



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

---

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 77

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 1976**

**SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER**

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of 199 residents of the community of Hant's Harbour in the Electoral District of Trinity-Bay de Verde. Sir, the prayer of the petition is as follows; A petition to the hon. House of Assembly, Whereas the roads to Custer's Head, Caplin Cove and Meade Gardens in the Town of Hant's Harbour have been upgraded and prepared for paving by the Department of Highways, and whereas the paving of said roads has been promised on several occasions, and whereas paving equipment will be in the area in the near future to complete paving of other roads, that is, the Northern Point Road in Heart's Content, and the road around the pond in Cavendish, be it resolved that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador undertake the paving of said roads during the Summer of 1976. We the undersigned voters of the Community of Hant's Harbour who are all nineteen years of age and over do hereby request the government to do everything in its power to see that this project is completed.

Now, Sir, in speaking in support of the petition I would like to remind the hon. House, Mr. Speaker, that the paving of the Custer's Head road in particular was a promise made in writing, in print, in fact, in the P.C.'s campaign pamphlet. It was stated quite clearly and quite plainly that the Custer's Head road would be paved by the end of September, 1975. Now, Sir, in the district of Trinity-Bay de Verde, September -

MR. J. CARTER: Who promised that road would be paved?

MR. ROWE: Well if the hon. member wants to know who promised the road to be paved, Sir, it was the then hon. Jim Reid, who was a Minister of Crown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROWE: Now are we finished, Mr. Speaker?

MR. RIDEOUT: Now is that the reason why it should not be done?

MR. ROWE: I do not know what the minister is implying, Sir, in his goings on across the way, but the fact of the matter is, Sir, is that the people have been given the distinct impression in writing that that road would have been paved by last September. And I think that this government, this administration, should honour the commitment of a former minister of the Crown. Now since that promise was made, Sir, I checked it out, and the Minister of Transportation will probably confirm this, that although that promise was made there were no tenders called for the paving of that road, neither was there a contract let. So I do not know what the promise was based on. But I still reiterate this simple fact, a previous minister or a late minister of the previous administration, -

AN HON. MEMBER: The then minister.

MR. ROWE: - the then minister did make a commitment to the people of Hant's Harbour to have this road paved.

MR. NEARY: But he has made the supreme sacrifice.

MR. ROWE: So, Sir, I - he has probably made the supreme sacrifice - but I would like to hear some support from the Minister of Transportation and Communications with respect to this particular petition, Sir, because the road is out there now ready for pavement, is on the edge of the harbour and of course it is slowly, through rain and wind action and sea action being worn away, eroded away, and if that road is to stay a road some black top has to go on that particular road. It is only about, I think, it is something less than a mile of road. And Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be placed upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates, and I hope that it gets the support of the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this petition so ably presented by my colleague, the hon. House leader of the Opposition. In view of the fact that it has been upgraded so long.

Mr. J. Winsor:

paving will save the government a lot of money on repairs and maintenance, if they keep it like it is now it is going to be very expensive deal. Mr. Reid kept a good many of his promises, such as Hermitage, and Harbour Breton, They were done. Apparently Hant's Harbour has not been done. And I think they justly deserve this, therefore I support wholeheartedly the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before the Minister of Transportation rises in his place to comment on the petition, Sir, I want to support the prayer of the petition presented on behalf of 199 residents of Hant's Harbour. He should have made it a round figure and got at least 200 residents there. But I support the petition not for the same reason that the member who presented it in the House gave, Sir, I do not think that was a justifiable reason for having the road paved, the fact that Mr. Reid, who went down in defeat, who paid the supreme sacrifice, made a promise to the people in that district, Obviously they did not accept his word or his promise because the gentleman was defeated, and he is not here in the House to see that the promise was fulfilled. I would be more inclined, Mr. Speaker, to think that there are other justifications for having that road paved, that the road is probably dusty, it is not adequately maintained, that it is causing a nuisance in the area, a dust nuisance, a menace, to people who travel in the area it is probably a safety hazard. I would be more inclined to think that these are the reasons, Sir, for having that road paved and not the fact that Mr. Reid made a promise in the last election. Every road that needs to be upgraded and paved and reconstructed in this Province has to stand on its own feet, on its own merits. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition. And I think the prayer is justified, not for the reason the hon. member gave but because the people in the area deserve to have better road conditions.



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

HON. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to say a few words in support of the petition and on the petition, comments on it, I think it is rather unusual, or it is a very poor way to represent people of a district. When a petition is brought before the House of Assembly of this nature with a justifiable request, if it is a gravel road, a rough gravel road, in fact, all gravel roads in the Province, there is a justifiable request for them to be reconstructed and paved. But to play politics with a request of the people in such a way as to indicate the reasons for it to be reconstructed and paved is because a promise was made by a politician in some election campaign who was defeated, that is a very poor way of bringing forward the needs of the people in that area. However I will overlook that point, and I will say that the request of the people from Hant's Harbour will be given the same consideration as hundreds of other people who have brought petitions to this House of Assembly, and passed along to my department, and unfortunately there are insufficient funds to do all the work that needs to be done with regards to road work, reconstruction and paving, in any one year, in fact, any two years. But the people of Hant's Harbour will be given the same consideration as thousands of other communities around the Province where there are rough gravel roads.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word or two in support of the petition which my friend and colleague from Trinity-Ray de Verde (Mr. Rowe) presented, and I think the petition is a very sound request and a very strong request and a very well merited one. And I do not mind the Minister of Transportation and Communications trying to twist and to distort the member's effort in presenting the petition, but I think it is fair of me to repeat the fact that it is entirely relevant to the point of this petition and to the prayer of the petition to point out that this is not something new for which

Mr. Roberts:

these petitioners are asking, but it is a commitment made by the government of which the hon. gentleman from Bonavista Bay South (Mr. Morgan) is at present a member, or as he would sometimes call it, his government.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, the point is that this government promised these people who live along the Custer's Head Road in Hant's Harbour this road, and there can be no excuse at all for the Minister of Transportation and Communications not paving that road this Summer. If he does not do it, Mr. Speaker, it is -

