



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 3

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand that we have in the gallery today the Hon. William Tetley, the Minister of Financial Institutions, Companies and Co-operatives; from the National Assembly of Quebec. On behalf of all honourable members of this honourable House, I would like to welcome him here and trust that his visit is most enjoyable and informative.

PETITIONS:

MR. B. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from 327 voters of Bay de Verde. The prayer of the petition is, which has been addressed to me: "We the undersigned residents of Bay de Verde, in the District of Bay de Verde, Newfoundland, wish to bring to your attention a matter of vital importance. The matter we bring is an old and a very traditional one and that is one of water and sewerage facilities for the Community of Bay de Verde. We witness here every day not just the lack of good water but a condition of a very serious lack of sanitation. Soon it will not be possible to get water here that is not already contaminated.

"We feel sure that you are acquainted with some of the seriousness of this matter. We beg to solicit your earnest assistance as our official representative in government to do all in your power to alleviate our hardships. We wish at this time to refer you to the many reports already in on the unsanitary conditions as they exist in Bay de Verde at present. We wish also to refer you to the many communications of the Reverend Father Matthews, Parish Priest of Bay de Verde, to yourself and to federal members of government. We place into your authorized and competent hands this petition and beg your most earnest assistance in soliciting your government's immediate action for the installation of adequate water and sewerage facilities for the Community of Bay de Verde."

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition wholeheartedly because in the Community of Bay de Verde today there is hardly a drop of water which is fit to drink. The situation is getting worst instead of better. I urge this government to do everything within its power to see that the people of the Community of Bay de Verde will be given water and sewerage facilities as soon as humanly possible.

I urge that this petition be placed upon the table of this House and to be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the petition presented by the Hon. member for Bay de Verde, on behalf of 327 of his constituents, who are without the services of water and sewerage.

Now, Sir, they tell me that over in Bay de Verde the situation is absolutely deplorable. Because of the rock structure over there, it is impossible for people to install septic tanks and they are being forced in a good many cases to use the outdoor privy. I think, Sir, that in this day and age, when we are celebrating the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of Confederation, that we should be ashamed of ourselves to force people in communities like Bay de Verde to have to go down on a cold winter's day, the snow drifting in under their noses, to squat on an outdoor privy, Sir.

I am told that the water in Bay de Verde is unfit for human habitation and no wonder, Mr. Speaker, because there is no place for the sewerage to run. It is squeezing up between your toes, I am told, the sewerage over in Bay de Verde. The Minister of Health is sitting there with a smile on his face. He knows that we already have one or almost an epidemic breaking out in this province. I would not want to see another one occur in the sister District of Bay de Verde, right next to him, my honourable friend's own District of Carbonear.

Sir, about two years ago we were told by the Hon. Premier, outside of this House and in this honourable House, verified by the

Minister of Finance, that there was a freeze placed on water and sewerage installation in this province; that the town councils would have to do more themselves. Well, Sir, I hope that the situation now has thawed out and that the Minister of Finance, will be able to provide his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, with a few pauntry dollars, Sir, to install water and sewerage, which is so badly needed, in the District of Bay de Verde.

MR. A. M. DUNPHY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present this petition on behalf of some ninety people in the Bay St. George Area, some of them from the southwest coast, and the west coast. This petition, signed by these people of the southwest coast and the west coast feel that due to the terrain

in that area it is unpractical for the hunting of partridge during the fall season. Recently a survey was completed through the island to ascertain whether there was sufficient game presently on the island to continue on with this season, at least in the fall.

It is noted here by the people that because of this terrain there are areas where the game is known to frequent, it is difficult to get to and little if any hunting is done at that time. The ideal time they feel would be during the February, March months when these areas are accessible, and they do not necessarily share the opinion of the wildlife division that the season will not be open again this year.

However, I would like to add at this time that the Minister of Tourism has informed me that the season will be open, but we are now asking that he give consideration to this request that the season would be put forward in these areas to February or March when these areas can be accessible to the people and the various types of rigs that they use in hunting.

The prayer of the petition goes thusly: "We the undersigned petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Department of Wildlife, to open the season for small game, namely ptarmigan (partridge) for at least a two week period between February and March for the west and southwest coast area of the Island of Newfoundland."

We ask, myself the member for the district, to assist in our effort because this area is impractical for hunting during the regular hunting season. I ask that the petition be placed upon the table and sent to the department to which it relates. I am sure the honourable member for Ferryland will give it due consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bonavista North.

MR. P. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to voice our support on this side of the House in supporting this petition presented by my honourable colleague, the member for St. George's, and request

that the partridge season for that area be changed from the fall until late winter months.

We do so, Mr. Speaker, and we hope that when the minister takes this into consideration that the minister will and I am sure is quite aware that at the present time in the Province of Newfoundland that partridge, as we know it in Newfoundland, is practically on the verge of extinction. We have very low yields of partridge all across our province with the exception of Labrador and I am sure that the minister in his wisdom must realize that possibly a closed season for at least one season would not at all hurt the partridge population. I trust that when the minister considers this petition that he will take this into account and while we support the petition, as he realizes, previous to last year we did have a winter hunting season for partridge in Newfoundland.

In the winter of 1972-1973, this season was abolished and I was not aware of this being opened this year. I thought it was abolished also for this year and of course the reason why it was abolished in the first place or the excuse that was given by the minister was because of a low population of partridge on the island portion of our province. I trust that when he considers this petition and possibly others that may be coming to the minister that he will take the whole area of

partridge population into account.

MR. SPEAKER: I have just been advised that in the Speaker's gallery we have presented the Mayor of Roddickton, Mayor Christopher Decker. I would certainly like to welcome him here to the Chambers today.

Are there any other petitions?

NOTICE OF MOTION

HON. W. W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a resolution to read:

Be It Resolved that the Standing Orders 4(c), 4(d), 5,7, 14, 25, 31, 43, 51(b), 84, 85, 86, 87, 88 and 89 be amended in the following manner; (1) To amend Standing Order 4(c) be inserting the words -

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, would the honourable gentleman submit - these are fairly technical and perhaps if the honourable gentleman could be permitted to table this item, copies could then be circulated because I think the experience of most of us has been that unless one compares it against printed standing orders really the changes do not mean too much. Would it be in order if we were to take them as read; put them in the notice paper and then we could study them? Would that be in order?

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honour, if that be acceptable I think that would be the best suggestion rather than going through this because it is a lengthy eleven page document.

MR. ROBERTS: Meaningless without the -

MR. MARSHALL: We could say we could take them as read, with leave of the House, Mr. Speaker, and circulate them accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: Do we take it then that the resolution is read? Agreed. Are there any other notices of motion? The honourable the member for Bell Island.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce the following resolution:

Whereas the new social assistance programme in its diversion of federal funds discriminates against larger families;

And Whereas such an unprincipled action was never contemplated by the Federal Department of National Health and Welfare when it instituted its new family allowance plan;

And Whereas the discrimination is causing actual hardship to parents in their struggled to cope with the rising cost of living;

And Whereas this discriminatory policy is robbing the children of larger families of equal educational opportunities and equal preparation for their future roles in our society and economy;

Now Therefore Be It Resolved that the Minister of Social Services be instructed by this Honourable House to draw up a programme of social assistance benefits completely independent of the federal family allowance plan and based on our traditional long-time humane principle of providing benefits proportioned directly to the size of the family.

MR SPEAKER: I shall accept the resolution under advisement and rule on it later. Are there any other notices of motion?

Order, please! Notice of questions and answers to questions:

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know Tory times are hard times but would the Minister of Tourism tell us what is happening to the birds on the Southern Shore. Are they starving to death like the people of this province?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I am quite serious. I would like to know what is happening to the birds on the Southern Shore?

HON. T. M. DOYLE (MINISTER OF TOURISM): Mr. Speaker, while I do not think the question is at all deserving of an answer I will say that yes we are reserving them for our tourists.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, according to reports there are hundred of birds dying on the Southern Shore. I asked the minister a sensible question. Would the minister please give me an answer?

MR. DOYLE: I will take it under advisement, Mr. Speaker, and get an answer for the honourable member.

MR. NEARY: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the minister does not know what is going on in his own district.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Would the minister inform the House if it is the intention of the government to take advantage of the federal subsidy to try and keep down the price of the increases in milk in this province that are proposed in the next week or two?

HON. E. MAYNARD (AGRICULTURE AND FORESTS): Mr. Speaker, the government did take advantage of the last federal subsidy to keep down the

price of milk. I understand that negotiations are going on in Ottawa or across Canada. Now, for further increase we have no idea what the federal government is going to propose, whether it is another subsidy or any kind of relief to the consumer but if they do suggest any subsidy or relief of any kind, we will certainly take advantage of it as we did before.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary question: Would the minister inform the House if the Provincial Government, this government, intend to do anything about keeping down the proposed increases in the price of milk?

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, we have no means whereby we can keep down the price of milk. It is a national problem related to the cost of feed and cost of dairy products.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services. Would the minister inform the House if his department have reversed their decision to pay social assistance to able-bodied, single males and females in this Province who are unemployed through no fault of their own?

HON. A. J. MURPHY (Minister of Social Assistance): It is our decision. We judge each case on its merit. Anybody that refuses to work, we cannot afford to give them seventy dollars pocket money. We do not get that ourselves. Every case, as I say, is being judged on its merit. We are looking at the thing very clearly because some twenty-per-cent of our short-termed case load are single, able-bodied men who in many cases refuse to work and I am sure the taxpayers, whatever about the member who asked the question, the taxpayer is not too happy about paying it out and basically, I say, we look at every case with merit.

If it is deserving, as pointed out in our department, we supply need. We are not a department of handouts. We are a department that supplies needs of people, whether they be single, able-bodied, married, what have you. We are looking at every case, Sir, as they come up and they are been judged on the merit whether they are deserving or not, an allowance or not.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would the minister then inform the House what steps his government is taking to create work for these people?

MR. MURPHY: I do not have the time just now, Sir, to do it. It might take about three weeks but I am sure that when the various departments, we look at what has happened, I can give a rundown of my own if you want it here but I do not know if that question is - If the honourable wants (I use the word honourable in its broadest sense) an answer to that he can table it and I can give him all the particulars, what we have done, what the Department of Rural Development has done and many others and I am happy to report, Sir, I have not the actual numbers, the case load, of short term assistance as at December but I have the value between November and December, 1972 to November and December 1973. Our cost of everybody's assistance has been reduced by \$300,000 and I think someone is doing something somewhere and not living on welfare.

Sir, I have been asked the questions and I am trying to answer them to the best of my ability. I am happy to see the Hon. Leader of the Opposition back. I know he wanted to stay home yesterday to get clear of the load that he left his friend there to broadside at us; but that is all right.

MR ROBERTS: A further supplementary question to the gentleman from St. John's Centre, the Minister of Social Services. Would he tell us please whether there have been any prosecutions launched or whether any are contemplated or whether any cases are being investigated by his officials? He made the statement that people have refused to work. That is fine. That is an offence, Sir, under the law of this Province. Would he tell us what his officials propose to do about it and whether any prosecutions have been launched?

MR. MURPHY: I will take notice of that, Sir.

MR. ROBERTS: In other words, he has no idea what he is talking about, as usual.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Well done, Jasper.

MR SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FRED ROWE (St. Barbe North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the honourable, the Minister of Education. Would the minister inform the House what he is prepared to do concerning the critical problem with respect to school operating costs, as outlined by the President of the Federation of School Boards, the Reverend Don Harvey?

