



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number ~~28~~<sup>13</sup>

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1974**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL**

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

HON. JOHN C. CROSBIE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a question of a breach of privilege of a member of this House; namely the member who is now speaking. I refer to Page 98 of Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, which says that libels on members being constantly punished, but to constitute a breach of privilege, they must concern the character or conduct of members in that capacity. The libel must be based on matters arising in the actual transaction of the business of the House. In Beauchesne, Page 101: "Willful misrepresentation of the proceedings of members is an offence of the same character as a libel."

Mr. Speaker, the breach of privilege I wish to refer to appears in an editorial in the "Evening Telegram" of Monday, February 18. The editorial is headed, "The Long Hoist." Mr. Speaker, this is an editorial which concerns myself on a debate in the House a week ago tomorrow, Wednesday, February 13, when a private members' resolution by the member for St. John's North was being debated and I spoke on that debate. The editorial in question is a willful misrepresentation of what I said in that debate. I wish to go into that now.

It was an editorial written by an anonymous editor but the anonymous editor is Mr. Wickford Collins, commonly known as Wick Collins of the "Evening Telegram." It is an editorial that is motivated by malice, by spleen, by venom and apparently by a vindictive desire to harm a member of this House. The editorial is not only careless of the truth but it is willfully false. It twisted and corrupted what I said. It is an attack on my character and reputation. I refer to the editorial but I will not read it all. The second paragraph says:

"Mr. Crosbie seems to be well informed on election financing. He spoke with easy familiarity of the abuses that take place and left the impression that there is not much of the seamy side of politics that he does not know about, and apparently is prepared to accept for now. Perhaps at some later date he will be less inclined to accept the patronage and graft that become part and parcel of the donation to party funds."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the debate last week, I spoke for seventy-five minutes. The debate is covered in Hansard. We have the Hansard No. 9, Volume 3, 3rd. Session. My speech is recorded on pages 702 to 737 of that Hansard. There is not one place in that debate, when I spoke, where I appeared inclined to accept patronage or graft or anything of that nature. The whole burden of my speech was that there needed to be change and reform along the lines of the resolution provided by the Member for St. John's North. I showed some of the abuses that were necessary to be corrected and that only this legislation could correct it or legislation along those lines.

Mr. Speaker, on page 707, I spoke about the intention of legislation and why it was necessary, why there must be reform of the financing of a political party. Further down that page, I mentioned that patronage is the system in all ten provinces and in the Government of Canada. In that connection, I admitted when questioned, that the awarding of an advertising contract, i.e.,<sup>†</sup> to George McLean would be an act of patronage, that the Government at Ottawa awarded tens of millions of dollars in advertising contracts in the same way each year, which is an example of patronage, and that this was common in all provinces.

Now what is patronage, Mr. Speaker? I used a standard college dictionary. Patronage is defined as: "The protection, support or position of a patron; in the public service, the power or right to

distribute offices, especially political offices." That is patronage, Mr. Speaker, and that is what patronage means; "The awarding or protection of a patron or the power or right to distribute offices, especially political offices." It has no connection whatsoever with corruption



nor has it any connection with dishonesty. I mentioned this as one of the things that can only be corrected if we have reform of the Electoral Law. On page 709, that is quite clear. "Mr. Speaker," I said; "This is why this kind of thing is needed." That is the kind of legislation that is being contemplated in the resolution.

The editorial, Mr. Speaker, is extremely clever in its concoction because it is concocted with a view to the laws of libel. If we just look at the paragraph which I just read, we will notice that Mr. Collins said; "Perhaps at some later date he will be less inclined to accept the patronage." Then he goes on and adds; "And graft." Graft was never mentioned in the debate.

What is the definition of graft, Mr. Speaker? A standard college dictionary says that graft is the act of getting personal advantage or profit by dishonest or unfair means, especially through one's political or official connections. So, Mr. Collins goes on to add to patronage, graft. I will proceed on to the fifth paragraph in the editorial. He calls for an enquiry into the relationship between Mr. McLean and the P.C. Government and then says; "This kind of patronage is the worst and most insidious form of graft." Graft. "And any premier or cabinet minister who is prepared to defend it as right and proper should not be trusted to hold high office in this province."

Mr. Speaker, I did not defend it as right and proper nor right or proper. I said that this was an example of the things that needed to be corrected and could only be corrected through reform of the Election Financing Law.

The editorial goes on in the next paragraph and it says; "Does it not strike anybody in government from the merest backbencher to the Premier himself, that patronage is the doorway to crooked government and by Mr. Crosbie's admission we gather that the P.C. Government has already gone through that doorway. Is it not ironic that the P.C's. who have charged the Liberals with running dishonest government, are themselves doing the same thing and

defending it as if it were justified." There is no defence of dishonest government in any remark I made last Wednesday as reference to the Hansard will show.

It goes on to say; "If the P.C's. had any firm stand against crooked government, they would give the highest priority to a new bill to control election expenses." Then, Mr. Collins says; "Perhaps their lack of hurry is dictated by the desire to fill their own money pots before they bring such a bill."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Collins is well aware of the fact that you cannot libel a group, that you cannot libel a whole cabinet, so this is why he words his editorial; "Perhaps their lack of hurry is dictated by the desire to fill their own money pots before they bring in such a bill."

The whole editorial, Mr. Speaker, completely misrepresents the record of this House, completely misrepresents what I said

and is a libel on the government which is not actionable because it is the government generally. It is a scurrilous and insidious attempt to vilify and defame me by an anonymous character assassin who I identified today as being Mr. Wickford Collins. It is unscrupulous journalism of the wrong sort. I know that it is probably a waste of time to bring it forward. I know that editorials are not widely read but anyone who reads that editorial will believe that I made a speech last Wednesday in which I supported graft corruption, crookedness in government and boasted about patronage, claimed that it was the right system and said that we should not change it. That is the whole tenor of the editorial.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say this to Mr. Collins and the "Evening Telegram" (The "Evening Telegram" by the way properly reported my speech last Wednesday and the report was quite accurate as to what they had in the newspaper.) I say this and I challenge Mr. Collins to do this; I challenge Mr. Collins to print an editorial or statement which says that John C. Crosbie has defended patronage or that John C. Crosbie has defended graft or advocated graft or that John C. Crosbie has ever accepted graft or supports graft or defended graft. I challenge him to print a statement that John C. Crosbie's lack of desire for this Electoral Reform Bill is dictating by the desire to fill his pockets, his money pots, before such a bill is brought in. Let Mr. Collins say that about me so that I can take the proper action against him in the courts. Let him put up or shut up. Let him not be weasel-worded in his editorials criticizing in this way a collectivity that he knows cannot sue. Let him state that the person he mentions in his editorial that he is trying to insinuate believes in this or has done this, let him come out straight and say that I am not supporting the electoral reform because I have a desire to fill my own money pots before it is brought in.

Let him come out and say that I am dishonest or that I believe in crooked government or support crooked government. Let him make one of these statements directly instead of concocting a weasel-worded, insidious, nasty, vicious, vehement, bilious editorial of a type that he perpetrated in the "Evening Telegram" yesterday, Monday, February 18, completely

contrary - I challenge any member of the press or any member of the House to read my remarks in Hansard and see how this editorial can apply to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that in the case of privilege as a member of the House that you can bring forward a resolution but I have no desire to make Mr. Wick Collins or any other member of the press a hero by asking that he be brought before the Bar of this House. I just wish the right to defend myself against this kind of vicious and scurrilous editorial that can do nothing but discourage anyone who is interested in this province from ever putting his nose forward in the public life.

#### PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Member for Grand Falls.

MR. A. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition at this time. This petition is not from my own district and before I comment on the prayer of the petition I would like to make a few remarks which I feel are relative to this situation.

In regards to comments which I made last Friday in my speech, in the Address In Reply in this honourable House. At that time I made some statements to the effect that I had received many requests from people around the province in districts that were represented by Liberal members. I did this in defence, Sir, of the much criticism that we have received on this side of the House as members in performance of our duties. I was challenged at that time to produce evidence of such requests.

So, Sir, I feel today in answer to that challenge that I can produce some evidence in support of the comments that I made.

This petition was presented to me by the Local Improvement Committee of Frederickton in Fogo District. The prayer of the petition states that we do earnestly believe that

present highway between Main Point and Carmanville are in an upgraded condition and ready for paving. We do urge that any delays on the part of government can only mean an added cost to future programmes as the roads continue to deteriorate. We further urge that the aforementioned highways be paved as an urgent and top priority with the present Government. We contend that the said highways do caretake for mail service, school children, transportation, as where many of the school children in the various communities are bussed to the school at Carmanville, all business concerns travelling the Northeast Coast, in the area of freight transport and general passengers to and from Gander. This is not to overlook the tremendous percentage of workers travelling to and from Gander and other immediate areas for work.

We hereby distribute this document so that it solicits the consensus of the populace, all voters of nineteen years or beyond. Hereby, we the undersigned do petition the Provincial Government of Newfoundland for immediate attention in the paving of highways from Main Point through Davidsville through Frederickton, from there through the community of Noggin Cove and finally connecting to the road in Carmanville which leads out of that community. They have requested that paving could commence as early as the spring of 1974. Upon

Upon receiving this petition I checked into the matter somewhat and I find that the Government has, since 1972, spent a considerable amount of money in this area, grading the various roads and making them ready for paving. I further understand that this is an ongoing project and in line with other priorities in the Province that I am sure this request will receive all due consideration.

Sir, the community of Frederickton is a typical rural community, maybe not too much heard of, maybe considered insignificant but yet and again in line with many of the remarks which I made on Friday, it is the type of community which is making a great contribution to rural development in this Province.

In addition, Sir, to the items of concern outlined in the prayer of the petition, I would also like to point out that the community of Frederickton is an important collecting centre for various species of fish, particularly lobster and salmon. I have been informed that as high as 330,000 pounds of lobster and 150,000 pounds of salmon are shipped out of this Community by the road in question here and this has a market value somewhere in the vicinity of \$2 million. I am told This fish is shipped by refrigerated truck through Gander, along the Trans Canada Highway to Port aux Basques, then Sir, across the Gulf, down the Eastern Seaboard to the market in Boston. Again, Sir, a significant example, a great example of a contribution that a small community is making to the economy of Newfoundland.

In view of that, Sir, I take great pleasure in supporting this petition and would request that our Government would give it all due consideration in line with other priorities within the Province. I hereby request that the petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates. I could mention before that, Sir, that this is signed by seventy-six residents of the community of Frederickton and there were no refusal of signatures to the petition.

MR. E. W. WINSOR (Fogo): Mr. Speaker, first of all in supporting this petition I want it to be known that I am not offended that the honourable member for Grand Falls, as the organizer for the P.C. Party, is going travelling around the community, through the Province, soliciting such things as he has done today and for the sake of the people of Frederickton, it is a well-know fact, that Frederickton is perhaps the lone area where the P.C. stronghold is



is very good there is no denying that. If by presenting that petition to this honourable House, being a supporter of the government, that the people of Frederickton can force this government to pave that road from Gander all the way around the route. I say; God bless them! I would encourage the honourable member to do more travelling like that and solicit more support because he is going to need it in the next election. I do not think for one moment that this petition is going to change the voters of the district as a whole. In Frederickton it is what I expect. I take much pleasure in supporting the petition.

Now I would expect from the government that this road would be paved this year, as a true sign of wanting to do something for people who are and have been loyal to the P.C. Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

HON. E.M. ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word in support of this petition. I think my friend the gentleman from Fogo has put the case very well. I have nothing to say about the gentleman from Grand Falls except to say, Sir, with respect to the petition, that I hope that people anywhere in Newfoundland who are represented by any member will feel free to send their petitions to any member of the House for presentation. In behalf of the nine of us on this side, Mr. Speaker, I invite any of my constituents or any constituents from any of the eight other constituencies represented by my colleagues, to send their petitions to the gentleman from Grand Falls in the hope and expectations, Sir, that the work requested in the petition will be done this year.

I say now, here, as the member for White Bay North, three times returned by the people in White Bay North, that I would be honoured and proud if they wanted to send any petition or representation to the gentleman from Grand Falls or to any gentleman on that side, and that I expect that any such representation will be honoured this year.

I think my friend from Fogo has put it well and if this

petition, Sir, whether solicited or not, and I will leave that to the gentleman from Grand Falls and his conscience to decide, that this petition, Sir, will be granted. I hope that any of my constituents who wish to raise matters with the government would feel free to do so and then not become the subject of a third-class political attempt by a third-class politician, namely; the gentleman from Grand Falls, and that the petitions be sent in. If any of my constituents feel that they can get greater advantage from the government by seeking the assistance of the gentleman from Grand Falls, I hope they will feel at liberty to do so.

What counts on the petition, Sir, or what counts in this House, as the gentleman from St. John's East Extern said yesterday when I had the pleasure of waiting upon him with a delegation from my constituency and I believe I am quoting him correctly - we were talking about a road in Croque - when he said: "It makes no difference what side of the House we are on, a need is a need." I was glad to hear him say that. I agreed with him there at the meeting in the presence of the Parish Priest from Conche, from that Parish, Sacred Heart Parish, and in the presence of three other gentlemen from Croque, that if any of my constituents feel the urge, feel that they will get better treatment by sending a petition as this one to the gentleman from Grand Falls, I hope they will. I hope they will send it to the Premier or to any other member of the House, because what counts and what counts on this petition, Mr. Speaker, is that the prayed for work be done.

I hope the road will be paved this year. I hope that the road will be paved this year, Sir, and now that the gentleman from Grand Falls, as an exemplar of his concern for the people of Fogo District and as an exemplar of his immense and intimate acquaintance with all of the people of this province, and now that he has presented this petition so ably and with such research and such hoopla, I have no doubt the road will be paved.



Certainly, Sir, the people in Frederickton will be expecting it, the people served by that road will be expecting it and they will be expecting it this year. I support the petition and do it gladly, Sir.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Hear! Hear!

MR. J.C. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I too support this petition but I take some exception to remarks made by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition with regard to -

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My understanding of the rules is that one may not debate on a petition. The gentleman from Bonavista South, I say, Sir, has intimated that he is touching off a debate and I would ask Your Honour to warn him, to nip it in the bud as it is, Mr. Speaker. We are not allowed, and I understand Your Honour has ruled time and time again in this House, Sir, that one may not debate a petition. One may speak in support of it and I invite the gentleman from Bonavista South to observe the rules, Sir.

HON. F.D. MOORES (Premier): Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. It is all very well for the honourable the Leader of the Opposition to talk about Croque in his remarks and to talk about the Parish Priest and to talk about the various problems in transportation and communications but as latitude has been

been provided up until now on this particular petition and the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition, I suggest that equally the member for Bonavista South has the same latitude.

MR. ROBERTS: If I may say a further word other than to welcome the Premier into the debate for the second time in this session may I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a difference between some latitude and speaking in support of a petition to which the gentleman from Bonavista South is obviously as entitled as any member to debate and if the Premier does not realize the difference, Sir, I invite him to spend some time in the chamber and learn.

MR. MOORES: Sir, further to my remarks previously, it seems that the honourable Leader of the Opposition and his point of order once again reverts to personalities. For someone, Sir, with all due respect, whose life has been spent studying the rules rather than doing a damn thing for this province - I totally disagree with his remarks.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: It has always been the custom in this House to allow some leeway in the presenting of petitions and otherwise I suppose if we were sticking strictly to the rules, only the member presenting petitions would be permitted to have anything to say and that might be something to keep in mind for the future. There always has been, at least in the short tenure that I have been here, some leeway given with regard to members saying a few words in support of petition, in fact I think I had something to say about that in a previous session.

Seeing as we have had one member present the petition and a couple of members from the opposition speak in support of it, I shall permit one more member, that being the member for Bonavista South, to say a few words on this petition and then we shall proceed with other business.

MR. J. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker! I too support this petition.

I know that the petition was not solicited by the honourable gentleman from Grand Falls. It is a petition that was presented to him because they felt that their need must be brought to the attention of this honourable House.

Their need is a genuine need. There should not be any partisan views brought into the need at all, whether they are Progressive Conservative supported as mentioned by the honourable member for the district, that is irrespective. They have a genuine need and to label a community looking for paved roads as being Progressive Conservative Party supporters, as a reason why they must present their views to the government side, to me is showing disrespect for these residents, a complete disrespect for their need.

I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I sincerely hope that in the future, any government member on this side of the House of Assembly, brings forward the needs of people in rural areas whether they be in a district from the honourable gentlemen on the opposite side or on this side, that their needs be dealt with accordingly as a need and not on any partisan views and not to use slanderous statements like; "The petition was brought forward as a third class effort," as was labelled by the Opposition Leader.

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, I ask Your Honour's direction. Is it in order -

MR. MORGAN: Speak to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I want to know if it is in order to refer to another honourable gentleman's remarks as "slanderous?" If it is, so be it, I will happily abide by the rule but I would like to have a ruling, Sir?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in continuing -

MR. SPEAKER: On that point of order, I did not interpret the remarks made by the honourable member for Bonavista South as being slanderous to remarks made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: No. No. The word "slanderous" is that a parliamentary word?

AN HON. MEMBER: If they were slanderous.

MR. ROBERTS: No. He did not say if they were slanderous. He said they were slanderous. Is that a parliamentary term? That is all I ask.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not recall in Beauchesne the word "slanderous" as such in the list that is given there of unparliamentary words.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the petition was not brought forward by a third-party politician or a by a third-class, third-rate politician. It was brought forward by a politician like all politicians on this side of the House of Assembly, genuinely concerned for the needs in all rural parts of the province. I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, in the future when petitions are brought into this House, that these partisan views will not be again brought forward. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I will not permit anyone else to speak with regard to this petition. I think we

MR. SPEAKER: have had four persons now and if the honourable member is presenting another petition, that is quite in order.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker, I do wish to present a further petition. I would like to indicate, Sir, just for the clarification of the House that these petitions were received in the mail, addressed to, Aubrey J. Senior, M.H.A., Confederation Building, and not to the Progressive Conservative Headquarters.

I take great pleasure, Sir, in presenting a petition on behalf of 127 residents of Noggin Cove, in the District of Fogo. Noggin Cove, in the District of Fogo, is situated approximately two miles from Carmanville, between Carmanville and Frederickton. These residents, Sir, are concerned with the completion of this road for basically the same reasons that I outlined when I commented on the prayer of the previous petition; so that they can receive the proper mail service, so that the school busses can travel over the road safely, from Frederickton through Noggin Cove into Carmanville, so that they can receive freight in the area from Gander and for the other reasons which I have outlined.

The 127 residents of Noggin Cove, Sir, have also supported this petition and I take great pleasure in presenting it. I would like to have it tabled in the House and referred to the appropriate department.

CAPT. E. W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, now I am beginning to get a bit worried. When the honourable member finds the time to present a petition here on behalf of the good Liberals of Noggin Cove, then I cannot but accept the fact that he has a genuine feeling toward that district. Now I think that it is obvious too that that honourable member is getting worried in Grand Falls. As well as being kicked out of the cabinet, he may be kicked out of that district in the next election. If he is trying to get a stronghold in the Fogo District, well we will see how that will work when the next election rolls around.

I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, because I am genuinely concerned with the people of Noggin Cove, Frederickton, Carmanville, all over the district. They should be provided with an upgrading and a paved road to serve their communities. I can see now, Sir, where it will be very satisfying to me after next summer to travel that district on a first-class paved road instead of the gravel one which I have had to travel over for the past year or so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of this petition from Noggin Cove. Noggin Cove is a place that I have visited several times. It is a beautiful little settlement. It happens by mischance to be in the Fogo District. Even despite that, it is still a lovely little community. In that community lives the Pennell Family, the father and the parents of Mr. Wallace Pennell, who now lives in St. John's, a wonderful couple indeed, great carpenters, boatbuilders, first-class Newfoundlanders. If it is anyway possible during the next year for the pavement to be squeezed out in Noggin Cove, I certainly would be delighted to see it. In any event, I certainly support the petition.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 108 residents of Davidsville in the District of Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. SENIOR: This is a rather serious matter, Mr. Speaker, but I realize the sequence of events may be quite humorous. If I may draw just a brief mental picture, Sir, of the situation here and why all these people are concerned is that we have a stretch of road which commences

at Carmanville, it runs about two miles to Noggin Cove, approximately five miles to Frederickton, another five miles or so to Main Point and then on to Davidsville to connect with the paved road to Gander.

The prayer of the petition, Sir, is that the road be upgraded. Well it has been upgraded as I mentioned before. We already spent considerable money on this road upgrading it. There would have to be some further work done I suppose in putting class A material on it to make it ready for paving. They state the same reason, Sir, in presenting their case to have this road upgraded. They are confronted with the same problems as I outlined in the previous petitions that concerns the mail service, the transportation of goods, the transportation of schoolchildren and so on.

In view of the fact that we have done considerable work in this area they are requesting that the government would in line with other priorities in the province see fit if possible to commence the paving of this road in 1974.

Being quite familiar with this area, Sir, I take great pleasure in supporting the petition because these are Newfoundlanders who as I have outlined before are making a great contribution to this province. I feel sympathetic towards their cause. I support the petition and request that it be tabled in this honourable House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Member for Fogo.

MR. E. W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, again I am obliged to support the petition and I am genuinely happy that the Hon. the Member for Grand Falls, who is slowly but surely trying to find a nesting place for the next election, is trying to do it in Fogo District. Sir, I would advise him to go slowly,

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the petition

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable member has risen to a point of order.



MR. J. C. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, this petition is not dealing with whether or not the Hon. the Member for Grand Falls is going to run in Fogo in the next election or Grand Falls in the next election. The matter is, there is a petition before the House asking for improvements in a community in the District of Fogo.

The honourable gentleman speaking must speak in support of the petition and not in support of whether the Hon. the Member for Grand Falls is going to run in Fogo or not in the next election.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the Hon. the Member for Bonavista South is well taken. I feel that the Hon. the Member for Fogo was varying a great deal from the prayer of the petition as presented. I urge him to speak to the prayer of the petition as such.

MR. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to add. I have been long enough in this House to know, I think particularly the rules. I have no intention of deviating from the rules. I am very happy that the Member for Grand Falls has an interest in Fogo District. I will ask him to continue it if it means that the people of Fogo District will get services that they are entitled to and the Member for Grand Falls feels that he can do a job for them, may God Bless him, continue the good work but do not challenge me in the next election.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker, it seems the P.C. influence in the district is spreading because I am in another community right now where I have another petition from twenty-four residents of the Community of Main Point in the east side of Gander Bay.

Again, Sir, without going into the same detail that I did before and this is in, of course, the District of Fogo. We are still dealing basically with the same problems but merely these people have presented the petition from this particular community to support the same cause because again they are confronted with the same problems. They share the same concern as the other communities, that they receive good service, that their schoolchildren are transported in safety, that their goods are brought in at a minimal cost, that they can travel to and from the urban centres faster and over a higher grade of highway.



Sir, again I think their request is justified. I take great pleasure in supporting this petition.

I would further point out, Sir, there are many other instances where I have received requests from districts such as this. I have been reluctant to bring them before this honourable House but Sir, when I get up to speak in this House, I try to be very careful in making statements that I cannot substantiate and when challenged to do so, Sir, I will substantiate them. I have documented files which I can present to substantiate statements that I make. If there are any other districts in the Province which feel that they are not been adequately looked after by Liberal members, I will be very happy to hear from them. I will be very happy to present their petitions in this honourable House. Anytime at all.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I will have them on your doorstep tomorrow.

MR. SENIOR: I take great pleasure, Sir, in supporting this petition. I will discuss this matter with the minister as requested. I request that this petition be tabled with the others and be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, it is a grand day for the member for Grand Falls and it is equally as good for me.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WINSOR: The honourable member, in presenting petitions, stated that if any other district which cannot get any response to their requests to have roads paved - Does the honourable member realize that it is the responsibility of the government to upgrade and pave roads? Does he not realize that?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WINSOR: I, Mr. Speaker, would like to see more petitions presented around this Province from other communities requesting the government to upgrade and pave roads. Maybe that is what the government needs, more pressure and if the people of Fogo District can get upgrading and paving by presenting a petition to the government member, well I say, thank them and I hope their request will not fall on deaf ears.

So, I have much pleasure in supporting all of those petitions, Mr. Speaker and perhaps next week we will get a few more when the honourable member gets time to do a little more travelling.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador North.

MR. MELVIN WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of the petitions so ably put before the House by the honourable member for Grand Falls now representing the district of Fogo. I think that a number of other petitions have come before this House in the last couple of years and there have been no other results. Maybe this is a deliberate attempt on the part of the Liberals and I wish it is to try to get some action and it seems very odd to have the organizer of the P.C. Party - it looks as if there is some type of conspiracy going on, Mr. Speaker whereas the honourable third class member for Grand Falls who had been almost kicked out of his district makes an attempt to discredit a member in this House.

