



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 20

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1974**

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

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of some 176 citizens of the Mount Scio Road, Nagles Hill Area in the District of St. John's East Extern. I am presenting it because I was asked to by the petitioners and because I sincerely believe in the cause for which they are striving, even though it amounts to reversal of government policy.

The petition asks that Our Lady of Lourdes School, situated on Nagles Hill and administered by the St. John's Roman Catholic School Board, not be closed down this year as scheduled, or any other year for that matter.

The prayer of the petition reads, Mr. Speaker; "We the undersigned, feel that it would be detrimental to our children's education to close Our Lady of Lourdes School. It would be harmful because of the overcrowding in other schools. If we lose our school we will lose our church, also we will lose the very wonderful teacher-student-parent relationship that now exists, the relationship where each and every child counts, Because of these and many other reasons Our Lady of Lourdes School should be kept open."

Attendance at this school had been diminishing and the Board felt no doubt that it would be more efficient if the remaining pupils were bussed to some of the larger schools nearby as is presently done with the higher grades in the area. However, the school population there is now on the increase. Last year grades kindergarten to eight totalled ninety-two, this year grades kindergarten to seven totalled one hundred and thirteen, according to my information.

The petitioners would prefer that pupils be brought in from outside rather than that the school should close, furthermore that

grade eight should be reinstated.

Mr. Speaker, I know this neighborhood. I live and make my living in sight of this school and have watched it grow from its small two room school to a modern brick building, to be destroyed by fire in 1966 and then be rebuilt to flourish once again, not only as a school but as a centre of interest, concern and recreation for the whole community. Throughout the school system generally there is a declining school attendance, the population bulge is now through the elementary grades but this place proves the exception and has been selected to suffer.

The interest of the parents and of the neighbors generally remains high and they stand ready to devote their efforts to any worthwhile activity that the school suggests, however arduous or time consuming. Mr. Speaker, I find it unthinkable in this enlightened age that a new and growing school situated in the midst of an enthusiastic community

should be closed down for any but the most urgent of reasons, especially so when the demand for more and bigger schools is waxing not waning.

This petition will be directed to the department to which it relates, Education. The minister will quite properly reply that he is powerless in this matter. This is so. But the solution does lie in the hands of this legislature with the tiniest amount of restructuring of the lines of authority and hence effective communication could be opened up and these unwanted developments could be stopped.

The location of schools should be a political decision in the best sense, not an authoritarian one. The needs and aspirations of a community should enter into all such deliberations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the parents do not want this school to close, the pupils do not want this school to close, the teachers do not want this school to close. I do not think all school board members want this school to close. I doubt if the Episcopal Corporation welcomes this development. I suspect that the officials of the Department of Education are not enthusiastic about this. I am sure many members of this House regret this stand. I bet even the minister would not like to be the one to close this school. The officials themselves who have to implement this decision will I suspect do so unwillingly. The public is fed up with paying more for less.

I therefore urge the government to take another look at what is happening right under their very noses and stop it before it is too late. What took fifty years to build can be destroyed in as many minutes.

Here is the petition, table it.

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

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition. I have the greatest sympathy, Sir, with the people in that area as the honourable member knows because up to last year my children went to Our Lady of Lourdes School and I go to mass every Sunday morning, Sir, over at the church on Nagles Hill, Every Sunday morning at 10:30 A.M. you will find me and my family in that church over there. I must say,

Sir, that I feel rather bad about that school having to close down. Of course, if the school closes down it means that they close the church. I have a great deal of sympathy for the people in that area, Sir.

Last year I attended a public meeting, a meeting of the parishioners in that area when we were fighting to keep the school open. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I lost heart because the statistics and the background information that was supplied to us left no doubt in my mind that -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yes. It left no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the school would eventually have to close and the school board gave a year's notice, if my honourable friend will remember, a year ago. They told us that a year from September past the school would close; that means at the end of June this year. I felt rather bad about that, Sir, because my children had been doing remarkably well in that school, Sir, I am not saying that they are not doing well now down in St. Pius Tenth where I had to enroll them this year because I did not want to make the change over this September coming. They did remarkably well, Sir, as a matter of fact one of my girls was in a choir that won first prize against the bigger schools in St. John's, Sir, at The Kiwanis Music Festival last year. The teachers over there, Sir, were out of this world and as far as I am concerned the student/teacher ratio at that school is what it should be throughout the whole province.

So I felt rather bad, Sir, but I am afraid I have to surrender, I gave in and the people over there really did not put up what you would call a strong fight to keep the school open a year ago, maybe they are fighting a little more now.

Sir, the real reason for that school having to close down as my honourable friend knows is that the Pippy Park was established, all the beautiful land, Sir, that we have in that area was frozen,

people could no longer build in the area, so, the population was controlled and had a tendency to decrease if anything, because up Nagles Hill and up in the Mount Scio Road area, people for a while were not allowed to repair their homes. Now they are allowed to repair their homes. - Mr. Speaker, I cannot listen to two conversations at the same time.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It would be better.

MR. NEARY: Well, okay, maybe it would but I happen to be speaking right now. The honourable Leader of the Opposition complains in this House when someone else is doing it, so just give me a chance.

It is a pretty serious matter, it is a pretty serious matter, Mr. Speaker. Maybe it does not interest some honourable members in this House but it happens to be of tremendous interest to me as I have a stake in this as my honourable friend knows. Sir, sometimes I question the wisdom of establishing that park and freezing all of that land, turning it over to Memorial University when we have such a desperate shortage of building lots in this Province, Sir. I question the wisdom of it, freezing all that great, huge area over there and giving it to Memorial University. I do not know, Sir, if we did the right thing or not. I question it and I doubt it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, it happens to be in my honourable friend's district. Sir, sometimes I wonder if we should not unfreeze that land and let the -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Mr. Speaker does not have to ... (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the present administration has the courage to unfreeze it, I might be tempted to go along with it. There is such a desperate shortage of building lots in this city, Sir.

What is the university going to do with all that land, Mr. Speaker? What are they going to do with it? Are they going to put their little, what do they call them, their toy railroad - what is it that they call that? Are they going to put their model railroads out there running around, Sir? I think it could serve a far better use to our people in

this area. They could go over and build homes over there. I am rather sad about that school and church closing, Sir. I would not like to see it close and I would like for the Minister of Education to use whatever influence he can on the Board to try and keep that school open on Nagles Hill.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words with reference to the petition presented by the honourable member from St. John's North and the support for which was expressed by the honourable member for Bell Island.

The honourable member presenting the petition, the member for St. John's North stated that he hoped that the prayer of the petition would be acceded to, even if it required a reversal of government policy. I think I should point out to honourable gentlemen that this is an area of responsibility of the Roman Catholic School Board of St. John's. There is obviously state responsibility in Newfoundland but we do not have a state system of education. The honourable gentleman in, I think, realizing that went on to suggest the possibility of some slight restructuring whereby the location of schools should be a political decision in the best sense. I am quoting the honourable gentleman's words there. "The location of schools should be a political decision in the best sense."

Mr. Speaker, I am far from convinced that - depending on what definition one would give "political decision in the best sense" I am far from convinced that government, either political, of a minister or in terms of bureaucracy, should be the only decision-makers in society and I am far from convinced that the general principle of delegated responsibility in areas with respect to school board and indeed with respect to other areas as well, is not a sound, sensible principle. Obviously, no system is perfect but I am by no means convinced that the



kind of restructuring whereby the location of schools would be a political decision even in the best sense, would be in the overall in the best interest of the province.

What I shall certainly undertake to do is to communicate to the Roman Catholic School Board of St. John's, the fact and prayer of the petition and certainly request them to bear this in mind in their deliberations and in their decision making. With reference to the request or suggestion of the honourable member for Bell Island, speaking on the same area and with reference to Pippy Park, of course this is related to a lot of things apart from the school. The whole area, people living in that area certainly there are few decisions which, very few if any which open minds should not be prepared to study and to review and to see whether if in fact original reasons for doing such a thing were valid; even if they were, whether they are still valid. Perhaps they were and are and perhaps they were not and are not or were and are not. There are all kinds of possibilities. I shall certainly undertake to have that matter looked at anew.

In terms of the petition itself, I think what I will do is to communicate the fact and prayer of the petition to the school board responsible.

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

MR. T.V.HICKEY (Minister of Transportation and Communications):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to the petition presented by my colleague the member for St. John's North. I am quite familiar with the problem in relation to the proposed closing of that school. I attended the meeting to which the member for Bell Island referred and it seems, Mr. Speaker, that the - or at least there appears to be a lack of consistency on the part of the school board, at least in relations to this particular subject. While on the one hand it is my understanding the school boards are desirous of lowering the student-teacher ratio, on the other hand



a situation such as this school and others throughout the province those schools seem to now be headed for closing, almost because the student-teacher ratio is too low.

I am not so sure that there is such a wide gap between the two. It is of even greater concern to me, Mr. Speaker, that this policy does not only apply to this school in question. There is another school in my constituency, in Flatrock, and I understand that this school and the people of that community have also been given the same news.

I think that while I agree with my colleague the Minister of Education that there is not that much that the government can do directly, because this is a matter outside their jurisdiction, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in adding my support to this petition on behalf of those people and the students concerned and indeed in connection with this whole policy, that not only the petition be referred to the minister in question but indeed that this House endorse it unanimously and forward it to the school board expressing concern and asking that the school board re-examine their position on this policy or at least give a stay of execution until further study is done into this whole matter. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

MOTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice:

HON. T.A. HICKMAN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the honourable Minister of Finance, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in relation to the granting of Supplementary Supply to Her Majesty for the financial year ending the 31st. day of March, 1974.

That I will on tomorrow

ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending March 31, 1974 And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service."

On behalf of the honourable the Minister of Mines and Energy, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Petroleum And Natural Gas Act".

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I am not certain that I am in order here but as leader of the House I would like to clear up a minor error that occurs on today's Order Paper concerning a question which I placed on that Order Paper, question no. 1. It was directed in error to the Minister of Tourism. That should read the Minister of Finance.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Address and Reply, I think the honourable member for Bell Island adjourned the debate last night and I think from looking that he has forty minutes left.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must first of all apologize for going down the throat of my honourable colleague here, Sir. I hope it will not be misinterpreted. That happened to be a matter that was very dear to my heart and I just wanted to get on the record as supporting that petition, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, in support of the amendment now before the House, Sir, I would like to again point out that the present administration has not initiated a single programme of its own. It has not even given this honourable House, Sir, and the people of Newfoundland the faintest hint of its intention to develop a programme of its own to deal with the two major crises facing the people of this province, namely the spiraling living costs and unemployment that is mounting in geometric ratio and inadequate housing. The administration, Sir, has not given the people of this province the faintest hint what it intends to do about

these two or three major problems, namely unemployment, spiraling cost of living and the desperate shortage of houses.

The Minister of Finance when he spoke in the House the other day, Sir, told us all about some of the projects that were being carried on in Newfoundland and Labrador at the present time. Without exception, Mr. Speaker, I would say that every project named by the minister was started by the former Liberal Administration. Every project, Sir, bar none - the Health Science Complex, started by the former Liberal Administration, Carbonear Hospital that my honourable friend is so proud of, started by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, when he was Minister of Health. It was started, Sir, with construction actually under way.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What was in the ground?

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not care what was in the ground, Sir. The contracts were let and no sweetheart agreements with Babb's Construction. It had to start somewhere, Sir. You had to start with the foundation and build up. There had to be a hole in the ground. That project over in Carbonear was started by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, when he was Minister of Health. The former Liberal Administration -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Saunders turned the sod.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I do not know if Mr. Saunders went down and turned the sod. He may have.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance talked about the Linerboard Mill

and told us how well it is doing. Well what else is new, Sir? What else is new? The Linerboard Mill was put there through the sweat of one J.R. Smallwood, not that honourable crowd over there, Sir. The logging operations down in my colleague's district of Goose Bay that if that crowd had their way over there, they would shut it down, it was started by the former Liberal Administration.

Senior Citizens' Homes: I do not think there is one new one started since I left the Department of Social Services. They were all on the drawing board if not underway. The one in Gander, Sir, I had the privilege of attending the opening there about a year ago or a little less than a year ago. It was built by the former Liberal Administration. The one in Grand Falls was started by the former Liberal Administration. The one in Lewisporte was started by the former Liberal Administration - approved, not started. I must confess the construction had not actually started but it was approved by the former Liberal Administration. The one in St. Anthony was approved by the former Liberal Administration. In Grand Bank, there was one in the negotiation stage when I left. Some people in high political places, not on this honourable side of the House, Sir, were trying to pressure me into buying a motel for a senior citizens' home on the Burin Peninsula that I considered, not only I, Sir, but the fire marshall of this province, to be a fire trap. We would not permit the committee on the Burin Peninsula to purchase that motel for a senior citizens' home. We told them to go ahead and make their plans. The formula had already been worked out. To my knowledge, Sir, no change has been made in that formula to date. It has stood the test of time. The minister has the gall to stand in this honourable House and take credit for these senior citizens' homes that are cropping up and so badly needed around the province. They were started by the former Liberal Administration.