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, as the honourable gentleman may know, because it is public knowledge, the executive of the Federation is meeting within a few days among themselves discussing this and then the President with representatives of the executive plan to meet with me shortly after. I presume that will be sometime next week. We obviously will be listening carefully and examining carefully their proposals and their assessments and their judgment. For me to make a statement beyond saying that the government is obviously aware of the

rising costs in terms of maintenance and operation, with much of it related to fuel. That is not the only item, of course, but much of it related to that. For me to say more than that would, obviously, be ill-timed and I think discourteous, given the fact that the federation is meeting internally among themselves, their executive, I believe it is Friday, it is within the near future, and they wish then to meet with me afterwards.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, would the minister be prepared to supply additional emergency money over and above the amount that will be contained in the budget for operating the cost of schools for the next year?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I think that the answer to the first question is operative to that as well.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, has the minister received any representation from school boards, any of the thirty-seven school boards in the province, within the past, since the fiscal year began, the past ten months, on this problem?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have received representation from a number of school boards on this matter, the rising cost of maintenance and upon many problems in many areas of education, many areas within the jurisdiction of the school boards and within the area of interest and concern and responsibility of the Department of Education, on this matter and on many matters.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary: What have the government done about these requests? Is it correct that school boards as long ago as May and June, in Central Newfoundland at least, sent word to the government, supported by the figures, that they would run massive deficit even before (at that stage nobody could foretell) the very rapid increases in the price of heating oil and some costs that they could not escape? What if anything have the government done about that?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, back to June or indeed any period, to the best of my knowledge, I am not aware of any period, certainly in recent history, when school boards have not been in close touch with the

Department of Education and have not been under quite severe financial difficulties. I am not aware of any time, at least in the recent past, when school boards have not been in a position where they wish more money, where they could not put money to excellent use, where there is not a desire for more financial assistance.

In this respect and in particular with reference to rising costs, we have assured them of our awareness of that and we have also asked them to keep us in a current position with respect to their own assessment of the problem. We have assured them of our awareness of it and that obviously this is an important factor in considering the estimates of expenditure in the next fiscal year which, of course, begins in April

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: Other than a statement to the boards that the government are aware of their problems, have the government done anything concrete to - they have asked the boards to keep them in a current position; have the government done anything to keep the boards in a current position? My understanding is that every board in Newfoundland is now falling behind significantly and that some have current accounts deficits of as much as one half million dollars. Surely this is becoming intolerable.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition means have we altered the estimates voted in the legislature last year; no, we have not.

MR. ROBERTS: Have they been given any assurances of anything?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: For this present fiscal year?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. The year ending March 31.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No.

MR. ROBERTS: So they can all go bankrupt.

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

MR. F.B. ROWE: In the absence of the honourable the Premier, Sir, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Education. Would the minister inform the House whether the government will be able to give a policy statement on student-aid for Memorial University in

time for the students to make their plans for the third term this year?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the honourable member is referring to the term starting May, May - June, I believe, in that period. Certainly the government will be in a position to make known its position with respect to student-aid in the next fiscal year, certainly before that period. I would hope - when I say before that period, I do not mean a day before or a couple of days before but at least several weeks or a month before, a considerable length of time before.

With respect to the report itself,

I am not sure if honourable members are aware or not but at the request of the univeristy a committee on student aid was established. This committee has representatives from the university faculty, from the student body and from government. That committee, before making its recommendations, has been awaiting the report of Professor Parsons which they now have. There is a committee on student-aid with representatives from the university faculty, from the student body and from government. We expect to have their report within a couple of weeks, within the next two to three week period. They have been unable to go any further, awaiting the report which was made available a few days ago.

Mr. Speaker, it will certainly be a great discourtesy to the university or the university students if we were to announce a policy without even considering the recommendations on student-aid from a committee set up at the request of the university with representatives from the university faculty and representatives from the student body. For the government to announce a position without even waiting to have the benefit of their advice would be typical of the kind of unilateral action which this province certainly has seen enough of and which is not the policy of this government to perpetuate.

MR. ROBERTS: May I ask the Minister of Bonaparte's Retreat, prolonged, agonizing and decisive, when the government adopted this policy? Because twice we had the Minister of Finance stand and announce a policy and the only consultation - indeed the Minister of Finance, as I recall it, heard a delegation at some length - the only consultation was when it was announced. When have the government changed their policy and come to this new, humble and wise course? Let the minister admit he has made a terrible mistake and let him ask to correct it.

HON. WILLIAM W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: What is the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The honourable Leader of the Opposition will sit down.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sitting down.

MR. MARSHALL: I am rising on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: We will all be quite, so speak

MR. MARSHALL: The honourable Leader of the Opposition is, in his usual fashion, conducting a speech before the assembled throng. He is confined to asking questions under the orders and his remarks are out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, Sir, I was merely dealing with an out of order interjection made by the Minister of Education.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I am sure that each and every honourable member in this House is aware that questions should not be prefaced by speeches and I do think that the honourable Leader of the Opposition was very close to that.

MR. ROBERTS: Who, me?

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Minister of Education indicate what consultations took place before the changes were made in the student-aid programme at the university through the last two budget speeches?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I think that that was dealt with in the debate on the estimates last year, so it would be available in Hansard.

MR. W. ROWE: A question directed to the Minister of Industrial Development. Would the honourable minister inform the House how much money remains unspent of the \$25 million committed by Ottawa under DREE, I believe last May, expenditure of Newfoundland?

HON. WILLIAM DOODY (MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT): I think I will have to take notice of that and get the answer prepared. I have some of the information but I would much rather have it accurate, Sir.

MR. THOMS: The answer is too embarrassing.

MR. DOODY: No, the answer is not at all embarrassing but I would like to give out the full details.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Health: Could he tell us whether there is anything new on the reported outbreaks of diphtheria (a) on the Burin Peninsula and specifically have they

located, have the officials of the department located the carriers of the disease? I know people that are very concerned all over the province. Secondly, could the minister tell us whether there is anything new on the reported cases from the Happy Valley area? I believe there are two children from Happy Valley who have been brought to the Janeway and it is feared that they may have diphtheria. Could the minister bring us up-to-date on that, please?

HON. DR. A.T. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, there is no further information than that given yesterday. There have been no further cases diagnosed or no other suspects have come to the attention of the department.

On the question of the Happy Valley situation, there were two children admitted to the Janeway two or three weeks ago with complications that may have followed this particular disease. This has not been proven. The diagnosis is of peripheral neuritis for which there are other causes but it was suspected it may have been a post-diphtheritic complication but it has not been proven. Repeated swabs on these individuals have not grown the germ. One of them is being discharged

home this week completely well and the other is improving satisfactorily.

Over the weekend there have been some 5,000 people immunized on the Burin Peninsula and the programme will continue to cover the communities in the immediate area of Creston. There is no further number of cases on the information yesterday.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister and particularly the news about Happy Valley is good news but could he indicate whether the public health officials have located the suspected carriers of this disease? I realize there is a massive immunization campaign under way on the Burin Peninsula but with the speed of transportation today, epidemics, and I do not want to call it an epidemic, outbreaks of this kind are not necessarily confined to one locality. Have the officials succeeded in locating the carriers, the persons who brought this germ into Newfoundland or from wherever it came from?

DR. ROWE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to re-enforce that it is not an epidemic, there are sporadic cases. We have isolated two or three possible carriers. These persons are being treated and other persons are being swabbed but no new cases have turned up. We cannot at the moment say they origin of this, whether it came from somebody within the province or whether it was brought into the province. The three that have been found to be carriers, persons who did not show any overt or outward signs of the disease but on swabbing turned up the positive result of the diphtheria germ, are being treated. We have no knowledge of any other carriers but all contacts have been and are being swabbed and examined.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education and it is really a question to clarify earlier statements made by the Premier himself: Is it true as stated by the Premier on television some days ago and the minister yesterday in this House,

that the government puts a low priority on getting money from the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion for the construction of ordinary day schools? Is this the statement the minister made yesterday?

HON. GERALD OTTENHEIMER, Minister of Education: Mr. Speaker, the government puts high priority upon federal involvement and federal funds on a cost-sharing basis federal-provincial with respect to human resource development or the government feel that these funds would be better used in terms of development of our fisheries training, vocational training and technical training facilities and programmes.

MR. WM. ROWE: Are there enough schools in the province, Mr. Speaker? According to the Minister of Education, as a matter of government policy, does the government believe that there are enough ordinary day schools in the province?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, it is the government's belief that DREE day schools have been, let us say, a mixed blessing and that the costs of these facilities have been far ahead of the costs or price of totally adequate, modern, excellent facilities which are done outside of the DREE programme and that certainly is the province's portion of its public funds in terms of school construction could be used much better in school construction apart from DREE but that these funds and that this federal-provincial programme, that in the area of training in technical vocation, in these areas that is where we as a government could best use the federal resources.

MR. F. ROWE: Is the Minister of Education suggesting that no concrete proposals will be made to Ottawa through DREE for the construction of elementary and high schools but instead proposals will be made for institutions to take care of the College of Fisheries, Vocational Education, the College of Trades and Technology and this sort of thing? Would not these institutions cost the same amount of money to maintain as a day school or an elementary school

or a high school? The maintenance cost would be the same?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what I said before and that is that it is the government's belief that costs of school construction in DREE areas have been inordinantly high when compared to modern facilities outside of that programme and that these resources and this federal-provincial programme could be better expended in the public interest in the areas I have indicated. Obviously the maintenance costs of these are very high.

One of the big things with the DREE programme is not only the capital cost but the maintenance cost of DREE schools in comparison with other schools is extremely high and of course this is a continuing expense which DREE does not finance and school boards have found themselves in quite difficult positions because of the significantly higher maintenance costs of DREE schools and I think there are very many teachers, educators, superintendents, school boards and others who are of the opinion that public funds in this area can be better utilized in terms of education and training but in the manner that I indicated.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on the various questions on this whole matter: Would not the minister agree that this is a case of throwing the baby out with the bath water? Is it not better to renegotiate with Ottawa? If we have cadillac structures in other words instead of ones that we can live with, is it not much better for the government to negotiate with DREE and to get it down to a level that the government wants?

MR. CROSBIE: That is not a question.

MR. WM. ROWE: It is a question, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Minister of Finance should -

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: It is a question, Mr. Speaker. When did the Minister of Finance become the Speaker of the House? Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to continue - Crusty Crosbie, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, I object this is not a proper question. It is a specious argument rather than a question.

MR. ROBERTS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the honourable Minister of Finance is wrong. He is being abusive, obnoxious, harrassing and deliberately trying to intimidate my colleague who will not be intimidated by this. Furthermore he is being illiterate when he says the argument is "spacious," he meant "specious". It is not specious but it is spacious; the point of order has no validity whatsoever.

MR. WM. ROWE: Crusty Crosbie at it again.

MR. SPEAKER: I suggest there is not really a point of order and permit the honourable member to ask his question.

MR. WM. ROWE: He is down to his proper size, Mr. Speaker, an inch above the ground.

Would the Minister of Education care to respond to that? Does this government have any intention of trying to renegotiate with DREE the specifications of DREE schools in the province? Because there are are millions and millions of dollars at stake in the matter, Mr. Speaker, and for the minister to casually say they do not want any money from Ottawa for schools -

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for White Bay South is getting into a speech.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the experience of this administration indeed of the previous administration has been one with respect to the DREE schools as I have already outlined. That does not mean of course that it may not be possible to bring the capital costs and equally important the continuing maintenance costs in line. That of course is easily said, not easily done. It does not mean that it cannot be done.