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

MR. MORGAN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable gentleman from Labrador North did not stand in this House today to support the petition. He stood to condemn a member of the House. He did not stand to support the petition. If he is going to stand in the future to support petitions, let him stand and do it properly.

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the honourable member from Labrador South that he did rise to support the prayer of a petition and he was straying somewhat from that, so I suggest that he speak to the prayer of the petition.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, a correction. It was the honourable member for Labrador North.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry.

MR. WOODWARD: I say on behalf of the people of Main Point in Gander Bay, Mr. Speaker, in the district of Fogo, that they have had difficulties and there have been a number of petitions presented in

this House previously and I hope as a result of last year, the year before, as a result of the honourable P.C. Party organizer that they will get some results on the petitions that have been presented today.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: A petition if I might. It is from the district, Sir, of Humber West, represented as it is so ably in the House by the Premier of our Province, Sir. I had not intended to present this, Sir, and in fact I have had this petition, Sir, since August, 1972. I have had this petition, Sir, which was sent to the government at that stage in the hope it would be presented in the House of Assembly.

It is signed, Sir, by 192 persons in the Community of Meadows in Humber West. It was sent to me by way of a copy from Mr. Harley Anderson, Secretary of the Community of Meadows, I will read;

"Another very disturbing fact is that the council presented to government a petition for water and sewerage for our area -

MR. CROSBIE: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is not a genuine, apparently it is not a genuine petition it is a copy. How can the honourable gentleman present a copy of a petition?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly genuine. It is perfectly genuine, Sir. If the honourable gentleman wishes to allege that it is not let him prove his evidence. I say it is genuine, Sir, and I should be allowed to present this petition without harassment from the gentleman from St. John's West.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, everything in this life is a copy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Especially the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MARSHALL: If I can speak to that point of order a moment, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Well a point of order has been raised, now if the petition is signed it may be presented but Standing Order 91 does not allow copies of petition to be signed because it says a petition may be either printed or written and if more than three persons sign it, at least three signatures must appear on the page. Now if signatures appear it is not a copy, fine. It may be a duplicate obviously of a petition. The honourable Leader of the Opposition said he was presenting a copy so we would like to clarify whether the petition is in fact signed or whether it is not signed. He indicated it is a copy and obviously is a duplicate. In any event, petitions have to be signed.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, this is a petition signed by 192 electors. It is of course a photostat and I submit, Sir, there is

nothing to the point of order in Standing Order 91. I shall read, Sir, Standing Order 91 in its entirety.

"A petition may be either printed or written and if more than three petitioners sign it, at least three signatures," (and in fact, Sir, sixty-seven signatures) "must appear on the page containing the prayer of the petition. Every petition must be written in English or be accompanied by a translation."

Sir, this is written in English. It is headed, "Petition for water and sewerage system for the Community of Meadows." I shall read, Sir, if I may the sixty-seven names that appear on this -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable Leader of the Opposition is speaking to the point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the point of order, if I may continue, is that names have to be attached. Here they are, Sir; Eric Leslie Brake -

AN HON. MEMBER: Are they signed?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes they are signed, Jean Brake. The signatures are right here. Roland Blanchard, Gloria Blanchard -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order. May I carry on, Sir?

MR SPEAKER: I would like to see a copy of the petition and judge whether it is a copy of the petition or an original, and I shall rule whether it is in order or not.

MR ROBERTS: To submit this, may I in the normal way present it and then Your Honour will judge. All right then, if we can have one of these page boys.

May I proceed to present another petition, Sir, from the District of Humber West?

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER, Minister of Education: Mr. Speaker, I wonder

if I could speak to that point of order?

MR. ROBERTS: No.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I asked Mr. Speaker, not the Leader of the Opposition, if I may speak to the point of order, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Looking at this petition it is very obvious that it is a copy and not original signatures, and therefore I rule the petition out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the government want no part of it. May I now proceed to present another petition, Sir, from the people of Humber West, from Dyke's Road in Corner Brook. I will present the petition. If some honourable gentleman wish -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, do this crowd -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

HON. L. BARRY, Minister of Mines and Energy: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, Since obviously the honourable the Leader of the Opposition cannot be trusted to present the proper type of position may I finish the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

It is never contemplated, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition upon being sent a copy for his information of a petition that has been sent to another honourable member of this House, it is completely scandalous that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition should then attempt to present the copy when he has kept it in his files for two years. What a fraud! What a charade of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition



in his attempts to make it a rule of this honourable House. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that every petition that is brought by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should be vetted by Your Honour. It should be vetted by Your Honour to ensure that he is not attempting to carry on the same fraud that he attempted to perpetrate here this afternoon.

MR. ROBERTS: I shall not attempt to deal with the cowardly, base, fraudulent and slanderous attacks -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order. I invite Your Honour's attention to the petition. There are signatures affixed in ball point pen to that document, Sir, unless Your Honour wants to rule that they are fraudulent. I submit, Sir, that it is as much in order as any petition as has ever been laid on the table of this House. Furthermore, I have a letter here by the man who took that up saying, "Would you please raise this privately or publicly." If the Premier is so uninterested in his district, Sir, that he has not presented the petition nor done anything about it, I submit, Sir, that the petition is in order and I should be allowed to present it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

This petition as I read it here is addressed to the Hon. the Premier and there are some names which are to me, at least, (I do not profess to be an expert in handwriting) original signatures but at the top of this petition, it is written, "copy." It appears to me that it is a copy and not an original and I therefore have to rule it out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: I accept Your Honour's ruling, of course, but would Your Honour be so kind as to inform somebody of some precedent for this ruling. The matter has never come up before. It is obviously an important one. Whether they allow it in or not, the people of Humber West know the representation they have had. They know that the Premier has not represented them.



AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order. If the gentleman from St. John's West, who is having another of his bad days - would Your Honour be good enough - I ask merely for direction's sake. From now on, Sir, every petition in this House is going to be strictly in the form laid down by the rules and the precedents or it shall not be accepted. Over the years, Sir, a wide variety of petitions have been accepted in this House, a wide variety, Sir. I submit that most petitions are not in order according to the rules. All I want is Your Honour to give me the authority.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. Your Honour has made a ruling. It is improper for the Leader of the Opposition to get up and to ask the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker, if he be in the Chair, hypothetical questions of this nature. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that under the guise of attempting to debate Your Honour's ruling, he is raising certain questions and these questions themselves are out of order. I suggest that Your Honour has made a ruling and that we get on with the business of the House, unless the Leader of the Opposition wants to appeal Your Honour's ruling.

MR. BARRY: To a point of order: Your Honour, just before you make a ruling, if Your Honour would care to look at Beauchesne, page 257, paragraph (334): "A petition must have original signatures or marks and not copies from the original nor signatures of agents on behalf of others, etc."

Now, Your Honour, I submit that this is a deliberate attempt of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to degrade this great tradition of presenting petitions on the part of the people of Newfoundland, which has been a custom. It is a political attempt

by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition because of the series of petitions that the Hon. Member for Grand Falls presented this afternoon. He went to his files and hauled copies of petitions that he has had since 1972. I submit that that is a fraud which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition attempted to perpetrate on this honourable House. He should be condemned for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy rose to speak, I was about to quote the same Standing Order and subsection on page 257 of Beauchesne as referred to by the honourable minister, Standing Order 334, Subsection (1): "A petition must have original signatures or marks and not copies from the original nor signatures of agents on behalf of others, except in case of incapacity by sickness. It must not have letters, affidavits, appendices or other documents annexed. The signatures must be written upon the petition itself and not pasted upon or otherwise transferred to it."

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order, Sir, with respect to the four petitions presented by the gentleman for Grand Falls, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I submit to Your Honour that Standing Order (90) since we are having such a tender regard for petitions, Standing Order (90) has not be observed and therefore Your Honour should rule the attempt to present the petitions by the gentleman for Grand Falls to be out of order, Sir. They have not been signed in his own hand - it says they shall be signed in his own hand. They are out of order, Sir.

MR. W. W. MARSHALL: (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition is raising spurious points of order. He also knows that when points of order arise they are to be brought up immediately. These four petitions have already been dealt with, I do not know whether they were or were not signed by the Member for Grand Falls but the point is his time for objection on that has long since past.

MR. ROBERTS: If I may, Your Honour, I have just checked the petitions. Not one of them has been properly signed. I submit, Sir, it was the first opportunity I had to do so. Furthermore the precedents are clear and quite concise that a rule that is broken shall be brought to the House at any time, Sir. I submit that Standing Order (90), not a precedent, not a citation in Beauchesne, a Standing Order of this House, Sir, says; "shall sign it with his own hand."

I just looked at those four petitions, Sir, they have not been signed by the member's own hand therefore they are out of order. I suggest, Sir, that they should be redrawn, withdrawn, resubmitted and then if they are in order they will be accepted but since we have had such a tender regard, Sir, for the amenities and proprieties of presenting petition I submit, Sir, that we should follow all of the rules and I invite Your Honour to rule that the Standing Orders say what they do in fact say.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. As a member of this honourable House I am ashamed. We have spent an hour of this honourable House, I am as much to blame as any other honourable member in that we get carried away with these, I was going to say with these bloody rules of debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ah come on now!

MR. BARRY: The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition is doing nothing more but diverting the time of this honourable House from the business of the province which we are elected for and which we should be devoting our efforts to carrying out. Here the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition - I am almost speechless with -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down!

MR. BARRY: infamy of what he is attempting -

The Hon. the Member for Grand Falls presented four petitions. They were gracefully accepted by the member for the district. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition goes in and hauls out two or three petitions which he had in his filing cabinet for two years. He now comes, when he is shot down on that particular stratagem he now goes over and he decides he better check out a bit more carefully the petitions that have been filed.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. BARRY: It is a waste of time in this honourable House, Your Honour, and I ask you to rule the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may -

MR. BARRY: It is not out of order, it is out of existence possibly.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I repeat that point of order, Sir, I am ashamed to be a member of the House in which a gentleman, such as the gentleman for Placentia West, the intellectual camp-follower of the Minister of Finance, can get up and make slanderous personal attacks on people under the guise of specious points of order. If this matter has taken up ten or fifteen minutes and the matter, Sir, I would remind, Your Honour, in its genesis began because members on the opposite side objected to petitions being presented in a form in which they had been

presented in this House time and time again. Then when I invite Your Honour to enforce the rules, Sir, members on the other side try to howl that down and try and pretend that somehow it is wrong to enforce the rules. I have no doubt, Sir, that Your Honour will say the rules must be enforced. If we do not have the rules in this House, Sir, we have mob rule. If we do not have the rules that are printed and written and the gentlemen on the opposite side do not wish to observe them, Sir, I suggest that they return to the country forthwith.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is the honourable member going to Ontario?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

With respect to the point raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition re: these petitions as presented by the Hon. the Member for Grand Falls, these petitions were presented, no point of order or any objection was raised. They were tabled with the support of all members of this honourable House and therefore I rule that they cannot be taken back at this time. I would caution honourable members presenting petitions in the future that are perhaps not in order. I do think perhaps it should be right for me to expect honourable members to check each and every petition with me to see that they are in order. I would like to think that I am free to trust honourable members on both sides of this House to present petitions that are quite in order. Petitions in the future that are found not to be in order shall be ruled exactly that but I would like to trust to the integrity and the honesty of all members present.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

HON. E. MAYNARD: (MINISTER OF FORESTRY AND AGRICULTURE): Mr. Speaker, I have a few amendments that I would like to table.

Amendment Orders Nos. 2,3 and 4 of the Newfoundland Egg-Marketing Scheme, 1973, the Financial Report of the Farm Development Loan Board for the years April 1972 to March 1973, the Amendments to the Newfoundland Egg Marketing Scheme 1973, Regulations of the Newfoundland Crop Insurance Agency, Statements of Expenditure for the Newfoundland Marketing Board 1972 - 1973 and Regulations regarding the harvesting of lingdon berries and blueberries.

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

HON. J.G. ROUSSEAU (Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations):

I have a few regulations I would like to table in the House, Mr. Speaker, they are done up very well by the department. The Elevator's Amendment Regulations 1973, the Elevator's Amendment No.2 Regulations 1973 and also the Minimum Wage Order which was published sometime ago, another effort by this government to upgrade the minimum wage in the province, a part of the ongoing study with two more increases in the minimum wage which will come into effect in the next six months and year. I have copies here as well, Mr. Speaker, for the press.

Also, as Minister of Public Works and Services I would like to table in the House the Report of the C.A.Pippy Park Commission for the year 1972 - 1973. I also have some copies here for the press.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Fogo:

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, before we get into Orders of the Day, in the absence of the honourable Minister of Social Services, I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Premier: Would the Premier use his good office to reverse the decision of the Welfare Department to have welfare issued to the unfortunate fishermen who were compensated for three hundred dollars because of loss of time last spring when the ice prevented them from getting out fishing?



MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier:

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly check into it with the Minister of Social Services.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island:

MR. S.A.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Fisheries inform the House what action his government has taken to restrict the province's flounder fishery to trawlers based only in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: That question could be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister of Fisheries, then, if it is true, Sir, and this is a very, very serious matter, if it is true that substantial unemployment could result unless steps are taken to restrict this fishery?

MR. SPEAKER: That question relates to the first one and could be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is a most serious matter. It could happen this year, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the - Mr. Speaker, if the minister should want to answer the question, would it be in order for him to do so?

MR. SPEAKER: That would be judged by the question itself.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, these are very, very serious matters that affect the lives of 15,000 fish plant -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please!

MR. NEARY: 15,000 fish plant workers in this province.

MR. W.N. ROWE: They have no intention of giving any answers.

MR. NEARY: Sir,

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries if the government have received a resolution from the fishing industry on this matter and if they have, Sir, do they intend to support this resolution?

AN HON. MEMBER: Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, that is not for the Order Paper. Is the minister going to answer the question?

MR. SPEAKER: The question will be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Obviously, we are not going to get any information on this very serious matter, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the minister if it is true, Sir, is it true that George McLean is representing the provincial Department of Fisheries and National Sea Products? That is why we cannot get support for the resolution, conflict of interest.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! That question could be placed on the Order Paper.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh! This is a little much "Steve" they are not going to answer any questions.

MR. NEARY: Sir, are we going to have a serious question and answer period in this House or is it going to be a farce?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No! No!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is it going -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I am sure the honourable member for Bell Island is aware that it is not the responsibility or duty of the Speaker to become involved in any debate with regard to the question period.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get some kind of definition of what is an urgent public matter in this House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Put that on the Order Paper too! Sure! Some chance!

MR. NEARY: By the time we get the answer on the Order Paper, 15,000 -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: 15,000 Newfoundlanders will be unemployed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable Premier. Would the Premier inform members of the House



if he will be going to the Province of Quebec tomorrow or next day to follow the pattern established by the much maligned honourable J.R.Smallwood...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: To sell Quebec on the idea of using Newfoundland power from the Lower Churchill or transmitting power from the Lower Churchill through the Province of Quebec as was done in the development of the Upper Churchill?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier:

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no I will not be following in the footsteps of the honourable J.R.Smallwood, we cannot afford it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador South:

MR. M.MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question which I would like to direct to the honourable Premier. I am wondering if he is aware of allegations of more racial discrimination being practiced at North West River, in the District of Labrador North, by a government agency named the Labrador Services Division, in that the depot belonging to that division are not allowed to sell gasolines to anyone but Indians?

MR. MOORES: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no. I was not aware of it and I am pretty sure no one else outside the House was aware of it. Certainly it will be checked into immediately and whatever needs to be done to make sure that there is no discrimination to anybody will be done, Sir, as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. Barbe North:

MR. F.B.ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the honourable the Minister of Communications and Transportation. Has the minister received any request from any of his officials in St. Anthony or Deer Lake or St. Barbe for additional snow-clearing equipment in the District of St. Barbe North?

AN HON. MEMBER: Order Paper.

MR. F.B.ROWE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister received a letter from myself, dated February 7, asking for

an extra snowblower for the District of St. Barbe North, for the months of February, March and April?

MR. HICKEY: What date?

MR. F.B. ROWE: February 7.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of such a request. It certainly has not been brought to my attention but I will endeavour to find out.

MR. F.B. ROWE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware of the fact that the Great Northern Peninsula Highway at present is blocked and one of the snow clearing machines is broken down? There is a need for additional snow clearing equipment at this time of the year when you have severe storms for the three months that are coming up. Would the minister indicate whether or not he was able to get some additional snow clearing equipment into the district?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that each day I am given a road report and I am aware that there are problems in that area. I am advised by my staff that every effort is being made to sort the situation out. I have not been made aware of a particular, special request for additional equipment. I would assume that if there is additional equipment required, then certainly every effort is being made to have it sent there or directed there. I will undertake to find out and give the honourable member the latest report.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador North:

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. I wonder if the minister would inform the House when the royal commission on Labrador will be made public?

MR. RICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I gave that information to the honourable House on opening day. I cannot remember the exact date now but my recollection is around the end of March or early April. I know that it is being proof read now, at least I am advised by the Chairman, that it is. As soon as we receive the report, Mr. Speaker,

we will follow the well established practice of this administration.

It will be presented to cabinet and forthwith made public.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Like the Seabright one.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Premier. Would the Premier inform the House if advertising currently solicited from businessmen throughout this province, throughout the Island and Labrador, is being solicited for a souvenir anniversary book. in behalf of the provincial government or in behalf of the Tory Party?

MR. MOORES: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly take notice of the question but I am not exactly sure what the

the member is referring to but certainly I am sure the information can be ascertained easily enough and I will undertake to do it.

MR. NEARY: Well Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Premier aware that the member responsible for petitions is not only soliciting petitions, Sir -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable member for Bell Island is proceeding to make a speech and I have to rule him out of order.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island is proceeding to make a speech and I have ruled him out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware that one of his colleagues, the member for Grand Falls, is soliciting advertising for a souvenir booklet? Is this being done on behalf of the Tory Party or is it being done on behalf of the government?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly answer the question in this way that I am sure the member for Grand Falls, who is also the Provincial Director of the Progressive Conservative Party, is very active and is doing everything possible to ensure that the Progressive Conservative Party is successful in the next election as is everybody else on this side of the House. I would suggest the member from Bell Island get his ass active or he will not even be the member for that singular district, let alone the province.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, who is making a speech? Do the rules apply to this side, Sir, the same as that side? We do not have rules in this House, Sir, for one side and another set of rules for the other side.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Can I ask another question, Mr. Speaker?

Sir, I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications if his department has had any representation from the City of St. John's or any other municipality in Newfoundland

where they have street lights, to make it legal to turn right on a red light?

MR. HICKEY: We have not had any representation of late, certainly not since I have been minister. We have discussed the matter on a number of occasions and while we were in the process of writing City Hall suggesting that this practice be adopted for the City of St. John's, when a few days ago we were made aware of the fact that one of the councillors had made a similar suggestion so I can only say that my department supports such a move from the point of view of traffic congestion and that is about all. There has been to my knowledge no official or formal request that we take any action because really it is outside the jurisdiction of my department, at least as it applies to St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, a few days ago when the honourable Minister of Social Services was speaking in the Address in Reply he made some remarks to the effect perhaps that the honourable member for Bell Island had deliberately proceeded to the eighth floor on a certain day and instigated some troubles there.

The honourable member for Bell Island explained to the House the reason for his being on the eighth floor, how he came to be there and I have accepted the explanation as given by the honourable member for Bell Island, so the honourable member for White Bay South rose on a point of order, and I rose on this, and it is not a point of order it is merely a difference of opinion between two honourable members.

I have to make a ruling on another matter, Yesterday the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing made a ministerial statement on which I think the honourable member for White Bay South raised a point of order. There may have been some words in that ministerial statement that initiated some debate back and forth on a partisan viewpoint but upon examining the ministerial statement I

could find nothing unparliamentary nor wrong with it.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am clear, and members on this side of the House indeed all members are clear as to what Your Honour has just ruled on, I asked Your Honour to make a ruling as to whether it was parliamentary for the Minister of Social Services to accuse a member of this House of encouraging commission of a crime which was the import of his charge which was the import of his words. Your Honour has ruled that that is parliamentary, as I understand it. Is that so, Your Honour?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member, as I read the transcript of the remarks made, stood and rose on a point of order and I have ruled on the point of order, and that is really a difference of opinion between two honourable members.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I might point out to Your Honour that I did not get an opportunity that particular afternoon to explain how I came to be on the eighth floor.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Your Honour has made a ruling, and you know, is this going to be continued on? Your Honour has made a ruling with respect to a point of order that has arisen and again the member on the other side of the House, namely the honourable member for Bell Island, is getting up debating it. He accepts Your Honour's ruling or else he bears the consequences.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please! Honourable members seem to persist in speaking and making comments after I have risen to rule on a point of order on anything. I find that this is quite unmannerly to say the least, and I am sure that in future if I proceed to name some honourable members, then they will have to bear whatever the result of that might be.

In making a ruling, if honourable members on any side of this House are not in agreement with it, I am sure they are aware of the



procedure that might be followed next. But I have made a ruling and if honourable members do not agree with it then I suggest they follow the appropriate procedure.

MR. NEARY: I agree with Your Honour's ruling. But, Sir, there was one aspect of Your Honour's ruling and perhaps Your Honour might elaborate on this, that the words were used by the Minister of Social Services that afternoon and I think my colleague the member for White Bay South wanted clarification of this too, The minister referred to members on this side of the House as "scum" and "slime", Sir, now I would like to ask Your Honour if these are acceptable parliamentary words? Is this acceptable parliamentary language in the future, Sir?

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, look the honourable member for Bell Island is addressing a question to Your Honour in the course of carrying out Your Honour's duties, Order (26) clearly says; "Questions dealing with matters within the jurisdiction of the Speaker are out of order. Hypothetical questions are out of order," and the questions that are being advanced by the honourable member for Bell Island are completely out of order. If he wants any answers with respect to parliamentary procedures I suggest he take a post-graduate course from the geni on the other side of the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to that point of order, Sir, I would like to point out to the House that this is not a hypothetical question.

MR. MARSHALL: It is.

MR. NEARY: It is not, Your Honour. These remarks were made in the continuous personal character assassination from that side of the House, Sir. These remarks were made and all I am asking is if they are parliamentary. If these words are accepted in parliamentary language and if so then we will be able to use them in the future, that is all.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I think that the honourable member for Bell Island has not brought up this point at the first opportunity. It perhaps should have been raised when the alleged words were said.



I have no intention of getting into a debate with any honourable member and I shall not say anything further on this matter now.

MR. NEARY: I thank Your Honour very much but I thought my colleague had included that in his point of privilege, Sir. I accept Your Honour's ruling.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable Minister of Education adjourned the debate last night.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Honourable members will no doubt be very sorry to hear that I have something of a cold and therefore will not be able to speak at great length. I trust that their disappointment will not be too great.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words and to inform the House of matters in the district that I am pleased and honoured to represent, the District of St. Mary's Bay, and then to speak briefly on some matters referred to in the Speech from the Throne.

St. Mary's Bay, Mr. Speaker, is a district with much in common with many of the rural areas of Newfoundland. Indeed although not far from this city, it is in terms of being a rural district, as rural as I would say any in the province. Mr. Speaker, the needs and aspirations of the people of that district are real.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order please! It is very difficult to hear the honourable minister with three or four conversations

going on around the House and I ask honourable members if they would observe the rules

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As in many rural districts, as indeed I suppose in all, there are very real needs and I think that rural districts in general, that all of us in this House and Government have very real responsibilities toward, obviously, all districts but in a very special way, rural districts, because of the overall importance to the economy of the Province and equally important to the way of life or heritage of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, like many other areas, the people in the district of St. Mary's Bay had felt neglected, had felt that the benefits of Confederation had not accrued to them in the same measure as to the urban areas of this Province and that they did not participate fully or properly or enough in the benefits of Confederation.

During the past couple of years, Mr. Speaker, much has been done, but that does not mean that there is not still much to do. In terms of transportation, I would say that St. Mary's Bay was perhaps one of the least favoured in the Province. During the past two years, some significant progress has been made. The Salmonier Line, which is a very much-travelled road, paving has now been completed and also between Salmonier and St. Joseph's, a distance of approximately five miles, paving has been completed, upgrading and paving. The area from Peter's River up through St. Stephens, St. Vincent's and on to St. Mary's has been upgraded for paving. So, in that part of the district, Mr. Speaker, the pressing needs in terms of transportation are for the pavement of that part which was upgraded for paving last year from Peter's River to St. Mary's and then the continuation of the loop which must be upgraded, obviously, before being paved, and that is on from St. Mary's to St. Joseph's.