MR. MORGAN: Not by the minister.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it was not promised by the minister, Sir, but the minister has got to learn a very fundamental fact of Cabinet government, that it is not I, as the minister often says, it is we. A Cabinet functions as a group.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman, Leader of the Opposition, is now getting involved in debate on the petition which is not allowed under the rules of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was merely responding to a point made by the hon. gentleman to which I say, Sir, (a) I am not debating and (b) if the hon. gentleman raises a point, he can be hardly heard to whine and to snivel and to complain when he comes back and says that the gentleman replying to it is debating. If the hon. gentleman does not intend his points be replied to, Sir, I would suggest that he not make them. I would suggest furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in finishing my remarks on this point of order, that the hon. gentleman observe the rules of the House and extend to members on this side the same courtesy which we extend to him, namely, allowing hon. members to speak when they have been recognized by Your Honour without being interrupted by hon. gentlemen opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On the point of order, naturally comment is to be restricted to what is asked for in the petition. Along with that certainly the reasons that it is asked for. One of the references made by the hon. gentleman presenting the petition was his opinion of a former

MR. SPEAKER:

commitment. This was commented upon by the hon. minister, and the hon. minister's comments on that are now in turn being commented upon. As long as this is related to the request of the petition and not made the subject itself of the discourse, then I do not see that I could rule it out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying for the benefit of the minister, commitments are not made by ministers, they are made in behalf of a government. And he must function, Sir, as a member of the government and whether or not he has personally, ministerially, officially and in his own flesh and living blood and gorgeous clothes made a commitment, it is a commitment made in behalf of the government by a man who was a member of the government, Mr. James Reid, at that time the Minister of Rural Development. My friend and colleague in presenting the petition quite properly drew attention to the fact that the government which is still in office made this commitment. All I say, Sir, is that the people in Kent's Harbour have a right to expect the commitment to be kept. If it is not kept, it is solely the responsibility of the Minister of Transportation and Communications and he should resign forthwith from the Cabinet if this year ends and that commitment is not kept, Sir. I say if he is a man of political principle and courage, Mr. Speaker, he will do that.

MR. WELLS: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that suggestions of this sort really are entering into the realm of debate. I think there is no question about that.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I fear I probably did slip over the line into debate. It is hard, Sir, in dealing with the Minister of Transportation and Communications not to slip over the line because, of course, Sir, the minister's conduct demands debate and his refusal to allow his estimates to be discussed in the House this year prevented us from doing so. But if I may conclude my remarks -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! There is a point of order now made.

MR. MORGAN: On a point of personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: I am about to -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: As I said I am about to rule on a point of order and I cannot interrupt a ruling on a point of order with anything. A point of privilege the minister can intervene while a point of order is being debated, but not during a ruling.

The point of order raised by the hon. Minister without Portfolio is a valid one and indeed that was conceded by the hon. gentleman with respect to whose remarks the point of order was made. Certainly further references with respect to the consequences, let us say, of non-paving would be out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: May I continue?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of privilege, the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition stated that this minister refused to have his estimates brought before the House of Assembly. That is a totally incorrect statement. The only reason that the estimates of my department were not brought before the House of Assembly is because of the time lapse, the time had elapsed, the time allotted for debating the estimates, and the time was taken up in trivial matters brought forward by the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues.

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

MR. MORGAN: That is the only reason.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman has stated what in his opinion was a point of privilege but there is no matter of privilege involved.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may conclude my remarks, let me say again I support the petition. I believe the people who live along Custer's Head Road in Hant's Harbour make a reasonable request. The road should be paved on its own merits as a road which needs pavement,

MR. ROBERTS:

a road which has sufficient traffic to justify the laying of pavement. And the road should be paved as well because the government of this Province speaking through the lips of one of their ministers made that solemn commitment to the people of Hant's Harbour in a recent election campaign, and the present minister, Sir, must ensure, the present Minister of Transportation, must ensure that the commitment is kept or else be exposed as a member of government who do not keep their word. I support the petition, Sir.

MR. SPFAKEP: The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the people of Gaultois, some 260 of them which represents obviously just about every person over the age of nineteen years. The population is 650, approximately. So that would clearly indicate that every adult person has signed this petition. The prayer of this petition is a bit complicated and rather lengthy. I hope, Mr. Speaker, the House will bear with me while I try to present it.

"We, the people of Gaultois are very disappointed over the mishap in which the M.V. Bonavista struck and cut down the M.V. North Bay while tied up at it's own wharf resulting in the boat being out of service for the Summer months. We, along with the community, wish to make clear that this vessel was our only connection with the Mainland during stormy Winter nights, always standing by in case of sickness, and was also available for transportation each day to and from Hermitage."

The real meat of the prayer is that CN have a boat replace the North Bay. "If not CN should schedule the Marine Sprinter to connect with Hermitage on the weekends. The Sprinter while going down the coast eastward makes the right connection for the people of Gaultois to come to Hermitage. Its schedule is now to arrive at Gaultois 9:00 A.M. Saturday mornings. However the present schedule of the Marine Sprinter going up the coast westward is not convenient for weekend travellers. On the present schedule the Sprinter arrives

MR. J. WINSOR:

at Gaultois at 3:00 P.M. Sunday afternoons. We wish to have this schedule changed so that the Marine Sprinter would remain in Hermitage, or not arrive there until 8:00 P.M. Sunday evenings, then cross to Gaultois and remain there for the night instead of Milltown. This would give the people of Gaultois a better chance to return home for the weekend.

"We also propose that the wharf to be notified of CN boats arrival in Gaultois one hour in advance, that there be space provided within the freight shed for travellers to place their luggage while waiting. We also suggest a wind and rain shelter for travellers while waiting, that CN install a pay telephone on the government wharf in Gaultois, that the Marine Sprinter spend at least fifteen minutes in port thus allowing people who have to walk to the wharf carrying luggage ample time to get on board.

"We are aware of instances in which due to not knowing when to expect the boat and because the boat spent less than five minutes in port travellers have missed the boat." That is the basic essence of the prayer. There are other proposals listed on this petition which I need not read. They all cover this. I am sure that the department responsible will be able to sort it out and will see that these suggestions by the people who are certainly long suffering and isolated, the only island I believe in Newfoundland that is so isolated. I therefore request, Mr. Speaker, that this petition be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

HON. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in saying a few words on the petition which seems to be within the realms of jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the CNR's operations, I would be only too pleased to support that petition in that regard in the hope that CNR will change their scheduling in the area to the satisfaction of the residents. Also I would like to point out that I am hoping that the hon. gentleman would request the support of his colleague in Ottawa, the Hon. Don Jamieson, the M.P. for that area, in the hope that he can use his influence with his colleague, the Minister of Transport, who in turn could influence CN in changing the scheduling in the satisfaction of the residents of the area.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the prayer of the petition. I understand, I believe, from the prayer of the petition as it was being read by the hon. gentleman, and I was trying to follow him as closely as I could, there is really two problems; they would really like to have a replacement for the North Bay to go back and forth between Hermitage and Gaultois every day, and also have Gaultois included in the schedule of the Marine Sprinter. So I believe -

MR. J. WINSOR: Not quite.