As honourable gentlemen know there are various levels through which these DREE schools go and architects and consultants and liaison committees and in many respects the schools boards are in a very difficult position when architects and consultants and others come in

recommending various facilities. If it were likely that not only the construction but continuing costs of these schools bore a reasonable resemblance to other modern, quite adequate excellent schools, then obviously I would be very pleased to look more closely at it.

So the government's position is, as things now are, priority in terms of the DREE programme in education and training would better be used in the area as indicated.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the President of the Council:

MR. NEARY: Would Monsieur President inform the House, Mr. Speaker, if there is a definite shortage of fuel in Gander? If so, would the minister inform the House what flights are being affected? Would the minister also inform the House what companies, what suppliers of fuel in Gander have the government met with and if the overseas' flights through Gander are being affected or if it is the chartered flights that the minister referred to in his statement on VOQM today?

HON. DR. T. C. FARRELL (Minister without Portfolio): I would like a list of the questions, Mr. Speaker, but I will try to answer them to the best of my ability. This government have been negotiating for increased aviation fuel for the Gander Area with M.O.T. and officials of the Newfoundland Refinery, which is the only source that we possibly could obtain fuel from. These negotiations are on-going right now between the refinery and the distributors in the Gander Area, which are Shell and Imperial. Those people have recently begun to allocate their fuel to their present customers and do not have enough fuel to supply extra flights, chartered flights coming into the Gander Area.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, these negotiations are on-going. The fuel from the refinery - this is not a provincial responsibility, this is a M.O.T. operation, a federal responsibility. We are trying to assist them in obtaining this extra fuel. I feel that this fuel will be available possibly by July. There is a fairly unlimited amount but at the present time I cannot give any statistics. I will be delighted to inform the House when we do find out the exact requirements. These negotiations are not on going with the provincial government. They are going on between the refinery and the suppliers or distributors.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Am I right in interpreting the minister's answer as meaning that normal operations

at Gander are being carried on and this is merely additional fuel that is being negotiated for Gander? Is that a correct interpretation?

DR. FARRELL: Yes, normal operations as far as their supply is available at the present time. The operations have decreased over the past period. That is a fair statement. This fuel will be extra fuel available to the distributors in the Gander Area. At this moment, M.O.T., again I repeat, and the Provincial Government are doing what little they can in this area by influencing the refinery that as much fuel as they can make available to the Gander Area is found. The production period will be around the beginning of June as far as I know at this present time. As far as to what the up-to-date figures are right now, I have not got them. When I do have them, I will be delighted to inform the honourable House.

MR. M. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance if he would inform the House if the government will be providing housing this year for the Labrador Linerboard employees in the Goose Bay-Happy Valley Area?

MR. CROSBIE: No!

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you.

MR. CROSBIE: No, I will not tell the House. The honourable gentleman asked me if I would inform the House. My answer is; no, I will not inform the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Maintenance Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Social Services, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance, a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Gift Tax Act, 1972," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance, a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Succession Duty Act, 1972," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Pension Of The Chairman Of The Board Of Commissioners Of Public Utilities," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Change Of Name Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, which is the Address in Reply. I think the Hon. member for St. John's South adjourned the debate yesterday and he has thirty minutes of his time left to finish his address.

MR. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are two matters which were outlined in the Speech from the Throne that are going to be brought before the House in this session that I must say I am pleased to see mentioned and they are; the matter of forest legislation and an act respecting public tenders.

Now to deal with forest legislation first. I am delighted to see that. I think it should provide for an interesting debate. We have never to my knowledge really had a forest policy in Newfoundland. Most of us, like most Newfoundlanders, I think, believe that the forests were there; they just grew; they would always grow in abundance; there was nothing to worry about and that there would always be plenty of wood to cut.

Although the forest is a renewable resource, the forest is not going to serve us well and is not going to serve us as well as we ought to be served unless the forest is managed and controlled. Up to now, I think, the approach taken by the paper companies for the most part has been just to leave the forest where it has been cut over and allow it to grow naturally. We have never had the sort of programme

that some other provinces in other parts of the world have where seedlings are planted in the forest, programmes of afforestation and reforestation. We have never had that sort of thing and I think the time has now come when it ought to be introduced. I hope that the legislation dealing with forest policy, when it is introduced, will deal with that sort of thing, with the nurturing of our forest, rules, regulations and legislation to ensure that the forest not only, hopefully, continues a sustained yield but a greater yield by reason of planting, nurturing and care generally.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I look forward very much to that legislation and

to the debate which I am sure it will generate.

The other thing that I mentioned is public tender legislation. I have no idea what that legislation is going to contain. I hope it contains provisions to the effect that when public monies are spent they will be spent on every case possible by means of the public tender system. This is something that many of us in past campaigns and political activities spoke for, worked for and believed in. We still believe in it. It is in the Speech from the Throne that this is going to be introduced and I may say, personally, that I am delighted to see it, Mr. Speaker.

One thing I would like to see introduced and one way that I would like to see the public tender system operate is this; the public tender system to me means not only that tenders are called and you send in your tender and somewhere at sometime the tenders are opened. What I would like to see is a place named. In other words, tenders for the "X,Y,Z" project will be opened at the -- well not the Sir Robert Bond Auditorium, because it is gone now but at some government building, some particular place and the tenders would be opened at a certain time and the persons who were tendering on a job would go there with their tender in their pockets and would take it out, pass it to the appropriate official and all the tenders be handed in and opened right there on the spot.

Some may say that this is not necessary, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps it is not but at the same time it is like the expression; "Not only must justice be done but it must be seen to be done." In this business of public tendering and the filing of public tenders and the opening of public tenders, I think the only way that justice can be done and seen to be done is if people go along to the appointed spot, at the appointed time, with their tender in their pocket, hand it to a man, he opens it along with all the other tenders, in the presence of the people who have tendered or brought along their tenders. Then the person who puts in the lowest tender, if he can provide the necessary bonding, gets the job. That is the way that I

hope this system will work. I hope to see something like that in the legislation. In fact, that is the only way that I think it can work and that people can be satisfied that justice is being done, for the tender to be brought along, handed in and opened in the presence of everyone right there along with all the other tenders of that time.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. WELLS: Yes. Absolutely.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Does the honourable member, Sir, agree or disagree with the method used by the government in awarding the tender for the junior college in Corner Brook where there were a number of proposals made and apparently a committee of cabinet recommended one rather than the tendering process he suggests?

MR. WELLS: Obviously I believe in the tendering process I just described. Previous government and this government obviously have seen need from time to time to enter into leaseback arrangements. This building, for instance, is built under a leaseback arrangement.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. WELLS: Is it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no lease back.

MR. WELLS: Just a straight lease? What is under leaseback? The Memorial University?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. WELLS: Yes I know, but is that Memorial University?

AN HON. MEMBER: The present Memorial. Yes.

MR. WELLS: Does the honourable member mean to say that we will never own this building? The province?

MR. W.N. ROWE: What is the position, Mr. Speaker, with two ministers differing on it?

MR. WELLS: Wait now! Wait now! As I recall it...

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. WELLS: Ah! So now it is a leaseback.

MR. W.N. ROWE: For one dollar? What a fraud!

MR. WELLS: It is a leaseback, Mr. Speaker, this building. If we continue to pay rent for a certain period and then buy it if we wish...

MR. W.N. ROWE: For one dollar?

MR. WELLS: Yes. It is a lease with the option to purchase at the end.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: It is the same thing.

MR. WELLS: Whatever government is in power in twenty years from now, whenever the thing has been paid for in effect, I presume will want to buy it, will not want to go on paying rent. For my part I do not like to see it. I know it is convenient, it does not go in the public debt and all this sort of thing but I still think the taxpayer gets better value for his money when the government call tenders and have bids on the project and give it to the lowest tenderer who can provide bonding and goes and builds the building, owns and maintains it. Any other system, it seems to me, allows for a profit to the entrepreneur who puts the building up.

We have an obligation, obviously, not only we but any government that are elected anywhere, to get the best possible value for money for the people who put it there. As I say, I look forward to this legislation that is going to be proposed. I do not know what is going to be in it but I hope that it firmly comes down on the side of the tender system. I would also like to see them presented and opened in the way that I described.

Mr. Speaker, there is a fair bit of noise, a fair bit of competition. (If you will excuse me I will leave my seat for a moment and close the door.) To return to the debate, Mr. Speaker, one of the things which I would like to see debated in the House at this particular session, is the matter of our energy policy. I think this is probably one of the most important things that has come to the attention of Canadians and Newfoundlanders in recent years. I think it is going to affect all of us and it may, in fact, it is going to

do more than that, it is going to affect our children and it is going to affect people all over this country not just the Province of Newfoundland.

I think it is very difficult for any layman to try to find his way about a complicated question like this energy business without advisers and without technical advice. At the same time, I think we have to do it and I think we have to try to understand these things and express ourselves on them as members of this House.

The whole thing arises, it seems to me, if this is the immediate arising of the problem, by what to do with, if you like, windfall profits. When the Countries of the Middle East raised the price of crude oil, obviously, and it shows how fragile these international things are, it started I believe with the Venezuelans, but other countries, Nigeria, Canada, everybody decided if the Arabs can get that kind of money for oil we are going to get in on the act and we are going to get that kind of money or something approaching it also.

I think this is fair enough. Why should we supply oil on the international markets (that is Canada) which is the United States in our case and get a lesser price for it than the Venezuelans get for theirs supplied to Eastern Canada, or other parts of the world get from the States or Europe? I think that although the Americans may refer to us in Canada as blue-eyed Arabs, they can refer to us as what they like, I think we too have a right to get as much as possible from the sale of our oil.

This raises the interesting question, also, and there are many questions here, Mr. Speaker, but there is the question of control of the resource. I think our government's stand is absolutely correct in that we must insist that we control the resource and let us assume for the moment that there is gas and oil on the Continental Shelf off our shores, I think we have to insist that we have control of it and that we are in charge of the development of it, that we give the permits and that we make sure that the thing is done to the best advantage of

this province. By saying to the best advantage of this province I mean that the employment or whatever can be generated in the way of business, that these things benefit us and our people.

Obviously, in the case of Alberta, which seems to be the province which is clearly attracting the most attention in this current crisis, Alberta does not have that problem quite the same because the oil resource is within its immediate territorial boundaries.

The you come to another question and this is a fundamental question, I think, Mr. Speaker. When the windfall profits occur as they have occurred now in the case of Alberta oil and Saskatchewan oil, to a lesser extent, who gets the money? This is a fundamental question. It is argued by Alberta that Alberta is entitled to keep that tax money. All right! Let us look at what flows from that. If Alberta keeps that money and there is a strong argument and anybody living in Alberta would put forth I am sure this same argument, but at the same time what happens to the country? If Alberta is to keep this money it will have vast windfall profits which will greatly enrich that province. Under the equalization formulae, as I understand it, then other provinces have to receive monies from the federal government to make up the difference. In other words, to avoid the disparity that would then occur between Alberta and the other provinces. That means that the federal government is going to have to find money in vast quantities somewhere.

It can find it in two places as I see it

one can be found in Alberta or from the taxation in some way or a share of the taxation of that oil, these windfall profits or it can find it from the general revenues of Canada to dish out to the other provinces.