In the other part of the district and that is the communities of Point Lance and Branch which are also parts of, they are usually referred to as parts of the Cape Shore, important work was done two years ago

on the road from North Harbour to Branch. Last year beginning was made on two bridges, one at Red Head, a very considerable bridge, and this work had to be done before any road work could be completed. What is now necessary, of course, is to complete those bridges upon which work has already started and that will leave between eight and nine miles for that road to be completed. This is new road but it is not over-rough or very difficult terrain. It is over basically flat terrain and I understand terrain that is not difficult, comparatively speaking, for road work.

So, Mr. Speaker, we can see that within, as I say, a two year period or so the very serious deficit and lack of transportation facilities will hopefully be a thing of the past for St. Mary's Bay. This is, of course, not only important from the point of view of comfort, it is important from the point of view of all kinds of transportation including school bus transportation, people getting to hospital, people getting to the doctor, transportation of fish because there is in Admirals Beach a quite important longliner fishery— last year about eight longliners operating. It is expected that there will be perhaps twelve or so this coming season. In Branch there is an inshore fishery or a non-longliner fishery. It is a trap fishery and the same, of course, is true in Peter's River. In Admirals Beach, Mr. Speaker, through a LIP Grant last year and through provincial funds available from the provincial Department of Fisheries and through, as well, the assistants of the Salt Fish Corporation, very important work was done in the construction of a community stage and when completed, certainly this will have a great benefit in terms of quality control and terms of icing and terms of storing. It will mean that much more local labour will be involved, that some processing will be able to be done in the area and that when there is a lot of fresh fish that fish will be able to be salted as well.

It is important for the people of that community, indeed for that area, that that facility be completed. It is important, as well, and this was a matter raised by the honourable gentleman from St. Barbe

North, when speaking on his district yesterday, and that is the need of a slipway or haulout for longliners. That is a very real need in Admirals Beach as well. There is no doubt that depending on the terrain, if there is no appropriate way of getting the longliner out of the water in the fall and into the water in the spring, serious damage can and frequently is done to the frame of the boat. Certainly in the course of two or three years or how ever many years it may well be, such a facility would more than pay for itself because, after all, these boats are built and engines put into them and equipped largely with the help of public funds, through the Fisheries Loan Board, and it would, I think, be, apart from other things, enlightened self interest in areas where there is significant longliner fishery to make these facilities available.

Mr. Speaker, a certain number of honourable gentlemen have spoken about rural development. The Rural Development Programme of this administration - some have spoken with praise and some in derision thereof. As far as the district I represent is concerned, I have to say that the Rural Development Programme has been of very real assistance. There have been quite a number of people, Mr. Speaker, who have applied and who have not gotten it and that is true, obviously, in every district. I can say unequivocally that there has been not one instance of political favouritism or patronage in the awarding of any rural development grants in that district. That I am sure I can say unequivocally and from my own personal knowledge.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of that whether anybody working in the public service, if he supported the P.C.s or if he supported the Liberals or if he did not support anybody, I would think the criterion for anybody is "Are they doing a good job and in doing it are they being impartial and doing a good job?" That I suggest is the criterion. To suggest any other criterion would

really mean that if the P.C.s were in, no P.C.s could be employed and if the Liberals were in, no Liberals could be employed. That, obviously, would be utter chaos. I think the real criterion is if people who are paid to do a job are they doing it well, are they doing it adequately, are they doing it fairly? And these, Mr. Speaker, these are the real questions, not the other area.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check. I do not really carry around in my head the list of people -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, what I said was that to the best of my knowledge there is absolutely no political favouritism in rural development grants been given to that district.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I do not carry around with me every single person who got the grant. I have it in my office too. That is quite immaterial.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

While the honourable the Minister of Education may

wish to engage in a debate with the Hon. Member for Bell Island. It is completely out of order. It does not receive the approbation of the Chair. I suggest that the Hon. Member for Bell Island is fully cognizant of the rules of the House and should observe them.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Would the honourable member wish to debate the ruling?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I would not wish to incur this approbation, Mr. Speaker. Actually, I meant at the very beginning when I spoke to ask Your Honour to be particularly solicitous in case I should break forth in speaking in oaths. I am not sure, Your Honour, if you are aware but I was quite surprised actually to read in a recent newspaper column that during a recent speech of the Minister for Social Welfare that I had, at least, mentioned some oath. I, of course, was not aware of having broken forth in such profanity nor indeed does Hansard show any such oath. I would hope, Your Honour, that in case some demon does seize me and I break forth with these oaths that Your Honour will quickly call me to task. The honourable gentleman heard. I am glad that somebody did ask.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne had some mild criticism from honourable gentlemen opposite and in fact it used to be understood and to be encouraged that the whole two-party system requires that. Obviously we are not all of one accord because if so, we would all be of one party or we would all be sitting on one side of the House. That, apart from being quite contrary to the parliamentary system, would certainly take a great deal of the enjoyment out of the proceedings. I am sure that the members of the press would have a much more difficult task getting their news reports in various columns if we were all on one side.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the members of the opposition have had some criticism of the Speech from the Throne. I think it was said that it was barren of ideas and that there were no forward programmes and that it was disappointing and this and that.



Mr. Speaker, I think one's reaction to a Speech from the Throne depends to a large extent upon what one expects from it. Now I would suggest that for a fairly lengthy period in our history, since Confederation I am speaking, since parliamentary government was restored, we in Newfoundland were led to expect certain things from the Speech from the Throne which perhaps it was never designed to contain. Perhaps people began to think that the Speech from the Throne should be a whole series of spectacular announcements and that it was to be full of surprises; things that no other honourable members, perhaps on the government side, certainly on the opposition side, even the public had ever heard of before. Here were some surprises and some brain storms, grand announcements and brand new programmes that other members of the Legislature, whether government or opposition, were not aware of at all, that the general public were not aware of, that people in whatever sector of society these programmes were to affect had never heard of it at all. Certainly if one judges the Speech from the Throne and I would suggest any future and every future Speech from the Throne of this administration, if one is to expect that, then there will be no Throne Speech from this administration which will win the approbation of the opposition. We are not going on that philosophy. We do not regard the Speech from the Throne as a list of spectacular announcements, of brand new ideas, of brand new projects that have never been publicly discussed before, because we do not think, Mr. Speaker, that this is the way that really programmes can be devised and implemented.

Mr. Speaker, this administration feel that government policy results from initiative from government and indeed initiative from others who are willing maybe to put it forward. Then there is the process of dialogue and discussion and negotiations and agreement here and disagreement there and further working things out. Now this is a much less spectacular approach to an announcement of overall government policy, which is basically what the Speech from the Throne is



if one were to give it a definition - a statement of overall government policy.

Mr. Speaker, if an administration views the development and articulation of government policy as part of a process of initiative from government and initiative from as broad a segment of society as possible and a series of discussions and dialogue and negotiation, agreement and disagreement and multiplication and finally then a crystallization of a programme - there seems to be in the complex age of today of changing circumstances when nobody or no group in government or out of government, in the Legislature or out of the Legislature, in any area of society, when no group has a monopoly on wisdom or insight or good suggestions or good ideas.

Mr. Speaker, this administration accepts that. Therefore, the Speech from the Throne, which is a statement of overall government policy, is going to reflect that attitude toward government. I suggest that the contrary attitude is that the Speech from the Throne should not indeed be something with which people in many of its areas are already familiar, which has been discussed and debated at various levels in society, with input in negotiations from various people but rather that it should come as a miraculous occurrence that nobody ever expected, with announcements of brand new things that nobody had ever dreamed of before, the unveiling of great new paradises.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that things are too complex and too many people in facets of society are involved necessarily and properly in decision making and programme implementation for that philosophy to be valid any longer. I would say that it is inevitable that the opposition and perhaps others would not greet it with great welcome. I think it is probably based on a different philosophy of government, Sir.

MR. F. ROWE: Why then did the March Throne Speech contain a great list of projects and promises? How does the minister rationalize that, at that time and not at this point in the game?

MR. OTTEHNEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any essential

difference between the two Speeches from the Throne but it could be that as the administration grows in years, it also grows in wisdom. I do not rule that out as a possibility. My first reaction - it has been some time since I read the beautiful rhetoric of the former Speech from the Throne, it has been some time and I cannot recall item by item what was in it. I, not in having a photographic memory and recalling specifically item by item nor paragraph by paragraph what was there, think that the same approach to government is evident in both documents. That is my impression. Obviously there can be a difference of interpretation. The honourable gentleman does not agree that both speeches are evidence of the same attitude toward government. It is my contention that they are both evidence of the same attitude towards government and that if one takes either of them and one compares it to any during the former administration - I am not saying ours are better speeches or that theirs are better. As a matter of fact from the rhetorical point of view, the point of view of flourish, rhetorical questions, the great surprise element, there is no doubt where there were the great elements of surprise,

of announcement of the spectacular. We take our hats off totally to the Speeches from the Throne which were the product of the former administration in that area of spectacular, captivating, great gamble theory, the utter surprise, the miraculous element or the suggestion of the miraculous.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not that.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now the honourable gentleman here said bombastic, it may have been an occasional element. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is a real difference on the part of this administration and the former of what the Speech from the Throne should be. For us it is a general statement of government's intention in terms of what it is going to do, in programme, in legislation. As such we do not evolve programmes in a vacuum, a monologue or one or two way communication with the Deity. We endeavour to involve as many throughout society as possible.

We lose the element of spectacular surprise. We lose the hint of the miraculous but I think we gained in realistic, down-to-earth programmes and legislation in the formulation of which people throughout the province have already been involved because they are aware of it and this is the crystallization of that process which involves people in making decisions affecting their own future.

Mr. Speaker, hear briefly but I think it is an important point, I point out that difference. I can see that honourable gentlemen opposite would not be pleased with this document -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Because there is a basic change of attitude. It is like somebody reads prose and the other person reads poetry. The poetic gets sometimes close to the miraculous. Well we have had the poetic Speeches from the Throne and now we are in the area of prose. I think, Sir, for the communication of realistic, undramatic, down-to-earth programmes based on the social and economic needs of Newfoundland, we are better off dealing in prose than in poetry.

Mr. Speaker, there are just a few areas mentioned in the Speech from the Throne that I would like to say a few words on. I think that the Premier and indeed his government are to be commended for the initiative

they have taken with respect to Canada's position at the Law of the Sea Conference to be held next summer. Because at the initiative of this administration there was unanimous approval at the Premiers Conference held in Charlottetown - unanimous approval that Canada, the federal government, should take the position that Coastal State Canada's jurisdiction over the marine resources should extend 200 miles outward or to the end of the Continental margin, whichever is the greater. That I think, Mr. Speaker, is a very important and vital consideration for this province especially, for Canada as a whole as well. It is to be hoped that the federal government will be able to have that agreed to internationally and if not then I would suggest, although we are not a federal legislature here, I would suggest that perhaps Canada be willing to incur the tut-tuts from some other communities and do unilaterally what cannot be done by agreement.

Others have done that, the most noticeable being Iceland - it can well be argued Canada is a different nation than Iceland. We depend upon foreign countries, there could be retaliatory measures etc. etc. These are all possibilities but I would suggest, Sir, that none of them are insurmountable. If there cannot be agreement then certainly the vital interest of this province and I suggest too the eastern provinces and a very important national interest is at stake there, one would hope that can be recognized within the next several months when this matter hopefully will be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, as well my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, has articulated the position of the government with respect to the offshore oil potential. This province, in the Speech from the Throne, restates and gives emphasis to this province's determination to exercise its jurisdiction and rights over that resource of this province. It states this province's willingness to continue negotiation to reach an agreement suitable to this province whereby the vital interest of this province will be realized and, if that is not possible, the government's willingness to seek adjudication on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of minimum wage, this administration can and indeed is in fact very proud. The Speech from the Throne outlines the action we have taken there and I do not think that any administration in Newfoundland's history has take such progressive measures with respect to the improvement of the minimum wage at any time in our history.

In the area of education, Mr. Speaker, there are two areas referred to in the Speech from the Throne. I just intend to mention them briefly now. After the budget is read and during the debate on the estimates is the ideal time to go through, point by point, matters within the purview of the Department of Education. There are two areas mentioned there which I will refer to briefly; one is government's intention to inaugurate an extended teaching day in the district vocational schools throughout the province. This is in accord with government's policy to maximize the use of the facilities that we have. This extended day programme which you know obviously means that it starts earlier in the day and goes later in the day using the same facilities, which are very expensive, the capital costs are very expensive, using the same facilities, obviously a need for staff increases but you know that depending on a number of circumstances. Obviously there is an increase in current costs because we are thinking of more students and a certain number of hours which people may teach and others they cannot. That is all governed in the agreement, an agreement between the government and NAPE which represents vocational schoolteachers.

What it does mean is that these physical facilities we will be able to maximize their use and that we envision being able to serve an additional thousand students in the district vocational schools. This will be in operation starting in September. There are of course other possibilities as and when that increased capacity is used maximumly - as and when that increased capacity which will see an additional thousand, approximately, people being served in the vocational school areas. Then there is another possibility and that of course is a swinging to a fourth semester system as and when that capacity is maximumly utilized or even a further extension of the day as maximumly

utilized, that is another possibility. It is one with certain difficulties because there are in the main dealings with the trades and with the apprenticeship programmes and with work patterns.

Specifically here it is the vocational schools, and extended day which is also the policy for the College of Trades and Technology; and that is use to the maximum. Who knows what is use to the maximum, because we can always push somebody else in. Certainly the facilities there are used to a very great extent. They also in many areas have an extended day, there are classes up there evenings and during summer time. But they will be able to process an additional one hundred students through, where possible, an application of this system. We are thinking essentially there of one thousand one hundred students in the vocational, technical training area, through this extended-day programme.

This is going to cost over a million dollars. This will cost the public treasury over \$1 million. I think



money well spent because I think vocational and technical education are extremely important in this province.

Let me say now, Mr. Speaker, what I have said before, that I do not acknowledge any hierarchy in these areas of vocational education or university education or this institution or that institution. I think all of the young people, and not only young people, we in general have a right to education and training in accord with our interests and aptitude. Sometimes one is criticized, or the government is criticized for a hierarchial view and sometimes it is suggested you put universities at the top and the others are discriminated against. Then sometimes one hears the criticism that the others are discriminated against. Well recently maybe vocational and technical schools you know are at the top and others are suffering by comparison. Let me say, Sir, what I have said before, that I personally do not acknowledge any hierarchy. I do not think any hierarchial view is warranted. I think any hierarchial view would be regressive. Suggestions as to that of a hierarchy there are totally out of order.

The other area, Mr. Speaker, and that fairly lengthy statement made a few days ago, last Wednesday I believe, on a new system of teacher allocation that the government views as a very important step forward in terms of the qualitative aspect of education in our schools. No doubt the needs in other areas, buildings, grants, money in the operation, all that be that essential but we never lose sight of the fact that it is the quality and relevance of what goes on within the school are really what it is all about.

Now saying that, I am not minimizing obviously or am I unaware of the importance of the other areas as well. I do not intend to go through that statement again. That too of course will be a very costly measure, after the first part is implemented in the next academic year, the second part the year after. When fully implemented, without taking into account any increases in teachers' salaries, without taking any of that into account, just going as if everything would be the



same then as it is now, which is somewhat unrealistic, when fully implemented that would come approximately to \$6.4 million additional. That is not taking into account any other factors whatsoever.

Next year, in its implementation next year, it will mean an additional 300 teachers available to the pupils of Newfoundland, approximately 180 there in the specialists area, approximately 120 not in the specialists area, in the area of the general allocation. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a very significant and worthwhile contribution towards the improvement of the quality of education.

Now everybody knows of course that reducing the pupil teacher ratio in itself or having less children in classrooms or more teachers for children, that in itself, you know there is no inevitable connection between that and improved quality. There is nothing inevitable about it. What it does do, I think, it facilitates and encourages and makes much more possible and facilitates and encourages the improvement in the quality of instruction, and this is what we have to aim for. There is nothing inevitable. I do not suppose there is. Basically teaching is human relations; There is nothing inevitable in that whole area but certainly it facilitates significant improvement in the quality of education and that is something of utmost importance in the education of Newfoundlanders.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes the remarks that I wish to make, laterly just to say a few words about the two areas of education referred to in The Speech from the Throne. There are many other areas there of interest and importance.

which I think are perhaps best dealt with when the estimates of the department are dealt with because they are the inter-relationship of these various areas as seen because I do not know if in any other area things are more inter-related and one can hardly talk about expenditures here without expenditures there or a programme here without - it is an overlap. The things are very, very inter-related.

So, on that I wish to acquaint honourable members with conditions in the district of St. Mary's Bay and I wish to point out as well which I hope I did, that the disappointment of honourable gentlemen opposite in the Speech from the Throne is inevitable and is not to be worried about. It is totally inevitable for a number of reasons.

I suppose one reason would be because the honourable gentlemen are sitting over there and we are sitting over here. That would be a physical reason. That would be a physical reason why honourable gentlemen opposite do not share our enthusiasm about this document. There is that physical reason, that they are sitting over there and we are sitting over here.

Apart from that, I would suggest as well that there is an intellectual reason and again I am not getting into hierarchies here, I am not getting into hierarchies. There is an intellectual reason, one that honourable gentlemen opposite are used to and no doubt convinced that the Speech from the Throne should have this spectacular and surprising and miraculous approach whereas we on this side are of the opinion that however beneficial that may have been at one time, today people should and must be involved in the evolution of government programmes and that you do not save everything for a great big surprise and people learn of it and they have never heard of it before and perhaps never will again. That has happened on more than one occasion.

We go on the theory that it is an overall plan of the government's course of action which comes as the result of initiatives and negotiations and co-operative effort between government and all segments of society.

I think that this deduction is a real one, it is a valid one and people have to make up their mind which kind of speech they prefer and which kind of government they prefer.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bay de Verde.

MR. B. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate the member for Bonavista South and the member for Harbour Grace for their excellent speeches they made in moving and seconding the gracious Speech from the Throne.

I would also like to take this opportunity to welcome the new member for Hermitage to this House and no doubt he will be as colourful as we expect him to be.

Before getting into the main aspects as far as the Speech from the Throne is concerned, I would like to dwell just for a little while upon the things concerning my district as a whole. The only things I can say about the district are things that I have already said before and therefore it will be a repeat in that regard.

After listening for the past few days to the different members of this honourable House speaking in the Throne Speech debate, sometimes it is actually a little sickening. I will go back and reminisce on some of the notes that I have taken down. For instance, a few days ago we heard the honourable member from Bonavista North speaking in this Throne Speech debate and he was speaking about a do-nothing government, the government which has not done anything for two years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the only way I can speak is for my own district. I cannot speak for anybody else. I say for the people of

Bay de Verde and for the people of the District of Bay de Verde, thank God for a P.C. Government!

We have, Mr. Speaker, in the past eighteen months received more from this present administration than we have received from any other administration in the history of Newfoundland. Since I have been elected to this honourable House, Mr. Speaker, I will just take, for instance, the Community of Bay de Verde itself. Eighteen months ago we did not even have a road in Bay de Verde, that is, the Community of Bay de Verde, that was fit for a goat to go over much less anything else. Right now, today, you can drive any part of Bay de Verde and meet a car going forty miles an hour. I think this in itself is a great achievement.

Talk of our fisheries; Red Head Cove, Grate's Cove, Job's Cove, Old Perlican have been sending petitions on top of petitions, not only to the provincial government but to the federal government, to try to get facilities. Nothing big, just enough so that they could prosecute the fishery and see their families. Not one thing was done. In the last eighteen months, Mr. Speaker, contracts have been awarded to put a slipway in Red Head Cove, one has been awarded to put a slipway in Job's Cove, tenders have been called to put a marine complex in Old Perlican, which I understand will probably cost in excess of \$1 million by the time it is completed. Preparations are underway to call tenders for a slipway at Grate's Cove, a longliner haulout at Bay de Verde, plus all the other things that have been on the taking, like giving 220 power to the fish plant at Lower Island Cove, getting roads to that settlement which it never had before. I do not know what anybody can expect of an administration after only eighteen months, but in my estimation, that is progress.

We never heard anything from the opposition about the government taking the tax off children's clothing nor taking the tax off fuel oil. The only thing we have heard is criticism from day one up to the present, and not very constructive criticism at that, I might add.

By listening to the honourable members in this House presenting petitions for different things in all districts, sometimes I wonder if anything has ever been done. It would be wrong for me to say that there was nothing done because that would be false. There have been things done. Listening to the opposition, they expect us to do so much in two years but the previous government could not accomplish it in twenty-two years, which I think is ridiculous.

We also hear the opposition coming out and saying; "Resign!" "Resign!" "Call an election." They say this on one hand and on the other hand they get up and say; "What a waste of the taxpayers money to call an election in March of 1972." It was a waste to call an election in 1972 when no side of the House had a majority but it is not a waste to call an election in 1974 when there are thirty-two members sitting on this side of the House. I wish somebody would make up their minds.

I would like to refer back, and I think the Loyal Opposition on the other side should take note of this, to a letter which appeared in the "Evening Telegram" of February 14, 1974, and is signed by "Under thirty" of Bonavista North.

The first thing I will tackle in that, Mr. Speaker, is welfare, then I will elaborate when I quote what the honourable gentleman had to say. The letter reads as follows, this is a paragraph from it;

"Steve Neary knows all about welfare."

AN HON. MEMBER: True.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the clerk count the House please?

There is a quorum.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I am quoting from a letter which appeared in "The Evening Telegram," February 14, this paragraph was connected with welfare. It says;

"Steve Neary knows all about welfare. No one can tell him anything. The Mayor of Stephenville say when he was minister, Mr Near was asked to do something for a partially lame mother and her eleven children in the way of an apartment or house. His reply was that the department did not find housing for people and left it at that. Now he is not in office he sees no good in anything being done by the present Minister of Social Services."

I say to the opposition, have done with lesser things and get on with the business of the country, give credit where it is due and criticize where it is justified and necessary.

Speaking of welfare, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take my thoughts back to October 1971, when I was campaigning in the District of Bay de Verde. At that time I ran across a welfare family, a family who had to depend on welfare because the man of the house was sick and he was after putting in for some clapboard, to the Welfare Department etc., it amounted to \$72. He did receive that \$72 for his material but in the process of carrying out the improvements to the home he needed an extra \$12 worth, but he was told by the department at that time or by representatives from that department that they could not supply him with the \$12 extra because he did not include it in the beginning.

When I come to think back to that year of 1971, Mr. Speaker, it breaks my heart to see how many hundreds of thousands were spent



it breaks my heart to see how many hundreds of thousands were spent in other districts and we could not get \$100 spent in Bay de Verde.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. HOWARD: On welfare.

Another quotation I would like to take from that letter is this; "There is too much of the old tactics in evidence with the present Liberals sitting in opposition. Some of the members must be humiliated by some utterance such as the Throne Speech being barren, barrens as the Funks and Waddams Island. If the gentleman who made that statement had landed on either he would have seen it was not barren. He should have consulted the captain sitting on that side of the House."

It goes on to say; "Very likely he has consulted the captain by this time."

This goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that before the opposition on the opposite side starts criticizing anything, at least find out what the facts are before they start. To clue up on this letter I am quoting from it say; "Let Mr. Roberts tell the public about the Bison deal and the \$400,000 cheated from the taxpayers of this country. The opposition at that time was assured it would be paid, certainly Roberts, Rowe and Neary must have known when that assurance was given by their leader that it was incorrect.

"Neary who was Minister of Labour should know who were the promoters of the Philip Building and



Compensation Board, coming under the Department of Labour should have been under the eye of the genial minister.

MR. ROWE, W.N. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not know why Your Honour has not drawn the honourable member to order. There is a clear ruling in our Standing Orders in a commentary relating thereto on page 39, Quoting from Newspapers, documents, etc. "It is out of order to read extracts in a debate if they"- there are a number of various things there - "Contain personal allusions derogatory to members."

Your Honour, I submit respectfully, should draw the honourable member to order and not permit him to read letters or extracts from anything which are derogatory to members of this House. It is a clear commentary on the rules, on the Standing Orders of this House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the clear meaning of those words "Contain personal allusions derogatory to members " is exactly that, personal allusion, that you speak about the personal characteristics. You say that they are ugly or they are dishonest, so you make some personal allusion to them. Criticism of members of the House with regard to public decisions that they made or to what they stated publicly in the course of their duties or their responsibilities as members of a government is certainly not "Contain personal allusions derogatory to members."