MR. NEARY: That is not? Well maybe I interpreted what the member said incorrectly. What they want then is a daily schedule of the Marine Sprinter.

MR. J. WINSOR: If I may, Sir. The Sprinter schedule does include Gaultois, but it is not at all convenient.

MR. NEARY: I see. Well then maybe I misunderstood the beginning of the prayer of the petition. The member started off by saying that the people regretted that the North Bay, that had been cut down by the Bonavista, had not been replaced.

MR. J. WINSOR: The North Bay was owned by Gaultois Fisheries.

MR. NEARY: By Gaultois Fisheries, right. And I presume used to operate between Gaultois and Hermitage. I believe, I am not sure if



Mr. Neary:

that is the one I had the pleasure of making a trip on or not.

MR. J. WINSOR: No, the Louisa Holt I guess you made a trip on.

MR. NEARY: Anyway I did have the privilege of making a trip between Gaultois and Hermitage. But I support the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, As a member who represents a Southwest Coast District I understand the problems and the frustrations of the people in Gaultois. We have it all up and down the Southwest Coast. And, Sir, I do hope that the minister will do a little arm twisting and put the pressure on Ottawa as well as the suggestion that the minister made to the official old-line Opposition that they may be able to persuade their colleague, the Leader of the Opposition may be able to persuade Mr. Jamieson to grant the prayer of the petition. This seems to be very common sense and very justifiable on behalf of the residents of Gaultois.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of the petition. The prayer of the petition, if interpreted narrowly, is really addressed to CN in the sense that CN adjust the present schedule of the Sprinter. If I understand the transportation concerns of the people of Gaultois at all, I would suggest that the overall prayer is that they have a better daily access to Hermitage than is the case right now. And the Minister of Transportation is right in reminding us to talk to Mr. Jamieson. In turn, Mr. Speaker, we would be right to remind him that had we the ferry between McCallum and Gaultois and Hermitage that was committed three years ago we would not have this petition today.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further petitions? The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a second petition from the same community, and I might add both of the petitions were circulated by the Local Improvement District of Hant's Harbour. Sir, the prayer of this particular petition is: A petition to the hon. House of Assembly, whereas the community of Hant's Harbour

Mr. Rowe:

has enjoyed the service of a good water supply system since 1972; and whereas the availability of such a service has led to the installation of a large number of individual sewer systems which are not practical because of the lack of a good water supply; and whereas the terrain in most areas of Hant's Harbour is rocky or boggy, and it makes drainage of such systems very poor and slow; and further whereas some septic systems already have created health problems and others are an inevitable health hazard; be it resolved that the Provincial Government of Newfoundland make funds immediately available for the commencement of the installation of a sewerage disposal system for the community of Hant's Harbour. We the undersigned do strongly support this petition and urge the government to give this matter serious and prompt consideration."

Sir, this is signed by 192 residents of the community of Hant's Harbour. Now, Sir, I realize that the government is strapped for funds this year, and I further realize that there may not be new starts to water and/or sewerage systems this year, but rather a continuation of water and/or sewerage systems that are already in progress. In other words, the administration may carry on with some of the second or third phases of water systems or sewerage systems that are already in progress.

This is an example, Sir, of a community and a system that is already in progress. And therefore I would hope that the minister, when he goes through his estimates and when he allots various amounts of money to the various communities throughout the Province for a continuation of work on these various projects, that Hant's Harbour will be one of the communities that will fall into the list that will get money for a continuation of their water and sewerage system. But this petition relates specifically to a sewerage system. Because Hant's Harbour, Sir, as are many other communities, are becoming virtual cesspools or are becoming very large septic tanks because of the fact that water is running through the homes of these communities and septic tanks are being overloaded, and I know for a fact that the swimming hole

Mr. Rowe:

in the river running through Hant's Harbour is now polluted to the point where the children in Hant's Harbour cannot swim in that community, and this little beach out there called Caplin Cove that is also becoming polluted because of the drainage of sewerage into that particular Cove.

Sir, I sympathize with the minister in trying to grapple with this problem of trying to bring water and sewerage services to the many rural communities that we do have in this Province, but I think Hant's Harbour here is a very industrial community, it is contributing greatly to the economy of this Province through the fish plant there, particularly with respect to the catching and the processing of crab meat in that particular area, and they have a good market system going, and they are contributing significantly to the economy of this Province, and I think the people of Hant's Harbour are deserving of getting some assistance from government in order to get a sewerage system provided in their area.

Just in closing, Sir, in supporting the petition probably I could ask the minister if he would indicate, if he is going to speak to the petition, if he would indicate what progress is being made with respect to new and probably unorthodox methods of taking care of human waste. Of course, we have heard recently of the humus toilet. I do not know how far experimentation has gone on in that particular area, but it seems to me that in many of our communities where we have very boggy areas or where we have very cold temperatures or where we have very rocky terrain, the traditional sewerage system is very, very expensive and the humus toilet concept may be the way out to serve the sewerage needs, if I can put it that way, of communities that have a very rocky terrain. So I would appreciate if the minister could relate to that particular topic if he speaks to this particular petition.

Sir, I give this petition my wholehearted support, and I ask that the petition be placed upon the table of the House and related to the department to which it relates.

MR. ROBERTS: It is well petitioned.

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

MR. PECKFORD: I would like to acknowledge the petition presented by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde, (Mr. Rowe). All I can say to him, and through him to the people of his area, and particularly and specifically the people of Hant's Harbour, is that every consideration will be given to the request in line with the budgetary restraints that everybody knows are in existence.

Now I personally - and I am sort of proud of this fact in one sense - personally know what it is like to want a sewerage system because my home and family in South Brook, Halls Bay, we have our own septic tank, and we have that very problem this present day. So I am pretty familiar with places that do not have sewerage systems and, of course, I was bought up in places that did not have them until I was almost as old, you know, a few years ago.

Thirdly, on the business of alternate ways of serving or facilitating sewerage problems in this Province, specifically the humus toilet, I had meetings with the doctor at the university, Dr. Evans, relating to the humus toilet, and he did a display for us out to the last Federation of Mayors and Municipalities in Corner Brook.