Now either way, for the Province of Alberta if it keeps its oil money and for the other provinces if it keeps its oil money and the federal government shares other monies, tax money around, it would be a great windfall for these individual governments. The think that worries me a bit and I would like to hear perhaps more clearly explained is, if that has to be done, if Alberta keep all the money that comes from these windfall profits and equalization has to be increased by the federal government and federal funds found to pay for it the burden of taxation in this country is going to be increased in a shocking fashion.

So therefore -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: Well it may be not, but maybe, but maybe -

MR. CROSBIE: Propaganda.

MR. WELLS: Well, these are the questions that we have to be assured of, I think not only the members of this House but the citizens of this province, because if that be not correct, well what is the position? If a province keep the money which it gets from such windfall profits, if the federal government are not going to put money into the other provinces to bring them up also, then we are going to have a sort of Balkan State, we are going to have vast inequalities between the various provinces of Canada, if it be not rectified in some way.

I think these are fundamental questions, Mr. Speaker, and I think we are indebted to the Minister of Finance who was on television the other day and he talked about these matters. The way he expressed it is that we may have to choose in Canada between a federal system which we have now or a unitary system. That may be, I do not dispute with him on that but it seems to me unless we find a formula whereby these windfall profits can be distributed throughout this nation and throughout Canada, then the question may become far more fundamental than whether

we are going to have a federal system or a unitary system. We may be if some provinces become extremely rich in relation to other provinces, if no formula is found to share this money, then it may be that the fundamental question is not between the federal government and a unitary government or a federal state and a unitary state but the future of this country itself.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is something that has to be debated not only here but all across Canada. It is a fundamental thing which has to be resolved. I think that it could go right to the root of the success of Confederation of Canada if the wrong formula is found or to put it another way if the proper formula is not found.

Well, Mr. Speaker, these are a few remarks, in addition to the remarks I made yesterday. I look forward to this session. I look forward to the debate on the various legislation which is brought before the House. I must say, I think that from time to time in this past two years there have been much sterile debate in this House about what was done in the past, what this one said, what that one said. The only thing that matters to the people who put us here, Mr. Speaker, is what we propose to do now in the present and about the future. I can only say that I hope the debate revolves and resolves itself into a debate on the questions and problems and the difficulties and the solutions hopefully that face Newfoundland. I hope that we can address ourselves to these problems and not spend as much time as we have talking about the past. With that hope and expectation, Mr. Speaker, that I look forward or then I look forward to the balance of this session with a great deal of anticipation and pleasure.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the member for Port au Port.

MR. F. R. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for St. John's South is indeed a difficult act to follow. His eloquence here and in other places is well known. However, I will do my best.

I would like to preface my remarks on the Speech from the Throne with some general comments about my district. It is relatively infrequent that a member of the House of Assembly gets the opportunity to speak at

length or even briefly about his district. To the people on the eastern side of the province, the side that traditionally has been most blessed by the various governments that have held office in this country and in this province, it might be somewhat enlightening for you to know something about one of our more rural districts.

The District of Port au Port under redistribution will be two districts or conceivably will be two districts, the District of Stephenville and the District of Port au Port. The District of Port au Port will be a rural district unless massive industrialization takes place there as it is not improbable. We may then have two urban districts. The District of Stephenville itself is probably fairly well known to most of you.

The Peninsula of Port au Port has a rather story history. It is one of the areas that was thought to have people slaving at the jaws to get away from it. It was an area designated as a resettlement area. I found even before I became a member for the district and certainly since becoming a member for the district that is anything but the case. The spirit of rural Newfoundland is the desire to live, prosper, raise one's family in a rural setting. It is certainly as alive in the rural part of Port au Port as anywhere else and probably more than in many other places.

We have successfully stymied, killed probably, the idea of resettlement so far as our district is concerned. This has been done. It was not an easy task. The first year 1972 there were LIP programmes that were thwarted because there was a feeling throughout the provincial level of government, the provincial civil service level, and the federal level that to put money into rural Port au Port was throwing it away. For that reason several very worthwhile projects were not approved. That is the reason that was given.

While with the help of the Minister of Rural Development who visited us on a number of occasions, the Minister of Fisheries, both Ministers of Fisheries, especially those two gentleman, the ghost of resettlement has been set to rest. The Port au Port Peninsula is now beginning to come

into its own. For those of you who want to see it more pictorially I believe that the CBC will have a programme dealing fairly extensively with the French culture on the Port au Port Peninsula which is basically centered around the two communities one on the southern part of the peninsula, the Community of Cape St. George and on the northwestern part of the peninsula the Community of Mainland.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that a new one or -

MR. STAGG: This is to be a new one, at least as far as I know it is, taken this year.

We do have a French culture in Port au Port. There are many people there who speak French as their first language and are now beginning to speak French again as their first language. It is a very interesting area. Pride in their culture is certainly giving them pride in any other facets of their lives. I hope that in our way and in my way we will be able to assist them.

The basic problems of Port au Port District are the traditional problems of rural Newfoundland, fisheries development, agricultural development and the provision of proper roads. Each government, federal and provincial, have been presented with the chicken and the egg dilemma as far as Port au Port is concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no fishery.

MR. STAGG: The honourable member says there is no fishery because there are no fishermen or they are not sufficiently well-equipped to carry out

the prosecution of the fishery. Yet, there is an abundance of fish. The reason there are not enough fishermen is that there are not enough facilities and basically that entails the building of small boat shelters on what is now a very rugged stretch of coast.

At the present time there is before the Federal Department of the Environment, fisheries section, a very comprehensive engineering report on a place we locally call Blue Beach. It is located on the long point of the Port au Port Peninsula, the narrow needle jutting out into the Gulf of St. Lawrence. That in itself is a very picturesque place. It is a salt water pond surrounded by beach which would have to be breached, fortified by breakwaters and so on. In my view this is probably the most significant need in the whole district. You can take everything else and, while many things are very necessary - there are a lot of motherhood issues that of course it is very difficult to say that they lack the priority or lack a great priority.

It is my belief that if the Federal Government come through with their part of the bargain and it is a rather large chunk of money, in the vicinity of \$600,000, that we can virtually wipe out the welfare problem that has traditionally raked the Port au Port Peninsula. We are getting better, getting much better. I think our short term and long term assistance load in that district has practically halved in the past couple of years. We are very pleased with it. I believe that not only would it wipe out welfare but you would have an area there that was a strong economic contributing unit to this province. I want to see the Federal Government come up with the money that we know they have.

I know that what I say is certainly reflected by the member for St. George's and other members on the West Coast of Newfoundland, that our people have traditionally been maligned, left out in the cold because we have been far from the seat of power in St. John's and until recently diligently returned our Federal member with a record that would not have been accepted in the eastern part of the province. So, we are looking for our fair share on the West Coast.

The Provincial Department of Fisheries has fulfilled its obligations. It has served notice that it will contribute the money that is required to do this major development of fisheries in my district. I am looking forward to the Federal Government picking up their end as well.

Roads in my district are coming along. We had a great batch of road building in the fall of 1971, tremendous. Since 1971 we have spent a great deal of money as well. I trust and hope that this on-going programme will see the Port au Port rural area becoming a tourist haven because it is a beautiful area and it is being discovered by the media. It seems like the media only discover it though after the roads get paved. They do not like going over the dirty roads anymore than we do.

MR. W. ROWE: Inaudible.

DR. FARRELL: I am afraid to declare that now. There might be riots in the other. We have the traditional problems of municipal services but I believe that one of the things that have been responsible over the years for the lack of functioning municipalities is that the legislation has been somewhat lacking. It has not had the teeth that we need to function in rural Newfoundland. I am looking forward to the Royal Commission on Municipal Government's report being quickly received and adopted. I had hoped it would have been with us long before this. Let us hope that the wait is worth-while.

I believe that our problems are similar to those in other areas where you have community councils and local improvement boards of trustees that have excellent councillors. The community councils and local improvement boards of trustees throughout the province, I submit, have a very high quality person on the respective councils but they are confronted with this problem that they have no paid employees. They have no clerks. They have very little of the ordinary municipal clerical services that are required to carry on a functioning municipality.

Regional government, I do not really know what regional government

is but it sounds like a good idea. It sounds like getting communities together so that they plan their programme for succeeding years so that municipal government is not done on an ad hoc basis were the small community that has the most vociferous councilors or has the most votes or whatever, was able to exert the most pressure, that they get things far out of proportion to what is desirable for the whole area. So, I am looking forward for good things from the royal commission and I am sure that that is reflected by other members of this House.

We have had a major issue in the Stephenville area in the past five or six months and that is the amalgamation of Harmon, Stephenville. It is an issue in which I, contrary to advice from all quarters, got myself involved in. I think that problem has been successfully navigated - stormy waters at times. I believe that the Harmon and Stephenville area will soon herald the third city in Newfoundland, the City of Stephenville. We have enough people now and were it not for the difficulty in getting the City of Stephenville Act I would be sitting down in the minister's office on that particular tack and probably will before the year is out.

In this connection I would like to tell this honourable House just what I think of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs has been a tremendous aid, has given tremendous assistance to our area. He has always been ready to come and talk when the going got rather tough. His cool, mature guidance has been of tremendous assistance to us. He has reactivated the Harmon Corporation which was formed in 1966 as the industrial arm of the Harmon area and which was really unfortunately let wither for many years. When this government took office in 1972 they were unfortunately confronted with an nonfunctioning Harmon Corporation. I am very pleased that the Harmon Corporation is functioning and functioning well under the chairmanship of

Mr. Frank Spencer, Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, President. We are very lucky to have him. I wondered at the time whether he would be a paper tiger, whether his appointment would be merely one to fill the office, to say that it had been filled, or whether he would actually do the job. Well, I am optimistic that he will do the job. The Stephenville Linerboard Mill, the Labrador Linerboard Mill - I prefer to call it the Stephenville Linerboard Mill, even though its corporate name is Labrador Linerboard - we are looking forward to this tremendous industrial achievement being incorporated into the new town of Stephenville so that when the mill is sold there will not be any haggling about whether it is going to pay taxes to the new town or not.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is it paying taxes not?

MR. FRED R. STAGG: No, it is not. It is a crown corporation. It can pay a grant in lieu of taxes. Of course this is one of the things that the new town will have to take up with many of the businesses that are on the Harmond Corporation. Their situation with regard to the overall tax structure of the town is one that can only be solved over a period of time.

The Harmond Corporation which had all sorts of blessings from the public of our area certainly from the then administration told an unfortunate story in that the only industries in that area that have really succeeded have been those backed by Newfoundlanders. We have had a lot of industries come into that area that have been brought in by good-meaning people. Certainly the government did not bring in any people who they thought would do harm to the area but the unfortunate truth is only those, and there may be a couple of exceptions, but basically only those which are backed and staffed and usually owned by Newfoundlanders have been successful and some of them have been very successful.

It has been in the news lately that after two attempts to set up a third brewery at Stephenville, Atlantic Brewery was unsuccessful. Bison Brewery was overcome by flood and I think there was famine before

that. It does appear that another larger brewery, one of the big three is very interested in that. Excellent facility.

Mr. Speaker, last year, about this time, the regional college was announced for Corner Brook; the community college or some similar institution for Stephenville. I am very pleased that the regional college is practically a reality for Corner Brook. I have pretty well resigned myself to that fact. It took some doing but I guess you do not beat that horse too often and had not the exigencies of the time presented themselves, I would have had a committee working on the curriculum for the Stephenville Community College. Basically, it appears to me that not only in the expansion of our present adult centre and the Stephenville Crossing Vocational School, there are many interesting things that can be done with community colleges and rather than spout off in general terms I am looking around for some specifics and it is a difficult problem but I think in the next year or so we will have that one looked after as well.