Mr. Speaker, every fish plant in Newfoundland - they talk about rural development - my honourable friend down there is wet behind the ears when it comes to rural development. Every fish plant, Sir, in Newfoundland.

every one I think, without exception, there may be one or two that did not require assistance from the government -

MR. ROBERTS: Not one.

MR. NEARY: My colleague the Leader of the Opposition says not one. I am inclined to agree with him. Every fish plant in Newfoundland that is doing so well today and employing so many thousands of Newfoundlanders, men and women, and women getting equal wages with men, all started by the former Liberal Administration. It was not a give-away programme, Sir. It was a programme to try to develop the greatest natural resource that we have in this province; namely the fishery. It was not a give-away programme like my honourable friend is running down there now.

MR. REID: I will remember that for Bell Island in the future.

MR. NEARY: Ah! There is a threat! Is that a threat, Mr. Speaker? If it is, Sir, if the minister is going to punish my constituents for what I say in this honourable House, Sir, I say God help him!

Mr. Speaker, last year when I spoke in this honourable House I had great praise for the minister's Rural Development Programme. I did, Sir, and I meant every word I said.

MR. REID: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No I will not change my opinion after a while, Sir, because the minister's Rural Development Programme is after getting off the rails. I will tell the minister where he has gone wrong if he wants me to.

Mr. Speaker, when I sit on that honourable side of the House, then I will show the minister where he went wrong. Nothing would give me greater pleasure in this province, Sir, than to be Minister of Rural Development.

MR. REID: It will be too late.

MR. NEARY: Ah, it will not be too late.

Mr. Speaker, I will read a letter I got from the Human Rights Association later in my remarks, if I had the time. That should keep honourable gentleman

quiet for the rest of this session of this honourable House, Sir, he got slapped down by the President of the Human Rights Association. Mr. Speaker I do not intend to get into this matter of rural development in any great depth because when my honourable colleague, the member for Hermitage, speaks, Sir, in this debate, when he tests his fledgling wings in this honourable House, Sir, he will deal with the Minister of Rural Development and all I want to say about it now, Mr. Speaker, is that it is off the rails and how it got off the rails, Sir, was because it was put together in a hurry.

I remember the Premier during the election campaign going around talking about a great rural development programme that he was going to introduce. As far as I can see, Sir, that programme was put together in thirty days. Officials of the minister's department, before he became minister, were called to the Premier's Office and were told by the Premier that they had thirty days to produce a rural development programme.

MR. REID: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what kind of an inquisition? What kind of a question is that, Sir? I would not dare, Mr. Speaker, mention anybody's name in this honourable House because that crowd over there would immediately have a commission of enquiry. They are not so smart having one about Saunders, but anybody else. If you dare criticize this crowd, the newspapers have been taken to task by every member who has spoken in this debate so far and spoken on the amendment. Open line programmes have been criticized and the minister wants to know the names of persons.

MR. REID: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: So that the minister can go back to his office and fire him. There is no way, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the programme was put together in a hurry, too much of a hurry, Sir, thirty days and after the thirty days are up, back to the Premier's Office, 'yes we have got a programme. Let us set up a rural development authority.' "Great" says the Premier, dancing with



glee, "We got it. We are going to keep our election promise,"  
made in the newspaper of what date?

MR. WM. ROWE: There is no date on it.

MR. NEARY: There is no date on it, put out during the March Election.  
"We are going to keep our great promise to develop rural Newfoundland."  
He was so proud, Sir, and he did not know what to do. So, "go off,  
set up your rural development authority" he told them, which they did,  
and the first mistake, Sir, in my opinion was allowing it to get  
in the hands of the bureaucrats.

I know what I am talking about. Mr. Speaker, that was  
mistake number one. They should have gotten it out of the hands  
of the mandarins and the bureaucrats. If the Premier had been  
using his head, Sir, he would have set up a crown corporation to  
deal with this matter of rural development, and there is a constructive  
suggestion if the minister wants one, and get the whole thing removed  
from politics and get it out of the hands of the mandarins and the  
bureaucrats. Get it out of their hands, Sir, put it in the hands  
of a crown corporation. But, Sir, that was mistake number one but the  
biggest blunder of all, in my opinion, is that no guidance, no guidance  
Mr. Speaker, was given to these people that obtained loans. It was  
merely, Sir, another form of welfare. It was a handout.

The minister says that they have created over a couple of  
thousand jobs and Sir, I would like to see it documented. Most of  
these loans, Mr. Speaker, were doled out to people who were already  
in business who ordinarily would be using their own money but they  
saw a windfall, they saw a bonanza, they saw a way that they could get  
it out of the public treasury and so they came to the minister and  
instead of using their own money

they are using money from the public treasury to carry on their business. Now I am not taking it away, I am not going to get very much further into this.

So, Sir, the minister and his department fell down badly on the job when it came to counseling and giving people the guidance that was so necessary to make an industry flourish in rural Newfoundland. It is an uphill battle, Sir, anyway, an uphill battle to get an industry started in rural Newfoundland or around any other part of the world. It is a very difficult task, Sir, you are fighting an uphill battle, you are bucking the technological age.

So, Mr. Speaker, what you have to do is take an industry and you have to nurse it along. You have to provide the people with the expertise. You just cannot give them the money and then go away and forget about it and come back and it is gone. It would be like that fellow who took the money and went up to Toronto -

AN HON. MEMBER: Up to P.E.I.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker,

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: What about what Saunders did?

AN HON. MEMBER: I do not know anything about that, I am not concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about a statement that the minister made there a few moments ago because, Sir, I may be critical in my remarks of some aspects of rural development but I still believe in rural development, Sir. I hope that the minister will reconsider his statement there a few moments ago and will not discriminate against residents of Bell Island because I happen to be a member.

MR. REID: I did not say that but (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, indeed I would not. As a matter of fact

MR. REID: Number one, I am criticized by your Leader ...

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, look one thing that gets me right down in the pit of my stomach, Sir, is the way that this crowd talk about being

criticized. You would not know but the government was an abstract thing, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: A personal attack (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: The government is not an abstract thing, Sir, it is made up of human beings, of people like ourselves. When you criticize the government or when you criticize a minister for his policy, Sir, it is not a personal thing. My God, do I have to say that in this honourable House, Mr. Speaker? It is not a personal thing. It is a criticism of the minister's policies. Sir, if the minister were president or vice-president or secretary of a corporation he would have to bear the responsibility for the decisions that are made by that corporation. If he did anything improper he could be put in jail, if he were the president of a corporation.

So let us get away from this nonsense of aiming criticism at ministers. The government is not abstract. It is there. There they are thirty-two of them sitting over there; eighteen cabinet ministers, a record number. They are there, Sir. They are individuals, if they do not like the heat of the day they can always get out. They can always get out, Sir, there is nobody behind them with a gun in their backs saying, they have to stay in politics. Anytime they feel like it they can leave, if they do not like the criticism they can clear out anytime they want to, Sir.

So as long as the minister heads up that department when I have a criticism to make about it in this honourable House I am going to do it. I will also give the minister a few constructive suggestions. The minister was good enough to come to Bell Island with me last summer and I appreciate that, Sir. But I have a job to do in this honourable House. When I see the taxpayers money being wasted, Sir, it is my duty as a member of this honourable House to bring it to the attention of members and to bring it to the attention of the people of this province. I think the minister at this late stage, even though, Sir, they have thrown away about \$4 million or \$5 million, even at this late stage, Sir, I think the

minister could salvage something out of his department, set up a crown corporation and bring in people that can provide guidance to those who wish to establish industries. This is the weakness in the minister's programme.

MR. REID: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Newfoundland we have

successful.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about people from Holland. The minister has them down there from all over the world.

MR. REID: No I have not.

MR. NEARY: Yes he has.

MR. REID: Not one. One hundred per cent Newfoundlanders.

MR. NEARY: No they are not one hundred per cent Newfoundlanders. No, Mr. Speaker, they are not.

MR. REID: One hundred per cent.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, No. No, Mr. Speaker, they are not. The minister had better go and check his payroll. They are not one hundred per cent Newfoundlanders. Even if they are it could very easily be that the minister has made a few political appointments, I do not know.

MR. REID: Never did.

MR. NEARY: No? Above that? Above making political appointments?

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not recommend them.

MR. NEARY: Sir, there should be an advisory board of some kind. There should be an advisory board comprised of successful businessmen in this province who can provide the counselling that is so necessary. You just cannot launch a business, Sir, big, small or medium without giving the people that launch that business the counselling that is so necessary to make it a success.

The minister knows that. He probably knows it better than I do, from his own experience in operating a business. If you do not have a little bit of business sense about you the thing is going to fail. I think the minister would be the first to admit that. I hope we will have no more of this flinging out the taxpayers money right, left and center and talking about creating two or three thousand jobs that do not exist, unless the minister can provide the counselling that is necessary to these businesses to start up.

Mr. Speaker, today we arrived in the House to find on our desks today's copy of the "Daily News." "Fisherman's Annual" it is called today. "Fisherman's Annual Today." We have read under "Fisherman's Annual Today" the highlights of the Throne Speech in Ottawa and I would say, Thank God! Ottawa is up there! Right underneath it says; "New approach to inflation. Help fishermen and farmers to boost food production."

I glanced through it before the House opened this afternoon. There is not one new idea, Mr. Speaker, in here for the fisheries. Not a new idea. We heard the other day, Sir, that the Minister of Fisheries who does not happen to be in his seat right now, is going to send a delegation off to Europe to find out how to auction fish. Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear of anything so foolish in all your life? Send a delegation off from his department to find out how they auction off fish in Europe and the minister is going himself. Off to the fleshpots of Lisboa or Madrid, the delights of Paris or wherever else he is going.

All he has to do is go downtown here and he will find people right here in St. John's who can give him all the information that he wants about fish auctions in Europe. Go down and ask the Spanish Consul. Go over to the university. If he cannot find them here, Sir, all he need do is send off a very carefully worded letter to Europe, it will probably cost a twelve or fifteen cent stamp, instead of the flying circus taking to the air again, going over to Europe. The Premier is probably going with them if he gets back from the bistros of Montreal or Vancouver or New York or wherever he is right now, Sir

There is no need of this. This is a waste of the taxpayers money, Sir, sending this crowd off to find out how they auction off fish in Europe.

The Minister of Agriculture and Forests; My God!



He came up, Sir, with his brain thrust of how to cope with the cost of living in this Province. I could not believe it when I heard it, Sir. The minister who I gave credit to for having a small amount of intelligence, do you know what the minister's contribution was to combat the high cost of living in this Province, Sir? Would anybody have a guess at what it was? The minister set up, Mr. Speaker, a turkey marketing board, and we are not a producer of turkeys.

So, Mr. Speaker, not an original idea from this administration, Sir, since they took office two years ago. To finish what the Minister of Finance was saying, he was going around the Province, talked about Churchill Falls, condemned it again, condemned Churchill Falls again, Sir. Well, I listen very attentively to what the Minister of Finance has to say about Churchill Falls and my mind went back to 1967, Sir, and the Minister of Education will know what I am talking about, when the minister stood here last week in this honourable House and criticized the concessions, the tax concessions that were given to BRINCO in order to get that great hydro development off the ground.

Well, Sir, I have here the whole debate on that Bill that was brought into this honourable House. It was given first reading on April 17, 1967.

MR. CARTER: The honourable member from Bell Island is departing from his prepared text. I wonder is he going to say what he said he was going to say or is he going to say something else or perhaps he does not know what he is saying. I wonder would he inform us.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for St. John's North has become the professional buffoon in this House. That is not a point of order, Sir. That is something you would expect from the honourable gentleman. No wonder they flung him out of the cabinet.

Sir, here is the verbatim report of a bill that was introduced in this honourable House in 1967. The whole debate, the bill was introduced by J. R. Smallwood. When on April 21, Mr. Smallwood introducing the bill, April 21, then came the Leader of the Opposition's turn, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition, gave his turn to comment on the bill. Let us see

what he said. The Leader of the Opposition at the time, would anybody care to have a guess as to who it was? Any guesses? The Leader of the Opposition at the time, Mr. Speaker, was none other than my good friend my learneth friend, the Minister of Education, the member for St. Mary's. Does the honourable minister remember the debate?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Only vaguely.

MR. NEARY: Only vaguely. Well, I will remind the honourable minister of the debate and the honourable minister will remember that the present Minister of Justice sitting on that side of the honourable House was then over on that side of the honourable House with the Liberal administration as Minister of Justice. Is that correct?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The minister says yes.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The minister - no, the Minister of Justice, Attorney-General. The Minister of Finance, the Minister of Finance, where was he seated in this honourable House at that time? A member of the Smallwood cabinet, sitting over there as proud as a peacock, not concerned one iota where the election expenses came from, could not care less, not worried about conflict of interest, sitting over there as proud as a peacock, nose up in the air looking down at people.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, where was he at the time? He was asleep then, Mr. Speaker, the same as he is asleep now, only it would not be fair I suppose to say that the - no, I better not say it.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier of the day finished introducing the debate, introducing the bill, great debate.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You are very unkind. You are very unkind.