MR. DOODY: Did he do a display?

MR. PECKFORD: And I hope my words are not wasted on this topic, because it is a little irrelevant from the petition. But the point is this that Dr. Evans was pushing this kind of a facility, and after he came in to see me about it, and I had agreed to entertain some experimentation in smaller communities in the Province, it was then brought to my attention by his immediate superior at the university - and after he had also talked to the city of St. John's - that this humus toilet was not ready for large scale experimentation, say, fifty or sixty homes or one hundred homes. So we were to some extent led a little bit further along in this whole idea. And so they asked us then, his superior and people at the university, to not go ahead with any programmes based on this facility for another year until more experimentation was done. So that has been held up because of more things that have to be done with experimentation.

Mr. Peckford.

Apparently the whole idea was first envisaged as a facility to be used by Summer cabins, Summer cottages, one or two -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Similar to chemical toilets that have been in use for years or not?

MR. PECKFORD: No, no!

MR. DOODY: No, it is organic.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Organic.

MR. PECKFORD: It is organic.

Dr. Evans has one at his own home here near St. John's, and he has sold some to people who have Summer cottages around the Province. But to use it on a large scale in a community -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Large scale - you mean, a central organic disposal?

MR. PECKFORD: No, individual.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What does the minister mean by 'large scale'?

MR. DOODY: One in every house.

MR. SIMMONS: Is this year round use as well?

MR. PECKFORD: Well this is what I was coming to. Its year round use, disposal use, and the firm who builds these things in Scandinavia somewhere and in England are working on other ways of trying to make it so that it can be used by an average household -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Year round.

MR. PECKFORD: - for a twelve month period.

MR. NEARY: Can you use the stuff as fertilizer after?

MR. MORGAN: It is all burned up.

MR. PECKFORD: And they were afraid. It has an electrical current in it as well. So in any case that alternative is still being looked at. And as soon as they are ready to let us go ahead and experiment with it, I shall be approaching my colleagues to have that done.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is the minister somewhat hopeful that it might work out?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because the minister appreciates how important that would be.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, very definitely.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. minister's colleague does not anticipate any -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not think it is a bit funny.

MR. PECKFORD: No, I do not think so.

So I can only say on that other alternatives for sewage disposal are also coming to the fore, as most hon. gentlemen will realize. And to that end we are looking at some larger scale modified septic tank proposals for groups of houses ranging even up to 100. And we are discussing this with environmental officials to see whether we can get such modifications made and still be environmentally acceptable. In a number of communities we are now negotiating currently on that very issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the subject of the humus toilet has some humorous aspects, but it also has some serious aspects. Because, of course, as the hon. minister says one of the problems we do face in this Province is the disposal of sewage, or human waste or whatever we want to call it, and if there is some way that we can find some new technology or adapt some new technology, it would be a very great value. There are many communities in the Province - it has often been mentioned in the House - that there are many, many communities throughout the Province where we do have health hazards or potential health hazards as a result of the improper or inadequate disposal of sewerage, and there are many, many other communities where we might not have a health hazard, we certainly have an environmental unpleasantness of some considerable dimensions. The costs involved in applying the standard technology are immense. They are made all the greater because so many of the communities of this Province are founded or built on rocky areas where you have to blast every inch of the way to get trenches, and in addition so many of our communities are spread out. So the cost per home of servicing is inordinately higher than it would be if the communities were built in grid areas.



MR. PECKFORD: Two big costs now in the last two or three years besides the trenching per se, the slope in the community giving you so many lift stations and then the sewage treatment.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister has given yet another area that has added to the costs and is very much relevant, and that is the need for lift stations and pumping stations given the fact that so many of our communities are hilly or built around harbours and, of course, as well the need for secondary, and in some cases, I understand, even tertiary treatment stations, because we are discharging entirely too much raw sewage into the ocean. And while the ocean has served us very well for hundreds of years as the ultimate sewage disposal facility, I suppose there is a limit, and certainly in some of our bays and some of our inlets in the harbours that limit is reached. And so, you know, anything that will help technologically should certainly be looked at. I would commend to the minister as well what I understand to be the Soviet experience, and it would be particularly relevant in the case of Makkovik where I understand they put the sewage system in Makkovik using a cut and trench method has cost several million dollars, close to \$3 million. And how many homes are there in Makkovik - 150?

MR. PECKFORD: There are 150.

MR. STRACHAN: Less.

MR. ROBERTS: Less than 150.

MR. STRACHAN: There are 120.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is of the order of \$20,000 a home to provide a water and sewage system to that home. You know, that is a staggering cost. I would imagine that many homes in Makkovik could be bought or sold for less than \$20,000. That is what it cost us, and most of it, too, paid by Ottawa under the appropriate federal/provincial agreement, but still the cost of \$20,000 per home. And there must be many communities on this Island where the cost is \$8,000 or \$10,000 per home to provide adequate servicing facilities. And, of course, given the fact that these costs are not borne in lot

Mr. Roberts.

purchase costs, they are borne, in effect, by all the taxpayers of this Province, and not only is that a burden, but, of course, if it cost us - we only have so much money available - if it cost us so much to service one area, we cannot service another area. But the point I suggest we might look in the Northern communities is the Soviet technology where I understand they run their utility facilities, water and sewer lines, over the ground in insulated - much like the Utilador concept which we used in the Canadian North. I think we should look at it. Dr. Paddon in North West River has amassed quite a pile of literature on this, most of it in English, and, you know, translated from the Soviet technical journals, although many of those are published in English as well, because English is the international scientific language. It is certainly something that we should look at. It would apply to parts of the Island. Down in Flowers Cove in my district now we are going to have to heat the water. It has been six feet down, buried six feet in the ground in trenches, it still freezes up. Now we are looking at moving what amounts to warm water or hot water, or heated water through those mains in an effort to keep them from freezing. And, you know, the costs are becoming just beyond all control. And if there is any way through alternate technology that we can help the people in Rant's Harbour and elsewhere in the Province, we should do so. The humus toilet is certainly, you know, the type of area we might look at. Sure we poke fun at it, but it is not an entirely humorous subject. It may have its humorous aspects. Mr. Speaker, we should also look at other technology, and I think in particular the Soviet technology. The Soviets have millions and millions of people living in Siberia, North of any area that is inhabited in Canada, and yet living in conditions that are comparable to most of the areas of Canada. They have managed to do it. Surely to Heavens we, in North America, can manage to do it, and that is particularly in the Northern part of this Island, Sir, and in the coastal or the inland areas for that matter of



MF. Roberts.