We also have in Stephenville a twelve thousand foot runway - the best runways in Eastern Canada, and while unfortunately we have a rival somewhat to the north.

MR. WOODWARD: We are looking for international status.

MR. STAGG: We have international status, Mr. Woodward. We have it. We had it before Goose Bay too. However, we do not look to Goose Bay as our rival. There are two airports on the west coast. My only hope is that our area when it achieves the greatness which it is destined to have will get the air service it deserves. That is enough about Port au Port, I guess.

The Throne Speech itself, Mr. Speaker: I guess every member tries to tailor the Throne Speech to what it means to his district. By looking at the Throne Speech in a more general way, there have been many costic comments made about its style, what it contains, what it did not contain and so on. I was very surprised to hear them but I presume they were tactic, traditional responses to government's opening package. To me it appears to be a document of a functioning

working government. As we said yesterday, programmes are not saved for the Throne Speech only. They are unveiled when the time arrives. In fact we may be evolving away from the Throne Speech. I understand that in Quebec the Premier makes a statement rather than have the Lieutenant Governor make the Throne Speech. There may be other reasons for that in Quebec. They have traditionally shyed away from the parliamentary or the regal aspects of Throne Speeches. But as far as I am concerned and I am sure I reflect other members of this House, if it is for the betterment of Newfoundland that the Throne Speech not be full of magnificent revelations, that everything has to be saved up for the Throne Speech, so be it. Maybe the traditional propaganda-ridden, the propaganda-ridden Throne Speech is not the style of this government anyway. I hope not.

The previous speaker has mentioned in some detail and I would say every other speaker in this debate will also mention the rationalization of the forest industry. Apparently we have room in this province and Labrador for tremendous yield, tremendous sustainable yield of wood resources and yet this yield is not being taken up ever. We have got a lot of wood just over-maturing, falling down, dying, creating disease among healthy timber and through the process of spontaneous combustion, I suppose, it gives rise to forest fires.

I believe that the government's policy in woods operation, and I am not fully acquainted with it, I am just acquainted with it in a general way - I am not one of the architects of it - there must be justice for all, and that includes the paper companies or any potential paper companies, justice for all, malice towards none. The member for St. Georges whispers, saw mill operators. Of course, saw mill operators as well. They must not be discriminated against in a rush for feeding the appetites of mills. It appears from the public announcements that we have heard that the paper companies are willing

to co-operate with the government and my guess is that this co-operation could have been achieved a long while ago. The fishery - I have already alluded to that or spoken on it in some detail. The chicken and the eggs as far as my area and many of the other areas are concerned, you cannot have the fishery until you get the harbours. You cannot have the harbours until you get the fishery. That is what the federal government says and in some cases our own government.

I believe that through the activity of men in this House, on both sides of the House, that there is a new philosophy evolving as far as the fishery is concerned. I am certainly not completely satisfied that we have acted as quickly as we could. Taken in the context of 500 years, we have only been in office for a very short period of time. The price of food is going up and fish is a very sustainable resource. They multiply by the millions and it looks as if the ICNAF Conferences and various conferences are going to allow us to take a much larger proportion of the annual take from the sea and Newfoundland, after all its three main resources are fishing, farming and the forests.

Energy - it has almost become the cliché of the last couple of years. It covers a lot of ills. Politicians have attempted to use it to bail themselves out of a lot of hot issues or cold issues and it is a very misunderstood problem. It is tied with the international diplomacy of oil, some of which is not too diplomatic.

Newfoundland's position can only be talked about by us in general terms and I think our position was very clearly enunciated by the Premier at the recent Energy Conference in Ottawa. He did not clear it with me before he went although I had an opportunity to attend the caucus at which it was discussed, I had other business so I was not sure what the position was going to be. I knew what mine was and I am happy to say that it coincided with his and that of his department, certainly that of the government.

Now the British North America Act is at best a musty document, something that most of us meet very irregularly but we have certain working knowledge of it. The British North America Act sets out that property and civil rights are the realm of the province. Property, as far as I am concerned, takes in the assets above and below the earth, certainly takes in the electrical energy of the province and we are in the fortunate historical position of having history on our side as well as the framers of the amendment, I suppose, to the British North America Act which allowed Newfoundland to join Confederation in 1949.

Newfoundland has her traditional rights which she brought with her into Confederation, the rights of a sovereign nation, a sovereign nation under commission of government but still her rights as a sovereign have never really been taken away. So we have all of these and apparently we have the chance to be the holders of tremendous assets as far as energy concerned, petroleum.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundland's position at that Energy Conference is a mere pinprick, a pinprick compared to the massive assaults that have been made on Confederation by a province like Quebec over the past twenty years or so, probably since the formation of the country. They have stretched confederation taut time and time again and yet the country has survived. I do not seriously believe that Newfoundland's position at the Energy Conference and this government stating its position is in any way jeopardizing the Canadian Nation, not at all. I think we will come out of it. We may have to compromise somewhat but then an apparently inflexible position is one that is usually adopted before you compromise to what you were willing to settle in the first place.

I wonder why, I may be stealing the thunder of the member for Green Bay here because I got the information from him -

MR. NEARY: There is very little thunder in him.

MR. STAGG: The member for Green Bay is going to be very thunderous. He has a few hammers of Thor he is going to unleash. Apparently the letters are flowing in from the Mainland applauding Newfoundland's position and they are not all from Alberta and Saskatchewan either.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Right here, do you want to hear it?

MR. STAGG: I will let the member for Green Bay deal with them. Mr. Speaker, I will have to ask you to curtail the member for Green Bay

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister of Mines and Energy and his very efficient crew down there in his department, led by an old college colleague of ours, Cabot Martin, are doing an excellent job. Mr. Martin is the fellow who had the initiative some time ago, something like John Shaheen I suppose, to predict the energy crisis. He went away and did a masters in ocean law. He came back to Newfoundland and I hope we will keep him and I hope we continue to produce men like him.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Premier's articulation of our position at that Energy Conference and his continued articulation of that position by this government is one that we can all be proud of. We are gambling. Yes, we are gambling but I believe we are dealing as well.

AN HON. MEMBER: Too bad you are not gambling with your own money.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne deals with the rules of the House, or at least it mentions the rules of the House. I would like to have a few words on that and maybe the position of Deputy Speaker might be one that we analyze very carefully while these House rules are being debated.

I say to you the honourable members, and you, Mr. Speaker, that I am a partisan figure. I am a partisan figure. I was elected Progressive Conservative candidate in the District of Port au Port. I have a seat in this House, unlike Your Honour, and

it is my contention that when I am not in the Chair, I have all the rights and duties of an ordinary member of this House. I have all the rights and duties. Of course, a fellow can make it as easy or as hard for himself as he wants. I am a partisan figure. I make no apology for it.

I believe the Hon. member for White Bay South and I today were trying on the Chair for size. He just coincidentally happened to be sitting in it there, maybe shadows of things to come, when we get an impartial speaker, deputy speaker.

I must say this that when a person gets into that Chair or that one that you assume the position of an umpire who goes on the field when the regular umpire does not turn up and you happen to be playing for one of the other teams. I have done it many times and I am sure those of us here who are ball players have done it as well. You step in and you attempt to arbitrate various disputes, call them as you see them and that is where your personal integrity is involved, where you are asked to be nonpartisan, not to be vindictive, to operate with equanimity, objectivity, maturity and with discretion, all of these things.

Your Honour, I will leave it to the House to decide whether or not I have performed these duties. Maybe my predecessor may have done his role - not my immediate predecessor but the predecessor in the past government - he ended up on the Supreme Court bench.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The honourable member may never fear that he is going to end up there.

MR. STAGG: I doubt it.

MR. NEARY: He may end up before the bench.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Justice Noel, of course, is a man - it would be very difficult to perform with the competence he did. However, I am doing my best.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, "Stagg" is no tyrant - no tyrant. While honourable members opposite may attempt to goad me into partisanship or into attempts to favour this side as opposed to that side because this, of course -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: This would be disaster. I do not think they will succeed. It is a strange thing that comes over you when you get in that Chair. You feel to be a little above it all. Maybe it has something to do with the ^{mystique} ~~mystic~~ of our parliamentary system. There is a certain feeling of nonpartisanship which comes over me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having dealt with that matter, which no doubt we will hear more on later, I would like to talk about representation by members of the House of Assembly. Just what is the function of the members of the House of Assembly. Now I am an ordinary member; some people say, very ordinary.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Some people say that as well. There are not as many who use the word extraordinary.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, members of this House have a duty to spend as much time in their districts as possible. Now I have gone down the ranks on this side here, this honourable crowd on this side and as far as I can see, they represent their districts; they spend a great deal of time in their districts, even those who live in St. John's. I am satisfied, fairly satisfied, that their performance, as far as representation is concerned, is adequate; maybe a few nuances here and there.

I look on the other side and I see members who represent rural ridings, who are living in St. John's, and I wonder how much time they are spending in their district. I wonder. I live in mine. I live there. I have a great deal of difficulty representing my district. I

have a great deal of difficulty representing it. A member is hard put to represent it even with one-third of his time. I am not sure but I believe we are paid a certain stipend for travelling throughout our districts. I would like to see just how many days honourable members opposite spend in their districts. It is a great thing a man takes upon himself, if he has the audacity of being an urban-city dweller, never having known anything else, to have the audacity to go out into the rural areas and say that he is going to represent them.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: I do not know. I am a rural fellow myself. I have difficulty enough. Of course, I have only been elected twice in approximately two years.

MR. ROBERTS: Elected twice in six months.

MR. STAGG: Yes, that is right.

I am wondering if these honourable members opposite are doing justice to their constituents.

MR. W. ROWE: Surely that is where the constituents decide.

MR. STAGG: Yes, it is for the constituents to decide.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. STAGG: I am wondering if these honourable members are spending anything near of what I would consider to be the minimum, which would be seventy days -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I move that there be an immediate election and we settle this question once and for all, seconded by my colleague from White Bay South, that we have an immediate election throughout the province, Sir. Would Your Honour be good enough to arrange it?

MR. STAGG: Spurious! Spurious!

MR. ROBERTS: What do you mean spurious!

MR. STAGG: Completely spurious!

MR. SPEAKER: I do not consider that as a point of order.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, we have a federal member on the west coast,

Mr. Jack Marshall. I believe that he has spent as much time in St. Barbe North as the member for St. Barbe North.

MR. NEARY: I probably see more constituents before breakfast, before he gets out of bed in the morning.

MR. F. ROWE: Point of order, Mr. Speaker: What evidence does the honourable member have to make that statement?

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: No withdrawl, no withdrawl. I live over there. I know when the honourable member is in his district and it is not too often.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. The deputy speaker, if he knew anything about the rules of the House, should know that it is against the rules to cast aspersions on any member of this House with regard to his conduct in the House or outside the House or in his district. If he knew the rules, he would know that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I am talking about representation, which I think is very basic to this House. I am asking whether -

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, would the Speaker care to rule on the point of order?

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure the Hon. member for Port au Port is aware that he is not supposed to cast any aspersions on other honourable members. I do not consider, really, that he is doing that. I should urge him to be a little cautious in his future remarks.

MR. STAGG: Thank you,

Mr. Speaker, just suffice to say that accountability, political accountability is something that we all have to look very closely at. I also say that representation over the long distance telephone is at best weak.