MR. NEARY: Great stuff, Sir. Anybody that cares to take the trouble to read the debate will find out that it was great stuff and here is what the Leader of the Opposition of the day said. It says: Mr. G. Ottenheimer, Opposition Leader. "Mr. Speaker, without speaking to the bill, I would request that the Opposition have an opportunity to speak at second reading at a later date." Correct? Verified by,

read by the minister. Let us see what he said at a later date.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Now listen to this, Mr. Speaker. This is about three days later. It was not off the top of his head, Sir. He was not having a bad day. The minister was one of the few Leaders of the Opposition that we had any use for in this honourable House, one of the few and there were a good many since I came here. Here is the minister's contribution. Now remember, Mr. Speaker, in between the Minister of Finance who was over with the Smallwood Administration at the time and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Justice up to this point, he had made no contribution to the debate. Here is what "Mr. Ottenheimer" says according to the verbatim report. It is a good thing we have them around, Mr. Speaker, the verbatim reports.

"Mr. Speaker, this legislation and the agreement which it will authorize provides, among other things, exemption from gasoline tax for the purpose of transmission as well as development, the non-application of the Public Utilities Act and the repayment by the Government of Newfoundland to BRINCO and its subsidiaries of corporation tax collected by the Government of Canada," ( It is the very thing now that the minister's colleague is condemning. The minister agreed with this.) "and return to the Government of Newfoundland. The dispute which for some time has been going on in this province between benefits of the development of the hydro power by private companies on the one hand and publicly owned utility companies on the other hand are, I think, no more than an academic matter. The decision has been made that the development of Churchill Falls and Twin Falls, I think it is safe to say, are inexorably linked with BRINCO and the development of the hydro power in Labrador."

"It seems therefore," says the Hon. Leader of the Opposition of the day, "that for no other reason than enlightened self-interest, it would require that this province facilitate the development of BRINCO

and its subsidiaries by reasonable forms of tax abatement. With that view or with that purpose, we certainly raise no objection to the principle. (On motion the bill read a second time)."

Mr. Speaker, now we hear the whole thing was all wrong. But, Sir, I want to get to the contribution in that debate made by the Minister of Justice, the present Minister of Justice then and now. Just listen to his contribution, Sir. It is a beaut. It is a dandy. Now he supports the Minister of Finance in condemning this agreement. Let us see what he had to say, Sir. You would never believe it. When I read it out, you will never believe it, Sir, if I can find it. It is a one-liner. It is in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker, now seven years later, we find the Minister of Finance condemning that agreement and two years ago in this honourable House, Sir, I stood in my place here and I advised the Premier to remove the Minister of Finance from these negotiations with BRINCO, otherwise the Lower Churchill would never be developed. The Premier just laughed it off at the time.

Later we heard a statement of government policy, all the power was going to be used in Newfoundland and not one kilowatt would be sent up to the Province of Quebec or sent up to the Mainland or down in the United States. Oh yes, here it is, the great contribution made by the Minister of Justice. This is in Committee of the Whole. "Hickman: 'In the Schedule, Appendix (b), Area (3) should read Lake Humber and I move the amendment.'" Lake Humber, there was the minister's contribution to that great debate that gave these concessions to Brinco that we are condemned so much for now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, now what happens? Two years ago we said; "Look, it is life and death. Go out and negotiate, sit down and -" Do not honourable members remember me last year saying to the Premier, pleading with him and begging him, "Go out and sit down and negotiate with Brinco." Instead of that, the Minister of Finance took them on head on and two years later, Mr. Speaker, two years later with hat in hand, the flying circus yesterday took to the air to go over to Montreal to sit down to negotiate with Brinco, something that we told them to do two years ago. A complete reversal again, Mr. Speaker, of what their stated policy was. Now they are going to try to find a customer for the power.

Mr. Speaker, my honourable colleague just made a point that I was about to make. Two or three years ago, Sir, the Lower Churchill could be developed for \$5 million or \$6 million. Now, it is over a billion, Mr. Speaker, up over a billion dollars and the question at the moment is, is it feasible at all? That is what happened, Sir. That is what damage was done as a result of this delay in the negotiations. Now, they are just following in Joey's footsteps again. Away to the races again, up trying to negotiate the best deal they can with Quebec Hydro in the province of Quebec and with Brinco.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, I could go on for days and days but, Sir, Recreation centers - something else that was started by the former Liberal Administration - stadiums, parks. Sir, we cannot forget about

that great oil refinery down there at Come By Chance. I heard the minister even boasting about that the other day, Sir. There is no way that you can mention that oil refinery without identifying it with Smallwood and the Liberal Party.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: \$130 million you say.

MR. NEARY: Not \$130 million.

Mr. Speaker, this crowd have not come up with an original idea of their own, Sir. They have not shown any leadership in two years in office. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have to say this - we have been sitting in this honourable House now eighteen or twenty days and if you took all the time and added it together, Sir, that the Premier has sat in this honourable House since we opened, it would not equal one sitting of the House which is three hours. He is pulling the same thing here, Sir, as he pulled in Ottawa. He was elected as a member of parliament and did not attend the sessions. His attendance record was the worse in the whole of Canada. His attendance in this House, Sir, is the worse that I have seen in thirteen years. They are over there in complete disarray, no leadership. No wonder they cannot get anything done, Sir. They do not know what their priorities are. They think priorities are bonfires and bridge tournaments and song contests, beauty pageants, silver coins - twenty five dollars a set. How many welfare recipients will be buying these I wonder?

They think priorities are a rip off for Goerge McLean. While all of this is going on, Mr. Speaker, we have hundreds and hundreds of young people



pouring out of the high schools, out of post secondary institutions with great expectations, Sir, but they soon become discouraged and disillusioned and disenchanted when they find that the possibility of finding employment in this province or ever owning a home of their own, Sir, is dismal to say the least.

Mr. Speaker, apparently this caretaker administration all they plan on doing, Sir, is passing the buck to Ottawa for everyone of its major and urgent responsibilities. This attitude, Sir, this unconstructive futile attitude is so obvious, Mr. Speaker, from the original Speech from the Throne and from every utterance that we have heard from the government benches including those of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, when he had spoken in this session, which is very rare I suggest. I would suggest from their tone, Sir, from what they have said that the government have abdicated their rights to run this province, Sir. They have abdicated their responsibilities in dealing with the real issues that Newfoundlanders are faced with today, the bread and butter issues upon which the helpless half million of us, Sir, the helpless half million citizens of this province depend upon the government for decisions that they do not know how to make, Mr. Speaker, or for decisions that they refuse to make, for decisions whose lack suspends every citizen of this province, Mr. Speaker, in an unpleasant Limbo of uncertainty as to both his present and his future.

So, Mr. Speaker, I could go on for days on this vote of non-confidence but I am restricted by the rules of the House, Sir. Before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, I would urge every honest, conscientious member on the government benches to join with us on this side of the House and support the amendment to the programme outlined in the Speech from the Throne that will force into the foreground the issues upon which our whole province depends today, namely; Sir, unemployment, cost of living and lack of public services.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Green Bay.

MR. A.B. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is getting more humorous as the days go by, Sir. It is one of the easiest things to do for anybody who has been in this honourable House for the past week to establish

without any doubt the disarray that the opposition finds themselves in. It is really, Sir, extremely simple, it can be illustrated in just a few moments by their supposed strategy here in this honourable House dealing with the private members' resolution that was discussed yesterday, dealing with the forest policy that revolutionary policy that has been brought in by this government, by the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, and now by this amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Because, Mr. Speaker, it shows a complete lack of consistency. On the one hand the opposition are saying the government have brought in a forest policy. As everybody knows in this province over the last decade the forest industry of this province has been studied to death. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition showed in his remarks on forestry that he has a blatant ignorance of anything to do with the colour green.

I have never seen such a display of ignorance for a public man in this province who has been in public life for the past eight or ten years to still have such a lack of knowledge of the forest industry. Now with that great new bill that the government want to bring in to completely change the policy regarding forestry in this province, this policy, this forest industry that has been studied to death over the last ten years that everybody knows something about, supposedly, except the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable members opposite. This kind of policy, they want to direct that for further study, to send it to a select committee of the House. You talk to anybody within the forest industry, anybody who has any knowledge of it is quite aware what needs to be done. It is quite obvious; we have been experiencing it for the last forty or fifty years. It is no great secret that they want to shelve it - they want to shelve it.

On the private members' resolution brought in by the honourable the Member for St. John's North, an election expenses

revolution, the idea that has not been given that much discussion or debate in this honourable House over the last decade. They want us to swallow hook, line and sinker, Bill (C) 203, proposed in Ottawa and passed without any debate. No committee now; give us thirty days, just thirty days. On the forest policy which, Mr. Speaker, will help increase employment opportunities in this Province and hence make their amendment to the Address and Reply completely obsolete and almost out of order for its lack of fact, they want to shelve that. They want to shelve a policy which will give more jobs to this Province, so that they can bring in an amendment to the Address in Reply voting a nonconfidence in this Government for not taking action to provide more employment opportunities. How can you supply more employment opportunities if the Opposition contend that they want this forest policy, which will do exactly that, to be shelved for a few months, to send it to a select committee and let us go over it all again after experts on the Task Force studied it, after the various studies that were made in the last ten years by the previous administration? Yet, they want to shelve it.

How inconsistent can you get? How without policy, how without consistency can you get, and without any fact to back them up? The honourable member from Bell Island is a prime example of it. It is just one stream of verbosity containing absolutely no facts, no logic but just an attempt to take up the House's time which could be more valuably used.

So, Mr. Speaker, you do not have to be all that wise. You only have to have a bit of common sense to see that the Opposition is being completely inconsistent and hence only out on every occasion where it seems like it pleases them to oppose the Government destructively, because if they really believed in this amendment on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, if they really believed that the Government is not doing what it can (they say here) and regret the failure of the administration to introduce adequate programmes to reduce the extremely

high numbers of our people who are unemployed, if they believed that, they would allow that Forest Policy to be passed, they would not want it sent to a select committee, no way. And the honourable Leader of the Opposition has the audacity, the outright gall to suggest, to give the impression that the big companies in this Province, who have done much for this Province economically, might not, he was not sure, he did not know and he left the impression that they did not, the big companies never ever highgraded any blocks of timber in this Province. He was not sure of that, no, no, of course not.

I wish the Leader of the Opposition would just jump in his car someday and beat it over the highway and drop off anywhere where there is a pulpwood contract or a sawmill operation and in five minutes it would be cleared just how ignorant that honourable gentleman is of what the forestry in this Province is all about.

So, here is their inconsistency. On the one hand they are regretting the failure of the administration in not bringing in programmes to help ease the unemployment situation in this Province and then on the other hand they are saying; "Oh, Oh, they are bringing in a programme that is going to reduce our unemployment; we had better get them to shelve that."

Mr. Speaker, this whole amendment here, "Be it resolved that this House regrets of failure of the present administration to introduce adequate programmes to lessen the severe impact on our people of the rapidly rising cost of living." Anybody with a T.V. set, Mr. Speaker or a radio or anybody reading the papers in the past eighteen months to two years or even longer are aware that their Leader in Ottawa, Mr. Tredeau, has said on numerous occasions, when Mr. Stanfield and others on the Opposition and the NDP have questioned the Leader of Canada on this, that a lot of this has to do with international trade and finance and that not even the Federal Government, not even the Federal Liberal Government - You would think, Mr. Speaker, with a Federal Liberal Government up there, from what the Opposition tell us, that they could solve just about anything

and yet it has taken them until now and in a Speech from the Throne which really does not get to the guts of the issue as far as inflation is concerned, taking no measures to immediately reduce or to control the inflationary spiral in this country.

These are the people nobody wants, I do not think anybody on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, necessarily wants to just point a finger at Ottawa for every ill that occurs in this country. We have to take our share of the responsibility. I think it is clear to any sane, sensible individual who is reading the papers and who is knowledgeable about affairs, international affairs, knows that the prime cause of inflation goes far beyond the boundaries of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, where this Administration or this Government can take action to try to reduce prices or to increase salaries, we have done it and we have done it on a far better scale within the area of our jurisdiction than the Federal Government has in theirs. They have the Bank of Canada. They are the ones who control all the high finance. They have a better capability, financially, to do something about the rising cost of living than we do, than a province does. Anybody can tell you that and yet we are suppose to all resign over here, Mr. Speaker, because we have not been able to take adequate measures to control the rising cost of living.