All the Hon. the Member for Bay de Verde is doing is referring to certain things that occurred while the members opposite were in the government and criticizing them for it. He is quoting a letter from the paper in that connection and it is certainly not out of order whatsoever.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to revert to what the minister had to say on that. We have no objections to the honourable member himself making whatever allusions he wants to, as a member of this House that is his right to speak about past goings on in government or past goings on in this House as long as they are not derogatory to members of the House.

Sir, it is certainly out of order as I read this for a member to come into this House with a letter, Sir, to a newspaper or to himself, and to cast spurious derogatory remarks or allegations with respect to members of this House. The reason for the order is a good one, Sir, the kind of thing which is an insult to the members of this House who have been elected by the people of this province. It is one thing for one member to say something about another member, for me to say something about a member of the House. We are all in an equal boat but for a member to drag into this House extracts from letters perhaps anonymous, casting aspersions on members of this House, Sir, is an insult to a member of this House. That is why that Standing Order is there. That is why that rule has been constantly upheld.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, let me reply to that before you make your decision. You see the honourable gentleman gets up and he says there are rules against this. It is unparliamentary. He cites no authority whatsoever. The only authority in Beauchesne refers to ministers of the Crown, what they are at liberty to do or not what to do in connection with the dispatches or other state papers.

The hon. Member for Bay de Verde is perfectly entitled to read a letter to the House or say that he has read the letter and give a summary of what is in the letter or dock what is in the letter. There is no rule at all against it. I therefore submit the point of order should be overruled.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure the honourable member is aware of the rule pertaining to reading of extracts, letters and so on. I think the matter raised by the Hon. the Member for White Bay South is more a matter of opinion perhaps than a point of order.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, actually the content of the letter is and I will sum it up in two words - If you do not know what you are going to say before you open your mouth, do not open it!

I would like to go on to speak briefly before going into the Throne Speech debate about something that came to my attention this morning in

fact and this is about the \$300. I believe it is \$300 which has been granted to fishermen owing to the fact of starting late this season due to ice etc. In the District of Bay de Verde I would like to point out and I am sure that in other districts the same

thing happens. In the inshore fishery, the man of the house generally has to wait until his son returns from university before he can hope to prosecute the cod fishery as far as trapping etc. is concerned.

What I am trying to bring out here, Mr. Speaker, is that over the past weekend there were certain people in my area, not saying that they should not receive it, who prosecuted the fishery with certain skippers of the boats for a certain period of time, awaiting their sons to come home from university etc. but when the cheques were passed out, the three hundred dollars passed out to these people who were employed for a short while, the students did not receive same. Now someone may come out and say; "Well, this has to go to bona fide fishermen." Mr. Speaker, I would say that if a man cannot go fishing until his son comes home from the university and when he returns to university because this is the trapping season anyway, all his fishing gear etc. is in on the land. Then, that particular student should be classified as a bona fide fisherman.

Mr. Speaker, now I will get into the main part of the speech, the Speech from the Throne. I would like to point out, however, before doing that that I am quite happy with this present administration and if they do as much for the District of Bay de Verde in the next two or three years as they have done in the previous two, there will not be anything left over there for any other administration to do.

The Speech from the Throne this year is in many respects a milestone in the development, progress of Newfoundland. The opposition would have us believe that the Speech from the Throne contains nothing. Having done so little in the past themselves, they automatically expect everyone else to be measured by the same level of performance.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most notable pieces of legislation that

will be introduced in the House of Assembly this year in the legislation concerning the management control of the forests within our province. Over the years previous governments have given in to most all requests on behalf of paper companies, mining companies and anyone else who could think up a scheme to acquire interests in Newfoundland at the expense of Newfoundlanders.

In other countries in the world and in other provinces in Canada, industry lives in harmony with the governments and with the environment. In Newfoundland, for some reason, the policy in the past has been to give away our natural resources with no consideration given to the consequences or the effects that it would have on later generations of Newfoundlanders. As long as big, multi-national corporations are well looked after, then, Newfoundlanders be darned. This policy I am very proud to say is not being continued by the Moores Administration and the P.C. Government of this province. This government feel that natural resources belong to the people of Newfoundland and that the people of Newfoundland should be the ones to derive the greatest benefit from them.

Mr. Speaker, lest I be misunderstood, let me make it crystal clear that the Moores Administration is not discouraging major industry from coming to this province nor is the Moores Administration putting the squeeze on the industries that are already here.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, this government would like the existing industries to accept some of the responsibility for an orderly and progressive development of this province,

utilizing the available raw materials to the fullest and coupled with a development plan which protects the environment as such.

Mr. Speaker, I find it terribly embarrassing for me to get up in this honourable House of Assembly and have to tell this general public of laws which permitted our natural resources to be given away in the past were not in the best interest of Newfoundland. It is a shocking state of affairs that our province should have been treated so badly by the previous government. One can look around and see that while we are very rich in many things in this province, most of our natural resources belong to other than Newfoundland.

The forestry rights by and large are held by people outside of the province. It is true that companies are operating in the province but their parent companies are located elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, we could go on and on into mining - mining concessions and what have you. It is disturbing that this situation should have been allowed to develop. On many occasions in the past, we have all heard the previous Premier, Mr. Smallwood, continuously expound his theory that companies were not exactly knocking on Newfoundland doors. This may be quite true and I feel very firm that it was but; in God's name! is it necessary to throw away our heritage in order to bring in industry that rapes the province and invests money that it makes off Newfoundlanders in areas outside the province.

Mr. Speaker, it is nothing short of public scandal that a crown corporation, Labrador Linerboard Limited, should have to go outside this province to bring in wood. If the previous government had the best interest of Newfoundland at heart when these concessions were given to the various companies, this situation would not happen today. We would not be forced into the position of rationing our forests. The previous government that allowed the situation to come about should hang their heads in shame. I feel very sad that Newfoundlanders were treated as badly as they were.



Mr. Speaker, what is a country without its natural resources? If it had not been for this government coming into power when it did, I am afraid that the natural resources, the few remaining natural resources would have been given away to some multi-national corporation or to some friend of the government.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that our efforts to correct this situation will be successful.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Gander Lake?

MR. HOWARD: The honourable member should know. He was there a lot longer than I.

I hope for the development of Newfoundland that we are not too late.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, to conclude my comments on forestry, I can only add that it is a very sad day in Newfoundland when small contractors, small sawmill operators, are finding it necessary to cut back on production because forest limits near where they are cutting are not owned by the Crown and the Crown, therefore, is not able to grant them a permit to cut. Yet in many cases, no cutting has taken place in this land for many years. Indeed, many of the lots are located so far away from the large paper mills that it is doubtful if economic foresting would ever be the order of the day for these companies. Why in Heaven's name these sawmill operators were not protected by the previous government is something that I can only leave to your imagination.

Mr. Speaker, had the Moores' Administration not come to power when it did, there is little doubt in my mind that the sawmill industry would have no future in Newfoundland because no steps had been taken to rationalize the forestry and no efforts were made to assist the sawmill operators. It seems that the previous administration were more interested in raising the welfare benefits to attract people away from work so that they would not be a thorn in the side of big business.

Mr. Speaker, the more people who were on welfare, the more secure the government felt and the less reason they had to worry about the small operator.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the policy of this administration. The Moores' Administration feel that every Newfoundlander should be entitled to a fair share, utilizing to the fullest the resources that God gave us.

Mr. Speaker, hopefully our measure will correct this terrible situation and will make the small sawmill and pulpwood operators feel that they are a part of this province and can earn a living in this province as well as the next man. It is their type of operation, Mr. Speaker, that will determine the success or the failure of the economic basis of Newfoundland.

For too long the governments in the past have hung their philosophy on the central development of major industries. This develop or perish attitude can only result in the continued exodus of thousands of our young, native Newfoundlanders to other provinces. Hundreds of millions of dollars mean very few jobs when they are invested in such large enterprises as linerboard mills, oil refineries or any other colossal industrial undertaking. With the re-alignment of our natural resources, the same hundreds of millions of dollars could provide employment for every single person in this province. Every Newfoundlander should be entitled to make the decision himself, whether or not he wants to stay in Newfoundland and work or whether or not he would like to work outside this province.

Mr. Speaker, under the previous administration thousands and thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders never had that choice. They were to stay in front of big cities like Toronto and Montreal or some place on the mainland, simply because our approach to handle our own natural resources did not provide the opportunity for them to take advantage of it. We are told that since the Moores Administration assumed power, many of our Newfoundlanders who left the province in previous years have returned. They have every intention of remaining in the province provided an opportunity is available for them to make a living.

In many cases it is necessary for them to acquire permits to cut on timber limits that are already allocated to other companies. Rationalization of the forest industry in Newfoundland should create many new job opportunities for many Newfoundlanders.

Mr. Speaker, on another matter that is of vital importance to me, because many of my constituents have derived their living from it, is the fishery. This Throne Speech indicates that the government recognizes fishing as the basic natural resource of the province. This, Mr. Speaker, is a far cry from years gone by when fishermen were encouraged to burn their boats, haul the boats upon the beach, tear up the nets etc., and wait for the develop or perish policy to provide two jobs for every Newfoundlander. What nonsense! What a scandalous waste of effort and talent!

Mr. Speaker, anyone with common sense realizes that year after year fishing vessels from other nations come to Canadian waters and off the Coast of Newfoundland. They spend months and months out there, fish our resource, acquire enough fish to keep their country going for the winter and then return home. Mr. Speaker, what a scandalous waste of natural resources! Again I can only wonder at the attitude of the previous administration with their "Burn your boat" policy.

Fishing has always been a worthwhile and respectful profession. It is true that many merchants exploited the fishermen in the past and not much money was made at it but one has only to go back into Biblical times to find out that some of the apostles of Christ were fishermen. Certainly to heavens! If it were good enough for them there is no reason why less humble people should not see fishing as a very honourable and worthwhile profession.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the fisherman who has seen fishing as something to get away from, it was the government of the day. The previous government who encouraged them to get out of the fishery. Consequently, we see an industry today that is in an almost total state of collapse and is in utter chaos. From an overall point of view it is only recently that fishermen have been getting

the just attention and wages that they deserve. Advances in technology make it of paramount importance that the Canadian Government work with this province in determining an adequate fishing reserve exclusively for Newfoundlanders.

For centuries Newfoundland fishermen existed using the barter system. That is a merchant provided them with food and fishing gear at the beginning of the season. The fishermen went out and caught fish all season. At the end of the season he brought his fish back to the merchant and in most cases the fisherman would end up worse off than he was before.

Thank God, because of unions and the effort the government is making, that this situation no longer exists and it is now possible for a fisherman to make as much money as any other tradesman.

Mr. Speaker, for many years we had a good codfishery along the Labrador and Northeast Coast of Newfoundland. It did fail occasionally for reasons never determined but it always recovered to yet another good year until recently. The last few years it has been a continuous failure with a severe effect on the economy of the area and the fishermen who harvest the Labrador fishery.

Mr. Speaker, during the fishing season of 1971 one foreign country took 600,000 tons of codfish off the shores around Newfoundland. Other foreign nations took 522,000 tons, a total of 1.2 million tons. Canada took one million tons for a total approximate catch of 2.2 million tons. A staggering amount of fish. How is all this related to the Labrador fishery? Well, Mr. Speaker, fish is one of the very best foods. It is an excellent source of protein, very low in fat but above all it is a renewable natural resource. It is a gift from heaven so to speak. We humans on this earth have a responsibility to protect one of our own natural resources.

Biologists, scientists and marine geographers have reason to believe that cod concentrate at certain areas in the ocean to spawn. One of these areas is the Hamilton Inlet Bank off the Labrador Coast

with such large catches as illustrated above, the remaining fish obtain all the food they need without coming to the shore of Labrador and the northeast coast of Newfoundland. This then eliminates the inshore fishery in these areas.

We know that there are some local stocks of codfish on this coast which do not mix with the Hamilton Inlet fish but these concentrations are small in number and size. What is urgently needed is an internationally agreed conservation measure. One such measure is that fishing stock in all areas where fish are known to concentrate to spawn, if this could be achieved by the Hamilton Inlet and an economically sustained yield reached, we could once again look forward to a reasonable inshore catch along Labrador and the northeast coast of this province.

With agreed conservation measures goes enforcement and management. We must ask Ottawa to press hard for management of our Continental Shelf. Canada has rights established by the 1958 United Nations Convention on permanently attached shellfish. We should have rights established over fish which return to our waters to spawn and such species should not be fished from the high seas. We should seek rights over our coastal species which live and breed in known areas such as haddock, lobster, etc.

The species which are wide-ranging we should manage under an international arrangement of all countries interested in fishing these species. Quotas should be set to allow an economical, sustainable yield both national and international in Canada, the coastal nation having inspection and enforcement authority. If such management is not rigidly enforced, soon we will pass the economical sustainable yield point from where it will take the stock years to recover.

Already nations are, with the help of very sophisticated automatic report devices, tracking migration of fish stock. A military like operation can now be planned. A decisive strike by any fishing fleet and another species is wiped out. Faced with these odds, this national renewable resource could be destroyed in the 1970's. Conservation



and management are essential for the coastal state immediately and Canada should host a meeting in Canada of all interested fishing nations.

We should seek international agreements on conservation, management and quotas. We hear much today of our caplin stock so large that a school exists 190 miles long

and two miles wide. The reason for such large schools - if they exist, is that its natural predator has been eliminated. The cod with military like operations now possible. How long before the caplin go the same way as the haddock, the cod and the fast dwindling stocks of redfish and flounder?

A word on the marketing may be of interest. No matter what happens in the fishing industry, the man who actually catches the fish always seers worse off. Why not have all catching efforts regardless of ownership, sell their catch through a marketing board where the catch would be auctioned. This would seem to bring the greatest return to the fishermen but it would also help the small processing plant which depends on inshore fishery for its raw material. The auction price would not be permitted if it went below a certain standard. In other words, there would be a minimum price in which the auction would take place.

When inshore catch is let down instead of the small plant closing down, it could contact the marketing board and bid on offshore fish of its choice. This would prevent temporary shutdowns during the seasonal operation and indeed lengthen the season considerably. Costly, the only limitation would be navigation and ice problems and other related weather conditions. If we were now processing our own catch we would have multi-purpose boats bringing fish into multi-purpose plants.

Where, regardless of the species that would be processed to a fine product and sold at the highest market prices allowing higher prices to the fishermen. We should also salvage our codtongues, codroe, cod-heads, codtails, herring, herringroe, caplin, caplinroe, just to mention a few. Most of these products now go to the meal plants.

It seems logical to look forward to the day when the by-product will be worth more than the fillet is today.

Mr. Speaker, after we have achieved control of our shellfish, haddock, lobster, salmon, etc., should we not do some research of our own? Why not have automatic devices reporting the salinity, the temperature, the tides, the sizes of schools of fish in the area? Why not have some sort of underwater environment device comparable to the satellites

in the upper atmosphere? These devices could record all of the necessary data. Further, it could watch the spawning habits of our turbot,

count the numbers of fish in the school, record their habits etc. This type of an operation could provide the proper background to try to determine the type of fishing that is necessary. The annual sustainable yield per species, the complete mating and moving habits of the species.

It is only against the background of complete knowledge can the Law of the Sea Conference or any other multi-national conference achieved the desired end and make fishing a sustainable business in years to come. A further advantage of some sort of underwater device would be as follows: This device would be linked into some sort of central information bank so the small inshore fishermen could check in with a command control in much the same manner as a person would make a telephone call. He could find out where the schools of fish are and any other related information that would be useful to him for that day. The centre would then check and reply with the necessary information as opposed to the haphazard way of fishing today when some of it is done on luck.

There is room for technology in fishing. However, that technology must be refined and improved if fishing is going to be the mainstay of our industry. No longer is it necessary to send hundreds of trawlers out into the ocean and sweep the decks with their huge gigantic nets without realizing or knowing what the consequences are.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see an ordinary plan developed and accepted at the multi-national level and possibly at the Law of the Sea Conference where a positive approach would be taken to fishing just as a positive approaches are taken in other areas of development. There is no reason why technology cannot improve our knowledge of fisheries just as it improves the catches of the gigantic trawler.

More on the local scene and concerning my district. Mr. Speaker, preparations have been made with tenders to be called for small boat slipways and storage areas at Grates Cove, longliner haulout to Bay de Verde. Contracts for phase one of the marine complex at Old Perlican have been awarded and contracts have already been awarded for small boat slipways at Red Head Cove and Jobs Cove.

Mr. Speaker, this is evidence that the Moores Administration is keenly interested in the fishing in the province because in just the short time that we have been in office a positive approach to fishing has been taken. While it will take many years to see the

results of the hard work that has gone into the planning and task force on fisheries. There is no doubt in my mind that the fishermen of Newfoundland have a very bright future. I can only encourage people in my district of Bay de Verde to remain with the fisheries and to bring their requests for improvement to government as it is from the grass-roots. That is the fishermen themselves, that we shall be seeking the information that can make fishing the industry that it should be for all Newfoundlanders.

Many of my constituents of Bay de Verde have made a very good living at fishing. With a little government assistance - they are not asking very much, Mr. Speaker, just improvement in their equipment and handling facilities that will make their job a little easier.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why do not the Tories give it too them?

MR. HOWARD: They will. Give them time. We have waited twenty-three years. Surely God we can wait another twelve months.

They will continue to make a good living. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Moores Administration will listen very carefully to any requests from the fishermen, which would pay us to be reasonable. If there is money available, it will certainly be done. I have no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker, and again I can only reiterate that it is my view that the basic natural resources of this province should be used to the advantage of all of those involved in the fishery in the province.

Again as in our forestry, Newfoundlanders have not gained a maximum from the fishery. In most cases we are exporting our raw material in block form to other parts of the world, to the United States where they are converted into fish sticks and other kinds of food. Many jobs have been created in these other countries. There is no need for us to export any jobs as long as we have unemployed people.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day in the very near future when we will not be exporting our jobs through our raw materials but whereby we will be converting our fish into the final form right here in



Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the fishing industry in Newfoundland can become

of paramount importance to the Canadian economy as a whole. When one realizes that Newfoundland contributes her share to the Canadian balance of payment I feel sure that the fishery will occupy an even greater place in export market than it has in years gone by. With the price of beef rising out of all proportion, I can foresee the day when fish will greatly replace meat as the main source of protein.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I call upon the ministers in the federal government to work with the Moores Administration in bringing about a sound fishing policy for Canada along with protection over our fishing limits. Mr. Speaker, I call upon the ministers in Ottawa to treat the fishermen of Newfoundland and indeed the Atlantic Provinces and the other parts of Canada with the same respect and with the same attention that they provide to the Prairie farmers.

One has only to listen to the radio to hear the concessions that farmers have been given over the years by those in positions of power in the federal cabinet. When it comes to fishing a different approach is taken altogether. I wonder if farmers in Western Canada have to wait a year or so to collect on crop insurance. One has only to reflect back on the situation in the Newfoundland fishery this year with the ice conditions and see how long the fishermen had to wait before they got some assistance from the federal government.

This attitude must change. The federal government must treat fishermen with the respect that they deserve and they must realize that fishing cannot be successful in the same environment that John Cabot found Newfoundland almost 500 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I ask those in position of authority in the federal government to take a new look at fishing and to realize it is one of the best natural resources that we have today, and to work with the province toward finding a satisfactory solution to the many problems that still face fishermen. While the Americans are sending men to the moon in the most sophisticated type of vehicle that there is, many of our fishermen in the province are still hauling up their boats with the hand capstan and in some cases by hand. This is essentially the

same operation that existed since the beginning of the boat building era many thousands of years ago.

I wonder if the federal government used farming out in our sister provinces in the west in the same regard? Are they satisfied to see farmers' harvest land utilizing pieces of wood for plows as were used thousands of years ago?

That needs no answer because we all know different. Why then do they take a different view of the fishery?

Mr. Speaker, another great natural resource that this province once had and which has largely been responsible in bringing about great wealth to the province of Quebec, is the great power development in Labrador, Churchill Falls. Here, Mr. Speaker, we find another very sad situation, whereby the wealth that has been generated from our natural resource finds its way to another province and that other province is effectively controlling our natural resource. This is a typical example of the type of policies that we need to change.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that the Moores Administration see the development of the power in Churchill Falls in a different frame of mind. Any benefits to be derived from any future development in Labrador should rightfully benefit the Province and the people of Newfoundland in general.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is why Moores is going up to see Bourassa.

MR. HOWARD: That could be.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HOWARD: I do not need the paper to read editorials, we are informed on this side of the House. We do not need the paper to tell us what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, to develop the Lower Churchill along the same lines as the other Churchill was developed would be to bring dishonour to the people of Newfoundland. Not only are we exporting much of our power to Quebec under the Upper Churchill contracts and thus bringing great revenues to that province, we are also at a disadvantage under the equalization payments that we receive from Ottawa. We lose money on equalization from Ottawa and at the same time the great revenues that are generating it from the sale of the Churchill power goes to the Province of Quebec. The little bit of money that the Province of Newfoundland receives is offset by the decrease in the

equalization payments so there is very little net gain to the province other than a few jobs that have been created of a permanent nature at Churchill Falls.

We hear cries of "Madness" from various people for the development of the Lower Churchill without due consideration being given to the consequences. Why the opposition wants to give away all our natural resources is something that I cannot understand. Why they insist on doing business on the development of the Lower Churchill on similar lines is something that I cannot understand either.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. HOWARD: Well the previous administration thought it was all theirs to give away. They gave it away anyway. They must have thought it was theirs.

Mr. Speaker, it would be much better for the development of the Lower Churchill not to go ahead, if it were to go ahead under the same conditions as the Upper Churchill. Thank God the Moores' Administration has the interest of Newfoundlanders at heart and will only allow the development of the Lower Churchill under certain conditions and these are that the development of the Lower Churchill will be to the advantage of the province.

Mr. Speaker, it is another blatant example of how another one of our great natural resources has been exploited and given away and how Newfoundland has been sold down the drain by the previous administration.

Now more so than ever, Mr. Speaker, with the energy crisis reaching out of all proportions, power in Labrador is more valuable than any other time in history and undoubtedly its value will increase as times goes by. While it may not be appropriate to those we are dealing with, I fully support the hard approach that the Moores' Administration have taken on the development of the Lower Churchill. We must drive the hardest bargain that is possible and if anybody gets short-changed, it must not be Newfoundlanders.

Electricity from Churchill is going to light cities and industrial areas in Quebec. I believe that any power that is not to be consumed in Quebec will be exported to their neighbours to the south.

This is another in the tragic set of examples of our "develop or perish" philosophy. Just a few days ago I heard the Hon. Leader of the Opposition call on the Premier to put his case



to the test before the electorate of the province. I can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has thought of some natural resource that has not been given away to some multi-national corporation or friends of the Liberal Administration. They would like to return to power so that they could give that as well. What a scandalous situation to have in Newfoundland! When will the Liberals realize that the resources of Newfoundland belong to Newfoundlanders and that never again will Newfoundlanders tolerate this type of attitude from any elected politician. Our natural resources are a God-given right and God help the politician who misuses or abuses these gifts in the future.

Mr. Speaker, if energy is basic to life, what does it supply? We think first of oil and heat. Electricity could

also supply heat. We think of cars, boats, planes and trains and other forms of transportation operated by oil. Electricity can also supply transportation. If an area has energy and has raw materials should not we be looking at a transportation policy utilizing fully the cheapest form of energy that we have, that of hydro electricity?

In developing such a policy, we could create a brand-new environment. Building a town to supply the workings of social life that goes with it, schools, hospitals, clubs, grocery stores, etc., all of this is possible.

Mr. Speaker, in the Lower Churchill which has a capacity for approximately 3 million horsepower - it is one of the last largest developments of its kind left in the world and already the industries that can utilize this power are looking at and planning for its use. This of course is healthy and good but should we lose sight of what this amounts to for the average person in this province?

In this time of energy crisis one needs little imagination to realize the benefits of cheap electricity providing an overall transportation system from one end of the province to the other and as well providing cheap heat and light to every householder at a very reasonable rate. Developments in the future, especially industrial developments, will be centered around areas that offer good natural resources as part of the economic base on which to found a particular industry. Newfoundland offers this economic base providing we are able to rectify some of the mistakes that have been committed against us by previous administrations.

Indeed it may not even be possible to correct all of the mistakes but where mistakes can be corrected, then they should. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the House that Newfoundland has limited natural resources and that we should make certain that the benefits of these resources are used exclusively for Newfoundlanders.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Fogo has adjourned the debate

and shall be given the opportunity to continue his speech next day.

On motion, the House at its rising do now adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at three of the clock, February 20, 1974.