The rural development authorities come under attack the last couple of weeks, the Department of Rural Development. I believe that this department has had a tremendous effect on the whole province and it has been greeted with cynicism, laughter and many other adjectives which I can not recall.

MR. NEARY: A political payoff.

MR. STAGG: Yes, it has been called all of that and it said that some well-known Progressive Conservatives are getting rural development loans. Well, Mr. Speaker, this province is divided into two groups of people, those that are Progressive Conservatives and those that are not and it is only natural that some of them are going to be Progressive Conservatives and some of them are going to be well-known. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Department of Rural Development, the Rural Development Authority are going to stand any test that can be thrown at them from honourable members opposite.

MR. ROBERTS: _____ We will see about that.

MR. STAGG: Yes, we will see.

MR. NEARY: Will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. STAGG: Yes, we will permit a question but not a speech though.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in connection with rural development, there is a loan for Bernard Fitzpatrick, St. John's Green Houses, \$7,184.60. I wonder if the member could tell me where I could find these Green Houses?

MR. STAGG: The honourable member will have a chance to ask that. I am not a member of the Department of Rural Development. I am not a member of the Rural Development Authority.

MR. ROBERTS: You are defending it.

MR. STAGG: Yes, I certainly am defending it and I will continue to defend it. I say that all the members on this side of the House will defend it.

MR. W. ROWE: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. STAGG: Honourable members opposite will flail away. They will flail away at something that is one of the real good things that has happened to this Province over the past ten years. They will flail away. They will flail in vain. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this government has now gotten over the jitters. I believe that we may have had a few jitters in the first couple of years and kept the honourable member in the House, which is unusual.

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

MR. STAGG: This government has now gotten over its jitters. It is onward and upward, greater things. Re-election, an isolation of the opposition, no, we would not want to do that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. M. MARTIN (Labrador South): Mr. Speaker, before I get on with my comments on the Throne Speech itself, I should like to welcome to our Assembly the new member for Hermitage. I hope that he is given the strength and courage to make as much a contribution to this Assembly as his great district has done to the Province as a whole. At the same time too, I cannot pass up the opportunity of expressing my pleasure at welcoming our friend and colleague the member from Labrador West back into the Province and at the same time I think I would be remiss if I did not congratulate the mover and seconder of the address in reply. I was with the gentleman, the honourable member from Bonavista South, up to a point and I clearly support the expressions made by the Hon. the Premier as well concerning the need for more decorum in the House. As I say I was with the honourable member from Bonavista South up to the point where he himself began to abuse the privileges and I was rather disappointed because up to that point I was rather admiring his courage.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. MARTIN: By becoming abusive of them. The Speech itself, Mr. Speaker, is commonly acknowledged to be a partisan document. I think as long as we keep that in mind we should not be getting too far off on the wrong track. But as a partisan document I believe it is time for us to recognize the fact that it is a further abuse of this House and in particular on the office of the Lieutenant Governor, in forcing

that honourable gentleman to make what should be a non-partisan speech in the House, forcing him to say things that should better be said perhaps by the Hon. the Premier. It is not becoming of a government, I think, to force a representative of the Queen to that kind of humiliation; tradition notwithstanding. I believe it is time to do away with this practice of forcing the representative of the Queen in this honourable Assembly to read that kind of a document and perhaps we should follow the role of the lead of Quebec and allow him merely to formally open the House and let the Premier get on with the business. I think it probably would be more fitting for the Premier to do it anyway. Then he could have a chance to vie for the honours with the honourable member from Bell Island, who has treated us to something of a performance of his obvious abilities as a great actor. I do not say that disparagingly. I think the honourable member from Bell Island did a commendable job, good debate, very good, absolutely. I think in this content we should allow the Premier to speak the words that are written in the Throne Speech and give it all the vim and vigor that should be put into such a partisan document.

I think if we allowed the Premier to do that kind of a thing; then we would be establishing something of a tradition ourselves. Here is another very important part of our cultural heritage in the making, much in the manner of the outport woman with the bag of fish guts as mooted by the great, late William Keough. I think it would go something in the same way.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, what did the Speech contain? It is of course something of a traditional stance as well for the government to come out firmly in support of everything that was contained in the Speech, for members of the opposition to come out and denounce it. The government is expected to defend it at all cost and the opposition is equally bound by tradition to declare it barren and worthless and empty, etc., etc., and noisy. I wonder how much strife we have to take before this particular issue no longer becomes debatable, either in a

technical or rhetorically sense of the word. The Speech, I think was neither good nor bad. There is, as the honourable member from St. John's East, I think suggested, a subtle difference in the speeches made by this administration and those put forward by the former Liberal administration.

To me, Sir, it is simply a matter of style and nothing more. In the first instance, the present government makes it a practice to announce each policy, each programme as they come due. That was not the case with the former administration and that was their privilege to do that as they saw fit. The point is, once we have decided whether or not the Speech from the Throne is necessary or desirable in the first place, once perhaps the government has deemed it desirable, we have to decide in which manner the Speech is going to be presented. Having read through this great document and read through it again, I became more and more perplexed about why the government in this Speech after taking credit for everything else did not for instance take credit for the late phase up on the Labrador Coast which was also a great benefit to our

population or maybe why they did not assume the responsibility for the nonarrival of the spruce bug worm in Alexis Bay this summer which also did great service. They took credit for just about everything else.

I will not go so far as to say the speech was barren, no Sir. We heard about such things as the Court of Appeals, a forestry programme, labour standards code, more money for local roads, we took another peek at that perennial nuisance the fisheries. All very commendable programmes, Sir, but having heard most of this before in ministerial statements, one would have liked to been delivered of a little more substance as to what exactly this government intend to do about these programmes which everybody recognizes to be badly in need of some kind of action.

We would like to have maybe a little bit more ammunition so that comes the time for some of these exciting all-night sessions we would have prepared ourselves a little better to get at the government.

It is rather sad, Mr. Speaker, to have to reflect upon the great lack of imaginative approaches which this government has taken to the problems of our society. It merely confirms, Sir, that except in a matter of degree of application of solutions to our problems that this particular government is not really substantially different from the government that formerly inhabited those benches. I do not say that facetously, I mean that sincerely, Sir.

Both these gentlemen here, these honourable members of the government and the honourable members of the opposition who were in government, and I must exclude here those honourable members who have joined the opposition since the Liberal Party formed the government, but both of these groups have shown abysmal lack of perspective of what it is that this society is all about,

what the problems are and how to go about curing them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Sir, I will, Mr. Speaker, because ever since 1949 we have seen a group of persons whom I think sincerely tried to deal with the problems, generally speaking for the most part and since the change of government another group of persons, supposed to be of a different political philosophy, tried to grapple with the same problems and still up to this point, no real progress has been made to put us on an even footing. In fact if it had not been for the money coming out of Ottawa, we would still be where we were in Commission of Government days.

MR. MURPHY: Where do you expect it to come from?

MR. MARTIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, to answer that question, where would it be coming from, perhaps we could have a little more rational development of our natural resources, perhaps we could be getting a little more out of things like ERCO, a little more out of giant corporation such as IOC, perhaps some more out of Churchill Falls, I think that perhaps we could have had this kind of development a long time ago and I think we should be now at least approaching the point where we can start to take care of ourselves instead of continuing to be beggars.

MR. NEARY: Develop or perish.

MR. MARTIN: I am not so certain, Mr. Speaker, that we have not already perished in a national sense, in a sense that we are people who are supposed to have a proud heritage behind us, of a people who are supposed to be independent, strong, broad-minded, able to stand up to anything the world has thrown up against us. I am not so certain that we cannot do that anymore and I think the reason is that we have had it bred out of us.

Governments, whether it is twenty-five years ago or five years ago or five months ago, must take a large part of the responsibility for that. What we have seen is a built in inflexibility of government programmes, a built in inflexibility to deal with

the needs of persons in general, whether these needs were expressed by petition or whether they were expressed by large pressure groups, whether they were expressed by large powerful industrialist concerns. The one thing that is common to all our programmes is the inflexibility that has been built into it, all we do is administer the aspirin to reduce the fever and leave the poison there.

Mr. Speaker, I in all sincerity cannot blame these honourable gentlemen, on either side of the House. I will not be so uncharitable as to suggest that they are not doing their best. I am certain, Sir, that they are doing their best. I can say with all sincerity, I mean this, that the honourable ministers on the other side of the House with whom I have had contact have treated me with nothing but respect and courtesy and co-operation to the best of their ability, and I stress to the best of their ability.

MR. NEARY: So what is the problem, are they all asleep or what?

MR. MARTIN: Well I cannot cast dispersions, Sir, on honourable members of this House -

AN HON. MEMBER: He could not even tell the truth.

MR. MARTIN: I must leave it to others to tell the blatant facts.

MR. WM. ROWE: We give the member leave to say whatever he wants to.

MR. MARTIN: If I could believe that, Mr. Speaker, then perhaps I would not be quite so reticent but knowing what has happened previously, you know I really cannot trust anybody these days.

AN HON. MEMBER: Really, Mr. Speaker, it would be uncharitable of anybody to blame these honourable gentlemen for not doing their duty to this country. Everyone of us here I am sure has come into this House firmly convinced that we are going to give everything to the cause. The fact that we do not have very much to give does not help solve our problems.

I think their best, these honourable members on the other side of the House, in the government benches, their best as compared

to the best which the honourable members of the opposition had to offer when they were in government, comes about on par. The fact that this is so is merely evidence that there is no substantial difference between the policies of one and the policies of the other.

MR. WM. ROWE: What is the average I.Q. of the Government of Newfoundland?

MR. MARTIN: That would be an interesting question to pursue, Mr. Speaker, and I might move that a special select committee of the House be set up to look into this matter of what is the average I.Q., not only of the government members, Mr. Speaker, but why not take a look at the whole honourable sorry mess.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARTIN: Absolutely, absolutely! The fact is, Sir, that we cannot very well expect persons to grapple with the real ills of society unless they have an understanding of what those ills are.

AN HON. MEMBER: Joey said that one time.

MR. MARTIN: That was very good. It was true then. It is true now. Perhaps it is time to get on -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARTIN: We must not condemn these honourable gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, we must not condemn them really. We should muster the Christian charity to be able to treat them -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order please. I do not know if the honourable member wishes a ruling from the Chair but honourable members to my left have been continually interrupting him and although he appears to be coping with it quite well, he does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am enjoying myself thoroughly, that is quite all right, Repartee from the other side, that is okay.

As I was about to say, this was a good point I was about to make incidentally; we really should treat these honourable gentlemen as we would anyone else who are similiarly handicapped. We are all

merely humans after all. Now God knows what is going to happen to us from here on.

MR. NEARY: Put them in Harbour Lodge.

MR. MARTIN: Then, Mr. Speaker, having reached the point where we are ready to accept the fact that these honourable gentlemen are incapable of carrying out the job for which they were elected, where do we turn now? Surely we cannot depend upon the official opposition. You grasped my point before I had a chance to make it.

MR. MARTIN: Now you see, Sir, these honourable men in the opposition have had ample opportunity to display their own inability to provide good opposition, just the same as they had plenty of opportunity to provide examples of poor government.

MR. W. ROWE: What does the honourable member provide?