Labrador where conditions are not dissimilar. We have got to do something. Else we will either have to bankrupt or near bankrupt the Municipal Affairs department to do it - that is one alternative - the other alternative is to do without; either which is unpalatable. The obvious answer is to see if we can find new technology. I support the petition, and I hope the result of all this, Sir, is that my friend from Wrinty - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) can go down to Hant's Harbour shortly and inaugurate the new sewage system there. And I know in that he will have the co-operation and support of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and also his colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, who I am sure would want to make another of his personal inspections of the project. I support this petition, Sir.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Teachers (Collective Bargaining) Act, 1973." Bill No. 87)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Wild Life Act." (Bill No. 88)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act, 1973)," (Bill No. 91), and also, Sir, to ask leave of the House to introduce an act. a bill to move the House Into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in relation to the advancing or guaranteeing of certain loans.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Registration And Regulation Of Consumer Reporting Agencies." (Bill No. 89)

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow introduce the following bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act." (Bill No. 90)

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. WELLS: I undertook for the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) to comment on the Placentia stadium matter, I have had the appropriate enquiries made in the department and there is nothing ongoing or nothing active in the department with respect to a stadium at Placentia. One of the first things that must be done is the people

MR. WELLS: of the community must apply to the department and then the process, there is an established process, that involves financing, that involves feasibility, that involves all sorts of assessments of the need for the thing. This has not happened as yet and the department has received nothing from the community and really there is little more to report beyond that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answers to questions placed on the Order Paper by the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), question no. 436, 443, 441, 439, 438 and 432. Lots of information today, a pile of information.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I thank the hon. minister and I congratulate him.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further answers to questions?

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my question would be addressed to the Minister of Manpower, who was in the Chamber a moment or so ago but seems to have gone out for a moment or so - no, here he comes. Well let me ask one of the Minister of Public Works, while the Minister of Manpower is on his way back to his seat, could the minister bring us up to date with respect to the government's negotiations to obtain additional office space? This seems to be causing a lot of comment. The tenders were called last year, were they not? There were some tenders called for office space, or an office building, or proposals on an office building or space. the big building, the one that we are all so interested in, is so badly needed obviously, At least in part, could the minister bring us up to date on that please, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, we did receive proposals publicly last year but nothing further has been done up to this time. A decision has not been made and when it is made I will be announcing it to the House.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the repeated statements by the members of the government that there is some urgency about acquiring additional space, could the minister tell us when some decision might be expected to be made, and I am not asking for a day but I am asking for a reasonable time frame indication, particularly in light of the fact that these tenders were called a year ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

DR. FARRELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that I will be delighted to make the announcement in due time when the Cabinet decides on what course to take.

MR. DOODY: When you get the dollars.

DR. FARRELL: When we can find the dollars.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition on a further supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary, and I thank the minister because he is obviously answering questions, Could the minister tell us whether the prices submitted a year ago, and I assume the proposals involved cost, whether those proposals are still valid given the fact that a year has passed and costs have obviously escalated, and if they are not valid could the minister tell us whether further proposals will be called or do the government propose to award this contract without calling further tenders?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

DR. FARRELL:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer at the moment how valid they are because no further discussions have taken place with the individuals concerned.

MR. ROBERTS: In other words, the minister's officials have not gone back to these companies and said, "Are your prices still holding there now?"

DR. FARRELL: No. There have been no discussions officially at all at any time since that as far as I know, to my knowledge. As far as the future is concerned, as I have said, this will be discussed. We may indeed go back, you know, to look at this and probably will. But at this time there is nothing being done in that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Urgent as it may indeed be that there be more office space for the civil servants, does the minister not agree that there are far more urgent needs for whatever money the government may have in the next year or two or three?

DR. FARRELL: Yes, I do agree, Sir, but I think if I could remind the House of some remarks made by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) yesterday, there are large expenditures of money going out of the Exchequer paying for space all over this city, and a vast quantity of space. I gave some figures yesterday. I mean they were arbitrary, I know. I am not -

MR. NEARY: \$1.5 million.

DR. FARRELL: What I mean, I was giving you just a rough estimate. I can get those -

MR. ROBERTS: That is paid in rent now, is it?

DR. FARRELL: Yes. I just gave that as rough. I do not know the exact figures. I can get those and the exact amount of space. Besides the inefficiencies, you know, which I think every member will recognize, we have even had to put extra offices for ministers who reside outside this building just to facilitate their work. I think myself it is a very urgent matter. Of course my good friend, the

DR. FARRELL:

Minister of Finance, is muttering under his breath there right now. but I would agree that to face this issue eventually is far down the road, and so far we can amortize the rents we are paying now into a new building or whatever.

MR. DOODY: Right.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance, Sir. Would the Minister of Finance inform the House now just exactly what the situation is regarding negotiations with NAPE. Has there been a complete breakdown in negotiations? Are negotiations still continuing with Treasury Board? Is there a stand-off? Just what is the situation now concerning the negotiations of the public service employees?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I kind of wonder sometimes at the way the hon. member phrases his questions, "has there been a complete breakdown in negotiations," you know, which is argumentative and pre-supposes all sorts of terrible things. No, that is far from the truth. There is a meeting this morning between the representatives of NAPE and of Treasury Board. I think they met at eleven o'clock. I had an opportunity at around one o'clock to chat briefly with some of the negotiators or one of the negotiators on the Treasury Board side. He indicated that negotiations were proceeding along the course. I did not get a chance to find out exactly where they had arrived in terms of decimal points or in positions and so on. But certainly there has been no breakdown in negotiations that I am aware of. They did meet this morning, which is the important factor, and they are negotiating. I think that that is what everybody in the House and in the Province is concerned with. There has been no suggestion to my knowledge of a breakdown. A complete breakdown, of course, is to my knowledge completely out of the question. I have not heard of any such suggestion.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary but before the hon. gentleman asks a supplementary I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members of the presence in the gallery of a number of school students. They are from Grade VI. There are forty-three of them from Holy Name of Mary, elementary school in Marystown accompanied by their teachers, Margarete Bishop, Elizabeth Collins and Bill Brake. I know that all hon. members join me in welcoming these students and their teachers from Marystown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Could the Minister of Finance assure the House that the Treasury Board are negotiating in good faith and that there has been a counter offer made to NAPE and that the government are not rushing to close the House because they are expecting a strike and they do not want to cross the picket lines? Can the minister reassure the House that this will not happen?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, as I interpreted there are three questions, one of which is Treasury Board or government's team method at the bargaining table, negotiating in good faith.

