-confidence that we regret the failure of the Government to provide the public of Newfoundland with the facts concerning our present economic and financial position. That is one of the economic positions that we would like to have information on, and that the public would like to have information on.

And part (5) of that question I asked - Was it the Government's intention to appoint a Select Committee to study these reports and to examine those who prepared them. Because the studies themselves Mr. Speaker, are not enough by themselves. You need to read the studies and then to examine the people who did them, asked the questions. The answer to that was "no".

That is why we are moving that Resolution, because the answer to this question is a reflection of the attitude of the Government, insofar as giving information - The Government will give the public information that it wants the public to have, or the Opposition, or the members of this House to have - but not the other information. That is kept - that is kept for a few, and we do not even know how few that few are. Is it one man that has seen all these reports, or more than one? And what do they dispose? I trust Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman will revert his policy on these reports before this Session ends. And certainly before there is an election - because surely the public of his province expect to hear what the facts are with reference to the major item of economic development that affects us all in this Province.

No, we are not to get them - Why not? We asked the question why not? Another question Mr. Speaker I asked - Question No. (44) These were financial questions that were asked the Minister of Finance.

As of January 1, 1970 what is the amount of the gross funded debt of the Province less any sinking funds?

(2) As of the same date, what is the amount of the net funded debt of Crown Corporations involved in leasebacks?

(3) As of January 1, 1970 what is the amount of direct unfunded debt of the Province under certain headings?

(a) bank overdrafts?

(b) Temporary borrowing?

(c) Due on new road machinery?

- (d) Due on road building contracts?
 - (e) Due on hospital equipment contracts?
 - (f) Other unfunded debt?
- (4) As of the same date what is the amount of the Guaranteed Debt of the Province under the following headings:
- (a) Guaranteed debenture debt with reference to the Newfoundland municipalities?
 - (b) Guaranteed debenture debt other than with respect to Newfoundland municipalities?
 - (c) Guaranteed bank loans for Newfoundland municipalities?
 - (d) Guaranteed bank loans for other than Newfoundland municipalities?
 - (e) Any other guaranteed debt?
- (5) As at January 1, 1970 what is the total amount of any commitments given by the Government to guarantee debt for others in the future showing the name of any municipality, corporation or person to whom such commitment has been given and the amount of such commitment?

The Minister of Finance rises to his feet - the hon. Minister and says "This is a matter for the Budget, this will be in the Budget". If this is in the Budget, it will be the first time it is in the Budget. And I do not care Mr. Speaker, whether or not it is in the Budget. We are entitled to ask what the position is as of January 1st.

The present Government had a bond issued just a week or two ago. All this information is right at their finger tips. It had to be prepared for the prospectus that goes out for the bond issue. Yet the Hon. the Minister of Finance comes in here and thinks that we will accept his answer, that this is the kind of thing that is going to be in the Budget.

Well we hope it will be in the Budget, but in the meantime, his officials in his department know and can get in an hour or two hours this information, so that we will know what our financial position was as of January 1, 1970.

It also asks what is the total amount of commitments given by the Government to guarantee debt? That will not be in the Budget. At least if it is, it will be the first time. We want to know, we would like to know also, the public would like to know - how many commitments have been given to people, and municipalities and corporations, that their bonds are going to be guaranteed - showing their name. We know some of them. We know Melville - Fifty-three

million, Whitmire Refining, thirty million, Newfoundland Pulp and Chemical, fifteen million, what others are there? Is that going to appear in the budget? Will the budget list the name of every person, company, firm or municipality to whom this government have given a commitment that they will guarantee their bonds or other loans for them?

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me? Surely he must know that the Loan and Guarantee Act and every other individual piece of legislation brought in has to reveal all that. He must know that. He must know it.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the Loan and Guarantee Act will show what actual guarantees, orders in council the government have passed -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: No. No. No. Is asking authority to do this or that, not what has been done but asking authority of the House to guarantee this or guarantee that or lend this or lend that.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the Loan and Guarantee Act will show the loans and guarantees a government have formally committed itself to at the Act is passed through the House.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Is not that what the hon. gentleman wants?

MR. CROSBIE: I would like more than that, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: What? What more? What?

MR. CROSBIE: What promises have been made for guarantees that are not included so far, to date -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Not except what is in the Act. There cannot be any except what is in the Act. The hon. gentleman knows that.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman is always willing to learn, and when the Loan and Guarantee Act comes up in this Session, then we will have a look at it -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: Then what the hon. gentleman just said is nonsense - If it going to be in the Guarantee and Loan Act, what has been said prior to that on that matter is utter trash.

MR. CROSBIE: Has the hon. the Premier finished? That was Question (44) Mr. Speaker. Now let us see how we fared in a few others? Question (46) Some parts of it were answered - About the Forestal Report - Forestal Forestry and Engineering. A couple of sections were not answered. What date was the

161

interim report received? It was received, but on what date? That has to be looked up. What payment has been made by the Government from Forestal Forestry and Engineering International Ltd. in connection with the said survey? That question is not answered.

What happened this morning Mr. Speaker is quite clear. Anybody can infer what happened. It was the opening day of the Session, with fifty-six questions on the Order Paper. And so the people who are directing this Government thought "by golly, we will show the public how we give out the information - we will answer as many of those questions as we can. It does not matter how trashy the answers are. We will answer thirty-six out of the fifty-six. And most of the answers did not amount to a row of beans. And the important questions, or some of them were not answered at all. But we were fobbed off with statements by the hon. the Minister of Finance, and the hon. the Premier, that we were not to have the information at all.

This Motion says the House regrets the failure of the Government to provide the public with the facts concerning the present economic and financial position. Well let us look at the third mill. Question No. (46) dealt with the proposed Newfoundland and pulp and Chemical Company Limited Mill at Come-by-Chance. And I asked about a study that Forestal Forestry and Engineering International Limited were hired to do by the Newfoundland Pulp and Chemical Company people, and by the Government of Newfoundland.

The members of this House have never seen the interim report. But the people of this country have paid for half of it, and we have never received a copy of the final report. But we paid for half of that - the taxpayers of Newfoundland. What is the position with reference to this third mill at Come-by-Chance. The Newfoundland Pulp and Chemical Company Limited Mill. We do not know. We are completely in the dark - We do not know. We do not know today, and we will not know much more either after today, if the Government does not cease its reluctance to give out the information that we are entitled to have and if the government is going to give us information on the third mill, let us see the copies of this interim report and the final report of Forestal Forestry and International, Limited. What do they say it is going to cost us to subsidize the cost of taking pulp from Labrador rather than from the Island of Newfoundland, if that has to be done? What does it say about the cost to us of constructing pulp roads? What does it say about all the other features that are involved in that project? We have a right to know. As a former candidate for the City Council had as a slogan 'We have a right to know' /62

I allowed that slogan to drop a bit while I was in the Government. But now that we are back here again -

PREMIER SMALLWOOD: The third time across the floor -

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, just as inconsistent as you -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

As it is now eleven o'clock this House now stands adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday at 3 P.M.

163