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 26

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1974**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL**

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

HON. JOHN C. CROSBIE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a question of a breach of privilege of a member of this House; namely the member who is now speaking. I refer to Page 98 of Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, which says that libels on members being constantly punished but to constitute a breach of privilege, they must concern the character or conduct of members in that capacity. The libel must be based on matters arising in the actual transaction of the business of the House. In Beauchesne, Page 101: "Willful misrepresentation of the proceedings of members is an offence of the same character as a libel."

Mr. Speaker, the breach of privilege I wish to refer to appears in an editorial in the "Evening Telegram" of Monday, February 18. The editorial is headed, "The Long Hoist." Mr. Speaker, this is an editorial which concerns myself on a debate in the House a week ago tomorrow, Wednesday, February 13, when a private members' resolution by the member for St. John's North was being debated and I spoke on that debate. The editorial in question is a willful misrepresentation of what I said in that debate. I wish to go into that now.

It was an editorial written by an anonymous editor but the anonymous editor is Mr. Wickford Collins, commonly known as Wick Collins of the "Evening Telegram." It is an editorial that is motivated by malice, by spleen, by venom and apparently by a vindictive desire to harm a member of this House. The editorial is not only careless of the truth but it is willfully false. It twisted and corrupted what I said. It is an attack on my character and reputation. I refer to the editorial but I will not read it all. The second paragraph says:

"Mr. Crosbie seems to be well informed on election financing. He spoke with easy familiarity of the abuses that take place and left the impression that there is not much of the seamy side of politics that he does not know about, and apparently is prepared to accept for now. Perhaps at some later date he will be less inclined to accept the patronage and graft that become part and parcel of the donation to party funds."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the debate last week, I spoke for seventy-five minutes. The debate is covered in Hansard. We have the Hansard No. 9, Volume 3, 3rd. Session. My speech is recorded on pages 702 to 737 of that Hansard. There is not one place in that debate, when I spoke, where I appeared inclined to accept patronage or graft or anything of that nature. The whole burden of my speech was that there needed to be change and reform along the lines of the resolution provided by the Member for St. John's North. I showed some of the abuses that were necessary to be corrected and that only this legislation could correct it or legislation along those lines.

Mr. Speaker, on page 707, I spoke about the intention of legislation and why it was necessary, why there must be reform of the financing of a political party. Further down that page, I mentioned that patronage is the system in all ten provinces and in the Government of Canada. In that connection, I admitted when questioned, that the awarding of an advertising contract, i.e., to George McLean would be an act of patronage, that the Government at Ottawa awarded tens of millions of dollars in advertising contracts in the same way each year, which is an example of patronage, and that this was common in all provinces.

Now what is patronage, Mr. Speaker? I used a standard college dictionary. Patronage is defined as: "The protection, support <sup>of</sup> or position of a patron; in the public service, the power or right to

distribute offices, especially political offices." That is patronage, Mr. Speaker, and that is what patronage means; "The awarding or protection of a patron or the power or right to distribute offices, especially political offices." It has no connection whatsoever with corruption



nor has it any connection with dishonesty. I mentioned this as one of the things that can only be corrected if we have reform of the Electoral Law. On page 709, that is quite clear. "Mr. Speaker," I said; "This is why this kind of thing is needed." That is the kind of legislation that is being contemplated in the resolution.

The editorial, Mr. Speaker, is extremely clever in its concoction because it is concocted with a view to the laws of libel. If we just look at the paragraph which I just read, we will notice that Mr. Collins said; "Perhaps at some later date he will be less inclined to accept the patronage." Then he goes on and adds; "And graft." Graft was never mentioned in the debate.

What is the definition of graft, Mr. Speaker? A standard college dictionary says that graft is the act of getting personal advantage or profit by dishonest or unfair means, especially through one's political or official connections. So, Mr. Collins goes on to add to patronage, graft. I will proceed on to the fifth paragraph in the editorial. He calls for an enquiry into the relationship between Mr. McLean and the P.C. Government and then says; "This kind of patronage is the worst and most insidious form of graft." Graft. "And any premier or cabinet minister who is prepared to defend it as right and proper should not be trusted to hold high office in this province."

Mr. Speaker, I did not defend it as right and proper nor right or proper. I said that this was an example of the things that needed to be corrected and could only be corrected through reform of the Election Financing Law.

The editorial goes on in the next paragraph and it says; "Does it not strike anybody in government from the merest backbencher to the Premier himself, that patronage is the doorway to crooked government and by Mr. Crosbie's admission we gather that the P.C. Government has already gone through that doorway. Is it not ironic that the P.C.'s. who have charged the Liberals with running dishonest government, are themselves doing the same thing and

defending it as if it were justified." There is no defence of dishonest government in any remark I made last Wednesday as reference to the Hansard will show.

It goes on to say; "If the P.C's. had any firm stand against crooked government, they would give the highest priority to a new bill to control election expenses." Then, Mr. Collins says; "Perhaps their lack of hurry is dictated by the desire to fill their own money pots before they bring such a bill."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Collins is well aware of the fact that you cannot libel a group, that you cannot libel a whole cabinet, so this is why he words his editorial; "Perhaps their lack of hurry is dictated by the desire to fill their own money pots before they bring in such a bill."

The whole editorial, Mr. Speaker, completely misrepresents the record of this House, completely misrepresents what I said

and is a libel on the government which is not actionable because it is the government generally. It is a scurrilous and insidious attempt to vilify and defame me by an anonymous character assassin who I identified today as being Mr. Wickford Collins. It is unscrupulous journalism of the wrong sort. I know that it is probably a waste of time to bring it forward. I know that editorials are not widely read but anyone who reads that editorial will believe that I made a speech last Wednesday in which I supported graft corruption, crookedness in government and boasted about patronage, claimed that it was the right system and said that we should not change it. That is the whole tenor of the editorial.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say this to Mr. Collins and the "Evening Telegram" (The "Evening Telegram" by the way properly reported my speech last Wednesday and the report was quite accurate as to what they had in the newspaper.) I say this and I challenge Mr. Collins to do this; I challenge Mr. Collins to print an editorial or statement which says that John C. Crosbie has defended patronage or that John C. Crosbie has defended graft or advocated graft or that John C. Crosbie has ever accepted graft or supports graft or defended graft. I challenge him to print a statement that John C. Crosbie's lack of desire for this Electoral Reform Bill is dictating by the desire to fill his pockets, his money pots, before such a bill is brought in. Let Mr. Collins say that about me so that I can take the proper action against him in the courts. Let him put up or shut up. Let him not be weasel-worded in his editorials criticizing in this way a collectivity that he knows cannot sue. Let him state that the person he mentions in his editorial that he is trying to insinuate believes in this or has done this, let him come out straight and say that I am not supporting the electoral reform because I have a desire to fill my own money pots before it is brought in.

Let him come out and say that I am dishonest or that I believe in crooked government or support crooked government. Let him make one of these statements directly instead of concocting a weasel-worded, insidious, nasty, vicious, vehement, bilious editorial of a type that he perpetrated in the "Evening Telegram" yesterday, Monday, February 18, completely

contrary - I challenge any member of the press or any member of the House to read my remarks in Hansard and see how this editorial can apply to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that in the case of privilege as a member of the House that you can bring forward a resolution but I have no desire to make Mr. Wick Collins or any other member of the press a hero by asking that he be brought before the Bar of this House. I just wish the right to defend myself against this kind of vicious and scurrilous editorial that can do nothing but discourage anyone who is interested in this province from ever putting his nose forward in the public life.

#### PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Member for Grand Falls.

MR. A. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition at this time. This petition is not from my own district and before I comment on the prayer of the petition I would like to make a few remarks which I feel are relative to this situation.

In regards to comments which I made last Friday in my speech, in the Address In Reply in this honourable House. At that time I made some statements to the effect that I had received many requests from people around the province in districts that were represented by Liberal members. I did this in defence, Sir, of the much criticism that we have received on this side of the House as members in performance of our duties. I was challenged at that time to produce evidence of such requests.

So, Sir, I feel today in answer to that challenge that I can produce some evidence in support of the comments that I made.

This petition was presented to me by the Local Improvement Committee of Frederickton in Fogo District. The prayer of the petition states that we do earnestly believe that

present highway between Main Point and Carmanville are in an upgraded condition and ready for paving. We do urge that any delays on the part of government can only mean an added cost to future programmes as the roads continue to deteriorate. We further urge that the aforementioned highways be paved as an urgent and top priority with the present Government. We contend that the said highways do caretake for mail service, school children, transportation, as where many of the school children in the various communities are bussed to the school at Carmanville, all business concerns travelling the Northeast Coast, in the area of freight transport and general passengers to and from Gander. This is not to overlook the tremendous percentage of workers travelling to and from Gander and other immediate areas for work.

We hereby distribute this document so that it solicits the consensus of the populace, all voters of nineteen years or beyond. Hereby, we the undersigned do petition the Provincial Government of Newfoundland for immediate attention in the paving of highways from Main Point through Davidsville through Frederickton, from there through the community of Noggin Cove and finally connecting to the road in Carmanville which leads out of that community. They have requested that paving could commence as early as the spring of 1974. Upon

Upon receiving this petition I checked into the matter somewhat and I find that the Government has, since 1972, spent a considerable amount of money in this area, grading the various roads and making them ready for paving. I further understand that this is an ongoing project and in line with other priorities in the Province that I am sure this request will receive all due consideration.

Sir, the community of Frederickton is a typical rural community, maybe not too much heard of, maybe considered insignificant but yet and again in line with many of the remarks which I made on Friday, it is the type of community which is making a great contribution to rural development in this Province.

In addition, Sir, to the items of concern outlined in the prayer of the petition, I would also like to point out that the community of Frederickton is an important collecting centre for various species of fish, particularly lobster and salmon. I have been informed that as high as 330,000 pounds of lobster and 150,000 pounds of salmon are shipped out of this Community by the road in question here and this has a market value somewhere in the vicinity of \$2 million. I am told This fish is shipped by refrigerated truck through Gander, along the Trans Canada Highway to Port aux Basques, then Sir, across the Gulf, down the Eastern Seaboard to the market in Boston. Again, Sir, a significant example, a great example of a contribution that a small community is making to the economy of Newfoundland.

In view of that, Sir, I take great pleasure in supporting this petition and would request that our Government would give it all due consideration in line with other priorities within the Province. I hereby request that the petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates. I could mention before that, Sir, that this is signed by seventy-six residents of the community of Frederickton and there were no refusal of signatures to the petition.

MR. E. W. WINSOR (Fogo): Mr. Speaker, first of all in supporting this petition I want it to be known that I am not offended that the honourable member for Grand Falls, as the organizer for the P.C. Party, is going travelling around the community, through the Province, soliciting such things as he has done today and for the sake of the people of Frederickton, it is a well-know fact, that Frederickton is perhaps the lone area where the P.C. stronghold is



is very good there is no denying that. If by presenting that petition to this honourable House, being a supporter of the government, that the people of Frederickton can force this government to pave that road from Gander all the way around the route. I say; God bless them! I would encourage the honourable member to do more travelling like that and solicit more support because he is going to need it in the next election. I do not think for one moment that this petition is going to change the voters of the district as a whole. In Frederickton it is what I expect. I take much pleasure in supporting the petition.

Now I would expect from the government that this road would be paved this year, as a true sign of wanting to do something for people who are and have been loyal to the P.C. Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

HON. E.M. ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word in support of this petition. I think my friend the gentleman from Fogo has put the case very well. I have nothing to say about the gentleman from Grand Falls except to say, Sir, with respect to the petition, that I hope that people anywhere in Newfoundland who are represented by any member will feel free to send their petitions to any member of the House for presentation. In behalf of the nine of us on this side, Mr. Speaker, I invite any of my constituents or any constituents from any of the eight other constituencies represented by my colleagues, to send their petitions to the gentleman from Grand Falls in the hope and expectations, Sir, that the work requested in the petition will be done this year.

I say now, here, as the member for White Bay North, three times returned by the people in White Bay North, that I would be honoured and proud if they wanted to send any petition or representation to the gentleman from Grand Falls or to any gentleman on that side, and that I expect that any such representation will be honoured this year.

I think my friend from Fogo has put it well and if this



petition, Sir, whether solicited or not, and I will leave that to the gentleman from Grand Falls and his conscience to decide, that this petition, Sir, will be granted. I hope that any of my constituents who wish to raise matters with the government would feel free to do so and then not become the subject of a third-class political attempt by a third-class politician, namely; the gentleman from Grand Falls, and that the petitions be sent in. If any of my constituents feel that they can get greater advantage from the government by seeking the assistance of the gentleman from Grand Falls, I hope they will feel at liberty to do so.

What counts on the petition, Sir, or what counts in this House, as the gentleman from St. John's East Extern said yesterday when I had the pleasure of waiting upon him with a delegation from my constituency and I believe I am quoting him correctly - we were talking about a road in Croque - when he said: "It makes no difference what side of the House we are on, a need is a need." I was glad to hear him say that. I agreed with him there at the meeting in the presence of the Parish Priest from Conche, from that Parish, Sacred Heart Parish, and in the presence of three other gentlemen from Croque, that if any of my constituents feel the urge, feel that they will get better treatment by sending a petition as this one to the gentleman from Grand Falls, I hope they will. I hope they will send it to the Premier or to any other member of the House, because what counts and what counts on this petition, Mr. Speaker, is that the prayed for work be done.

I hope the road will be paved this year. I hope that the road will be paved this year, Sir, and now that the gentleman from Grand Falls, as an exemplar of his concern for the people of Fogo District and as an exemplar of his immense and intimate acquaintance with all of the people of this province, and now that he has presented this petition so ably and with such research and such hoopla, I have no doubt the road will be paved.

Certainly, Sir, the people in Frederickton will be expecting it, the people served by that road will be expecting it and they will be expecting it this year. I support the petition and do it gladly, Sir.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Hear! Hear!

MR. J.C. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I too support this petition but I take some exception to remarks made by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition with regard to -

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My understanding of the rules is that one may not debate on a petition. The gentleman from Bonavista South, I say, Sir, has intimated that he is touching off a debate and I would ask Your Honour to warn him, to nip it in the bud as it is, Mr. Speaker. We are not allowed, and I understand Your Honour has ruled time and time again in this House, Sir, that one may not debate a petition. One may speak in support of it and I invite the gentleman from Bonavista South to observe the rules, Sir.

HON. F.D. MOORES (Premier): Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. It is all very well for the honourable the Leader of the Opposition to talk about Croque in his remarks and to talk about the Parish Priest and to talk about the various problems in transportation and communications but as latitude has been

been provided up until now on this particular petition and the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition, I suggest that equally the member for Bonavista South has the same latitude.

MR. ROBERTS: If I may say a further word other than to welcome the Premier into the debate for the second time in this session may I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a difference between some latitude and speaking in support of a petition to which the gentleman from Bonavista South is obviously as entitled as any member to debate and if the Premier does not realize the difference, Sir, I invite him to spend some time in the chamber and learn.

MR. MOORES: Sir, further to my remarks previously, it seems that the honourable Leader of the Opposition and his point of order once again reverts to personalities. For someone, Sir, with all due respect, whose life has been spent studying the rules rather than doing a damn thing for this province - I totally disagree with his remarks.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: It has always been the custom in this House to allow some leeway in the presenting of petitions and otherwise I suppose if we were sticking strictly to the rules, only the member presenting petitions would be permitted to have anything to say and that might be something to keep in mind for the future. There always has been, at least in the short tenure that I have been here, some leeway given with regard to members saying a few words in support of petition, in fact I think I had something to say about that in a previous session.

Seeing as we have had one member present the petition and a couple of members from the opposition speak in support of it, I shall permit one more member, that being the member for Bonavista South, to say a few words on this petition and then we shall proceed with other business.

MR. J. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker! I too support this petition.

I know that the petition was not solicited by the honourable gentleman from Grand Falls. It is a petition that was presented to him because they felt that their need must be brought to the attention of this honourable House.

Their need is a genuine need. There should not be any partisan views brought into the need at all, whether they are Progressive Conservative supported as mentioned by the honourable member for the district, that is irrespective. They have a genuine need and to label a community looking for paved roads as being Progressive Conservative Party supporters, as a reason why they must present their views to the government side, to me is showing disrespect for these residents, a complete disrespect for their need.

I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I sincerely hope that in the future, any government member on this side of the House of Assembly, brings forward the needs of people in rural areas whether they be in a district from the honourable gentlemen on the opposite side or on this side, that their needs be dealt with accordingly as a need and not on any partisan views and not to use slanderous statements like; "The petition was brought forward as a third class effort," as was labelled by the Opposition Leader.

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, I ask Your Honour's direction. Is it in order -

MR. MORGAN: Speak to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I want to know if it is in order to refer to another honourable gentleman's remarks as "slanderous?" If it is, so be it, I will happily abide by the rule but I would like to have a ruling, Sir?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in continuing -

MR. SPEAKER: On that point of order, I did not interpret the remarks made by the honourable member for Bonavista South as being slanderous to remarks made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: No. No. The word "slanderous" is that a parliamentary word?

AN HON. MEMBER: If they were slanderous.

MR. ROBERTS: No. He did not say if they were slanderous. He said they were slanderous. Is that a parliamentary term? That is all I ask.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not recall in Beauchesne the word "slanderous" as such in the list that is given there of unparliamentary words.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the petition was not brought forward by a third-party politician or a by a third-class, third-rate politician. It was brought forward by a politician like all politicians on this side of the House of Assembly, genuinely concerned for the needs in all rural parts of the province. I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, in the future when petitions are brought into this House, that these partisan views will not be again brought forward. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I will not permit anyone else to speak with regard to this petition. I think we

MR. SPEAKER: have had four persons now and if the honourable member is presenting another petition, that is quite in order.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker, I do wish to present a further petition. I would like to indicate, Sir, just for the clarification of the House that these petitions were received in the mail, addressed to, Aubrey J. Senior, M.H.A., Confederation Building, and not to the Progressive Conservative Headquarters.

I take great pleasure, Sir, in presenting a petition on behalf of 127 residents of Noggin Cove, in the District of Fogo. Noggin Cove, in the District of Fogo, is situated approximately two miles from Carmanville, between Carmanville and Frederickton. These residents, Sir, are concerned with the completion of this road for basically the same reasons that I outlined when I commented on the prayer of the previous petition; so that they can receive the proper mail service, so that the school busses can travel over the road safely, from Frederickton through Noggin Cove into Carmanville, so that they can receive freight in the area from Gander and for the other reasons which I have outlined.

The 127 residents of Noggin Cove, Sir, have also supported this petition and I take great pleasure in presenting it. I would like to have it tabled in the House and referred to the appropriate department.

CAPT. E. W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, now I am beginning to get a bit worried. When the honourable member finds the time to present a petition here on behalf of the good Liberals of Noggin Cove, then I cannot but accept the fact that he has a genuine feeling toward that district. Now I think that it is obvious too that that honourable member is getting worried in Grand Falls. As well as being kicked out of the cabinet, he may be kicked out of that district in the next election. If he is trying to get a stronghold in the Fogo District, well we will see how that will work when the next election rolls around.

I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, because I am genuinely concerned with the people of Noggin Cove, Frederickton, Carmanville, all over the district. They should be provided with an upgrading and a paved road to serve their communities. I can see now, Sir, where it will be very satisfying to me after next summer to travel that district on a first-class paved road instead of the gravel one which I have had to travel over for the past year or so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of this petition from Noggin Cove. Noggin Cove is a place that I have visited several times. It is a beautiful little settlement. It happens by mischance to be in the Fogo District. Even despite that, it is still a lovely little community. In that community lives the Pennell Family, the father and the parents of Mr. Wallace Pennell, who now lives in St. John's, a wonderful couple indeed, great carpenters, boatbuilders, first-class Newfoundlanders. If it is anyway possible during the next year for the pavement to be squeezed out in Noggin Cove, I certainly would be delighted to see it. In any event, I certainly support the petition.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 108 residents of Davidsville in the District of Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. SENIOR: This is a rather serious matter, Mr. Speaker, but I realize the sequence of events may be quite humorous. If I may draw just a brief mental picture, Sir, of the situation here and why all these people are concerned is that we have a stretch of road which commences



at Carmanville, it runs about two miles to Noggin Cove, approximately five miles to Frederickton, another five miles or so to Main Point and then on to Davidsville to connect with the paved road to Gander.

The prayer of the petition, Sir, is that the road be upgraded. Well it has been upgraded as I mentioned before. We already spent considerable money on this road upgrading it. There would have to be some further work done I suppose in putting class A material on it to make it ready for paving. They state the same reason, Sir, in presenting their case to have this road upgraded. They are confronted with the same problems as I outlined in the previous petitions that concerns the mail service, the transportation of goods, the transportation of schoolchildren and so on.

In view of the fact that we have done considerable work in this area they are requesting that the government would in line with other priorities in the province see fit if possible to commence the paving of this road in 1974.

Being quite familiar with this area, Sir, I take great pleasure in supporting the petition because these are Newfoundlanders who as I have outlined before are making a great contribution to this province. I feel sympathetic towards their cause. I support the petition and request that it be tabled in this honourable House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Member for Fogo.

MR. E. W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, again I am obliged to support the petition and I am genuinely happy that the Hon. the Member for Grand Falls, who is slowly but surely trying to find a nesting place for the next election, is trying to do it in Fogo District. Sir, I would advise him to go slowly,

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the petition

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable member has risen to a point of order.

MR. J. C. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, this petition is not dealing with whether or not the Hon. the Member for Grand Falls is going to run in Fogo in the next election or Grand Falls in the next election. The matter is, there is a petition before the House asking for improvements in a community in the District of Fogo.

The honourable gentleman speaking must speak in support of the petition and not in support of whether the Hon. the Member for Grand Falls is going to run in Fogo or not in the next election.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the Hon. the Member for Bonavista South is well taken. I feel that the Hon. the Member for Fogo was varying a great deal from the prayer of the petition as presented. I urge him to speak to the prayer of the petition as such.

MR. WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to add. I have been long enough in this House to know, I think particularly the rules. I have no intention of deviating from the rules. I am very happy that the Member for Grand Falls has an interest in Fogo District. I will ask him to continue it if it means that the people of Fogo District will get services that they are entitled to and the Member for Grand Falls feels that he can do a job for them, may God Bless him, continue the good work but do not challenge me in the next election.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker, it seems the P.C. influence in the district is spreading because I am in another community right now where I have another petition from twenty-four residents of the Community of Main Point in the east side of Gander Bay.

Again, Sir, without going into the same detail that I did before and this is in, of course, the District of Fogo. We are still dealing basically with the same problems but merely these people have presented the petition from this particular community to support the same cause because again they are confronted with the same problems. They share the same concern as the other communities, that they receive good service, that their schoolchildren are transported in safety, that their goods are brought in at a minimal cost, that they can travel to and from the urban centres faster and over a higher grade of highway.

Sir, again I think their request is justified. I take great pleasure in supporting this petition.

I would further point out, Sir, there are many other instances where I have received requests from districts such as this. I have been reluctant to bring them before this honourable House but Sir, when I get up to speak in this House, I try to be very careful in making statements that I cannot substantiate and when challenged to do so, Sir, I will substantiate them. I have documented files which I can present to substantiate statements that I make. If there are any other districts in the Province which feel that they are not been adequately looked after by Liberal members, I will be very happy to hear from them. I will be very happy to present their petitions in this honourable House. Anytime at all.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I will have them on your doorstep tomorrow.

MR. SENIOR: I take great pleasure, Sir, in supporting this petition. I will discuss this matter with the minister as requested. I request that this petition be tabled with the others and be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, it is a grand day for the member for Grand Falls and it is equally as good for me.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WINSOR: The honourable member, in presenting petitions, stated that if any other district which cannot get any response to their requests to have roads paved - Does the honourable member realize that it is the responsibility of the government to upgrade and pave roads? Does he not realize that?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WINSOR: I, Mr. Speaker, would like to see more petitions presented around this Province from other communities requesting the government to upgrade and pave roads. Maybe that is what the government needs, more pressure and if the people of Fogo District can get upgrading and paving by presenting a petition to the government member, well I say, thank them and I hope their request will not fall on deaf ears.

So, I have much pleasure in supporting all of those petitions, Mr. Speaker and perhaps next week we will get a few more when the honourable member gets time to do a little more travelling.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador North.

MR. MELVIN WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of the petitions so ably put before the House by the honourable member for Grand Falls now representing the district of Fogo. I think that a number of other petitions have come before this House in the last couple of years and there have been no other results. Maybe this is a deliberate attempt on the part of the Liberals and I wish it is to try to get some action and it seems very odd to have the organizer of the P.C. Party - it looks as if there is some type of conspiracy going on, Mr. Speaker whereas the honourable third class member for Grand Falls who had been almost kicked out of his district makes an attempt to discredit a member in this House.