What does taking seven per cent off the heating oil in this Province, for everybody in this Province do? Is that an attempt to increase the cost of living in this Province? Is that an attempt to make heating oils so expensive that ordinary people cannot but it or it is, Mr. Speaker, an attempt by this administration to try to lessen the blow of inflation on the people of this Province? Which is it? Surely it is clear that this is a measure, that this is a programme, if you want to use the term loosely, this is a measure within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government of this Province, to try to reduce the cost of living to the people of this Province. Yet the Opposition in its amendment says that we have not done

anything, that they regret our failure. Well, surely here is one area where we have not failed, Mr. Speaker. We have taken off that seven per cent on heating oil and that affects everybody. Just about everybody in this Province now, rural or urban, burns oil in their furnaces and everybody knows the last couple of winters we have had that the heating bills have been pretty high. Well, we have done what we could on that score. We have taken off the seven per cent. Surely, that is an attempt to try to reduce the inflationary spiral. We try to do our part within our jurisdiction, yet the Opposition try to claim that we have not done anything.

In 1972, the minimum wage in this Province was around \$1.10, one dollar and ten cents in 1972, and now it is 1974, the last of February or is it the beginning of March, 1974, and in two short years we have increased that minimum wage from one dollar and ten cents



to one dollar and eighty cents. That is seventy cents an hour increase. That should mean, Mr. Speaker, that their government are trying to put more money in the hands of those people who are on low incomes, to give them more buying power so that they will be able to buy some of those products that have gone up in price. If that is not an attempt to deal with the inflationary situation, with the cost of living in this province, I do not know what is. Yet we continually hear that we are doing nothing. Mr. Speaker, let there be no doubt that there are a lot of small businessmen and small contractors in this province. There are hundreds of people in this province who own small stores in rural Newfoundland and small contractors who have to pay wages to employees who had to take a little blow here on this, when we introduced the minimum wage to that extent, seventy cents an hour for one person in two years.

Mr. Speaker, here is another attempt by the administration to try to lessen the blow of the cost of living on the ordinary people of this province. Yet they want us to go on with their amendment, quit and get out. Mr. Speaker, it is humourous besides being almost crazy.

Then there is the much maligned social assistance programme, a programme that put more money into the pockets of ninety-one per cent of all those getting assistance from the government, all those people who are getting, if you want, "welfare." Ninety-one per cent of the people of this province who receive social assistance benefits from this government-received increases as of January 1, 1974. In other words, we are putting more dollars into their pockets to help lessen the blow of the increased prices on the products that they must buy. Is that an attempt to help counteract the cost of living situation in this province? If in December 1, 1973, a widow with two or three children was making \$140 or \$150 a month with which she had to budget for that amount of money and which she approximately got then, on January 1, she was getting \$170 or \$180 a month. She had more money to buy the things

and she did not buy all that much more or her needs were not all that much more in January over what they were in December. In January she had more money to spend. Are these the people that the government or the powers that be must be most interested in, those people on low or fixed incomes, those people who are working on the minimum wage and those people who are obtaining welfare assistance from the government? These are the people who are most hurt by the rising cost of living and these are the people that the government have tried to help.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is another measure by the government to help ease the cost of living in this province. Yet we are told nothing has been done, not a thing, we have not done a thing. We have been here now for two years and one can see the yarn come down from the Hon. Member for Bell Island. "They have not done a thing. That honourable crowd over there have not tried to do a thing. They just sat there for two years and watched the sun rise in the east and set in the west every day and went home and they have not tried to introduce one new programme."

Mr. Speaker, here we have brought in a radically new social assistance programme, increased the minimum wage and now are attempting to bring in a new forest policy to force those people who have timber limits to cut more of their trees. Now, if in a given area of the province, the government decide that the annual sustainable yield on that block of timber is "x" number of cords and many times the company has not cut there at all, that wood has to be cut. Now if that wood has to be cut, somebody has to cut it and that somebody is going to be some of those people who are on the unemployment role. The quicker that this forestry policy can get through, the better off we will be employment-wise in this province. It might not be a well-known fact by very many honourable members here, I do not know how many of them are in districts that depend heavily upon the forest industry, it is my opinion, it is only an opinion and I think I can back it up fairly

well, that if this forest policy does not get through and a number of management areas are not set up this year, it is going to be 300 to 500 jobs in this province, especially out in the Green Bay Area.

Mr. Speaker, if the opposition are interested, if the opposition are genuinely interested in reducing the unemployment rate of this province, they will get on with the job of bringing this forest policy into Committee of the Whole and discussing the various clauses of it and let us get it through. Let us get on with the job of setting up the management areas of this province. Let us get on with the job of getting the companies to cut more of their wood, cutting the over-matured wood, the bug-infested wood, wood that they have not touched. There is an area down in my district right now which could employ at least fifty men tomorrow morning, down in Robert's Arm, where there are 259,000 cords of wood standing there and it has stood there now for about three and one-half to four years, some of the best timber in the province, saw log timber and pulp wood. Under the new forestry programme, obviously there is going to be an annual allowable cut. Of that 259,000 cords right now, none is being cut. You do not have to be a forester to know that an annual sustainable yield will be perhaps 10,000 to 15,000 cords or more there. That will be 10,000 to 15,000 cords more that will have to be cut. People will have to cut it and now you are taking people off unemployment insurance and putting them back to work. Anybody who thinks that this forestry policy does not have a dramatic impact, if only by rationalizing the forestry industry and bringing management plans to bear, reforestation and conservation to bear on the forest resources - it also has a direct impact upon the number of people who are employed in this province - they better think again because the two are directly related.

Mr. Speaker, I think it has been a point that has been overlooked up to this point. This forestry policy does mean or does have a great impact upon the unemployment rate or those

who have been assisted under this programme. There is no way that the honourable member for Labrador North or the member for Bonavista North or the honourable member for Hermitage or the honourable member for Labrador South, although he could have a good point to make,

MR. WOODWARD: If I knew as little about Labrador as the honourable member does, I would sit down.

MR. PECKFORD: The debate, Mr. Speaker, is not about whether I know as much about Labrador as the honourable member for Labrador North. The question I am trying to bring to the attention of the honourable House is this rural development programme. I believe that the honourable gentlemen sitting on the other side at this present moment, especially the three in the Liberal Opposition, know in their own hearts and souls that that Rural Development Authority Programme to date has been a success (full stop) and that it has created jobs for our people.

There is no question about that. In order to talk about anything you can only be as tall or as short as when you compare yourself to somebody else. The honourable member for White Bay South is back in his seat and I am happy to see him back. I do not know what the administrations past, especially say from 1965 or 1966 on to 1971, I do not know what they were thinking about as far as rural development goes in that Community and Social Development Department. I think it failed miserably. He had men down there who supposedly, academically, theoretically were top-notch men but somehow or another they were not able to develop or did not want to, they were too highfalutin or something, to come up with a sound sensible, reasonable programme for rural Newfoundland.

We have succeeded in doing that and it aggravates to no end some honourable members on the other side. It has and I am speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, because the honourable gentlemen on the other side; "Regret the failure of the administration

to introduce adequate programmes to reduce the extremely high numbers of our people who unemployed." This government, this administration have attempted over the past year and a-half or two years to do something about this. We are not in a position as a government to completely eliminate all the unemployment problems in this province. It must be remembered too, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of people who fish in this province and make a good annual wage and there are quite a few of them, who apply for unemployment insurance and they are counted as among the number that are unemployed.

They are not really unemployed, they are down mending their nets.

MR. NEARY: How do they collect unemployment insurance if they are not unemployed? Do not be so foolish.

MR. PECKFORD: No, that is not right what the honourable member is saying there. You can collect. You are unemployed in one sense of speaking but as far as the fishermen go they are not. That is the kind of employment that they have and it dictates that they have three or four months in the winter when they mend their nets and do other things to get ready for the fishing season in the spring. That is not to alter the fact that there are still too many people unemployed in this province today than there should be. There are too many people unemployed in Ontario than there should. There are too many people unemployed just about anywhere in the world, not only in Canada. It still does not detract from the fact that this administration have attempted through a programme to try to eliminate some of the unemployment that does exist. That is the point. Have we done anything or have we not? That is the question. The answer to that is; yes we have done something. We have tried to eliminate the unemployment situation but it is not an easy task when you take over and within two years try to bring the unemployment rate down to a level that economists would agree would be almost zero unemployment or something within the Western World, which would be about four or five per cent.



That is not an easy thing to do in this province. There are a lot of factors mitigating against an administration's policy to eliminate unemployment. It is not just a simple matter of saying; "Let us bring in a programme this year or this month and we will bring the unemployment rate down three or four per cent." It is not all that simple. Anybody who tries to make it that simple is just trying to obscure the real facts of the situation.

The only point I am trying to make here, Mr. Speaker, on unemployment, is simply that I contend, that I submit that this administration have attempted and are attempting and will continue to attempt to introduce programmes that will reduce unemployment. Related to this is the social assistance programme over the last year and what we have tried to do. We had in 1972 something like 7,300 people getting able-bodied relief. These are men who were able to work but could not find work. I think that is what it was, somewhere around 7,300.

AN HON. MEMBER: Over 9,000.

MR. PECKFORD: 7,300 is the figure I am relating to and now it is down to 4,800 or 4,900. There were 7,300 able-bodied people in this province last year who were getting able-bodied assistance, getting relief, getting the dole. Twelve months later there were only 4,900. Where did they go? They all went to Toronto or Halifax? By far the majority stayed in this province and went to work. I know of individuals now, I can give their names, Mr. Speaker, and I will be only too glad to give them to members opposite, in my district and in the honourable member's District of White Bay South, who were - I know of one gentleman who was on able-bodied relief for about six years and this past year he got a job. As a result, directly, of the Rural Development Authority Programme, he was taken off able-bodied relief.

Although it is not always politically wise, from a raw politics point of view, and this administration is going to continue



to be criticized this way, it is sensible for a welfare officer in a regional office to say to a young man twenty-two years old who comes in looking for a dole order or relief order, which was not done before, I know because I was a welfare officer under the previous administration and I know what I am talking about, it is only right and proper to the taxpayers of this province for that welfare officer to say to that client; "Sir, have you tried to get a job?" If he says; "Yes I have." He asks him; "Where?" and "has he registered with Canada Manpower or has he not." If he has not he does not qualify and he has to prove to the welfare officer in that area that he has contacted X number of employers and that he is registered with Canada Manpower and he is willing to accept work, at least in that area, call it Central Newfoundland, call it Western Newfoundland or call it Southern Newfoundland.

That is the kind of thing that this administration is doing to try to stimulate people who are unemployed and who get in that rut and do not want to work or who only want a job for a month or so or until November when they can go in a shoot a few moose on the ski doo or catch a few rabbits, snare a few rabbits. That might sound like, in the academic sense, a great life and really I suppose it is in an academic sense or a poetic sense but from a purely governmental point of view, from the point of view of getting people to work, economically it is a disaster. It is a total disaster.

The whole life style of rural Newfoundland to some extent it mitigates against

total employment in that area. Although you can say a lot of good things about the life style of it, it still hurts the province. It still makes it harder on the taxpayer who works twelve months of the year around.

Unemployment insurance programme - although it is a wonderful thing, it is really hurting as far as employment goes. It really hurts. A person who contributes - you see it is a fallacy. It is a fiction. A lot of people on unemployment insurance believe that because - they do not want to believe anything else of course - but they say, well, I paid into that fund, therefore I should get my money back. If that client had to get back what he paid in, he would be on unemployment for three or four days. He might get a week out of it. The unemployment insurance will keep going on and the Federal Government will have to -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You can get as much as ten days out of it.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, sometimes you get as much as ten days but here they are on it for two or three months. This hurts the economy of the province, no question about it. So, I think the majority of people, the middle class and working people of this province and of everywhere else have very often, to me and I am sure to just about everybody else, mentioned about the high unemployment insurance rates; number one and for the length of time that that person gets it. It helps keep the individual who might not be all that energetic and full of initiative from becoming more productive. That is the point. It helps keep him in that psychological frame of mind which allows him three or four months in the woods each year snaring rabbits and getting his meat from the moose and really being a liability on the country, on the Federal Government particularly, and possibly then, if his unemployment insurance runs out, on the provincial government because he comes looking for able-bodied assistance. Well, I say he should not get it.

unless he proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that he has tried hard to get work.

The only problem there is when you are dealing with a family man and he has five or six children. Then you are into trouble because you have to make sure that they are looked after.

Another programme, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial government has had some doings in to try to reduce unemployment and to try to help make our country, our province more productive, is the Capital Assistance Plan that was signed with Ottawa, this programme that is to assist farmers which under the old scheme - the scheme is still in - a farmer who wants to clear land would get \$125 an acre from the provincial government. It was not a loan. It was a grant. He would get \$125 just to clear an acre of land. That programme is still in.