MR. MARTIN: The question, Mr. Speaker, that I asked of this honourable House, when I made my maiden speech last year, was that very question. What does this honourable member hope to provide? I would not be naive enough, Sir, to think that I could sway either side of the House with any kind of blatant, political power, which we might have, neither could I hope to equal the great oratorical abilities of those honourable gentlemen on either side whom I must confront. Therefore, what can this honourable member contribute to this Assembly? Maybe once in a while to be able to sort of insinuate myself between the arguments of both sides and plead for a little self-respect and a little concern for decorum and enter a plea now and then that we treat this Assembly with the kind of respect that the people who sent us here deserve.

MR. NEARY: Now remember, give me a break, I helped you save your boat.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, that is the first time I have heard that. I have heard these honourable gentlemen take claim for a lot of other things but I have not yet, until this very instant - oh, I am sorry, you said boat, I thought you said vote.

MR. NEARY: That is right. I helped the honourable member save his boat.

MR. MARTIN: I am sorry. True. True. I feel grateful for that, Sir.

The Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, brought all of this, I think, into fine perspective. It is after all no more than a summary of government action or planning for action. What the government does in our parliamentary system, of course, depends to a

large degree upon their sensitivity to public demands and to the effectiveness of the opposition, Sir.

The Throne Speech then casts its pale reflection upon all members of this House. If the government had not been quite able to carry off the job of providing good government, then it also must stand that the opposition has not been quite able to carry off the job of providing good opposition. I must count myself into that one as well.

Mr. Speaker, I still have some time left. If I may be permitted, I would like to touch briefly upon some of the items contained in this growing document, point by point, perhaps. Early on in the speech, very early on, after they had gone through the standard apology of having become bogged down in the chaos left by the Liberal Administration, right there in paragraph (3), I think it was, they introduced what was to become later on a recurring theme that they are undertaking. Now there is an unfortunate phrase, "undertaking." I quote:

"To improve the welfare of my people by careful planning." Now, Sir, I am all for careful planning but all things in moderation, surely. How careful must we expect our government to be? They have been steadfastly, carefully planning for the past two years. Surely, it must be just about time that we saw some of the fruits of their labour. The speech mentions that this past year has been a prosperous year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, Sir. I would welcome the chance to take any honourable member here down to my district to show them our share of that prosperity. I would like to show them what prosperity has done in Labrador South, where we still have to carry water two miles over the frozen bay ice to get anything fit to drink; where we have to dump pails of raw garbage and raw sewerage on the harbour ice because there is no other way of

disposing of it; where we have to impose voluntary rationing of groceries and other consumer commodities because somehow or other last summer a certain portion of the freight did not get delivered on the Labrador. I would like to know what kind of prosperity is involved with slogging over impassable trails, trying to get from one place to the other because somehow or other we did not get fitted into the Highway's Department budget. We are still paying gasoline tax.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what kind of prosperity allows our fishermen to go to sea, still, in eighteen foot open boats trying to get something or other out of the ocean to keep them alive.

Mr. Speaker; I would like to know what kind of prosperity it is that forces people to buy rejected, fresh frozen meats that were unsuitable for the local markets and were, therefore, dumped on Labrador.

MR. W. ROWE: Who did that?

MR. MARTIN: I can name the honourable member three or four of the general merchants who supply the Labrador, Sir, and that is standard practice and always has been.

Mr. Speaker, there is no prosperity in waiting for manpower to come up with jobs that never materialize. There is no prosperity to be seen in communities where people have to get up at the call of the boat, even if it is three o'clock of a windy, rainy morning, and go a mile out on the ocean to stop the coastal boats going by, Sir, so that they can unload freight. After all this time, we still do not have community wharves. There is very little prosperity associated with having to watch people die simply because there is no way of getting them to medical aid in time and no way of bringing medical aid to them. These cases are documented, Sir. That is the kind of prosperity which the people of Labrador have experienced over the past year:

Statement: " The growth of the gross provincial produce increased at a rate twice that of Canada as a whole" or words to that effect. I would like to ask, Sir, the honourable members of this Assembly, if we in Labrador South could now please have one small little bit of that gross provincial product to somehow make a start, just a start at bringing us up to a standard that is enjoyed by the rest of the people in this province.

The government states its resolute determination to continue to direct the affairs of our people in a careful and vigilant manner only after assessing all of the long-term effects of extraneous pressures. There is one extraneous pressure, Mr. Speaker, which will not wait; namely the accelerating pace of a changing world over which we have no control. In God's name, let us not please grind ourselves into obsolescence because while we are waiting and planning and making sure that everything is going to be done properly and by the time it is applied, it is no longer proper because things have changed around us.

At long last we are supposed to have a forestry policy. That is a commendable idea. The inclusion of this in itself, I think, will justify the Throne Speech. I sincerely hope, Sir, that the government will not again be bamboozled by the big companies who control most of the forest lands into letting them have cost-free lands without any kind of commitment from those companies to keep them productive. We are supposed to have access roads. That is all very well, if there is a programme for access roads, that is a commendable idea also. What good is a programme if the people cannot avail of it? I wonder if any attempt is being made to encourage local people in areas where there are forest stands to get involved, get themselves set up in the forest business. Or is it just simply a matter of letting it stand and hoping that nobody finds out about it because then they will have to bother with it?

Mr. Speaker, there is one sad statement in the whole of the Throne Speech and that was concerning fisheries. I still do not have any indication there is any evidence that

this honourable House of Assembly, knows the degree, the extent to which our fisheries and our fishermen have dropped. I am wondering if we have anything left in the stage of development at which we should expect to be, vis-a-vis that stage at which we were in say 1949, Sir. Others are going faster and we are being left behind.

Now, Sir, I say this sincerely that I do not believe there is anybody associated with this government that has any real idea of what has to be done. I do not know what has to be done. I do not have the answers. Surely, good heavens if it is our main industry then after all of this time, something has to be started!

Mr. Speaker, I know what should be tried. I know at least what should be tried in my district, an area with which I am more familiar. If I may recount, Sir, and I do not mean to be embarrassing to any one here, but last spring I brought before the Premier and the Hon. Minister of Fisheries an outline of a proposal, just an outline of a proposal, for the setting up of a fisheries development programme in my district. The gentlemen agreed that it was a good programme. It was a good, sensible proposal but that is all that ever came of it. There was nothing further happened from there.

Mr. Speaker, it is time surely that if we do not know for certain what we have to do with the fisheries, it is time to avoid caution. Sometime or another we have to take a giant step and be a little courageous and be prepared to make some mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, it is all very well with the offshore fishery, except for declining stocks over which apparently we intended to have no control, much to our shame and disgrace. The reason that the case for the offshore fishery has been so well documented is that it is simply an industrial programme, conducted by industrialists who are out to make a dollar and that is fair, that is fine, that is great. They know what they are up to and they know what they want.

Sir, there is a large segment of the fisheries, which is not so well-organized, which is made up of a group of small businessmen, independent fishermen, who really do not know what has transpired in the world of technology, do not know what is happening to their markets and cannot be expected to. I think somebody should take it upon themselves to find out and put something into action.

Now I will make what I hope is a constructive suggestion. I think it has been amply proven that as far as the fisheries are concerned, we are floundering. There are research groups, both provincial and federal, who are trying to grapple with the problems and mostly these are biologists, scientists and very careful people. What we need, Sir, is a resource group set up by government, a development authority if you will -

MR. PECKFORD: More planning.

MR. MARTIN: Not more planning, no - more action. We need a group set up, an authority set up, which has the authority to go in and take a hand in the development of the fisheries, not just to go in and lend assistance to fishermen to develop their own particular small enterprise but to go into an area where nobody else is mindful to; where perhaps it is not conceivable for a private businessman or industrialists to go in and invest private capital but where there is a demonstrated need for development, for that public authority to go in and take charge of that development. I think after a very short period of time, we would find something happening with the fisheries.

I am wondering if these honourable gentlemen in government really realize what the inshore fishery is all about or are they still plagued by the thought that perhaps dirty, stinky, old fish should be done away with altogether and we should get all our fishermen who are now out in the

little, small, uncomfortable boats into nice, clean, white, sanitary plants and have done with this foolish business of getting your boots in the gurry. I do not think so. I think there are some people up there who have some idea that the inshore fishery can be viable, but again, Sir, nobody has the courage to go and do anything about it.

One statement which I think has the tone of this whole Speech, "Prices paid to fishermen and wages for plant workers have reached an all time high and my ministers are continuing their efforts to improve the lot of the inshore fishermen by all available means." Mr. Speaker, that is not cricket. This leaves the impression that these honourable gentlemen in government are responsible for giving the fishermen higher prices. This is no less, no more than the kind of tactics we saw coming out of that side of the House for twenty-two years. Surely, surely there must be an error some place. These honourable gentlemen did not really expect anyone to believe that they are responsible for the increase in prices to fishermen. Good Lord! It is beneath them! Really, such tactics!

Energy is in vogue, apparently. I should like to dwell upon that sector of the energy-producing industry, if I might term it that, that is closer to home, in Labrador, the development of Lower Churchill, the development of all the other potential hydro sites in Eastern Labrador. I think it is about time we stopped talking about whether or not the Upper Churchill was a good deal or was not a good deal. I think it is time that we got on with the development of the Lower Churchill and I think it is time that we stopped giving away our foodies to private industrialists to make profits out of and if we do have the technology to do it ourselves; then we have the machinery, we have the power commission. In heavens name! why not let the Power Commission get on with it, development that potential and if we cannot use it, if we cannot sell it then it is still money in the bank. It is not going to deteriorate and the prices are going up. Further to that and the development of hydro on the Labrador, I would like to ask, in light of statements that have been made about

attracting power-hungry, power in the sense of hydro power, power-hungry industry to this Province, why it is that we never hear any talk of establishing those industries in the territory of Labrador rather than on the Island of Newfoundland?

It seems to me to make more sense if you could bring the user to the source than to have to bring the source to the user. What is wrong, for instance, with utilizing some of that empty space up on the former air force base in Goose Bay? Similiar to that idea, the Harmon Corporation, and utilizing the power for the Churchill projects, the Eagle projects and whatever is coming next, to give those industries, which we hope to entice there, a good reliable source of power.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible

MR. MARTIN: I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable gentleman from St. John's Centre has hit it right on the nose.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARTIN: I will deal with two questions separately. The fact that we do not now have a - we have no transportation system - I was going to say reliable transportation system. We do not have a ground transportation system and that fact I think is one of the reasons why we cannot encourage industry to establish. Having

accepted that and accepted the idea that we have to build some kind of a ground transportation system. Then there must be a terminal point. The main obstacle to transportation is ice. There are two kinds. There is the annual freeze-up of the shore ice, shore-fast-ice and there is the drift Arctic ice which comes down in the spring.

Beyond and north of Henley Harbour, the problem of shore-fast-ice is a great problem. It requires almost the constant use of icebreakers and becomes, thereby, expensive. South of Henley Harbour and into the Straits the problem is not so great because the ice field is neither as wide nor does the ice freeze to such a great depth. The currents are also in our favour as are the prevailing winds and we are not likely to get the same kind of freeze-up conditions anywhere near that which we have on the northern part of the coast. Therefore, I would propose that if the resource development of Labrador were taken as a whole, if it were not to be taken in a piecemeal fashion, that simultaneously we have to decide where those resources are that are to be developed, where we are going to lay that ground transportation system, where that terminal port facility is to be. We already have in Red Bay a perfectly natural harbour which is open or I should say, which is closed by the drift ice for no more at a maximum than two months of the year and I think this could possibly be extended by the use of better scheduling and the use of an icebreaker.