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

MR. MORGAN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable gentleman from Labrador North did not stand in this House today to support the petition. He stood to condemn a member of the House. He did not stand to support the petition. If he is going to stand in the future to support petitions, let him stand and do it properly.

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the honourable member from Labrador South that he did rise to support the prayer of a petition and he was straying somewhat from that, so I suggest that he speak to the prayer of the petition.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, a correction. It was the honourable member for Labrador North.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry.

MR. WOODWARD: I say on behalf of the people of Main Point in Gander Bay, Mr. Speaker, in the district of Fogo, that they have had difficulties and there have been a number of petitions presented in

this House previously and I hope as a result of last year, the year before, as a result of the honourable P.C. Party organizer that they will get some results on the petitions that have been presented today.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: A petition if I might. It is from the district, Sir, of Humber West, represented as it is so ably in the House by the Premier of our Province, Sir. I had not intended to present this, Sir, and in fact I have had this petition, Sir, since August, 1972. I have had this petition, Sir, which was sent to the government at that stage in the hope it would be presented in the House of Assembly.

It is signed, Sir, by 192 persons in the Community of Meadows in Humber West. It was sent to me by way of a copy from Mr. Harley Anderson, Secretary of the Community of Meadows, I will read;

"Another very disturbing fact is that the council presented to government a petition for water and sewerage for our area -

MR. CROSBIE: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is not a genuine, apparently it is not a genuine petition it is a copy. How can the honourable gentleman present a copy of a petition?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly genuine. It is perfectly genuine, Sir. If the honourable gentleman wishes to allege that it is not let him prove his evidence. I say it is genuine, Sir, and I should be allowed to present this petition without harassment from the gentleman from St. John's West.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, everything in this life is a copy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Especially the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MARSHALL: If I can speak to that point of order a moment, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Well a point of order has been raised, now if the petition is signed it may be presented but Standing Order 91 does not allow copies of petition to be signed because it says a petition may be either printed or written and if more than three persons sign it, at least three signatures must appear on the page. Now if signatures appear it is not a copy, fine. It may be a duplicate obviously of a petition. The honourable Leader of the Opposition said he was presenting a copy so we would like to clarify whether the petition is in fact signed or whether it is not signed. He indicated it is a copy and obviously is a duplicate. In any event, petitions have to be signed.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, this is a petition signed by 192 electors. It is of course a photostat and I submit, Sir, there is



nothing to the point of order in Standing Order 91. I shall read, Sir, Standing Order 91 in its entirety.

"A petition may be either printed or written and if more than three petitioners sign it, at least three signatures," (and in fact, Sir, sixty-seven signatures) "must appear on the page containing the prayer of the petition. Every petition must be written in English or be accompanied by a translation."

Sir, this is written in English. It is headed, "Petition for water and sewerage system for the Community of Meadows." I shall read, Sir, if I may the sixty-seven names that appear on this -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable Leader of the Opposition is speaking to the point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the point of order, if I may continue, is that names have to be attached. Here they are, Sir; Eric Leslie Brake -

AN HON. MEMBER: Are they signed?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes they are signed, Jean Brake. The signatures are right here. Roland Blanchard, Gloria Blanchard -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order. May I carry on, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to see a copy of the petition and judge whether it is a copy of the petition or an original, and I shall rule whether it is in order or not.

MR. ROBERTS: To submit this, may I in the normal way present it and then Your Honour will judge. All right then, if we can have one of these page boys.

May I proceed to present another petition, Sir, from the District of Humber West?

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER, Minister of Education: Mr. Speaker, I wonder

if I could speak to that point of order?

MR. ROBERTS: No.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I asked Mr. Speaker, not the Leader of the Opposition, if I may speak to the point of order, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Looking at this petition it is very obvious that it is a copy and not original signatures, and therefore I rule the petition out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the government want no part of it. May I now proceed to present another petition, Sir, from the people of Humber West, from Dyke's Road in Corner Brook. I will present the petition. If some honourable gentleman wish -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, do this crowd -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

HON. L. BARRY, Minister of Mines and Energy: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, since obviously the honourable the Leader of the Opposition cannot be trusted to present the proper type of position may I finish the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

It is never contemplated, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition upon being sent a copy for his information of a petition that has been sent to another honourable member of this House, it is completely scandalous that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition should then attempt to present the copy when he has kept it in his files for two years. What a fraud! What a charade of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition

in his attempts to make it a rule of this honourable House. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that every petition that is brought by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should be vetted by Your Honour. It should be vetted by Your Honour to ensure that he is not attempting to carry on the same fraud that he attempted to perpetrate here this afternoon.

MR. ROBERTS: I shall not attempt to deal with the cowardly, base, fraudulent and slanderous attacks -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order. I invite Your Honour's attention to the petition. There are signatures affixed in ball point pen to that document, Sir, unless Your Honour wants to rule that they are fraudulent. I submit, Sir, that it is as much in order as any petition as has ever been laid on the table of this House. Furthermore, I have a letter here by the man who took that up saying, "Would you please raise this privately or publicly." If the Premier is so uninterested in his district, Sir, that he has not presented the petition nor done anything about it, I submit, Sir, that the petition is in order and I should be allowed to present it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

This petition as I read it here is addressed to the Hon. the Premier and there are some names which are to me, at least, (I do not profess to be an expert in handwriting) original signatures but at the top of this petition, it is written, "copy." It appears to me that it is a copy and not an original and I therefore have to rule it out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: I accept Your Honour's ruling, of course, but would Your Honour be so kind as to inform somebody of some precedent for this ruling. The matter has never come up before. It is obviously an important one. Whether they allow it in or not, the people of Humber West know the representation they have had. They know that the Premier has not represented them.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order. If the gentleman from St. John's West, who is having another of his bad days - would Your Honour be good enough - I ask merely for direction's sake. From now on, Sir, every petition in this House is going to be strictly in the form laid down by the rules and the precedents or it shall not be accepted. Over the years, Sir, a wide variety of petitions have been accepted in this House, a wide variety, Sir. I submit that most petitions are not in order according to the rules. All I want is Your Honour to give me the authority.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. Your Honour has made a ruling. It is improper for the Leader of the Opposition to get up and to ask the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker, if he be in the Chair, hypothetical questions of this nature. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that under the guise of attempting to debate Your Honour's ruling, he is raising certain questions and these questions themselves are out of order. I suggest that Your Honour has made a ruling and that we get on with the business of the House, unless the Leader of the Opposition wants to appeal Your Honour's ruling.

MR. BARRY: To a point of order: Your Honour, just before you make a ruling, if Your Honour would care to look at Beauchesne, page 257, paragraph (334): "A petition must have original signatures or marks and not copies from the original nor signatures of agents on behalf of others, etc."

Now, Your Honour, I submit that this is a deliberate attempt of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to degrade this great tradition of presenting petitions on the part of the people of Newfoundland, which has been a custom. It is a political attempt

by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition because of the series of petitions that the Hon. Member for Grand Falls presented this afternoon. He went to his files and hauled copies of petitions that he has had since 1972. I submit that that is a fraud which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition attempted to perpetrate on this honourable House. He should be condemned for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy rose to speak, I was about to quote the same Standing Order and subsection on page 257 of Beauchesne as referred to by the honourable minister, Standing Order 334, Subsection (1): "A petition must have original signatures or marks and not copies from the original nor signatures of agents on behalf of others, except in case of incapacity by sickness. It must not have letters, affidavits, appendices or other documents annexed. The signatures must be written upon the petition itself and not pasted upon or otherwise transferred to it."

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order, Sir, with respect to the four petitions presented by the gentleman for Grand Falls, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I submit to Your Honour that Standing Order (90) since we are having such a tender regard for petitions, Standing Order (90) has not be observed and therefore Your Honour should rule the attempt to present the petitions by the gentleman for Grand Falls to be out of order, Sir. They have not been signed in his own hand - it says they shall be signed in his own hand. They are out of order, Sir.

MR. W. W. MARSHALL: (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition is raising spurious points of order. He also knows that when points of order arise they are to be brought up immediately. These four petitions have already been dealt with, I do not know whether they were or were not signed by the Member for Grand Falls but the point is his time for objection on that has long since past.

MR. ROBERTS: If I may, Your Honour, I have just checked the petitions. Not one of them has been properly signed. I submit, Sir, it was the first opportunity I had to do so. Furthermore the precedents are clear and quite concise that a rule that is broken shall be brought to the House at any time, Sir. I submit that Standing Order (90), not a precedent, not a citation in Beauchesne, a Standing Order of this House, Sir, says; "shall sign it with his own hand."

I just looked at those four petitions, Sir, they have not been signed by the member's own hand therefore they are out of order. I suggest, Sir, that they should be redrawn, withdrawn, resubmitted and then if they are in order they will be accepted but since we have had such a tender regard, Sir, for the amenities and proprieties of presenting petition I submit, Sir, that we should follow all of the rules and I invite Your Honour to rule that the Standing Orders say what they do in fact say.



MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. As a member of this honourable House I am ashamed. We have spent an hour of this honourable House, I am as much to blame as any other honourable member in that we get carried away with these, I was going to say with these bloody rules of debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ah come on now!

MR. BARRY: The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition is doing nothing more but diverting the time of this honourable House from the business of the province which we are elected for and which we should be devoting our efforts to carrying out. Here the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition - I am almost speechless with -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down!

MR. BARRY: infamy of what he is attempting -

The Hon. the Member for Grand Falls presented four petitions. They were gracefully accepted by the member for the district. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition goes in and hauls out two or three petitions which he had in his filing cabinet for two years. He now comes, when he is shot down on that particular stratagem he now goes over and he decides he better check out a bit more carefully the petitions that have been filed.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. BARRY: It is a waste of time in this honourable House, Your Honour, and I ask you to rule the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may -

MR. BARRY: It is not out of order, it is out of existence possibly.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I repeat that point of order, Sir, I am ashamed to be a member of the House in which a gentleman, such as the gentleman for Placentia West, the intellectual camp-follower of the Minister of Finance, can get up and make slanderous personal attacks on people under the guise of specious points of order. If this matter has taken up ten or fifteen minutes and the matter, Sir, I would remind, Your Honour, in its genesis began because members on the opposite side objected to petitions being presented in a form in which they had been



presented in this House time and time again. Then when I invite Your Honour to enforce the rules, Sir, members on the other side try to howl that down and try and pretend that somehow it is wrong to enforce the rules. I have no doubt, Sir, that Your Honour will say the rules must be enforced. If we do not have the rules in this House, Sir, we have mob rule. If we do not have the rules that are printed and written and the gentlemen on the opposite side do not wish to observe them, Sir, I suggest that they return to the country forthwith.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is the honourable member going to Ontario?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

With respect to the point raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition re: these petitions as presented by the Hon. the Member for Grand Falls, these petitions were presented, no point of order or any objection was raised. They were tabled with the support of all members of this honourable House and therefore I rule that they cannot be taken back at this time. I would caution honourable members presenting petitions in the future that are perhaps not in order. I do think perhaps it should be right for me to expect honourable members to check each and every petition with me to see that they are in order. I would like to think that I am free to trust honourable members on both sides of this House to present petitions that are quite in order. Petitions in the future that are found not to be in order shall be ruled exactly that but I would like to trust to the integrity and the honesty of all members present.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

HON. E. MAYNARD: (MINISTER OF FORESTRY AND AGRICULTURE): Mr. Speaker, I have a few amendments that I would like to table.

Amendment Orders Nos. 2,3 and 4 of the Newfoundland Egg-Marketing Scheme, 1973, the Financial Report of the Farm Development Loan Board for the years April 1972 to March 1973, the Amendments to the Newfoundland Egg Marketing Scheme 1973, Regulations of the Newfoundland Crop Insurance Agency, Statements of Expenditure for the Newfoundland Marketing Board 1972 - 1973 and Regulations regarding the harvesting of lingdon berries and blueberries.

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

HON. J.G. ROUSSEAU (Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations):

I have a few regulations I would like to table in the House, Mr. Speaker, they are done up very well by the department. The Elevator's Amendment Regulations 1973, the Elevator's Amendment No.2 Regulations 1973 and also the Minimum Wage Order which was published sometime ago, another effort by this government to upgrade the minimum wage in the province, a part of the ongoing study with two more increases in the minimum wage which will come into effect in the next six months and year. I have copies here as well, Mr. Speaker, for the press.

Also, as Minister of Public Works and Services I would like to table in the House the Report of the C.A.Pippy Park Commission for the year 1972 - 1973. I also have some copies here for the press.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Fogo:

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, before we get into Orders of the Day, in the absence of the honourable Minister of Social Services, I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Premier: Would the Premier use his good office to reverse the decision of the Welfare Department to have welfare issued to the unfortunate fishermen who were compensated for three hundred dollars because of loss of time last spring when the ice prevented them from getting out fishing?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier:

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly check into it with the Minister of Social Services.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island:

MR. S.A.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Fisheries inform the House what action his government has taken to restrict the province's flounder fishery to trawlers based only in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: That question could be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister of Fisheries, then, if it is true, Sir, and this is a very, very serious matter, if it is true that substantial unemployment could result unless steps are taken to restrict this fishery?

MR. SPEAKER: That question relates to the first one and could be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is a most serious matter. It could happen this year, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the - Mr. Speaker, if the minister should want to answer the question, would it be in order for him to do so?

MR. SPEAKER: That would be judged by the question itself.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, these are very, very serious matters that affect the lives of 15,000 fish plant -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please!

MR. NEARY: 15,000 fish plant workers in this province.

MR. W.N. ROWE: They have no intention of giving any answers.

MR. NEARY: Sir,

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries if the government have received a resolution from the fishing industry on this matter and if they have, Sir, do they intend to support this resolution?

AN HON. MEMBER: Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, that is not for the Order Paper. Is the minister going to answer the question?

MR. SPEAKER: The question will be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Obviously, we are not going to get any information on this very serious matter, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the minister if it is true, Sir, is it true that George McLean is representing the provincial Department of Fisheries and National Sea Products? That is why we cannot get support for the resolution, conflict of interest.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! That question could be placed on the Order Paper.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh! This is a little much "Steve" they are not going to answer any questions.

MR. NEARY: Sir, are we going to have a serious question and answer period in this House or is it going to be a farce?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No! No!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is it going -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I am sure the honourable member for Bell Island is aware that it is not the responsibility or duty of the Speaker to become involved in any debate with regard to the question period.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get some kind of definition of what is an urgent public matter in this House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Put that on the Order Paper too! Sure! Some chance!

MR. NEARY: By the time we get the answer on the Order Paper, 15,000 -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: 15,000 Newfoundlanders will be unemployed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable Premier. Would the Premier inform members of the House

if he will be going to the Province of Quebec tomorrow or next day to follow the pattern established by the much maligned honourable J.R.Smallwood...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: To sell Quebec on the idea of using Newfoundland power from the Lower Churchill or transmitting power from the Lower Churchill through the Province of Quebec as was done in the development of the Upper Churchill?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier:

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no I will not be following in the footsteps of the honourable J.R.Smallwood, we cannot afford it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador South:

MR. M.MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question which I would like to direct to the honourable Premier. I am wondering if he is aware of allegations of more racial discrimination being practiced at North West River, in the District of Labrador North, by a government agency named the Labrador Services Division, in that the depot belonging to that division are not allowed to sell gasolines to anyone but Indians?

MR. MOORES: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no. I was not aware of it and I am pretty sure no one else outside the House was aware of it. Certainly it will be checked into immediately and whatever needs to be done to make sure that there is no discrimination to anybody will be done, Sir, as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. Barbe North:

MR. F.B.ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the honourable the Minister of Communications and Transportation. Has the minister received any request from any of his officials in St. Anthony or Deer Lake or St. Barbe for additional snow-clearing equipment in the District of St. Barbe North?

AN HON. MEMBER: Order Paper.

MR. F.B.ROWE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister received a letter from myself, dated February 7, asking for

an extra snowblower for the District of St. Barbe North, for the months of February, March and April?

MR. HICKEY: What date?

MR. F.B. ROWE: February 7.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of such a request. It certainly has not been brought to my attention but I will endeavour to find out.

MR. F.B. ROWE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware of the fact that the Great Northern Peninsula Highway at present is blocked and one of the snow clearing machines is broken down? There is a need for additional snow clearing equipment at this time of the year when you have severe storms for the three months that are coming up. Would the minister indicate whether or not he was able to get some additional snow clearing equipment into the district?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that each day I am given a road report and I am aware that there are problems in that area. I am advised by my staff that every effort is being made to sort the situation out. I have not been made aware of a particular, special request for additional equipment. I would assume that if there is additional equipment required, then certainly every effort is being made to have it sent there or directed there. I will undertake to find out and give the honourable member the latest report.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador North:

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. I wonder if the minister would inform the House when the royal commission on Labrador will be made public?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I gave that information to the honourable House on opening day. I cannot remember the exact date now but my recollection is around the end of March or early April. I know that it is being proof read now, at least I am advised by the Chairman, that it is. As soon as we receive the report, Mr. Speaker,



we will follow the well established practice of this administration.

It will be presented to cabinet and forthwith made public.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Like the Seabright one.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Premier. Would the Premier inform the House if advertising currently solicited from businessmen throughout this province, throughout the Island and Labrador, is being solicited for a souvenir anniversary book, in behalf of the provincial government or in behalf of the Tory Party?

MR. MOORES: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly take notice of the question but I am not exactly sure what the



the member is referring to but certainly I am sure the information can be ascertained easily enough and I will undertake to do it.

MR. NEARY: Well Mr. Speaker, is the honourable Premier aware that the member responsible for petitions is not only soliciting petitions, Sir -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable member for Bell Island is proceeding to make a speech and I have to rule him out of order.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island is proceeding to make a speech and I have ruled him out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware that one of his colleagues, the member for Grand Falls, is soliciting advertising for a souvenir booklet? Is this being done on behalf of the Tory Party or is it being done on behalf of the government?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly answer the question in this way that I am sure the member for Grand Falls, who is also the Provincial Director of the Progressive Conservative Party, is very active and is doing everything possible to ensure that the Progressive Conservative Party is successful in the next election as is everybody else on this side of the House. I would suggest the member from Bell Island get his ass active or he will not even be the member for that singular district, let alone the province.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, who is making a speech? Do the rules apply to this side, Sir, the same as that side? We do not have rules in this House, Sir, for one side and another set of rules for the other side.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Can I ask another question, Mr. Speaker?

Sir, I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications if his department has had any representation from the City of St. John's or any other municipality in Newfoundland

where they have street lights, to make it legal to turn right on a red light?

MR. HICKEY: We have not had any representation of late, certainly not since I have been minister. We have discussed the matter on a number of occasions and while we were in the process of writing City Hall suggesting that this practice be adopted for the City of St. John's, when a few days ago we were made aware of the fact that one of the councillors had made a similar suggestion so I can only say that my department supports such a move from the point of view of traffic congestion and that is about all. There has been to my knowledge no official or formal request that we take any action because really it is outside the jurisdiction of my department, at least as it applies to St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, a few days ago when the honourable Minister of Social Services was speaking in the Address in Reply he made some remarks to the effect perhaps that the honourable member for Bell Island had deliberately proceeded to the eighth floor on a certain day and instigated some troubles there.

The honourable member for Bell Island explained to the House the reason for his being on the eighth floor, how he came to be there and I have accepted the explanation as given by the honourable member for Bell Island, so the honourable member for White Bay South rose on a point of order, and I rose on this, and it is not a point of order it is merely a difference of opinion between two honourable members.

I have to make a ruling on another matter, Yesterday the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing made a ministerial statement on which I think the honourable member for White Bay South raised a point of order. There may have been some words in that ministerial statement that initiated some debate back and forth on a partisan viewpoint but upon examining the ministerial statement I

could find nothing unparliamentary nor wrong with it.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am clear, and members on this side of the House indeed all members are clear as to what Your Honour has just ruled on, I asked Your Honour to make a ruling as to whether it was parliamentary for the Minister of Social Services to accuse a member of this House of encouraging commission of a crime which was the import of his charge which was the import of his words. Your Honour has ruled that that is parliamentary, as I understand it. Is that so, Your Honour?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member, as I read the transcript of the remarks made, stood and rose on a point of order and I have ruled on the point of order, and that is really a difference of opinion between two honourable members.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I might point out to Your Honour that I did not get an opportunity that particular afternoon to explain how I came to be on the eighth floor.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Your Honour has made a ruling, and you know, is this going to be continued on? Your Honour has made a ruling with respect to a point of order that has arisen and again the member, on the other side of the House, namely the honourable member for Bell Island, is getting up debating it. He accepts Your Honour's ruling or else he bears the consequences.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please! Honourable members seem to persist in speaking and making comments after I have risen to rule on a point of order on anything. I find that this is quite unmannerly to say the least, and I am sure that in future if I proceed to name some honourable members, then they will have to bear whatever the result of that might be.

In making a ruling, if honourable members on any side of this House are not in agreement with it, I am sure they are aware of the

procedure that might be followed next. But I have made a ruling and if honourable members do not agree with it then I suggest they follow the appropriate procedure.

MR. NEARY: I agree with Your Honour's ruling. But, Sir, there was one aspect of Your Honour's ruling and perhaps Your Honour might elaborate on this, that the words were used by the Minister of Social Services that afternoon and I think my colleague the member for White Bay South wanted clarification of this too, The minister referred to members on this side of the House as "scum" and "slime", Sir, now I would like to ask Your Honour if these are acceptable parliamentary words? Is this acceptable parliamentary language in the future, Sir?

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, look the honourable member for Bell Island is addressing a question to Your Honour in the course of carrying out Your Honour's duties, Order (26) clearly says; "Questions dealing with matters within the jurisdiction of the Speaker are out of order. Hypothetical questions are out of order," and the questions that are being advanced by the honourable member for Bell Island are completely out of order. If he wants any answers with respect to parliamentary procedures I suggest he take a post-graduate course from the geni on the other side of the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to that point of order, Sir, I would like to point out to the House that this is not a hypothetical question.

MR. MARSHALL: It is.

MR. NEARY: It is not, Your Honour. These remarks were made in the continuous personal character assassination from that side of the House, Sir. These remarks were made and all I am asking is if they are parliamentary. If these words are accepted in parliamentary language and if so then we will be able to use them in the future, that is all.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I think that the honourable member for Bell Island has not brought up this point at the first opportunity. It perhaps should have been raised when the alleged words were said.

I have no intention of getting into a debate with any honourable member and I shall not say anything further on this matter now.

MR. NEARY: I thank Your Honour very much but I thought my colleague had included that in his point of privilege, Sir. I accept Your Honour's ruling.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable Minister of Education adjourned the debate last night.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Honourable members will no doubt be very sorry to hear that I have something of a cold and therefore will not be able to speak at great length. I trust that their disappointment will not be too great.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words and to inform the House of matters in the district that I am pleased and honoured to represent, the District of St. Mary's Bay, and then to speak briefly on some matters referred to in the Speech from the Throne.

St. Mary's Bay, Mr. Speaker, is a district with much in common with many of the rural areas of Newfoundland. Indeed although not far from this city, it is in terms of being a rural district, as rural as I would say any in the province. Mr. Speaker, the needs and aspirations of the people of that district are real.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order please! It is very difficult to hear the honourable minister with three or four conversations

going on around the House and I ask honourable members if they would observe the rules.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As in many rural districts, as indeed I suppose in all, there are very real needs and I think that rural districts in general, that all of us in this House and Government have very real responsibilities toward, obviously, all districts but in a very special way, rural districts, because of the overall importance to the economy of the Province and equally important to the way of life or heritage of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, like many other areas, the people in the district of St. Mary's Bay had felt neglected, had felt that the benefits of Confederation had not accrued to them in the same measure as to the urban areas of this Province and that they did not participate fully or properly or enough in the benefits of Confederation.

During the past couple of years, Mr. Speaker, much has been done, but that does not mean that there is not still much to do. In terms of transportation, I would say that St. Mary's Bay was perhaps one of the least favoured in the Province. During the past two years, some significant progress has been made. The Salmonier Line, which is a very much-travelled road, paving has now been completed and also between Salmonier and St. Joseph's, a distance of approximately five miles, paving has been completed, upgrading and paving. The area from Peter's River up through St. Stephens, St. Vincent's and on to St. Mary's has been upgraded for paving. So, in that part of the district, Mr. Speaker, the pressing needs in terms of transportation are for the pavement of that part which was upgraded for paving last year from Peter's River to St. Mary's and then the continuation of the loop which must be upgraded, obviously, before being paved, and that is on from St. Mary's to St. Joseph's.