In addition to that provincial programme, which is still there, is this Capital Assistance Programme where any bona fide farmer can apply and get assistance to clear his land up to \$200 an acre, not \$125, and get a grant of \$6,000 or \$7,000 for buildings to put on that land and more money besides that. That is not known - it is only known by the farmers of this province and it is known by hardly anybody else. Here is a programme to help put more land in this province under cultivation. If you are going -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Well, this is one way, Mr. Speaker, this is one way. When the honourable member for Labrador North gets up, no doubt he will laud the Rural Development Authority Programme too. So, he will give more advertisement to the government's great programmes, and he will also laud this forest policy, and he will also laud this capital assistance programme. I can almost sit down, Mr. Speaker, and let the honourable member for Labrador North speak now because I know quite well that he too will laud all these great programmes.

He can hardly constrain himself now from getting up and to do just what he suggested a few minutes ago. I will try to stay up. I will try to stay on my feet and I will try not to give way to the honourable member for Labrador North because I know his comments will all be favourable towards what the government has done over the last two years.

So, this Capital Assistance Programme is another attempt because if you have to clear land, Mr. Speaker, and if you have to put crops in the ground, somebody must do it, it is not all done by machines, so hence you are going to attract more people into the agricultural industry and you are going to put more people to work. If you put more people to work, hopefully then you help offset the unemployment rate that exists. So, that is another programme relatively unknown by the people of this province. It has been signed by the provincial government, since we came into office, with the federal government to increase the amount of money to farmers, to try to attract more people into that industry so that we can produce more of our own crops, especially root crops like potatoes, turnips and so on, so that we can become more self sufficient rather than have to rely on Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick or other parts of Canada for those products.

So, these are policies, Mr. Speaker, that have been introduced by this administration, that have been pursued by this administration to try to offset the unemployment rate. I think that they can stand in their own place. It is quite easy with those programmes before you to show without any doubt that the administration has attempted in ways that it can do to reduce the cost of living or at least offset it for those people on low incomes and those people on welfare, to try to ease the blow to those and at the same time, through the seven per cent heating oil reduction, to help all people, regardless of their wages, with the spiraling costs of living.

Then it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, because it is also mentioned

in this amendment. I have covered the "rapidly rising cost of living" as I have the "regrets the failure of the administration to introduce adequate programmes to reduce the extremely high numbers of our people who are unemployed" and then finally, thirdly, Mr. Speaker, "regrets the failure of the administration to introduce adequate programmes to bring public services up to an acceptable level throughout all parts of this province."

As somebody mentioned the other day, Mr. Speaker - I think it was on this side of the House - to bring public services to an acceptable level, you know, that word acceptable sort of gets in the way there because it is debatable what ones means by acceptable. It is no secret but the point must be made when you have honourable gentlemen on the other side being the way they are, that the budget for this past year, 1973, was an increase over the budget for 1972 and so on as you go back. In just about every department in the government, related to public services, the government was spending more money than the year before. Just about in every area of government, that is a fact and it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, when ones talks about dollars and cents and all the rest of it

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do we have a quorum, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: We have a quorum.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, to even compound, Mr. Speaker, the inconsistency of the opposition, we even had a clash between the honourable member for Bell Island and the Leader of the Opposition today.

Yes, it is real freedom. You know all about freedom. The honourable member for White Bay South knows all about that. I saw him more than once when I was sitting up in the galleries of this House of Assembly years ago, all about freedom, he was frightened to death to speak, afraid the honourable gentleman who sat in that seat there was going to crush him right to the floor. He knows all about freedom. I can tell the honourable member for White Bay South an awful lot about freedom, do not worry about that because you performed for two or three years and you performed just the other day another example of intellectual, not dishonesty but fright, scared.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: That is right. That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us about it.

MR. PECKFORD: I am not going to pursue it. The honourable member for White Bay South -

MR. WOODWARD: No prompting from the audience.

MR. PECKFORD: On the business of the expenditures of the province in public services which is related directly to the third part of the opposition amendment of nonconfidence in this administration, I remember years ago teaching a high school course in economics where the students were always fascinated by the fact that Canada became a country in 1867 and was in debt in 1868 and that from there on, and they could not sort of grasp the concept of deficit financing or that it was a natural phenomena in the world, that most countries worked under that kind of an operation whereas families and so on, well even today they do, but they themselves had a job to grasp it.

The major current account expenditure for 1973-1974, the interesting thing there to note -

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that why you gave up teaching?

MR. PECKFORD: No, I gave up teaching, Sir, because I saw that I could serve my country even better -



AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: It was necessary to eliminate the Liberal members for Green Bay from 1949 to 1971, they were very consistent, unlike the honourable crowd over there now, they were very consistent, they never visited the district. They did not do anything for the district. They did not care about the district and it was only because of the independent initiative of some of the people in Springdale and other areas of Green Bay that they ever got anything done and that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that I had to put down that great profession of teaching and to put my energies into another field.

The first expenditure item under major current account expenditures was interest on the public debt - \$66.5 million and that the next one to that, Mr. Speaker, that was the highest, the next to that came teachers salaries and then on down through for other things. It is interesting to note that this province, although the point has been made clearly perhaps to everybody in this province by the Minister of Finance, not only in the last two years but since 1968 or 1969, that we find ourselves financially in a sort of a bind regarding dollars but the point still has to be made when you are talking about a government, especially the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in the seventies spending money, the point always has to be made that a large portion of the monies raised by this province, through taxes and revenues, must be spent on just debt charges and interest on our debt and so on.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is still a fact that even though we have the Labrador Linerboard business around our necks and trying to make it work, and that was a major achievement, besides having that and having the Health Sciences Complex over here which is a very expensive operation for this government, besides having the oil refinery agreement which we renegotiated and hence got ourselves out of a guaranteed situation, it did not mean dollars out of the pocket but it

could possibly mean that if the first refinery did not work, then we would be responsible for that money, getting ourselves out of that situation.

Even after all of these things, even after trying to bring Labrador Linerboard and get it on its feet, even renegotiating the oil refinery agreement and the Health Science Complex, after all that money was expended we were still able in last year's budget to increase the amount of money spent on public services around this province and in relation to salaries and so on, besides the minimum wage. One can easily recollect clearly last year all the various strikes and threats of strike and in many cases the increases in wages of people working for the government went up anywhere from five to ten, twelve per cent per year. So here was another sensible and reasonable approach that the government took and increased substantially the wages of many people who were employed with the province. So this should help offset the cost of living as well. You can look almost anywhere in the budget for last year and find that to be true.

In Education for example, in Education in 1972-1973 the provincial government spent \$144 million. In 1973-1974 they spent \$164 million. \$144 million in 1972-1973 and \$164 million in 1973-1974.

In the Department of Health where we spent \$95 million in 1972-1973, we spent \$116 million in this present fiscal year and so it goes all down through. Even in Social Services we were able to take able-bodied people off relief and bring them back into the work force, even in that department the amount allocated this present year is \$49 million compared with \$46 million the year before that. Rehabilitation and Recreation; an increase - \$13 million from \$12 million; Justice - an increase; Manpower and Industrial Relations, an increase

So, Mr. Speaker, when one takes into consideration our financial predicament in relation to our provincial debt and what has to be

paid there, one takes into consideration the problems with the Labrador Linerboard Limited and the amount of money that has to be spent there, one takes into consideration the money that is being spent on the Health Sciences Complex and so on, then for somebody to say, whether they are on the other side of the House or on this side or outside this House, to say that this government has failed in trying to improve public services in this province, you know it makes one wonder, I am sure, in my own opinion, in my own humble opinion, I am sure there are other amendments or motions that they could bring in which would be far more relevant, far more constructive and can far better test this administration, far better, if they thought about it.

I think the main problem with the opposition, Mr. Speaker, is simply that they work from day to day, the same way that Liberal Administration did for the last ten or fifteen years it was in power. It is an ad hoc arrangement. It is a day-to-day type thing and that there is no real research goes into their various motions but suddenly they get this brilliant idea in or out of caucus and the motion is hurriedly, this is the impression I get, it is hurriedly made up and presented in an attempt to indicate to the populus of the province that they are being effective, when in actual fact, to anybody who is really looking at them, they are being all the more ineffective with this kind of an approach.

So, Mr. Speaker, in public services, it really cannot be said that this administration is failing. Health Science Complex, total cost of project - Health Science Complex - \$45.3 million. Prior to 1973-1974, prior to this present fiscal year, before that, it was \$8.6 million. In 1973-1974 Health Science Complex - \$13 million. In 1974-1975 it is supposed to be \$15 million. If anybody wants to find out,

Mr. Speaker, some of the facts about the financial arrangements of this government on what we are spending and what we are not spending can easily be found in this - Carbonear Regional Hospital prior to 1973-1974 it was \$1.1 million, the total cost of the project was \$11 million. We are not doing anything for public services? We are continuing the Health Science Complex \$13 million this year; Carbonear Regional Hospital \$5 million this year; the Western Memorial Hospital in Corner Brook \$5.9 million this year; the Twillingate Hospital \$2.5 million this year. Is the Health Science Complex, is the Carbonear Regional Hospital, is the Western Memorial Hospital, is the Twillingate Hospital, is this a service that the government of this province provides for the people of this province? Does that come under their amendment? Is that what they are talking about? Or is health excluded? Do you suddenly exclude health or is health included under this amendment?

"To introduce adequate programmes to bring public services up to an acceptable level." Is this an attempt by this administration to do that because they are spending \$13 million, \$5 million, \$2.9 million, \$2.5 million on various health services around this province? Is that an attempt to bring the health services of this province to an adequate level? Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid so, it is. It is a pretty honest and earnest attempt. There are a lot of millions. That amounts to in total for 1973-1974 to \$13.2 million on capital projects on health in this province, \$13.2 million.

In the next fiscal year in 1974-1975 - \$26 million.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: This present year I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, it has been \$26.4 million this year and next year it will be \$30 million just in the health field. This relates directly to their amendment to bring public services up to an acceptable level.

Well I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is an attempt by the government to do exactly what they are saying we are not doing. Here are the facts millions of dollars, \$26.4 million. Yet they say we have failed in this regard.

Labrador Linerboard and its borrowing commitments, it is just tremendous.

Forestry and Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, Forestry and Agriculture: Have the government lagged? Here is another service we provide, here is another department of government. In 1972-1973, we spend \$11 million in the Forestry and Agriculture Department. In 1973-1974 we spent \$16 million.

Fisheries - there is the one that the honourable the Member for Fogo is interested in, the fisheries one. I am a member being in this honourable House back in 1968-1969 and so on and seeing the estimates going through when I think it was as low as \$2 million and \$3 million I think spent in the Department of Fisheries in a given year, \$3 million or \$4 million at the most.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, \$5 million.

MR. PECKFORD: Five million was the last when you were there. Do you know what it is today, double, Sir, \$10,093,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: This present year. Yes, this year I am talking about now, 1973-1974, \$10 million. Now the last year of the Liberal Administration so the honourable the Member for Fogo tells me, the last year that he was Minister of Fisheries that he can remember, they spent \$5 million. Now you know it does not take too much -

AN HON. MEMBER: To add five and five together.

MR. PECKFORD: No it does not take too much to add five and five, to show that we have doubled our budget in fisheries. Now we must be trying to do something in fisheries. We must be trying to do something but it says here we have not, you know, "the failure of the administration to introduce adequate programmes to bring public services to an acceptable level." Here is an attempt to do just that.

AN HON. MEMBER: George McLean (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: Mines and Engery is a very interesting one to me, \$22 million this year and \$17 million the year before.



Tourism \$7 million from \$5 million.

Rural Development \$4 million from \$3 million. There you have it.

Municipal Affairs and Housing, \$31 million in 1973-1974 from \$20 million, the year before that. Now that is one department, Mr. Speaker, one department where the word "services" really bangs home, really hits home because it is here where you get all the water and sewerage facilities and so on that so many of the municipalities around this province are crying out for today. It is very, very significant to note that in 1972-1973 we spend \$20 million in that Department of Municipal Affairs. In 1973-1974, \$31 million. Fantastic, what an increase! What the Hon. Joseph R. Smallwood would not do with those figures in this honourable House today is nobody's question at all. I can see him now saying that \$30 million, it would take him at least one hour. I mean you would have to give him an extension of time, Mr. Speaker, because it would take him at least one hour to discuss that Municipal Affairs and Housing one. An increase from \$20 million to the next year \$31 million. Not \$22 million, not \$24 million, not \$29 million but \$31 million spent on facilities around this province to help give them water, to help give them sewerage, to help make their lives more acceptable, to help give them the kind of life that I saw in Toronto when I was up there last week. This is the kind of thing -

MR. THOMS: At least Joey would have his name, not boring.

MR. PECKFORD: Well, Sir, the honourable Member for Bonavista North - that is quite ironic. The honourable the Member for Bonavista North I do not know how he would ever know anything about being boring. Does that word come naturally to you, Sir, or did it just suddenly pop in your mind. I have a sneaky suspicion that for some unusual reason that kind of a word would come into your mind for a given reason. I think I know the answer to it.

But just about in every department of



government, Mr. Speaker, here is the point. In just about every department of government there has been a significant increase in the amount spent in the various service departments. Yet, this amendment says; "Regrets the failure of the administration to introduce adequate programmes to bring the public services up to a sensible level throughout all parts of the province."