Mr. Doody:

I think that goes without saying, Sir,

DR. FARRELL: Always negotiate.

MR. DOODY: If there was any suspicion at any time that government or the Treasury Board people were not negotiating in good faith, I have absolutely no hesitation in saying that the NAPE people, Mr. Locking and his team, would have long since left the table. They are far more expert in that sort of area than even the hon. member with his long history in labour. He has been in labour for quite some time.

The second question was - what was the second question?

MR. NEARY: Did you ever get any counter offers?

MR. DOODY: This is the negotiating process, Sir, and since they were at the table from eleven o'clock on to lunch time, and I understand they are proceeding on this afternoon, there obviously must have been offers and counter offers, and this is as I understand it, not having had your background, I understand that this is what the negotiating process is all about.

And the third question is, are we rushing it through the House in order to get out of here before the strike happens? To my knowledge that has never been considered. I saw that written -

AN HON. MEMBER: What strike?

PREMIER MOORES: What strike?

MR. DOODY: - in the paper recently.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What strike are you talking about?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: Yes. Right. Which strike? Where? When? And how? I mean there is a strike, I understand there may have been a strike. You mean the NAPF general service people? Do you mean that we want to close the House down and panic and rush out of here just on the off chance that the general service might have to go? No. That question, I do not know if it really deserves an answer. I really think it is a terrible thing to say and to suggest. It certainly is



Mr. Doody:

not so, Your Honour. We are here to conduct the people's business and this we shall do while the collective bargaining process goes on in the regular manner. To think that we are going to charge through this hon. House and get through this session and the business before it in order to run before the possibility of a strike, you know, is absolutely unthinkable.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. J. R. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier, in view of the fact that we have labour legislation of eighty-one pages and other labour legislation of forty-three pages, and a Flag Bill and a Lottery Bill and the Hawkes Bay Lumber Mill legislation and a resolution on the San Juan, and a large number of other pieces, a Loan Bill, and the Address in Reply, in view of all of that to come before the House still, can the Premier assure us that there is absolutely no truth in this rumour, that I would call a foul and scandalous rumour, that the government want to get the House closed in the next two, three, or four or five days? Does the Premier assure us that the elected members of this House are to have what time is needed up to say a fortnight?

MR. NOLAN: The middle of September?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, first of all, any foul or malicious or unfounded rumours could never be associated with ourselves, I do not think. But, Sir, having said that I would say right now that as far as the length of time the House is opened is concerned will have nothing to do with any potential pending strike or whether there is a strike or there is not a strike. The government of the day, Sir, for the benefit of the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) will be here as long as the Opposition want to go into the depth that they should go into on any or all of these bills.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask the Premier just one supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And that is does he not realize that when I asked the question I did not have the negotiations that are going on with the civil servants in mind, I did not have that all in mind. Does he appreciate that?

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do. And as I say we will - some of these bills are of pretty major importance and I think to pass them just for the sake of passing them would be wrong and I hope that the Opposition and the government members would both discuss those of major importance, there are some of minor importance, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: Those of major importance should get the discussion that they deserve.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman may well have an opportunity later on, but I try to be as equitable as possible in the recognition of hon. members.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This question is to the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Energy. The Bowater's Power Company have recently made application to the-or is about to make application to the Public Utilities Board for approval to sell their distribution system plus any power surplus to their needs, to sell this they are going on the market looking for somebody to buy their distribution system plus any power that is or will be surplus to their needs. Would the Premier care to advise the House as to what implications lies in this action for the customers of Bowater's?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: First of all,

PREMIER MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, any application to the Public Utilities Board is made to the Public Utilities Board so that government itself is not directly or even indirectly involved, and that is why the Public Utilities Board is set up. As far as the detail of what the hon. member is concerned I will have to take notice of it because I am not familiar with it.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested on a number of occasions in this House and in this Province the possibility of nationalizing or buying out Newfoundland Light and Power. My question is this: Will the government consider having Newfoundland Hydro buy out any distribution system or surplus power from Bowaters to avoid a complete monopoly of the power distribution and production in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOOPES: I assume from what the hon. member said, Mr. Speaker, that he does not want to have a monopoly in the Newfoundland Light and Power Company, he would rather have a monopoly in Newfoundland Hydro.

MR. FLIGHT: At least we control it.

PREMIER MOOPES: The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that through the Public Utilities Board we control it anyway. The people are protected. The fact is, Sir, that there is no intention of spending the people's money today to buy any other facilities for the simple reason we do not have this sort of money. I am not saying it is not a good idea in time, I am not saying it is not a possibility in time, but it is not in the plans of the government to nationalize any other power companies in the immediate future.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Public Works. If I may be permitted may I say how happy I am and all of us to see him back in the House again by the way, to see that he is well fit and we are delighted to have him here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: Unlike some people apparently I seem to agree with the hon. minister that there is a need for additional office

MR. NOLAN:

space for civil servants. I think it is shameful that they are scattered all over God's half acre. If a lady comes in from Rose Blanche to find some department she does not know where to go, who to see and it is terrible. The only question I have is, one, to what degree are we locked into any kinds of contracts where we now have office space so that even if you had a new building tomorrow you will not be paying doubly because of some locked in arrangement - that is item one - and secondly, before any such contract is awarded for any major amount of square footage for the civil service government offices, can we be assured that public tenders will be called?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works.

DR. FARRELL: Well, number one, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for his kind remarks. Two, most if not all of the leases if I can remember, except one are pretty short term, two, three, at the most five years. I believe there is one ten year lease, on the Viking Building for Motor Vehicle Registration. I am not quite certain of that but I think I am right. Sometime I check this up.

Secondly, as far as any decisions, I have already said we have had public proposals on this. We have not made any decision on them. I think we will probably look at them again and be making some statements on them before we make any decision in what direction we will go at this time. That is the only answer I can give at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) followed by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, following along the same line of questioning put by my hon. friend, the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) to the hon. the Premier, can the hon. the Premier indicate to the House if before the session ends we will be discussing at least three of the major problems facing the people of this Province at the present time, namely, record unemployment, lack of production in this Province

MR. NEARY:

and the high cost of living? Will we have an opportunity? Will the government be bringing measures into the House to deal with these three major problems?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOOPES: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge that is what we have been doing or should have been doing since we have been here.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I see my friend, the Minister of Tourism is getting tense and anxious waiting for my question. However my question is to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. But he seems to be absent so maybe the Minister of Tourism would like to answer it. If he is within hearing -

MR. ROBERTS: I am sure the Premier will take it.