In the other part of the district and that is the communities of Point Lance and Branch which are also parts of, they are usually referred to as parts of the Cape Shore, important work was done two years ago



on the road from North Harbour to Branch. Last year beginning was made on two bridges, one at Red Head, a very considerable bridge, and this work had to be done before any road work could be completed. What is now necessary, of course, is to complete those bridges upon which work has already started and that will leave between eight and nine miles for that road to be completed. This is new road but it is not over-rough or very difficult terrain. It is over basically flat terrain and I understand terrain that is not difficult, comparatively speaking, for road work.

So, Mr. Speaker, we can see that within, as I say, a two year period or so the very serious deficit and lack of transportation facilities will hopefully be a thing of the past for St. Mary's Bay. This is, of course, not only important from the point of view of comfort, it is important from the point of view of all kinds of transportation including school bus transportation, people getting to hospital, people getting to the doctor, transportation of fish because there is in Admirals Beach a quite important longliner fishery - last year about eight longliners operating. It is expected that there will be perhaps twelve or so this coming season. In Branch there is an inshore fishery or a non-longliner fishery. It is a trap fishery and the same, of course, is true in Peter's River. In Admirals Beach, Mr. Speaker, through a LIP Grant last year and through provincial funds available from the provincial Department of Fisheries and through, as well, the assistants of the Salt Fish Corporation, very important work was done in the construction of a community stage and when completed, certainly this will have a great benefit in terms of quality control and terms of icing and terms of storing. It will mean that much more local labour will be involved, that some processing will be able to be done in the area and that when there is a lot of fresh fish that fish will be able to be salted as well.

It is important for the people of that community, indeed for that area, that that facility be completed. It is important, as well, and this was a matter raised by the honourable gentleman from St. Barbe



North, when speaking on his district yesterday, and that is the need of a slipway or haulout for longliners. That is a very real need in Admirals Beach as well. There is no doubt that depending on the terrain, if there is no appropriate way of getting the longliner out of the water in the fall and into the water in the spring, serious damage can and frequently is done to the frame of the boat. Certainly in the course of two or three years or how ever many years it may well be, such a facility would more than pay for itself because, after all, these boats are built and engines put into them and equipped largely with the help of public funds, through the Fisheries Loan Board, and it would, I think, be, apart from other things, enlightened self interest in areas where there is significant longliner fishery to make these facilities available.

Mr. Speaker, a certain number of honourable gentlemen have spoken about rural development. The Rural Development Programme of this administration - some have spoken with praise and some in derision thereof. As far as the district I represent is concerned, I have to say that the Rural Development Programme has been of very real assistance. There have been quite a number of people, Mr. Speaker, who have applied and who have not gotten it and that is true, obviously, in every district. I can say unequivocally that there has been not one instance of political favouritism or patronage in the awarding of any rural development grants in that district. That I am sure I can say unequivocally and from my own personal knowledge.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of that whether anybody working in the public service, if he supported the P.C.s or if he supported the Liberals or if he did not support anybody, I would think the criterion for anybody is "Are they doing a good job and in doing it are they being impartial and doing a good job?" That I suggest is the criterion. To suggest any other criterion would

really mean that if the P.C.s were in, no P.C.s could be employed and if the Liberals were in, no Liberals could be employed. That, obviously, would be utter chaos. I think the real criterion is if people who are paid to do a job are they doing it well, are they doing it adequately, are they doing it fairly? And these, Mr. Speaker, these are the real questions, not the other area.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check. I do not really carry around in my head the list of people -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, what I said was that to the best of my knowledge there is absolutely no political favouritism in rural development grants been given to that district.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I do not carry around with me every single person who got the grant. I have it in my office too. That is quite immaterial.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

While the honourable the Minister of Education may

wish to engage in a debate with the Hon. Member for Bell Island. It is completely out of order. It does not receive the approbation of the Chair. I suggest that the Hon. Member for Bell Island is fully cognizant of the rules of the House and should observe them.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Would the honourable member wish to debate the ruling?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I would not wish to incur this approbation, Mr. Speaker. Actually, I meant at the very beginning when I spoke to ask Your Honour to be particularly solicitous in case I should break forth in speaking in oaths. I am not sure, Your Honour, if you are aware but I was quite surprised actually to read in a recent newspaper column that during a recent speech of the Minister for Social Welfare that I had, at least, mentioned some oath. I, of course, was not aware of having broken forth in such profanity nor indeed does Hansard show any such oath. I would hope, Your Honour, that in case some demon does seize me and I break forth with these oaths that Your Honour will quickly call me to task. The honourable gentleman heard. I am glad that somebody did ask.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne had some mild criticism from honourable gentlemen opposite and in fact it used to be understood and to be encouraged that the whole two-party system requires that. Obviously we are not all of one accord because if so, we would all be of one party or we would all be sitting on one side of the House. That, apart from being quite contrary to the parliamentary system, would certainly take a great deal of the enjoyment out of the proceedings. I am sure that the members of the press would have a much more difficult task getting their news reports in various columns if we were all on one side.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the members of the opposition have had some criticism of the Speech from the Throne. I think it was said that it was barren of ideas and that there were no forward programmes and that it was disappointing and this and that.

Mr. Speaker, I think one's reaction to a Speech from the Throne depends to a large extent upon what one expects from it. Now I would suggest that for a fairly lengthy period in our history, since Confederation I am speaking, since parliamentary government was restored, we in Newfoundland were led to expect certain things from the Speech from the Throne which perhaps it was never designed to contain. Perhaps people began to think that the Speech from the Throne should be a whole series of spectacular announcements and that it was to be full of surprises; things that no other honourable members, perhaps on the government side, certainly on the opposition side, even the public had ever heard of before. Here were some surprises and some brain storms, grand announcements and brand new programmes that other members of the Legislature, whether government or opposition, were not aware of at all, that the general public were not aware of, that people in whatever sector of society these programmes were to affect had never heard of it at all. Certainly if one judges the Speech from the Throne and I would suggest any future and every future Speech from the Throne of this administration, if one is to expect that, then there will be no Throne Speech from this administration which will win the approbation of the opposition. We are not going on that philosophy. We do not regard the Speech from the Throne as a list of spectacular announcements, of brand new ideas, of brand new projects that have never been publicly discussed before, because we do not think, Mr. Speaker, that this is the way that really programmes can be devised and implemented.

Mr. Speaker, this administration feel that government policy results from initiative from government and indeed initiative from others who are willing maybe to put it forward. Then there is the process of dialogue and discussion and negotiations and agreement here and disagreement there and further working things out. Now this is a much less spectacular approach to an announcement of overall government policy, which is basically what the Speech from the Throne is

if one were to give it a definition - a statement of overall government policy.

Mr. Speaker, if an administration views the development and articulation of government policy as part of a process of initiative from government and initiative from as broad a segment of society as possible and a series of discussions and dialogue and negotiation, agreement and disagreement and multiplication and finally then a crystallization of a programme - there seems to be in the complex age of today of changing circumstances when nobody or no group in government or out of government, in the Legislature or out of the Legislature, in any area of society, when no group has a monopoly on wisdom or insight or good suggestions or good ideas.

Mr. Speaker, this administration accepts that. Therefore, the Speech from the Throne, which is a statement of overall government policy, is going to reflect that attitude toward government. I suggest that the contrary attitude is that the Speech from the Throne should not indeed be something with which people in many of its areas are already familiar, which has been discussed and debated at various levels in society, with input and negotiations from various people but rather that it should come as a miraculous occurrence that nobody ever expected, with announcements of brand new things that nobody had ever dreamed of before, the unveiling of great new paradises.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that things are too complex and too many people in facets of society are involved necessarily and properly in decision making and programme implementation for that philosophy to be valid any longer. I would say that it is inevitable that the opposition and perhaps others would not greet it with great welcome. I think it is probably based on a different philosophy of government, Sir.

MR. F. ROWE: Why then did the March Throne Speech contain a great list of projects and promises? How does the minister rationalize that, at that time and not at this point in the game?

MR. OTTEHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any essential

difference between the two Speeches from the Throne but it could be that as the administration grows in years, it also grows in wisdom. I do not rule that out as a possibility. My first reaction - it has been some time since I read the beautiful rhetoric of the former Speech from the Throne, it has been some time and I cannot recall item by item what was in it. I, not in having a photographic memory and recalling specifically item by item nor paragraph by paragraph what was there, think that the same approach to government is evident in both documents. That is my impression. Obviously there can be a difference of interpretation. The honourable gentleman does not agree that both speeches are evidence of the same attitude toward government. It is my contention that they are both evidence of the same attitude towards government and that if one takes either of them and one compares it to any during the former administration - I am not saying ours are better speeches or that theirs are better. As a matter of fact from the rhetorical point of view, the point of view of flourish, rhetorical questions, the great surprise element, there is no doubt where there were the great elements of surprise,



of announcement of the spectacular. We take our hats off totally to the Speeches from the Throne which were the product of the former administration in that area of spectacular, captivating, great gamble theory, the utter surprise, the miraculous element or the suggestion of the miraculous.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not that.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now the honourable gentleman here said bombastic. It may have been an occasional element. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is a real difference on the part of this administration and the former of what the Speech from the Throne should be. For us it is a general statement of government's intention in terms of what it is going to do, in programme, in legislation. As such we do not evolve programmes in a vacuum, a monologue or one or two way communication with the Deity. We endeavour to involve as many throughout society as possible.

We lose the element of spectacular surprise. We lose the hint of the miraculous but I think we gained in realistic, down-to-earth programmes and legislation in the formulation of which people throughout the province have already been involved because they are aware of it and this is the crystallization of that process which involves people in making decisions affecting their own future.

Mr. Speaker, hear briefly but I think it is an important point, I point out that difference. I can see that honourable gentlemen opposite would not be pleased with this document -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Because there is a basic change of attitude. It is like somebody reads prose and the other person reads poetry. The poetic gets sometimes close to the miraculous. Well we have had the poetic Speeches from the Throne and now we are in the area of prose. I think, Sir, for the communication of realistic, undramatic, down-to-earth programmes based on the social and economic needs of Newfoundland, we are better off dealing in prose than in poetry.

Mr. Speaker, there are just a few areas mentioned in the Speech from the Throne that I would like to say a few words on. I think that the Premier and indeed his government are to be commended for the initiative



they have taken with respect to Canada's position at the Law of the Sea Conference to be held next summer. Because at the initiative of this administration there was unanimous approval at the Premiers Conference held in Charlottetown - unanimous approval that Canada, the federal government, should take the position that Coastal State Canada's jurisdiction over the marine resources should extend 200 miles outward or to the end of the Continental margin, whichever is the greater. That I think, Mr. Speaker, is a very important and vital consideration for this province especially, for Canada as a whole as well. It is to be hoped that the federal government will be able to have that agreed to internationally and if not then I would suggest, although we are not a federal legislature here, I would suggest that perhaps Canada be willing to incur the tut-tuts from some other communities and do unilaterally what cannot be done by agreement.

Others have done that, the most noticeable being Iceland - it can well be argued Canada is a different nation than Iceland. We depend upon foreign countries, there could be retaliatory measures etc. etc. These are all possibilities but I would suggest, Sir, that none of them are insurmountable. If there cannot be agreement then certainly the vital interest of this province and I suggest too the eastern provinces and a very important national interest is at stake there, one would hope that can be recognized within the next several months when this matter hopefully will be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, as well my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, has articulated the position of the government with respect to the offshore oil potential. This province, in the Speech from the Throne, restates and gives emphasis to this province's determination to exercise its jurisdiction and rights over that resource of this province. It states this province's willingness to continue negotiation to reach an agreement suitable to this province whereby the vital interest of this province will be realized and, if that is not possible, the government's willingness to seek adjudication on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of minimum wage, this administration can and indeed is in fact very proud. The Speech from the Throne outlines the action we have taken there and I do not think that any administration in Newfoundland's history has taken such progressive measures with respect to the improvement of the minimum wage at any time in our history.

In the area of education, Mr. Speaker, there are two areas referred to in the Speech from the Throne. I just intend to mention them briefly now. After the budget is read and during the debate on the estimates is the ideal time to go through, point by point, matters within the purview of the Department of Education. There are two areas mentioned there which I will refer to briefly; one is government's intention to inaugurate an extended teaching day in the district vocational schools throughout the province. This is in accord with government's policy to maximize the use of the facilities that we have. This extended day programme which you know obviously means that it starts earlier in the day and goes later in the day using the same facilities, which are very expensive, the capital costs are very expensive, using the same facilities, obviously a need for staff increases but you know that depending on a number of circumstances. Obviously there is an increase in current costs because we are thinking of more students and a certain number of hours which people may teach and others they cannot. That is all governed in the agreement, an agreement between the government and NAPE which represents vocational schoolteachers.

What it does mean is that these physical facilities we will be able to maximize their use and that we envision being able to serve an additional thousand students in the district vocational schools. This will be in operation starting in September. There are of course other possibilities as and when that increased capacity is used maximally - as and when that increased capacity which will see an additional thousand, approximately, people being served in the vocational school areas. Then there is another possibility and that of course is a swinging to a fourth semester system as and when that capacity is maximally utilized or even a further extension of the day as maximally

utilized, that is another possibility. It is one with certain difficulties because there are in the main dealings with the trades and with the apprenticeship programmes and with work patterns.

Specifically here it is the vocational schools, and extended day which is also the policy for the College of Trades and Technology; and that is use to the maximum. Who knows what is use to the maximum, because we can always push somebody else in. Certainly the facilities there are used to a very great extent. They also in many areas have an extended day, there are classes up there evenings and during summer time. But they will be able to process an additional one hundred students through, where possible, an application of this system. We are thinking essentially there of one thousand one hundred students in the vocational, technical training area, through this extended-day programme.

This is going to cost over a million dollars. This will cost the public treasury over \$1 million. I think

money well spent because I think vocational and technical education are extremely important in this province.

Let me say now, Mr. Speaker, what I have said before, that I do not acknowledge any hierarchy in these areas of vocational education or university education or this institution or that institution. I think all of the young people, and not only young people, we in general have a right to education and training in accord with our interests and aptitude. Sometimes one is criticized, or the government is criticized for a hierarchial view and sometimes it is suggested you put universities at the top and the others are discriminated against. Then sometimes one hears the criticism that the others are discriminated against. Well recently maybe vocational and technical schools you know are at the top and others are suffering by comparison. Let me say, Sir, what I have said before, that I personally do not acknowledge any hierarchy. I do not think any hierarchial view is warranted. I think any hierarchial view would be regressive. Suggestions as to that of a hierarchy there are totally out of order.

The other area, Mr. Speaker, and that fairly lengthy statement made a few days ago, last Wednesday I believe, on a new system of teacher allocation that the government views as a very important step forward in terms of the qualitative aspect of education in our schools. No doubt the needs in other areas, buildings, grants, money in the operation, all that be that essential but we never lose sight of the fact that it is the quality and relevance of what goes on within the school are really what it is all about.

Now saying that, I am not minimizing obviously or am I unaware of the importance of the other areas as well. I do not intend to go through that statement again. That too of course will be a very costly measure, after the first part is implemented in the next academic year, the second part the year after. When fully implemented, without taking into account any increases in teachers' salaries, without taking any of that into account, just going as if everything would be the

same then as it is now, which is somewhat unrealistic, when fully implemented that would come approximately to \$6.4 million additional. That is not taking into account any other factors whatsoever.

Next year, in its implementation next year, it will mean an additional 300 teachers available to the pupils of Newfoundland, approximately 180 there in the specialists area, approximately 120 not in the specialists area, in the area of the general allocation. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a very significant and worthwhile contribution towards the improvement of the quality of education.

Now everybody knows of course that reducing the pupil teacher ratio in itself or having less children in classrooms or more teachers for children, that in itself, you know there is no inevitable connection between that and improved quality. There is nothing inevitable about it. What it does do, I think, it facilitates and encourages and makes much more possible and facilitates and encourages the improvement in the quality of instruction, and this is what we have to aim for. There is nothing inevitable. I do not suppose there is. Basically teaching is human relations; there is nothing inevitable in that whole area but certainly it facilitates significant improvement in the quality of education and that is something of utmost importance in the education of Newfoundlanders.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes the remarks that I wish to make, laterly just to say a few words about the two areas of education referred to in The Speech from the Throne. There are many other areas there of interest and importance

which I think are perhaps best dealt with when the estimates of the department are dealt with because they are the inter-relationship of these various areas as seen because I do not know if in any other area things are more inter-related and one can hardly talk about expenditures here without expenditures there or a programme here without - it is an overlap. The things are very, very inter-related.

So, on that I wish to acquaint honourable members with conditions in the district of St. Mary's Bay and I wish to point out as well which I hope I did, that the disappointment of honourable gentlemen opposite in the Speech from the Throne is inevitable and is not to be worried about. It is totally inevitable for a number of reasons.

I suppose one reason would be because the honourable gentlemen are sitting over there and we are sitting over here. That would be a physical reason. That would be a physical reason why honourable gentlemen opposite do not share our enthusiasm about this document. There is that physical reason, that they are sitting over there and we are sitting over here.

Apart from that, I would suggest as well that there is an intellectual reason and again I am not getting into hierarchies here, I am not getting into hierarchies. There is an intellectual reason, one that honourable gentlemen opposite are used to and no doubt convinced that the Speech from the Throne should have this spectacular and surprising and miraculous approach whereas we on this side are of the opinion that however beneficial that may have been at one time, today people should and must be involved in the evolution of government programmes and that you do not save everything for a great big surprise and people learn of it and they have never heard of it before and perhaps never will again. That has happened on more than one occasion.

We go on the theory that it is an overall plan of the government's course of action which comes as the result of initiatives and negotiations and co-operative effort between government and all segments of society.



I think that this deduction is a real one, it is a valid one and people have to make up their mind which kind of speech they prefer and which kind of government they prefer.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bay de Verde.

MR. B. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate the member for Bonavista South and the member for Harbour Grace for their excellent speeches they made in moving and seconding the gracious Speech from the Throne.

I would also like to take this opportunity to welcome the new member for Hermitage to this House and no doubt he will be as colourful as we expect him to be.

Before getting into the main aspects as far as the Speech from the Throne is concerned, I would like to dwell just for a little while upon the things concerning my district as a whole. The only things I can say about the district are things that I have already said before and therefore it will be a repeat in that regard.

After listening for the past few days to the different members of this honourable House speaking in the Throne Speech debate, sometimes it is actually a little sickening. I will go back and reminisce on some of the notes that I have taken down. For instance, a few days ago we heard the honourable member from Bonavista North speaking in this Throne Speech debate and he was speaking about a do-nothing government, the government which has not done anything for two years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the only way I can speak is for my own district. I cannot speak for anybody else. I say for the people of



Bay de Verde and for the people of the District of Bay de Verde, thank God for a P.C. Government!

We have, Mr. Speaker, in the past eighteen months received more from this present administration than we have received from any other administration in the history of Newfoundland. Since I have been elected to this honourable House, Mr. Speaker, I will just take, for instance, the Community of Bay de Verde itself. Eighteen months ago we did not even have a road in Bay de Verde, that is, the Community of Bay de Verde, that was fit for a goat to go over much less anything else. Right now, today, you can drive any part of Bay de Verde and meet a car going forty miles an hour. I think this in itself is a great achievement.

Talk of our fisheries; Red Head Cove, Grate's Cove, Job's Cove, Old Perlican have been sending petitions on top of petitions, not only to the provincial government but to the federal government, to try to get facilities. Nothing big, just enough so that they could prosecute the fishery and see their families. Not one thing was done. In the last eighteen months, Mr. Speaker, contracts have been awarded to put a slipway in Red Head Cove, one has been awarded to put a slipway in Job's Cove, tenders have been called to put a marine complex in Old Perlican, which I understand will probably cost in excess of \$1 million by the time it is completed. Preparations are underway to call tenders for a slipway at Grate's Cove, a longliner haulout at Bay de Verde, plus all the other things that have been on the taking, like giving 220 power to the fish plant at Lower Island Cove, getting roads to that settlement which it never had before. I do not know what anybody can expect of an administration after only eighteen months, but in my estimation, that is progress.

We never heard anything from the opposition about the government taking the tax off children's clothing nor taking the tax off fuel oil. The only thing we have heard is criticism from day one up to the present, and not very constructive criticism at that, I might add.

By listening to the honourable members in this House presenting petitions for different things in all districts, sometimes I wonder if anything has ever been done. It would be wrong for me to say that there was nothing done because that would be false. There have been things done. Listening to the opposition, they expect us to do so much in two years but the previous government could not accomplish it in twenty-two years, which I think is ridiculous.

We also hear the opposition coming out and saying; "Resign!" "Resign!" "Call an election." They say this on one hand and on the other hand they get up and say; "What a waste of the taxpayers money to call an election in March of 1972." It was a waste to call an election in 1972 when no side of the House had a majority but it is not a waste to call an election in 1974 when there are thirty-two members sitting on this side of the House. I wish somebody would make up their minds.

I would like to refer back, and I think the Loyal Opposition on the other side should take note of this, to a letter which appeared in the "Evening Telegram" of February 14, 1974, and is signed by "Under thirty" of Bonavista North.

The first thing I will tackle in that, Mr. Speaker, is welfare, then I will elaborate when I quote what the honourable gentleman had to say. The letter reads as follows, this is a paragraph from it;

"Steve Neary knows all about welfare."

AN HON. MEMBER: True.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the clerk count the House please?

There is a quorum.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I am quoting from a letter which appeared in "The Evening Telegram," February 14, this paragraph was connected with welfare. It says;

"Steve Neary knows all about welfare. No one can tell him anything. The Mayor of Stephenville say when he was minister, Mr Near was asked to do something for a partially lame mother and her eleven children in the way of an apartment or house. His reply was that the department did not find housing for people and left it at that. Now he is not in office he sees no good in anything being done by the present Minister of Social Services."

I say to the opposition, have done with lesser things and get on with the business of the country, give credit where it is due and criticize where it is justified and necessary.

Speaking of welfare, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take my thoughts back to October 1971, when I was campaigning in the District of Bay de Verde. At that time I ran across a welfare family, a family who had to depend on welfare because the man of the house was sick and he was after putting in for some clapboard, to the Welfare Department etc., it amounted to \$72. He did receive that \$72 for his material but in the process of carrying out the improvements to the home he needed an extra \$12 worth, but he was told by the department at that time or by representatives from that department that they could not supply him with the \$12 extra because he did not include it in the beginning.

When I come to think back to that year of 1971, Mr. Speaker, it breaks my heart to see how many hundreds of thousands were spent

it breaks my heart to see how many hundreds of thousands were spent in other districts and we could not get \$100 spent in Bay de Verde.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. HOWARD: On welfare,

Another quotation I would like to take from that letter is this; "There is too much of the old tactics in evidence with the present Liberals sitting in opposition. Some of the members must be humiliated by some utterance such as the Throne Speech being barren, barrens as the Funks and Waddams Island. If the gentleman who made that statement had landed on either he would have seen it was not barren. He should have consulted the captain sitting on that side of the House."

It goes on to say; "Very likely he has consulted the captain by this time."

This goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that before the opposition on the opposite side starts criticizing anything, at least find out what the facts are before they start. To clue up on this letter I am quoting from it say; "Let Mr. Roberts tell the public about the Bison deal and the \$400,000 cheate! from the taxpayers of this country. The opposition at that time was assured it would be paid, certainly Roberts, Rowe and Neary must have known when that assurance was given by their leader that it was incorrect.

"Neary who was Minister of Labour should know who were the promoters of the Philip Building and

Compensation Board, coming under the Department of Labour should have been under the eye of the genial minister.

MR. ROWE, W.N. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not know why Your Honour has not drawn the honourable member to order. There is a clear ruling in our Standing Orders in a commentary relating thereto on page 39, Quoting from Newspapers, documents, etc. "It is out of order to read extracts in a debate if they"- there are a number of various things there - "Contain personal allusions derogatory to members."

Your Honour, I submit respectfully, should draw the honourable member to order and not permit him to read letters or extracts from anything which are derogatory to members of this House. It is a clear commentary on the rules, on the Standing Orders of this House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the clear meaning of those words "Contain personal allusions derogatory to members " is exactly that, personal allusion, that you speak about the personal characteristics. You say that they are ugly or they are dishonest, so you make some personal allusion to them. Criticism of members of the House with regard to public decisions that they made or to what they stated publicly in the course of their duties or their responsibilities as members of a government is certainly not "Contain personal allusions derogatory to members."