If we are going to talk about development of the Labrador, we have to take into consideration and accept the fact that we are up against natural obstacles such as climate and ice. Surely this should not be a reason to then step back and say; "It is not worth it." If the Labrador Territory, Mr. Speaker, is not worth it to the honourable gentlemen in this government, then please let them give us the means to make it worth it to ourselves.

I have suggested that an organization similar to that one I referred to with the fisheries, a development authority, with a mandate to go in and develop regardless, that a special authority be set up for the Coast of Labrador to go in where there is a demonstrated need for

development, where there is a demonstrated source of raw materials and a labour force and regardless of the economics, the dollars and cents, the boardroom kind of decision, to go in and develop those industries for the sake of giving people jobs and getting them off the welfare rolls. I suggest that it has to be a special authority with public funding because no private corporation is prepared to invest dollars in that way, the return is too slow and too low.

When I made that suggestion originally, I was told that the Rural Development Authority was set up specifically to do just that. I do not believe this is the case. I think the Rural Development Authority is set up specifically to hand out money to private individuals to build their business enterprises. In that I cannot find too much wrong. That is a good concept but the concept does not go far enough.

Therefore, if this government, Mr. Speaker, is not willing to assume the role through their line departments of development of Labrador, then give us the means to do so by ourselves, create that authority, give us the funding and we will get on with the job.

If I might return briefly to the matter of hydropower, I would like to again remind honourable members that there is a great inequality in this province being perpetrated not just upon the people of Labrador but people of many far-flung rural regions of the island, and that is that there are two rates for electricity; one for that generated by hydro and one for that

generated by diesel. In most of the rural areas its a diesel generator and we get higher rates.

I believe it is time that we accepted the fact that we are all equal citizens of this province and give those people in the areas where they can least afford to pay higher rates, give them the benefit (I must not say that dirty word) give them some government money to equalize the two-rate structures. The service is atrocious.

We heard in the Throne Speech that new emphasis was going to be given to mineral resource development. I have one question to ask on that. When, Mr. Speaker, are members of a government who are charged with the responsibility of developing our mineral resources going to take a good clear look at what BRINCO have discovered up there, find out exactly how those resources, the development of those resources can be co-ordinated with the laying in of ground transportation and air transportation systems, with the laying in of power lines and seeing exactly what kind of a potential we have there for development?

BRINCO have been given the right to go and develop, or BRINEX, given the right to go and explore. I think it is about time, if this is confidential and perhaps it is a good reason why it should be kept confidential, I am not arguing with that but I would like some assurances from these honourable gentlemen in government that they do in fact know what BRINCO have found and to get on with the business of co-ordinating resource development, particularly minerals.

The Rural Development Authority, I will not enter into the controversy simply because I have not researched it well enough and my research staff is tired and overworked.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, does the honourable member want assistance?

MR. MARTIN: I will come back for it before the Budget Speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: The one comment that I do have to make on the Rural Development Authority, as I have already said, they seem to be an organization

simply for the handing out of money.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear! The honourable member put his finger right on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I am not arguing with the concept of passing out of resource development money or any kind of development money providing it is done above board. I am not even questioning that.

MR. W. N. ROWE: But the honourable member is against political favour.

MR. MARTIN: What I am saying, Sir, and again I am not trying to embarrass anybody, what I am saying is that this authority have not gone far enough. The simple handing out of monies to be used for the establishment of business does not go far enough because there are many areas in this province and particularly in my own district where the resources there are waiting to be developed, where the labour force is there on welfare and unemployment insurance. We have to some way get these two together and simply making money available to these people will not solve the problem because they do not have the managerial skills and they do not have the courage to get in and borrow that amount of money and to try and establish business. So the authority have to go one step further in take a direct hand in establishing these businesses. Take a direct hand the tying in of management personnel to run these businesses and allow them to take it over, over a period of time so that they eventually become self-sustaining without the inherent danger of having private individuals who mean well but who are nevertheless capable of wasting good public money.

AN HON. MEMBER: What kind of business can the honourable member put in his district?

MR. ROBERTS: A mortuary, a flower shop, a newspaper -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I hate to call upon you as a referee, Sir, but I do have the floor.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I do agree with the honourable member for

Labrador South that he does have the right to be heard in silence.

I request all honourable members to be silent for

the rest of the members speech.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I heard a question, Sir, what can be done in Mary's Harbour, for instance? I take it to be. Well, for instance we have a problem on the Labrador Coast of supply and last year the Department of Labrador Services or whatever it is now called spent considerable money in air-lifting emergency supplies because the ocean had frozen up too early. The problem with supply, Sir, is twofold. First of all there is not enough credit in the local merchant houses to extend their supplies over a six or eight month period. They are not that big enough. I am talking about development, Sir, of the whole community, one of which is a service center. For all resource development enterprises there must be a service center.

MR. NEARY: What about the Reverend Brainaird's proposals? Does the honourable member know anything about these.

MR. MARTIN: An excellent thought but I would like to deal with the one other item. If there were enough credit in Mary's Harbour to bring in supplies for that section of the coast and thereby allow people to get on with the business of resource development, there would be the matter of warehouse storage. I think that this is an area in which the rural development authority can legitimately become involved. What about the reverend gentleman's operation in Fox Harbour?

MR. NEARY: Is there a rural development association in Mary's Harbour?

MR. MARTIN: Yes, there is. In Mary's Harbour there is a development association. There is also a nonprofit company sponsored by the Anglican Parish which is even now in the process of building, under several government grants, a fish plant, fish processing operation. That is the Reverend Brainaird's operation, his concept, no longer his operation. He has moved out.

MR. NEARY: But he is really a very dedicated man.

MR. MARTIN: Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, let me inform these honourable gentlemen what has happened in Fox Harbour with this particular operation. Fox Harbour was notorious for its dependency on welfare. Since this gentleman became involved in trying to make these people self-sufficient

not only have they removed themselves from the welfare roles but they have strangely enough regained that kind of self-confidence and pride in themselves which they used to have before government started handing out money hand over fist without regard to making them earn it. What has happened in Fox Harbour in effect, if anybody wants to go down and have a look, is a perfect example of how rural development should be approached.

MR. ROBERTS: The Reverend Mr. Brainaird was the motivating force.

Am I correct?

MR. MARTIN: Yes, the Reverend Dr. Brainaird was the motivating force.

MR. NEARY: Does the honourable minister think so?

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. MARTIN: I do not mind, Mr. Speaker, I am all for group participation.

I have ten minutes in which to rap this up. So, if the honourable members will allow me, I have got five more pages to go through. I will try to do it briefly.

The Throne Speech also mentioned DREE. Now, here is something of a coup because - and we are really very pleased about this in Labrador - because previously we had been specifically excluded from DREE programmes. Now, there was a sinister reason behind this, Mr. Speaker. The reason was if we were not allowed to become involved in the expansion programmes offered by DREE, then we would be less likely to accept the fact that we could make a living on the Labrador Coast and thereby after a while pack it all up and go to Goose Bay or Foxtrap or some place and relieve the government of the burden of supplying the Labrador Coast. We are very, very pleased to see that DREE is now applicable to us.

This March, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be, along with the rest of the people of this province, entering into our celebrations of the 25th anniversary of Confederation. To us it means a little bit more than that because to us in Labrador it means the 25th anniversary of responsible government or perhaps we should say irresponsible government. It has been only 25 years since we have had a representative in the legislative assembly and we hope to be able to participate in

the celebrations to the fullest extent possible to make sure that the people of the Island of Newfoundland understand that we truly appreciate being Canadians. Unlike, I think, people in Newfoundland we did not go around crying "Canadian Wolf".

Education - Oh Lord! Education! Mr. Speaker, I could go on at great length about education but I have only one thing to say as regards to the student-aid programme. There have been questions as to whether this government are creating an eliteist institution of Memorial University. Judging from the decline in enrollments over the past year there is ample reason to believe, we must of course wait for the report, but there is ample reason to believe that with the cutting off of government assistance more and more people from rural areas, from low income families have found it necessary to drop out. Now if this is the case, Mr. Speaker, and history will decide whether or not Memorial University is becoming an eliteist institution, then the honourable gentleman opposite, in particular the Hon. the Minister of Finance should bear in mind, Sir, that he is himself regarded to be of the elite of this province. There is nothing wrong with that. A fine chap! History will also bear witness that if Memorial is to become an eliteist institution that it was the elite of this province who created it and made it so. I am not certain whether the honourable gentleman opposite would want to go down in history with that stigma.

The honourable member for St. John's South expressed concern about the method in which contracts were tendered. I have only one comment to make. Hopefully when questions are brought before the House later on in the session when this matter of contracting out is aired, for the light of day, that the honourable member for St. John's South will remember his comments and if necessary to remove himself from the ranks of government if he sees fit.

I cannot go passed mentioning the court of appeals which I think is a laudible effort on the part of our government. This only points up I think that the quality of justice in this province still has a long way to go.

The Trans-Labrador Highway which we heard so much about and which I mentioned earlier, I can only say on this that perhaps we are not exactly on the right tract,

Mr. Speaker, that we are merely giving ourselves another liability. That might sound strange coming from a member whose district has so few roads but I wonder if it is not time when people in this country started thinking about the differences inherent in trying to develop the north country. We have a different state of affairs altogether and I am not exactly convinced that a conventional highway is what we need in the north country. I think there is a better way of doing it. I am endeavouring to get some figures from engineers from which to put forth an argument when this subject later comes up for debate.

I do believe that there is reasonable cause to doubt the sensibility of carrying on with constructing a conventional type of highway across Labrador. While we are onto that I might get on the matter of air services because we have no roads and because navigation is closed for six or eight months of the year we have to depend a great deal on air services.

Now, Sir, when the money is dished out as to who is going to get what share of the air services budget, it seems strange to me that priorities have to be placed the way they have been. Let me give you one example under our other examples, four or five others, but let me just give you one because time is running out - in St. Barbe South, I think it is, Port au Choix, St. Barbe South, a first class highway goes right through there, a first class gravel highway and I think it is a good highway, certainly far, far above anything we have in Labrador South.

In the port of Port au Choix, I cannot say that it is a very good marine facility but at least it is a marine facility and there is not the same kind of isolation on the Northern Peninsula as there is across the Straits yet we find that a large slice of the budget was taken not only to simply upgrade that air field but to pave it. Now I do not begrudge the good people of St. Barbe South anything that they might be able to get but I just wonder whether or not somebody's priorities might have gone a little bit astray because we were also asking for a few thousand feet of runway

in Red Bay which is not yet forthcoming.

I do believe, Sir, that when the whole programme of air services is looked into, anybody will have to agree that Labrador has been short changed, not just by the federal government whose prime responsibility it is but by the provincial government as well.

In the matter of licencing of drivers, one of the honourable members opposite, I forget which one, I believe it was St. John's South, mentioned the great need for stiffer regulations in the licencing of drivers. I believe, Sir, this is an area in which everyone of us must take a greater part because if one life is lost because the regulations are not stiff enough then that surely is reason without even debate to look into the whole regulatory system and change it so that this thing cannot happen again. There is enough of the element of chance when driving on the highway these days anyway without putting people on the road who are infirm.

I am intrigued by the statements containing the code of labour standards. I am intrigued because I am wondering what is happening in particular the fisheries programme. Now, Mr. Speaker, I see that it is approaching six o'clock so I wonder if I might move adjournment until tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The debate has been adjourned. The honourable member will be given first chance tomorrow to continue.

MR. MARSHALL: I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, three o'clock in the afternoon and that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker: On motion the House at its rising stands adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 6, 1974, at 3:00 p.m.