MR. STRACHAN: I wish to ask the minister, in his absence then the Premier, that in view of the serious situation with forest fires in this Province - and I understand Labrador is slightly different this year, it is rather wet there at the moment - but in view of the serious situation, and possibly it will occur in Labrador, could he give us some assurance should forest fires break out in non-commercial timber stands on the Labrador coast that they will be fought this year if the water bombers are available rather than left burn for a number of weeks until they burn themselves out.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MP. ROUSSEAU: I am sorry, but could you repeat the question?

MR. STRACHAN: I will repeat the question.

PREMIER MOORES: You are going to get a choice of two answers!

MR. STRACHAN: Yes. Are you going to give me the answer  
the Premier was going to give me?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I do not know the question.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minister, I would like to say that as far as forest fires are concerned that the minister has been in touch with myself and his colleagues in the cabinet, and has expressed very forcibly the concern of the department, and for all of us, I think, on all sides of the House, everybody in the Province, of the tremendous threat of forest fires right now, particularly on the Island part of the Province, because of the dryness as opposed to Labrador which is not quite in the same position. There is also the situation whereby in the Island part of the Province most of the forest fires are caused, I would think, by people in the woods at given times, where in Labrador you have a situation where lightning is probably the prime cause. Bearing this into consideration, the steps that have to be taken on the Island are different than in Labrador. Certainly, I would assume - and I know I am speaking on behalf of the minister - that where it is necessary, where we have equipment available not being utilized for commercial stands of timber, if there is a non-commercial fire that is a threat of any kind or a hazard of any kind, if there is equipment available, not at a higher priority, that that equipment would be used to try to curtail the fire itself. I think that is a fair comment.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I presume now the member is concerned about Labrador, the fire fighting -

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, non-commercial stands. Non-commercial stands. I am not referring to Port Hope Simpson. I was referring to non-commercial stands.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You know, a forest fire to us is a forest fire, and we will combat the forest fire as best we can. We have a number of units.

Mr. Rousseau.

And I have the information, but I do not have it here. I will look very quickly. I can inform the member privately or tomorrow publicly on just what we have in Goose Bay. We do not have the water bomber up there yet, because we do not think it is necessary. We do not have it in Deer Lake yet, because the season in Western Newfoundland and in Labrador has been very good. It is Central and Eastern Newfoundland where the problems have been encountered thus far. But we will be having a water bomber and two helicopters and a number of men at Cartwright and Goose Bay, along the coast, to fight these fires. But a commercial stand or a non-commercial stand, a forest fire is a forest fire, and when there is a fire, even in a community, of course, or outside a community or no matter where it is, of course, we will use all the resources we have and the abilities we have to call on other people, which we have under law to be able to do, that we will fight all fires no matter where they are and no matter whether they are, on commercial or non-commercial land to the best of our ability. And if the member would like to have more information I will either give it to him privately or in reply to a question previously prompted I will do so tomorrow publicly.

MR. NOLAN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: I wonder would the minister be good enough to tell us that since at least two of the major paper companies - I am thinking about Bowaters and Price and perhaps others - have substantial timber tracts throughout Newfoundland, to what degree do they contribute to the public purse to look after the situation insofar as the expenses that are to be borne by this Province, primarily, to look after even their own stands, can you give us a dollar figure? And are we getting our just desserts or not? And if not, why not?



MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well one very minor point first; they do contribute to the Newfoundland Forest Protection Association with a grant as we do for the publicity for people in respect to forest fires, but that is a minor one. In effect what happens now is that if there is a forest fire in the Province - and the Forest Fire Bill that is now down here, if the hon. member's will notice one little point in it, the word 'Crown lands' is removed and the word 'woods' is put in so that the government in respect of any forest fire in the Province now becomes responsible, and that is the intent of the new Forest Land Management Taxation policy. Part of that taxation which increases over the next couple of years - it was two years before we could get this thing in - will increase greatly. Part of that is meant to be part of their contribution of paying for the total cost of the forest fires, although the government will bear the cost directly, day to day, but part of the money will come back to this Forest Land Management Taxation policy.

MR. NOLAN: Excuse me. But did we not have an arrangement with the companies? I thought that in the previous administration we had an arrangement with the paper companies of \$25,000 or something a year.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No. There is a complete new system now whereby the amount of money they pay for their Forest Land Management Taxation includes forest fire fighting. But in the event where either Price or Bowaters start a fire, which we feel is malicious and their fault, we can charge them more. Normally now, the normal thing in a forest fire on company lands, company owned, normally they pay the first three days of the fire, and then we pay the remainder. But the remainder is not actually a cost to government. It is recovered through their payment in the Forest Land Management Taxation system



MR. ROUSSEAU:

in which this is taken into consideration, the cost of fighting forest fires, but they will pay the first three days of cost. If indeed they are shown to have directly caused the fire then of course other methods will take precedence there.

MR. NOLAN: If the minister would permit another supplementary, that is -

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: - I am just wondering, although the minister suggests that they pay in the form because of the taxation, if we have a forest fire, God forbid, like we had, say, in 1960 - was it, when we had the bad fire, 1960, 1961? - I am just wondering to what degree the costs involved. My own understanding is that flying these aircraft, water bombers and so on is a heck of an expensive proposition. I am just wondering if in fact the paper companies do pay a fair share or is the Province really paying the shot in the final analysis. I mean, to what degree are we profiting by it from taxation? The same as we do from other people, hopefully.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Unfortunately for the hon. member I cannot give him the exact figures, but I would be prepared tomorrow morning in response to questions previously prompted to give him a complete indication of just where the companies stand in respect to forest fires. But, as I say, we feel that we do get our money back as a result of the taxation system, as a result of the fact that they pay the first three days of forest fires. They bill us, we bill them, and it is a kind of a set-off but we - of course this is a new programme too. It is going to take us a while to find out just what the system is. But I can assure you that it is not government's intention to pay for forest fires. I am sure that most companies would not desire us to have to pay for forest fires in that situation. They are responsible on their own lands. We are responsible on Crown lands.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: A question for the hon. Minister of Education. In view of

MR. LUSH:

the extreme financial bind in which Newfoundland school boards find themselves with respect to obtaining monies for new school construction- and this view was expressed recently by the Reverend A.B. LeGrow, executive officer of the integrated education committee. He also went on to forecast a moratorium on new school construction for several years unless something happens to relieve the situation- in view of this situation I wonder what plans the Department of Education has to help ease or to help alleviate the desperate situation in which school boards now find themselves in this most important and vital matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. LeGrow was enunciating of course some feelings that have been expressed over the past year. We have, the government has in the past two or three years projected fundings for school boards up to ten years. I believe it runs from \$11 million this year and escalating I believe in 1984 to \$16 million. So we have had discussions with school boards and of course the DECs and the Federation of School Boards on these matters. While we are not doing anything other than what has been projected for this year, discussions will continue. Hopefully we will be able to do something further another year.