All the Hon. the Member for Bay de Verde is doing is referring to certain things that occurred while the members opposite were in the government and criticizing them for it. He is quoting a letter from the paper in that connection and it is certainly not out of order whatsoever.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to revert to what the minister had to say on that. We have no objections to the honourable member himself making whatever allusions he wants to, as a member of this House that is his right to speak about past goings on in government or past goings on in this House as long as they are not derogatory to members of the House.

Sir, it is certainly out of order as I read this for a member to come into this House with a letter, Sir, to a newspaper or to himself, and to cast spurious derogatory remarks or allegations with respect to members of this House. The reason for the order is a good one, Sir, the kind of thing which is an insult to the members of this House who have been elected by the people of this province. It is one thing for one member to say something about another member, for me to say something about a member of the House. We are all in an equal boat but for a member to drag into this House extracts from letters perhaps anonymous, casting aspersions on members of this House, Sir, is an insult to a member of this House. That is why that Standing Order is there. That is why that rule has been constantly upheld.

MR. GROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, let me reply to that before you make your decision. You see the honourable gentleman gets up and he says there are rules against this. It is unparliamentary. He cites no authority whatsoever. The only authority in Beauséjour refers to ministers of the Crown, what they are at liberty to do or not what to do in connection with the dispatches or other state papers.

The hon. Member for Bay de Verde is perfectly entitled to read a letter to the House or say that he has read the letter and give a summary of what is in the letter or dock what is in the letter. There is no rule at all against it. I therefore submit the point of order should be overruled.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure the honourable member is aware of the rule pertaining to reading of extracts, letters and so on. I think the matter raised by the Hon. the Member for White Bay South is more a matter of opinion perhaps than a point of order.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, actually the content of the letter is and I will sum it up in two words - If you do not know what you are going to say before you open your mouth, do not open it!

I would like to go on to speak briefly before going into the Throne Speech debate about something that came to my attention this morning in

fact and this is about the \$300. I believe it is \$300 which has been granted to fishermen owing to the fact of starting late this season due to ice etc. In the District of Bay de Verde I would like to point out and I am sure that in other districts the same



thing happens. In the inshore fishery, the man of the house generally has to wait until his son returns from university before he can hope to prosecute the cod fishery as far as trapping etc. is concerned.

What I am trying to bring out here, Mr. Speaker, is that over the past weekend there were certain people in my area, not saying that they should not receive it, who prosecuted the fishery with certain skippers of the boats for a certain period of time, awaiting their sons to come home from university etc. but when the cheques were passed out, the three hundred dollars passed out to these people who were employed for a short while, the students did not receive same. Now someone may come out and say; "Well, this has to go to bona fide fishermen." Mr. Speaker, I would say that if a man cannot go fishing until his son comes home from the university and when he returns to university because this is the trapping season anyway, all his fishing gear etc. is in on the land. Then, that particular student should be classified as a bona fide fisherman.

Mr. Speaker, now I will get into the main part of the speech, the Speech from the Throne. I would like to point out, however, before doing that that I am quite happy with this present administration and if they do as much for the District of Bay de Verde in the next two or three years as they have done in the previous two, there will not be anything left over there for any other administration to do.

The Speech from the Throne this year is in many respects a milestone in the development, progress of Newfoundland. The opposition would have us believe that the Speech from the Throne contains nothing. Having done so little in the past themselves, they automatically expect everyone else to be measured by the same level of performance.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most notable pieces of legislation that

will be introduced in the House of Assembly this year in the legislation concerning the management control of the forests within our province. Over the years previous governments have given in to most all requests on behalf of paper companies, mining companies and anyone else who could think up a scheme to acquire interests in Newfoundland at the expense of Newfoundlanders.

In other countries in the world and in other provinces in Canada, industry lives in harmony with the governments and with the environment. In Newfoundland, for some reason, the policy in the past has been to give away our natural resources with no consideration given to the consequences or the effects that it would have on later generations of Newfoundlanders. As long as big, multi-national corporations are well looked after, then, Newfoundlanders be darned. This policy I am very proud to say is not being continued by the Moores Administration and the P.C. Government of this province. This government feel that natural resources belong to the people of Newfoundland and that the people of Newfoundland should be the ones to derive the greatest benefit from them.

Mr. Speaker, lest I be misunderstood, let me make it crystal clear that the Moores Administration is not discouraging major industry from coming to this province nor is the Moores Administration putting the squeeze on the industries that are already here.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, this government would like the existing industries to accept some of the responsibility for an orderly and progressive development of this province,

utilizing the available raw materials to the fullest and coupled with a development plan which protects the environment as such.

Mr. Speaker, I find it terribly embarrassing for me to get up in this honourable House of Assembly and have to tell this general public of laws which permitted our natural resources to be given away in the past were not in the best interest of Newfoundland. It is a shocking state of affairs that our province should have been treated so badly by the previous government. One can look around and see that while we are very rich in many things in this province, most of our natural resources belong to other than Newfoundland.

The forestry rights by and large are held by people outside of the province. It is true that companies are operating in the province but their parent companies are located elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, we could go on and on into mining - mining concessions and what have you. It is disturbing that this situation should have been allowed to develop. On many occasions in the past, we have all heard the previous Premier, Mr. Smallwood, continuously expound his theory that companies were not exactly knocking on Newfoundland doors. This may be quite true and I feel very firm that it was but, in God's name! is it necessary to throw away our heritage in order to bring in industry that rapes the province and invests money that it makes off Newfoundlanders in areas outside the province.

Mr. Speaker, it is nothing short of public scandal that a crown corporation, Labrador Linerboard Limited, should have to go outside this province to bring in wood. If the previous government had the best interest of Newfoundland at heart when these concessions were given to the various companies, this situation would not happen today. We would not be forced into the position of rationing our forests. The previous government that allowed the situation to come about should hang their heads in shame. I feel very sad that Newfoundlanders were treated as badly as they were.

Mr. Speaker, what is a country without its natural resources? If it had not been for this government coming into power when it did, I am afraid that the natural resources, the few remaining natural resources would have been given away to some multi-national corporation or to some friend of the government.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that our efforts to correct this situation will be successful.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Gander Lake?

MR. HOWARD: The honourable member should know. He was there a lot longer than I.

I hope for the development of Newfoundland that we are not too late.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, to conclude my comments on forestry, I can only add that it is a very sad day in Newfoundland when small contractors, small sawmill operators, are finding it necessary to cut back on production because forest limits near where they are cutting are not owned by the Crown and the Crown, therefore, is not able to grant them a permit to cut. Yet in many cases, no cutting has taken place in this land for many years. Indeed, many of the lots are located so far away from the large paper mills that it is doubtful if economic foresting would ever be the order of the day for these companies. Why in Heaven's name these sawmill operators were not protected by the previous government is something that I can only leave to your imagination.

Mr. Speaker, had the Moores' Administration not come to power when it did, there is little doubt in my mind that the sawmill industry would have no future in Newfoundland because no steps had been taken to rationalize the forestry and no efforts were made to assist the sawmill operators. It seems that the previous administration were more interested in raising the welfare benefits to attract people away from work so that they would not be a thorn in the side of big business.

Mr. Speaker, the more people who were on welfare, the more secure the government felt and the less reason they had to worry about the small operator.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the policy of this administration. The Moores' Administration feel that every Newfoundlander should be entitled to a fair share, utilizing to the fullest the resources that God gave us.

Mr. Speaker, hopefully our measure will correct this terrible situation and will make the small sawmill and pulpwood operators feel that they are a part of this province and can earn a living in this province as well as the next man. It is their type of operation, Mr. Speaker, that will determine the success or the failure of the economic basis of Newfoundland.

For too long the governments in the past have hung their philosophy on the central development of major industries. This develop or perish attitude can only result in the continued exodus of thousands of our young, native Newfoundlanders to other provinces. Hundreds of millions of dollars mean very few jobs when they are invested in such large enterprises as linerboard mills, oil refineries or any other colossal industrial undertaking. With the re-alignment of our natural resources, the same hundreds of millions of dollars could provide employment for every single person in this province. Every Newfoundlander should be entitled to make the decision himself, whether or not he wants to stay in Newfoundland and work or whether or not he would like to work outside this province.

Mr. Speaker, under the previous administration thousands and thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders never had that choice. They were to stay in front of big cities like Toronto and Montreal or some place on the mainland, simply because our approach to handle our own natural resources did not provide the opportunity for them to take advantage of it. We are told that since the Moores Administration assumed power, many of our Newfoundlanders who left the province in previous years have returned. They have every intention of remaining in the province provided an opportunity is available for them to make a living.

In many cases it is necessary for them to acquire permits to cut on timber limits that are already allocated to other companies. Rationalization of the forest industry in Newfoundland should create many new job opportunities for many Newfoundlanders.



Mr. Speaker, on another matter that is of vital importance to me, because many of my constituents have derived their living from it, is the fishery. This Throne Speech indicates that the government recognizes fishing as the basic natural resource of the province. This, Mr. Speaker, is a far cry from years gone by when fishermen were encouraged to burn their boats, haul the boats upon the beach, tear up the nets etc., and wait for the develop or perish policy to provide two jobs for every Newfoundlander. What nonsense! What a scandalous waste of effort and talent!

Mr. Speaker, anyone with common sense realizes that year after year fishing vessels from other nations come to Canadian waters and off the Coast of Newfoundland. They spend months and months out there, fish our resource, acquire enough fish to keep keep their country going for the winter and then return home. Mr. Speaker, what a scandalous waste of natural resources! Again I can only wonder at the attitude of the previous administration with their "Burn your boat" policy.

Fishing has always been a worthwhile and respectful profession. It is true that many merchants exploited the fishermen in the past and not much money was made at it but one has only to go back into Biblical times to find out that some of the apostles of Christ were fishermen. Certainly to heavens! If it were good enough for them there is no reason why less humble people should not see fishing as a very honourable and worthwhile profession.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the fisherman who has seen fishing as something to get away from, it was the government of the day. The previous government who encouraged them to get out of the fishery. Consequently, we see an industry today that is in an almost total state of collapse and is in utter chaos. From an overall point of view it is only recently that fishermen have been getting



the just attention and wages that they deserve. Advances in technology make it of paramount importance that the Canadian Government work with this province in determining an adequate fishing reserve exclusively for Newfoundlanders.

For centuries Newfoundland fishermen existed using the barter system. That is a merchant provided them with food and fishing gear at the beginning of the season. The fishermen went out and caught fish all season. At the end of the season he brought his fish back to the merchant and in most cases the fisherman would end up worse off than he was before.

Thank God, because of unions and the effort the government is making, that this situation no longer exists and it is now possible for a fisherman to make as much money as any other tradesman.

Mr. Speaker, for many years we had a good codfishery along the Labrador and Northeast Coast of Newfoundland. It did fail occasionally for reasons never determined but it always recovered to yet another good year until recently. The last few years it has been a continuous failure with a severe effect on the economy of the area and the fishermen who harvest the Labrador fishery.

Mr. Speaker, during the fishing season of 1971 one foreign country took 600,000 tons of codfish off the shores around Newfoundland. Other foreign nations took 522,000 tons, a total of 1.2 million tons. Canada took one million tons for a total approximate catch of 2.2 million tons. A staggering amount of fish. How is all this related to the Labrador fishery? Well, Mr. Speaker, fish is one of the very best foods. It is an excellent source of protein, very low in fat but above all it is a renewable natural resource. It is a gift from heaven so to speak. We humans on this earth have a responsibility to protect one of our own natural resources.

Biologists, scientists and marine geographers have reason to believe that cod concentrate at certain areas in the ocean to spawn. One of these areas is the Hamilton Inlet Bank off the Labrador Coast

with such large catches as illustrated above, the remaining fish obtain all the food they need without coming to the shore of Labrador and the northeast coast of Newfoundland. This then eliminates the inshore fishery in these areas.

We know that there are some local stocks of codfish on this coast which do not mix with the Hamilton Inlet fish but these concentrations are small in number and size. What is urgently needed is an internationally agreed conservation measure. One such measure is that fishing stock in all areas where fish are known to concentrate to spawn, if this could be achieved by the Hamilton Inlet and an economically sustained yield reached, we could once again look forward to a reasonable inshore catch along Labrador and the northeast coast of this province.

With agreed conservation measures goes enforcement and management. We must ask Ottawa to press hard for management of our Continental Shelf. Canada has rights established by the 1958 United Nations Convention on permanently attached shellfish. We should have rights established over fish which return to our waters to spawn and such species should not be fished from the high seas. We should seek rights over our coastal species which live and breed in known areas such as haddock, lobster, etc.

The species which are wide-ranging we should manage under an international arrangement of all countries interested in fishing these species. Quotas should be set to allow an economical, sustainable yield both national and international in Canada, the coastal nation having inspection and enforcement authority. If such management is not rigidly enforced, soon we will pass the economical sustainable yield point from where it will take the stock years to recover.

Already nations are, with the help of very sophisticated automatic report devices, tracking migration of fish stock. A military like operation can now be planned. A decisive strike by any fishing fleet and another species is wiped out. Faced with these odds, this national renewable resource could be destroyed in the 1970's. Conservation

and management are essential for the coastal state immediately and Canada should host a meeting in Canada of all interested fishing nations.

We should seek international agreements on conservation, management and quotas. We hear much today of our caplin stock so large that a school exists 190 miles long

and two miles wide. The reason for such large schools - if they exist, is that its natural predator has been eliminated. The cod with military like operations now possible. How long before the caplin go the same way as the haddock, the cod and the fast dwindling stocks of redfish and flounder?

A word on the marketing may be of interest. No matter what happens in the fishing industry, the man who actually catches the fish always seems worse off. Why not have all catching efforts regardless of ownership, sell their catch through a marketing board where the catch would be auctioned. This would seem to bring the greatest return to the fishermen but it would also help the small processing plant which depends on inshore fishery for its raw material. The auction price would not be permitted if it went below a certain standard. In other words, there would be a minimum price in which the auction would take place.

When inshore catch is let down instead of the small plant closing down, it could contact the marketing board and bid on offshore fish of its choice. This would prevent temporary shutdowns during the seasonal operation and indeed lengthen the season considerably. Costly, the only limitation would be navigation and ice problems and other related weather conditions. If we were now processing our own catch we would have multi-purpose boats bringing fish into multi-purpose plants.

Where, regardless of the species that would be processed to a fine product and sold at the highest market prices allowing higher prices to the fishermen. We should also salvage our codtongues, codroe, cod-heads, codtails, herring, herringroe, caplin, caplinroe, just to mention a few. Most of these products now go to the meal plants.

It seems logical to look forward to the day when the by-product will be worth more than the fillet is today.

Mr. Speaker, after we have achieved control of our shellfish, haddock, lobster, salmon, etc., should we not do some research of our own? Why not have automatic devices reporting the salinity, the temperature, the tides, the sizes of schools of fish in the area? Why not have some sort of underwater environment device comparable to the satellites

in the upper atmosphere? These devices could record all of the necessary data. Further, it could watch the spawning habits of our turbot,

count the numbers of fish in the school, record their habits etc. This type of an operation could provide the proper background to try to determine the type of fishing that is necessary. The annual sustainable yield per species, the complete mating and moving habits of the species.

It is only against the background of complete knowledge can the Law of the Sea Conference or any other multi-national conference achieved the desired end and make fishing a sustainable business in years to come. A further advantage of some sort of underwater device would be as follows: This device would be linked into some sort of central information bank so the small inshore fishermen could check in with a command control in much the same manner as a person would make a telephone call. He could find out where the schools of fish are and any other related information that would be useful to him for that day. The centre would then check and reply with the necessary information as opposed to the haphazard way of fishing today when some of it is done on luck.

There is room for technology in fishing. However, that technology must be refined and improved if fishing is going to be the mainstay of our industry. No longer is it necessary to send hundreds of trawlers out into the ocean and sweep the decks with their huge gigantic nets without realizing or knowing what the consequences are.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see an ordinary plan developed and accepted at the multi-national level and possibly at the Law of the Sea Conference where a positive approach would be taken to fishing just as a positive approaches are taken in other areas of development. There is no reason why technology cannot improve our knowledge of fisheries just as it improves the catches of the gigantic trawler.

More on the local scene and concerning my district. Mr. Speaker, preparations have been made with tenders to be called for small boat slipways and storage areas at Grates Cove, longliner haulout to Bay de Verde. Contracts for phase one of the marine complex at Old Perlican have been awarded and contracts have already been awarded for small boat slipways at Red Head Cove and Jobs Cove.

Mr. Speaker, this is evidence that the Moores Administration is keenly interested in the fishing in the province because in just the short time that we have been in office a positive approach to fishing has been taken. While it will take many years to see the



results of the hard work that has gone into the planning and task force on fisheries. There is no doubt in my mind that the fishermen of Newfoundland have a very bright future. I can only encourage people in my district of Bay de Verde to remain with the fisheries and to bring their requests for improvement to government as it is from the grass-roots. That is the fishermen themselves, that we shall be seeking the information that can make fishing the industry that it should be for all Newfoundlanders.

Many of my constituents of Bay de Verde have made a very good living at fishing. With a little government assistance - they are not asking very much, Mr. Speaker, just improvement in their equipment and handling facilities that will make their job a little easier.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why do not the Tories give it too them?

MR. HOWARD: They will. Give them time. We have waited twenty-three years. Surely God we can wait another twelve months.

They will continue to make a good living. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Moores Administration will listen very carefully to any requests from the fishermen, which would pay us to be reasonable. If there is money available, it will certainly be done. I have no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker, and again I can only reiterate that it is my view that the basic natural resources of this province should be used to the advantage of all of those involved in the fishery in the province.

Again as in our forestry, Newfoundlanders have not gained a maximum from the fishery. In most cases we are exporting our raw material in block form to other parts of the world, to the United States where they are converted into fish sticks and other kinds of food. Many jobs have been created in these other countries. There is no need for us to export any jobs as long as we have unemployed people.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day in the very near future when we will not be exporting our jobs through our raw materials but whereby we will be converting our fish into the final form right here in

Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the fishing industry in Newfoundland can become

of paramount importance to the Canadian economy as a whole. When one realizes that Newfoundland contributes her share to the Canadian balance of payment I feel sure that the fishery will occupy an even greater place in export market than it has in years gone by. With the price of beef rising out of all proportion, I can foresee the day when fish will greatly replace meat as the main source of protein.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I call upon the ministers in the federal government to work with the Moores Administration in bringing about a sound fishing policy for Canada along with protection over our fishing limits. Mr. Speaker, I call upon the ministers in Ottawa to treat the fishermen of Newfoundland and indeed the Atlantic Provinces and the other parts of Canada with the same respect and with the same attention that they provide to the Prairie farmers.

One has only to listen to the radio to hear the concessions that farmers have been given over the years by those in positions of power in the federal cabinet. When it comes to fishing a different approach is taken altogether. I wonder if farmers in Western Canada have to wait a year or so to collect on crop insurance. One has only to reflect back on the situation in the Newfoundland fishery this year with the ice conditions and see how long the fishermen had to wait before they got some assistance from the federal government.

This attitude must change. The federal government must treat fishermen with the respect that they deserve and they must realize that fishing cannot be successful in the same environment that John Cabot found Newfoundland almost 500 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I ask those in position of authority in the federal government to take a new look at fishing and to realize it is one of the best natural resources that we have today, and to work with the province toward finding a satisfactory solution to the many problems that still face fishermen. While the Americans are sending men to the moon in the most sophisticated type of vehicle that there is, many of our fishermen in the province are still hauling up their boats with the hand capstan and in some cases by hand. This is essentially the

same operation that existed since the beginning of the boat building era many thousands of years ago.

I wonder if the federal government used farming out in our sister provinces in the west in the same regard? Are they satisfied to see farmers' harvest land utilizing pieces of wood for plows as were used thousands of years ago?

That needs no answer because we all know different. Why then do they take a different view of the fishery?

Mr. Speaker, another great natural resource that this province once had and which has largely been responsible in bringing about great wealth to the province of Quebec, is the great power development in Labrador, Churchill Falls. Here, Mr. Speaker, we find another very sad situation, whereby the wealth that has been generated from our natural resource finds its way to another province and that other province is effectively controlling our natural resource. This is a typical example of the type of policies that we need to change.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that the Moores Administration see the development of the power in Churchill Falls in a different frame of mind. Any benefits to be derived from any future development in Labrador should rightfully benefit the Province and the people of Newfoundland in general.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is why Moores is going up to see Bourassa.

MR. HOWARD: That could be.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HOWARD: I do not need the paper to read editorials, we are informed on this side of the House. We do not need the paper to tell us what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, to develop the Lower Churchill along the same lines as the other Churchill was developed would be to bring dishonour to the people of Newfoundland. Not only are we exporting much of our power to Quebec under the Upper Churchill contracts and thus bringing great revenues to that province, we are also at a disadvantage under the equalization payments that we receive from Ottawa. We lose money on equalization from Ottawa and at the same time the great revenues that are generating it from the sale of the Churchill power goes to the Province of Quebec. The little bit of money that the Province of Newfoundland receives is offset by the decrease in the

equalization payments so there is very little net gain to the province other than a few jobs that have been created of a permanent nature at Churchill Falls.

We hear cries of "Madness" from various people for the development of the Lower Churchill without due consideration being given to the consequences. Why the opposition wants to give away all our natural resources is something that I cannot understand. Why they insist on doing business on the development of the Lower Churchill on similar lines is something that I cannot understand either.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. HOWARD: Well the previous administration thought it was all theirs to give away. They gave it away anyway. They must have thought it was theirs.

Mr. Speaker, it would be much better for the development of the Lower Churchill not to go ahead, if it were to go ahead under the same conditions as the Upper Churchill. Thank God the Moores' Administration has the interest of Newfoundlanders at heart and will only allow the development of the Lower Churchill under certain conditions and these are that the development of the Lower Churchill will be to the advantage of the province.

Mr. Speaker, it is another blatant example of how another one of our great natural resources has been exploited and given away and how Newfoundland has been sold down the drain by the previous administration.

Now more so than ever, Mr. Speaker, with the energy crisis reaching out of all proportions, power in Labrador is more valuable than any other time in history and undoubtedly its value will increase as times goes by. While it may not be appropriate to those we are dealing with, I fully support the hard approach that the Moores' Administration have taken on the development of the Lower Churchill. We must drive the hardest bargain that is possible and if anybody gets short-changed, it must not be Newfoundlanders.

Electricity from Churchill is going to light cities and industrial areas in Quebec. I believe that any power that is not to be consumed in Quebec will be exported to their neighbours to the south.

This is another in the tragic set of examples of our "develop or perish" philosophy. Just a few days ago I heard the Hon. Leader of the Opposition call on the Premier to put his case



to the test before the electorate of the province. I can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has thought of some natural resource that has not been given away to some multi-national corporation or friends of the Liberal Administration. They would like to return to power so that they could give that as well. What a scandalous situation to have in Newfoundland! When will the Liberals realize that the resources of Newfoundland belong to Newfoundlanders and that never again will Newfoundlanders tolerate this type of attitude from any elected politician. Our natural resources are a God-given right and God help the politician who misuses or abuses these gifts in the future.

Mr. Speaker, if energy is basic to life, what does it supply? We think first of oil and heat. Electricity could

also supply heat. We think of cars, boats, planes and trains and other forms of transportation operated by oil. Electricity can also supply transportation. If an area has energy and has raw materials should not we be looking at a transportation policy utilizing fully the cheapest form of energy that we have, that of hydro electricity?

In developing such a policy, we could create a brand-new environment. Building a town to supply the workings of social life that goes with it, schools, hospitals, clubs, grocery stores, etc., all of this is possible.

Mr. Speaker, in the Lower Churchill which has a capacity for approximately 3 million horsepower - it is one of the last largest developments of its kind left in the world and already the industries that can utilize this power are looking at and planning for its use. This of course is healthy and good but should we lose sight of what this amounts to for the average person in this province?

In this time of energy crisis one needs little imagination to realize the benefits of cheap electricity providing an overall transportation system from one end of the province to the other and as well providing cheap heat and light to every householder at a very reasonable rate. Developments in the future, especially industrial developments, will be centered around areas that offer good natural resources as part of the economic base on which to found a particular industry. Newfoundland offers this economic base providing we are able to rectify some of the mistakes that have been committed against us by previous administrations.

Indeed it may not even be possible to correct all of the mistakes but where mistakes can be corrected, then they should. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the House that Newfoundland has limited natural resources and that we should make certain that the benefits of these resources are used exclusively for Newfoundlanders.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Fogo has adjourned the debate

and shall be given the opportunity to continue his speech next day.

On motion, the House at its rising do now adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at three of the clock, February 20, 1974.