I think it can be shown factually, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment has no place in this honourable place at this time. No place whatsoever. It should never have been brought in. It was a mistake on the part of the opposition. They have shown now, through the election expenses bill, through their attitude on the forest policy and now their attitude on the Speech from the Throne that they are totally inconsistent, that they are totally in disarray over there and then, to personify that inconsistency and that disarray, the honourable member from Bell Island almost drove the honourable Leader of the Opposition out of the House at the beginning of this session today. He told him to keep quiet.

Just imagine! Telling his leader -

AN HON. MEMBER: They would never do that before.

MR. PECKFORD: They would never do that before, Mr. Speaker, that if for sure. That is for sure. Not only in their personal activities when the House opens are they in disarray but in their strategy, Mr. Speaker, in their strategy. At the one time try to shelve a great programme that we are trying to bring like the forest policy which has been studied to death over the last decade and which will help reduce unemployment in this province. Shelve that and then with the election expense bill, to ask the government to bring in legislation in thirty days, something that is a new concept that has not been discussed by this honourable House and which anyway the government have under advisement. Go ahead with that which is not going to make any difference to the cost of living, which is not going to make any difference to unemployment, which

is not going to make any difference to public services, take that kind of a bill which is not going to have anything to do to improve what they want improved and push it through in thirty days. But a forest policy which dictates in its legislation a change whereby more people will get employment from the forest industry to help reduce unemployment, that kind of a policy, shelve that one.

If that does not show their inconsistency, at the one time saying we have done nothing with the cost of living, have not done anything with unemployment, have done nothing with public services and then, in the next breath, when a new reform comes into the House to refuse to allow it to go through or to attempt to obstruct its passage so that we can help reduce unemployment in this province.

If you can tell me, Mr. Speaker, where there is any consistency by the opposition - the opposition is in disarray. Their leadership is in question and has been since the day the Leader of the Opposition took office in that position. Nobody knows what to do about it over there. The honourable member for Bell Island would like to do something about it but he is a bit afraid because he does not have provincial support. His support comes primarily from his constituency.

AN HON. MEMBER: He does not have many of them now.

MR. PECKFORD: The honourable member for Hermitage who is now in the House, he would love to do something about it. He would love to do something about it but then again he has to wait for a while. He has to wait for a while because he does not know how the - the honourable member for Bonavista North, I do not think he is going to run for the leadership yet. I do not if he has ambitions that way, I do not think he does. He does not know what to do about it. He is still faithful to the leader over there and the honourable member for Fogo really does not care. He is out to do a good job for his constituency. He really does not care that

much.

AN HON. MEMBER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is relevant to the amendment. Could you bring the honourable member to order?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I can speak to that point of order, I am relevant because I am trying to show that even amongst themselves they are being inconsistent in their strategy and this is my point. They are inconsistent in bringing in this kind of an amendment. In their whole approach to this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure the honourable member is aware of the rule of relevancy and he was straying from that. I would caution him to be a little more relevant as he continues his speech.

MR. PECKFORD: The point I am trying to make is that they do not know what they are doing over there and hence this amendment has no place being there. The cost of living in the areas of jurisdiction where we have control we have tried to do something. As far as unemployment goes, in the areas where we could do something we have tried to do something. In the areas of public services we have increased the budgets of all the departments relating to that, over from 1972 - 1973 to 1973 - 1974. That amendment has no place being there at all. It is a waste of time of the House even to discuss it. It was ridiculous for the opposition to bring it in. It shows their inefficiency, their ineffectiveness in this honourable House.

There are other amendments that the opposition, if they researched properly could bring in to better test this administration than this kind of a thing. It was hurriedly done, it shows their inconsistency, it shows they are not being effective. They are just out to try to make headlines thinking that the public of this province are just as gullible in 1974 as they were in 1964, when they should know better. Then, their whole leadership problem is in question as well.

MR. WINSOR: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. PECKFORD: No, I will not permit a question. No. Sorry!

MR. WINSOR: That is the first time I ever saw such discourtesy of a member, not to permit a question.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is the comment of the century. That is a gem, Mr. Speaker. In that case, Mr. Speaker -

MR. WINSOR: It is very unusual. It is very unusual.

MR. PECKFORD: In that case, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman from Fogo has not been in his seat very much in this honourable House.

MR. WINSOR: It is the first time I have ever seen it.

MR. PECKFORD: If is the first time the honourable member has seen it he just indicated to me - my impression of the honourable member for Fogo, my admiration for him has just gone right down the drain. In this honourable House in this session that has happened. That has happened. Honourable members on this side have asked questions of members on the other side and they have sneeringly refused to answer and sarcastically asked us to put it on the Order Paper. Then the honourable member has the gaul to say to me, Mr. Speaker, because I refused to -

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. What the honourable member is now talking about is questions on Orders of the Day not an ordinary question asked by a member when an honourable member is speaking. Most every member that I

recall would extend that courtesy to any member.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the honourable gentleman's point of order was but if it is and I will try to clarify it for him because I do not think he knows himself what he is trying to say but if he is trying to say that I am talking about questions between members rather than the amendment that is true. The only reason why I am doing it, Mr. Speaker, is because the honourable member attracted me into that kind of discussion. So, I do not know if you want to rule on some kind of a point of order that the honourable member from Fogo was trying to make. I do not know what it is but I will leave it to your discretion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure that the honourable member from Fogo is aware that he can only ask a question if the person then speaking permits him to do so. That is generally understood. As for the so called point of order raised by the honourable member for Fogo, I think he was merely rising to make a point concerning the debate between him and the member from Green Bay and it was not really a point of order at all.

MR. PECKFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I thought I was - the honourable member was not sure what he was talking about. So, on all points dealing with this amendment, on all points, this amendment has no place being where it is. The Government is attempting on all three points to pursue and to try to reduce the cost of living, to reduce the number of people who are unemployed and to bring more public services to all the people of this Province. I say, Mr. Speaker, sincerely, that when the Opposition, as they should, bring in amendments that they get together a little more frequently and a little more - do a little more research and bring in amendments which are more effective in testing the performance of this administration, not something foolishly concocted, some which, anyway, relates more to the Federal Government, their own Liberal Federal Government, than it does to the present administration, provincially. If they would just spend a little more time doing a little more research, they can bring in more effective amendments which would better



test the government's performance and also help them by bringing in that kind of an amendment, to give better government to this Province because if they were effective amendments then they would keep the Government more alert and more determined to bring in other programmes on that kind of an amendment. That is what they should be doing and that is where they are failing.

I have got a sneaky suspicion, Mr. Speaker, that a number of the honourable gentlemen on the other side agree with those sentiments and there is where the main problem lies. Better government does not mean that the party in power keeps on getting better. Better government means that when you have a constructive opposition who will bring in testing and effective amendments and nonconfidence motions that are worth discussion, that when these things occur then better government by definition will occur.

What is happening is that the Opposition is not playing its rightful role and it is just bringing in such amendments for the sake of bringing them in to try to pretend to the public that they are being effective when in actual fact, the effectiveness is just not there.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for us to soon vote on this amendment and get it out of the way so we can get on to more serious business of this Province to try to do the things that are necessary to make the Province even do better in the next six or seven months than it has been doing in the past. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member from Labrador North.

MR. MELVIN WOODWARD (Labrador North): Mr. Speaker, very impressive. The honourable member for Green Bay, from the Premier's office, I am sure that tonight all our Indians in Davis Inlet are so motivated that they will no doubt have a good pow-wow and the great rejoicing in the things that the honourable member has said will ring out through this land and the great White God - and we will no doubt have the filming much earlier of the White Esquimaux than we had expected; which will take place this summer. Such nonsense, MR. Speaker, such truck, for a member of the House to get up - the same programmes, if he had to



sit and listen to the honourable member for Bell Island who has named every programme that he mentioned, the Health Science, the hospital in Carbonear, that was all started by the former Liberal administration and then he gets up and says, "Look at the money we are spending on it".

Money is committed to those programmes by legislation, Mr. Speaker and there is no way that this particular administration could reverse that. If they could, no doubt, they maybe would have stopped the construction of the Health Science Complex as well as the hospital in Carbonear. They tried to stop the causeway across to Twillingate. The honourable, my colleague and honourable friend from Twillingate, in this House on a number of occasions had to get up and plead with the Government and then Minister of Transportation and Communications to get that programme going, and here for the honourable member, right from the Premier's office - I hope that he is not expounding on the Premier's philosophy of developing government or setting up adequate programmes to take care of this administration in this Province. If he is, Mr. Speaker, he is sure letting that honourable Premier down because I am sure that the people in this House today as well as the people on the outside, where you have his message going out to the airways of this Province, would not be too impressed.

We had that sad situation happen in the House here yesterday where a number of our honourable cabinet ministers fell asleep when we had the honourable member for St. John's North moving a motion. Yes, yesterday they fell asleep. Well, their eyes were closed, I did not here them snore, I heard some rumblings coming from over there. I do not know if this is the case or not.

Mr. Speaker, getting on a serious note. When we look at the amendment and when I look at the body of the amendment; they introduced adequate programmes to lessen the severe impact on our people of the rapidly high cost of living. When you live in Labrador, then it is very easy to speak on this particular motion because there is no type of programme that this Government has put into being or introduced that is at all affecting our people in that part of the Province.

Rural development, two grants in rural development, two grants.  
Mr. Speaker, if I was - I have here - I followed the rural development  
the rural development team throughout Labrador.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WOODWARD: It is bad.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: In three days they begin inspections.

MR. WOODWARD: You know, this is no reflection on the people who had the report written. When we think in terms of your going into a strange land, not when you are going to a community in your own province but this was written as if you were going into a wilderness, as if you are going to Mozambique and you are going into the jungle to visit people. On Monday, July 16, the first community visited was Nain. There were findings of the groups whereby the community consist of two areas, one comprising of the population of native Eskimos. Oh yes, there are native Eskimos living in the community of Nain - This is what they discovered - who are living under primitive conditions. Those people are living under primitive conditions in that community without running water or sewer facilities available and substandard housing. That is bad.

The native Eskimo expressed interest in some of the community amenities. Do you marvel at that? They said they would like to have a little bit of water and sewerage or a little bit of community road programme. They expressed an interest in having this.

MR. ROBERTS: Did they not take along their suitcases and give it to them?

MR. WOODWARD: Generally the people are dependent on the Labrador North services who are the supplier of consumer goods and who also is the marketing agency for their produce from the fishing industry, mainly salmon and Arctic char.

I will read the last paragraph in this particular report on - "There is an area of concentration of social development that could be undertaken to improve the facilities in the community which would inevitably get people to react and would help eliminate some of the apathy or the feeling of colonization which exists among the people." Now, we have discovered for the first time that we have not yet - we have been in the Confederation for twenty-three years - those people

have now discovered for the first time that they were still living back in the colonial age, in that primitive community. Now, Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is when people go into a community in their own province, if we are to consider Nain as an integral part of this province, when they go in with that type of attitude and they express those words, I would marvel at the minister traveling into the community of even Bonne Bay and saying: "Okay! Let us write what is happening to Bonne Bay. Bonne Bay is divided into two parts, Woody Point and Norris Point." Those are the attitudes. This is the way that they see those problems that exist in Labrador.

I can read the report and we can go on. The next community visited was Davis Inlet where the community is inhabited by Naskaupi Indians. There are Naskaupi Indians in that community. Tonight, because of the member for Green Bay, from the Premier's office no doubt the word has gone out over the airways, the great tidings of rejoicing, that this administration is bring to that community and no doubt that there is going to be a big powwow and we are going to consume some home-brew in that community tonight, Mr. Speaker.

I had not meant to get into, in the first portion of my speech, talking about rural development but it was prompted from the member for Bonavista South. I will go on again - "Indians who are resettled from Nutak and Hebron." There is no such thing as indians being resettled from Nutak or Hebron. Indians were resettled from across the border into Quebec and the Eskimos were brought down from Nutak and Hebron and settled in Nain. Here the community is dependent on Northern Labrador Services who operates a supply store and acts as a marketing agency for the produce from the fishing industry which is salmon and char.

Northern Labrador Services also purchases skins from the natives which are acquired from the limited hunting in the area. Some handicrafts which are produced in the craft workshops are sold

to tourists visiting from the coastal boat. You know, Mr. Speaker, how many tourists go ashore in Davis Inlet from the coastal boat? Two tourists go ashore from the coastal boat. Do you know how they get ashore? They go ashore in the mail boat. When the mail boat is put over the side to take the mail into the community, they take two tourists on board because this is all the boat can hold. We do not have a docking facility for the tourists to get ashore. There are two people who go up and travel in the community for a period of ten or fifteen minutes while the mail is being put ashore on the wharf and they take the mail off. This is the extent of the tourists visiting and buying from the handicraft shop in the community of Davis Inlet.

We are going to resolve that problem too, Mr. Speaker, through no effort of that honourable crowd on that side of the House. I have gone on to my good colleague in Ottawa, Mr. Rompkey, and he has seen fit to put in his budget for this year sufficient funds to erect a suitable wharf so that the tourists can go in, Mr. Speaker, into the community and then leisurely walk up through and do a little mainstreeting and window shopping and see primitive conditions.

I had a little note here and I will refer back to the Address in Reply - the honourable member for Bonavista South spoke in the Address in Reply and he said, "Mr. Speaker, this island province ..."  
"This Island province," that is indication enough to me of his concern.

for the mainland portion of our province. It does not even exist unless he wants a few of his fishermen to go down from his district and rob a few trap berths of some poor guy or some poor fishermen in David's Inlet or Hopedale just to deprive him of making a living. Salmon berths: I will deal with that later too, Mr. Speaker. I will deal with that. I do not care if it were twenty years today or tomorrow but what has the honourable member done or his administration. I was a Minister of Labrador Affairs in the dying day for six months. Even if I had been the Minister of Labrador Affairs for two years - I knew what those problems were at that time. They would have been corrected. What have we seen? We have seen a report commissioned for Donald Snowden to go in, to antagonize, to study, to read into the eyes of people - where are you from? Let me take a look at your. I think you came off Baffin Island. No the squint in your eyes is not enough, you must be from the Western Arctic, you are squinted in the other direction. This is the scrutiny, the antagonistic ways that the commission conducted their study, the same thing as is today. Stupid!

You believe in government and you believe in serving the needs of people. Well there are a number of people in this province my good friend who have real needs. If you go to David's Inlet and walk into the houses and visit with them, the same as I have, you will see their needs. What have we done? What type of programmes have we or you or your administration in this province to meet the needs of those native people? What are they?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, I do not care what happened in twenty years. I have just gotten the government to correct some of those inadequacies. Negative thinking - why do you not come out positively with something and say yes, this is one way, Sir, you can correct that. I will go back to Joe Smallwood; I will go back to Alderdice; I will go back to the days when we went on the Labrador Coast and we had no settlers on the



coast but today for your information my friend, Mr. Speaker - I will tell the honourable members my views. I will tell the honourable members what the views are going to be.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD Constructive views, to set up an original government in that portion of the province and put in adequate funding into that region, not to have - there is such an imbalance which exists between that portion. The Hon. Member for Labrador South - I do care about his political views but I share most of his ideas and the way to counteract the inadequacies which exist and this is what we are referring to here in the amendment, Mr. Speaker. The big problem is - I will tell the honourable members what the problems are. It is the province's attitude, their attitude of the people. When I look in the eyes of the people on the other side of the House and I know and feel their involvement and what they are going to do for Labrador, I get sick in the guts!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, I get sick in the guts! I know and I can read in my own mind what I must - what are we going to accomplish? We are going to accomplish nothing. We cannot motivate one minister to go up and even visit in the area.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD: They took away the Department of Labrador Affairs, rather than putting a \$5 million or \$10 million or \$15 million budget into the department and setting up an administration where they could touch the people, what did they do? They abolished it. What do we have in Labrador today? We have less today, Mr. Speaker, than we had two years ago. We have far less today than we had two years ago and the feeling of the people in most of the communities is that we are not looking for too much, we are not expecting too much because we know - it is not a matter of financing, Mr. Speaker. It is merely a matter of the attitudes of an administration that will not give

freely to that portion of the province. Before I go on with more generalities, I will touch on a few of the subjects.

We have a Forestry Task Force, the bill that the honourable minister brought before the House and a bill, hopefully, that will get passed. That Forestry Task Force, Mr. Speaker, consists of a number of experts. There are forty-three or forty-four drawn from all fields of forestry throughout North America. What concentration did they do on Labrador? Their involvement in the total Labrador forest was merely a guesstimate. We will guess what is here; we will guess what is there. There were no in depth studies. Maybe when the bill is going through Committee of the Whole, the honourable minister can tell the House what plans he has to conduct a comprehensive study of the forests in Labrador and not merely to go in and say we guess we have "x" number of cords. Those are the problems.

Mr. Speaker, they saw fit to bring into this House a half completed Forestry Task Force, completed for the island portion of the province with no involvement, nothing, as far as the Labrador forest is concerned. We have waited a number of years, Mr. Speaker, for someone to get involved to harvest the forests in Labrador. The honourable minister is saying that the over-mature wood, the dry, rotten wood, is not to the extent that it is here on the island. I question that, Mr. Speaker. I question the fact that if the honourable minister were sitting in Goose Bay three years ago, when we were exporting wood, pulp wood to France and saw the portion of wood that was culled for that export market, it was more like sixty per cent than thirty per cent that exists on this island. Shiploads arrived in France and were turned down.

The same thing applies today. You can go into the marketing area of the stockpile where Labrador Linerboard are piling their wood, the eighty odd thousand cords that they left on the wharf and in the woods at Goose Bay this year and did not arrange the shipping to get it down through the island or get it down to the mill in Stephenville.

MR. ROBERTS: How does that work?

MR. WOODWARD: Well you can - eighty thousand cords of woods at \$75 a cord, that is about \$6 million worth of inventory.

MR. ROBERTS: Just left there.

MR. WOODWARD: Just left there. I can go a little bit further, Mr. Speaker, I am not that critical of Labrador Linerboard Limited per se as a Crown Corporation, I do not think we have any right in this House, or I have any right to be critical of the Linerboard Company itself, those people are working very hard. But I am very critical, we had in this House last year and the year before, we heard from the honourable Minister of Finance, how they would set up that woods harvesting operation in Goose Bay and what measures of efficiency they would inject into that operation.

Mr. Speaker, that operation has not improved. That operation has not improved simply because of the fact that they have not attracted permanent management to sit in Goose Bay, Labrador, and run that operation.

A friend of mine, the manager of the woods operation, a brother to the Minister of Forestry, a very capable man, maybe equally as capable as anyone else in this province to run a forest harvesting operation, but that man's time is split between spending two days in Goose Bay, another three days down in Stephenville, back to Goose Bay, back to Stephenville, over on the Mainland buying wood and someplace else, How can he organize and establish a permanent type operation? Mr. Speaker, he has no one. There is no one to render that assistance today. There is a logging foreman that has no experience. So we look at the reason why last year we were to produce two hundred and fifty

thousand cords of wood and ultimately ended up with one hundred and thirty thousand cords of wood; what an engineering firm would call a class "D" estimate. You can be over a hundred per cent. On the banks there are eighty thousand cords.

Those are the things that have been going on, Mr. Speaker. Those are the things and this is why they have been very fortunate. Labrador Linerboard as such had not invested, other than buying a mobile camp, any money in the Goose Bay Area, in fixed assets such as buildings to house their people. This has been all given to them by the cut-back in the Canadian Forces and by the cut-back in the M.O.T., when M.O.T. moved from the northside of the base over to the southside. They have been very fortunate in acquiring those facilities. They have not themselves put any effort into establishing permanent facilities to house and to facilitate that type of operation.

The sad and I think most dismal thing, and I will refer back to the Minister of Forestry when he presented his bill to the House that said shipping is a problem in Goose Bay. Shipping, poor facilities, is a problem in Goose Bay. It is indeed a great problem, Mr. Speaker, they have programmed for this year to put on two gulf carriers with original gross tonnage of some 30,000 tons, measuring in length some 530 feet and we have berth space on the wharf for them that consist of 400 feet.

MR. ROBERTS: Great planning.

MR. WOODWARD: They have not approached Ottawa. I think that the honourable Leader of the Opposition has been in contact with the authorities in Ottawa, Mr. Dubé from Public Works. They have not approached Ottawa to ask for assistance to put in suitable docking facilities to look after the operation. Consequently to that who is suffering in the community? Labrador Linerboard are using a public dock. This facility has a frontage of 800 feet.

In and out of the Port of Goose Bay last year we had 166 ships, not to include the shipping of some 90,000 cords of wood over that dock, and some 90,000 cords of wood represents somewhere in the area,

Mr. Speaker, of 180,000 tons of raw materials, close to 200,000 tons of raw materials.

Now when you think in terms of tons and just to give it to the House here, that is a massive bulk of raw materials, Mr. Speaker. Now in addition to that we have 30,000 tons of dry cargo going over the same pier. We had a community of 12,000 people utilizing that facility. We had a number of accidents where trucks coming down would hook a car and lift it away for 300 feet or 400 feet. Those were the hazards, the dangers but they have not seen fit to go and negotiate with the federal people who they say should put the facility in there. So this is the type of planning that the honourable member from the Premier's Office, the honourable member for Green Bay, is telling us that they have done so well. We have had another very disappointing aspect:

Two years of this administration, we were told in both elections in October of 1971 and in March of 1972 that there would be a Trans-Labrador Highway. "Our administration supports the Trans-Labrador Highway" and this Trans-Labrador Highway was mentioned in the first Throne Speech. I discovered a week ago, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications has not yet been able to arrange a meeting with Ottawa even to sit down and discuss and plan for a Trans-Labrador Highway. After two years this is utter disappointment. This is utter disappointment. This is the reason why when you travel throughout this province that the people are saying, Mr. Speaker; what is this administration doing? They cannot find it.

They cannot find it. This is the reason for it after two years. We have now discovered that there is no planning, there is no nothing done and Ottawa has not yet been approached with respects to building a Trans-Labrador Highway.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, we last year had a record year as far as highways and upgrading of roads and paved were concerned. We did not have one cubic yard of pavement laid in any community or on any highway, not in the community - Happy Valley had one-fifth of a mile but not in any community did we have one cubic yard of pavement in the whole of Labrador, out of a budget of some \$43 million.

On the road that connects Goose Bay with Northwest River, that does not connect the communities, Mr. Speaker, because there is a need for a bridge across the river, on that road there was \$100,000 spent in upgrading. That road have existed since 1958 and still there is no pavement on that road.

While I am on the subject of transportation, Mr. Speaker, and transportation to us, in that very remote mainland portion of the province it is something that we feel there is a great need for upgrading. I attended last week down at the Holiday Inn the hearings by the Canadian Transport Commission looking into the inadequacies



of air transportation in the Maritime Provinces.

At that meeting the Hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications gave a brief on behalf of his government. You know the substance, the crux of that whole brief, Mr. Speaker, was not what we need to bring Labrador closer to the Island of Newfoundland. That was not even mentioned. It is not what we do for our coastal communities by bringing the people in to a central point so that they can get into the streamline or the limelight I think but that brief was complaining about the Air Canada Service, now the service west of Montreal versus the service east of Montreal.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WOODWARD: That is what it was all about, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if I get a little emotional please bear with me because the honourable Yahoos on the other side of the House do not think this is serious. This is why the people in the province are going about saying what a bunch of Yahoos.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was ten years ago.

MR. WOODWARD: That was ten years ago, my foot, you were never serious and you will never be.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WOODWARD: Well those were the problems.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WOODWARD: I will refer, Mr. Speaker, when I think of my own district and the District of Labrador South - to an editorial, not only are the people in this province saying; "What are they doing?" An editorial in the "Evening Telegram" dating back some three weeks ago, who took issues with this government and said: "Why, why are the Moores or the Crosbie-Moores Administration prosecuting the Districts of Labrador North and Labrador South? What do they have against those two districts? Is it because of the Member for Labrador South is a New Labrador Party man, and is it because the Member for Labrador North is a Liberal?" They were amazed, Mr. Speaker, that there would be such a lack of interest and for those two districts to be ignored.

It is a sad thing. It is a very sad thing. This government  
promised and I will go back to this and I will

repeat it and I will repeat this issue because I believed in it and now I understand it it not being done. This Government promised to bring the administration of government to the people.

Mr. Speaker although you made a very brief visit to Goose Bay, I would like to take you on a tour. I would offer to take any minister, or any member, at my own expense, by chartered aircraft and taking them along into my district and see if there is any presence of government. There is no such thing, Mr. Speaker. People talk about government as if it is a flying object. They do not know what government is all about but this Government, I thought, saw the need, came out and said, "Oh, yes, we are, Sir, we are going to bring administration down to you people so you can become a part of it."

It has not come, Mr. Speaker. We had the great, great, white father in the presence of one Don Snowdon with a commission. That commission will not go before this House this year. If it does, it will be after the budget is brought down. We have waited two years. Now, how can you implement any recommendations of that commission and fund for it unless it is now in the budget. So, we had to wait another year for the government to look over that monstrosity, a document of some 12,000 pages, no, 1,200 pages, x number of volumes of utter tripe, utter nonsense, utter bull, because everyone here knew what was going to be in that document even before Don Snowdon started it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: .... a committee to read it.

MR. WOODWARD: A committee to read it. Sure we will need a committee to read it. We will need a committee to go in and maybe a battery of lawyers to protect someone from something else.

Mr. Speaker, those are the real issues, the real problems. This is why this nonconfidence motion is moved. We have not seen any of this and I speak with a heart and a half for that amendment because I hope and pray that some honouring people on the other side of the House will hear me, not hear me in the sense that I am screaming at them but hear me in the sense that they try to understand.

We have a fisheries policy, one of the greatest fisheries policies in this whole world and you know what portion of that policy that they have instituted in Labrador? Do you know how much of that fisheries policy is there, Mr. Speaker? There is not one person from Provincial Fisheries, there never was, yes we did, we had the honourable, one member come down to Labrador and he had a hat on his head and it was a good hat and I thought he was a yachtsman, so he came in to say hello to me and I said I am going out to Hopedale. What are you going to do in Hopedale? Sir, I am going out to study the bluga whale. I think the whaling business is a good thing for Labrador. That is the extent of the research that has been done by the Provincial Government as far.

Now, we have another little thing, another little thing. You will hear, very soon now, where they are getting their little boats ready and the Cabot Strait is going down along with so many more people to take the Newfoundland fishermen into Labrador. That is a good move, Mr. Speaker. That is one of the best moves that this Government could ever make. Take the Newfoundland fishermen down to rape the harvest in Labrador.

One time it was a good thing. It was a good thing. If I were the member for Labrador South - I am very fortunate that we have concentrated on two areas through the help of the federal government as far as developing our fishery is concerned, Mr. Speaker. Two areas which are closely related. We had the federal government go and say; "Okay, we will bring in legislation to protect your inshore fishermen as far as the Arctic Char is concerned." They brought in legislation that says: "No one touches it only the inshore fishermen who live on the Labrador Coast." That was a good move.

This year I have asked and I have written the minister and sent our minister the copy, I have asked the federal government to impose the same type of regulations on the salmon fishery and allow no longliner operator to go down and surround the poor fishermen who are sitting in a cove with four or five nets. Go down and surround them with one hundred nets, pull all the salmon away, move away the next day to their own community and let the poor unfortunate fishermen sit there.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. WOODWARD: We want that exclusive protection. Have I heard from the Minister of Fisheries? All I have heard from the Minister of Fisheries is that he is going to start a fish plant in Gander, Mr. Speaker. I do not see what purpose a fish plant would serve in Gander. This is it! This is it! Those are the things! I will tell you what has happened; it is traditional over the years when no one inhabited that particular part of the coast, Mr. Speaker, it was all right for people to go in. Today, what is happening to our communities?

Take a community in southern Labrador where we have people who come down from Newfoundland and go to Pack's Harbour and process fish. They bring their own people down, Mr. Speaker, they bring their own people down, they go out there, they do six or seven or eight weeks and then they pack their nice little things

up, they put it all in their boats and they go back to the bays. I do not know which bay they come out of, they come out of a number of bays. What happens to the poor fishermen in Cartwright? Why do this government not see fit to say; "Okay, if you are going to prosecute that Labrador Fishery you do the same thing in Labrador as you do in St. Anthony. You do the same thing in Labrador as you do in Mary's Harbour." Put the fish plant in the Community of Cartwright. Put another one in Charlottetown and say; "Okay, if you are going to fish you fish and let those people process that fish and give them a chance to make a living, not go down to exploit and rob them those days are over."

It is very fortunate, Mr. Speaker, that I am relatively happy living under the conditions that I live under in Labrador. If I were a fisherman in the Community of Makkovik and I saw some longliner crew coming in with a hundred nets when I could only afford four or five and see them set the nets around me; Yes! We would repeat the White Eskimo Story, because I would never allow it.

I would like to see the honourable Minister of Fisheries take those issues because those issues are bread and butter issues these are not garbage issues, Mr. Speaker, this is what this government are all about, doing something for those people. Has it been done? No! It is a typical joke and it will be a typical joke and that joke should not continue for very much longer.

At the C.T.C. hearings in the Holiday Inn when we talked of the inadequacies of air transportation in Labrador, we had the communities of Wabush and Labrador City and I am sure that the honourable Minister for Labrador West is quite familiar with this. we prepared a brief. I think we



have more rumblings in the west, Mr. Speaker, although the honourable Minister of Labour - they had forecast, the communities of Labrador City, Wabush will have the population come 1980 of 40,000.

Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned some time ago the third city, the third city being the City of Harmon, Stephenville or whatever you want to call it. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that there are two cities emerging in Labrador, two cities. One time we thought of fishing communities but now we will have two cities. We have now fortunately the amalgamated community of Goose Bay, Happy Valley, a population well in excess of 12,000 people, Mr. Speaker, the third or fourth largest community in this province if you want to call it the province. Labrador City is boasting close to over 15,000 people with the additional expansion. I have seen no evidence of the honourable minister getting up and saying, I.O.C. is having problems with their expansion. They are having problems with getting people into that community. Why do we not do something about housing?

Mr. Speaker, the cities of Wabush and Labrador City are going through the same growing pains that your communities of Stephenville and Harmon went through and our communities of Goose Bay and Happy Valley. People are largely interested in not being under the auspices and being controlled by the companies any more. We have seen this plan, whatever it is, take place in a number of communities on the island. Peoples' big concern when I was in Labrador City and Wabush was, how do we develop our own housing? How do we get the land to build houses? If I am not working with I.O.C. I am a second-class citizen because I.O.C. or Wabush Mines control the land.

Have we not got the audacity for this administration to have the guts to come to grip with that sort of administration. You know I have been frustrated for years. I have lived with senior civil servants from Ottawa. Every time I went to the outhouse, there was

someone watching me, some civil servant afraid that I was going to break a regulation. I have heard the famous saying, "you who have lived under the shadows of civil servants." Those people are suppressed. They are living under the shadows of the companies and they have no breathing space. Why do we not go in and take over the community? Let our honourable minister, our good friend from Fortune take over the administration and treat those communities the same as any other communities in the province and give our people their freedom. Then only will we feel that we are part of this province. People do not feel a part of the government in Wabush, Labrador City, they feel a part of Wabush Mines or I.O.C. I am sure that the honourable minister will agree with me that that is the general feeling.

What are we doing to correct it?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Company towns.

MR. WOODWARD: Company towns. There should not be company towns because now with service industry going into those communities, these companies, there will be more people employed in service industry and retail industry than there are by the companies themselves. How do those people live? If I want a piece of land, I go up to the mine manager. The mine manager says, "who do you work for? I am working for City Motors. Well, Sir, I am sorry if you work for City Motors, you do not get a piece of land."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WOODWARD: A good Liberal Company. I am not so particular whether they are Liberal or they are green or they are black or they are blue. All I am concerned about is someone to take the initiative, say, "Look, if we are going to have an administration in this province, let us have a unified one. Let us not have this this disparity that exists today. Bring everyone into the flock and the fold." It is not happening, Mr. Speaker, it is not happening.

I will get back to something that is very dear to us and something

that maybe will change the minds of a lot of people in Labrador. It is the development of the Lower Churchill. I have repeatedly said in this House that the Brinco organization was a good corporate citizen of Labrador. Those people did more possibly for Labrador than anyone else could have possibly done. It is an unforgivable sin for the Minister of Finance to put those nonnegotiable items in his budget that he put in last year to turn that vast corporation off from the development of that portion of the province, Mr. Speaker.

It was criminal. The man did not know what he was doing. He was blind with revenge and hatred. Now, where do we sit? Where do we sit today on the development of the Lower Churchill? We have now discovered that according to the reports that project is going to cost somewhere over a billion dollars. They are going to bring transmission lines down through the island of Newfoundland. The honourable leader says, I have to support this motherhood to bring the transmission, to then develop our resources and to export them down here to attract industry to this portion of the province. Why can we not develop or put the odd one or two industries in Labrador?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Over there it will not work.

MR. WOODWARD: That is a good answer, Mr. Speaker. This is something that I expected.

MR. ROBERTS: That will ring through in Labrador. That crack will ring throughout Labrador.

MR. WOODWARD: Why do we all do this, Mr. Speaker? Sure, we are all polar bears. I can eat a half a dozen like you for breakfast.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: And then go to the outhouse.

MR. WOODWARD: And then go to the outhouse, at the greatest ease.

Why, Mr. Speaker, why has this got to happen? We ask ourselves. We do not have at our disposal in Labrador one iota of negotiations, one scratch of information as far as those negotiations are concerned. All we know is that we have lost confidence in the honourable Minister of Finance. We detest him. We think that he would sell us out tomorrow to gain his own personal gain to become leader of this Province. But where are we left? So, am I going to sit idly by? Am I going to sit idly by? I do not have the brilliance that this particular man professes to have when you see him getting on his feet with his tittles and jots and everything else that he possesses. Mr. Speaker, the Province is developing a passionate hatred for the man because he is depriving us of a living. Why? Why does he not come out to the people and explain. this is the reason why. Why does he not go down to Goose Bay and put on a seminar and say, "Look, boys, here are the facts This is why we are not developing the Lower Churchill."

It has not been done. In utter silence, Mr. Speaker, silence to a degree. Do you know what silence is? Did you ever sleep in a tent where a wolf is howling and all of a sudden it stops? Did you ever feel the creaky things going - what is he going to do next? This is the type of silence that exists in Labrador. This is the bitterness. This is why I am bitter and I am bitter and I deserve to be bitter when you get little cracks from little pimps that have no guts or anything else.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please!

MR. DAWE: May I ask the honourable member to withdraw his remarks?

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): I ask the honourable member for Labrador North to refine his terminology somewhat. I am sure at the time of debate men get carried away.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will refine my remarks to meet the rules and regulations that exist in this honourable House. I am sure that no one has swayed from the rules of this House in the last two or three years that we have been sitting here in debate.

No, Mr. Speaker, these are sad issues, these are the reasons and the reasons are sad. They are sad. They are sad because the people are left in the dark. No one will tell them what is going on. There is no logical reason for "John Crosbie" not to develop the Lower Churchill, or "Frank Moores." There may be reasons but the people do not know about them because no one has bothered to explain them to them. They do not know. I think it is criminal not to develop that great hydro project. I think it is criminal because, Labrador in the next twenty-five or thirty years are going to have a population of over one hundred thousand people. We are going to be numbers, Mr. Speaker, and this is the great danger that exists in Labrador. The greater the numbers the greater the discontent. The greater the numbers the greater the discontent. The longer you live there the more it grows on you.

The honourable the member for Harbour Grace would not know anything about that, Mr. Speaker, because he is a dead issue. Mr. Speaker, I support this motion. I do not want to be considered wealy mouthed. The issues that come up, I think, are worthwhile issues. I think this administration have done nothing and I think it is about time that they came to grips with those problems and try to correct them if we are going to be a part of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing:

HON. H.R.V. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, it is very close to six o'clock. I will adjourn the debate unless the members wish me to go on for five minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go on! Ruin your lovely speech.

MR. EARLE: Very well, Mr. Speaker, it is very limited time, not time enough to comment on anything the honourable member who just sat down had to say. I can only make this one observation at this late date in the evening and that is that I always knew that the winds from the North were loud and strong but until this afternoon I never knew that they were full of hot air.

The honourable member kindly invited members on this side to visit his constituency. I do not claim to be an expert on Labrador I have only been down there five or six times but I hope to go down there many times in the future and learn something about it but I do not think I shall accept his invitation. I am quite sure that if I travelled in the same plane with him it would never get back to earth. It would be like a balloon it would just keep going up.

MR. WOODWARD: I make at least a dozen trips a year and I always get back safe.

MR. EARLE: That is only one passenger. However, this is only - by the way, Mr. Speaker, what I really wanted to refer to is this motion which is before the House at the moment which in essence is so completely ridiculous it is almost impossible to find words to measure the sort of intellect that brought a motion of this type into the House.

The evidence is there of what has been done and later, tomorrow or whenever I get the opportunity to speak, I will enlarge on the evidence. The fact is that the successors to a government of twenty-three years who left to us this ungodly pile of mistakes to try to clear up have the audacity to come out and say that in two



years we do nothing when in those two years, Mr. Speaker, we have gone a long, long way to correcting many of these mistakes. Correcting mistakes unfortunately, is progress of a kind but it is not progress of the type that this government wish to see. I admit that I had the, I suppose, privilege of being in both governments. I served with the Liberals for eight years, Heaven forgive me! and I have served with this government, now, for two years. I think more than anybody in the House possibly, I am able to make an accurate comparison.

I know from one slight indication what this government have done and what they are doing. In the actual numbers of hours of real work that the members of this government are doing as compared with the former members and the former government, the comparison is beyond belief. You have a dedicated crew over here who are working long, difficult hours, right throughout the weekends on many occasions and are putting in more time, I would say, in one month than the members of the former government did in two.

The evidence, Mr. Speaker, I will bring out in my next address. There is plenty of material to go on there is plenty of evidence of what we have done and what we are planning to do. When I say planning, in spite of the sarcastic remarks from the other side, the planning is very relevant and time will tell. I will disclose that in my next remarks and I now wish to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to note that the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing has adjourned the debate.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 1, 1974, at 3:00 p.m.