See the whole matter is that we have projected, they can borrow from banks now for ten and twelve years. They want us to extend that power to go beyond that. Well we have not done this, but we are still discussing it. We met with the Denominational Education Committee about two months ago, and it did not seem to us at that particular time, or their president or the Chairman of DECs felt that they could continue another year to doing a fair amount of building under our present programme. I think that was in a meeting between myself and the President of Treasury Board. So Mr. Roberts I think is Chairman of the Denominational Education Committee for the integrated and it was felt that they can do a fair programme in the next two years. But beyond that it looks pretty doubtful. So we will be continuing

MR. HOUSE:

to discuss this problem with them hopefully to come to a good decision about it.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port followed by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MP. HODDER: A question to the hon. Minister of Social Services. Could the minister tell me what will happen to the homemaker group here in St. John's now that his department has taken over their services through the day care services?

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MP. BRETT: It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that those who are qualified will be absorbed into the staff. Some of them will come from our own staff across the Island. Other new ones will be hired and in the case of the city of St. John's they will be absorbed, be hired by us rather than the homemakers as they were before.

MR. J. HODDER: Does the minister feel that the service can be adequately maintained when the homemakers group had ten field workers, I believe, whilst my understanding is that the day care service will only have eight, it is reduced to eight under the day care service?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: The homemaker service, you mean, not the day care -

MR. HODDER: Ten field workers.

MR. BRETT: Right. I was not aware that they were to be reduced. My understanding is that there was sufficient money in the budget to cover the necessary number. And I do not know of any limit, I am sure if there are twenty needed they will be hired because you may need ten this week, two next week and twenty the next week. And my understanding is that they will be hired as they are needed.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one further supplementary.

MR. HODDER: It is my understanding that the homemaker group looked after, pretty well on a full-time basis, some five elderly people, and it is also my understanding that the day care service has a different emphasis. And I am wondering what will happen to the elderly people that the homemakers group are looking after now?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: They will still be looked after, Mr. Speaker. It will be no different than it was before.

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

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries if when he meets with the hon. Romeo LeBlanc tomorrow, if the minister will be registering a strong protest to Mr. LeBlanc for setting up the Joint Fisheries Commission over in Halifax and not here in the Province of Newfoundland where it should be?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

HON. W. CARTER: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes.

DR. FARRELL: Unqualifiedly.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one further supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. minister indicate what other topics he will be taking up with Mr. LeBlanc? Will the minister be taking up the matter of the caplin quotas that were - the bilateral agreement that was signed recently in Russia?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, we will be discussing that, the matter of bilaterals, the Russian redbfish/caplin agreement, and other matters of vital importance to the industry.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, and time permitting the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Premier, following on his announcement of some days ago about government's decision to continue the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation. I wonder is the Premier in a position now to indicate when a full-time minister will be appointed. We have nothing at all against the Acting Minister, but what is the Premier's intention in terms of naming a minister to the Department? And how do you apply?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: As soon as possible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. W. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder could the minister lay on the table of the House possibly a map and other particulars showing which land is owned by Newfoundland Refining in the Come By Chance area? I ask this question in view of the fact that the town of Come By Chance want to know these things for future planning.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

HON. J. ROUSSEAU: The hon. member is welcome to any information we have, you know, as best we have on it. As I suggested in the House yesterday, there are certain areas where we do not know-it is private land and that - but in respect to Crown land insofar as we are able to do it we will be more than quite happy to do so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Granted land?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Granted land. We have some problems, I suggested, and this is why we are on our mapping programme, we are trying to find out who owns what. But whatever we have is certainly more than available to the hon. member.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nothing specifically on that land?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, but whatever is available.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order 7.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Establish The Newfoundland And Labrador Youth Commission."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill, it is one that I have been involved in for a couple of years, and it is one that I have got a great deal of interest in as such. The success of it remains to be seen, and it is going to remain to be seen for, I would think, another couple of years. It really is taking a bill establishing a Youth Commission and a Youth Advisory Council to see if the youth of the Province, who have a great deal to offer in many ways, and have spoken in many occasions as having a great deal to offer, are prepared to accept the challenge of actually doing it.

The situation, Sir - if I could turn down the balcony out there - the situation, Sir, is that this Act will create a permanent authority to involve the youth of this Province in their government, no matter what party represents the people in that government. The fact is, Sir, that in my opinion youth and elderly people are the two groups in this Province that seem to have, both at the same time, if you like, the two groups that have a great deal to say and very little vehicle, very little of a means to translate their ideas and their considerations to government. I think we all as politicians, we all as people give a lot of lip service to these two groups, I do not think we really come to grips with the problems that they both represent.

The idea of establishing a Youth Representative Programme for the youth of Newfoundland and Labrador was conceived and encouraged by

Premier Moores:

the government approximately one and a half years ago, and announced in the Throne Speech of February, 1975. It was strongly believed at that time, as it is now, that the youth of the Province should have a voice in decision-making process of government, and they should be provided with every opportunity to discuss openly the problems which affect them directly, as well as those social, economic and political issues which are of importance to the Province's future generally.

Furthermore it was felt at that time that some type of agency should be established in order to effectively communicate to government youth's views, their ideas, and their recommendations regarding the issues themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we started off last year, as most people know with the conferences themselves there were some fifty-seven held, representing some 2,200 students who showed up at the high school level and 318 at the post secondary level or the district vocational schools in the main. Now at that time there were six, I think, four vocational schools, the College of Fisheries, and Memorial that were not held. This year the success ratio was not really as great. The high school ones went very well, with an average of some forty to fifty students attending all the high school conferences. The vocational school conferences were not well attended; as a matter of fact, most of them were not in fact even held. I think it was something like eight out of nineteen that were actually held, which was discouraging, if you like. But then again something that starts off with a bang like this sort of input the first time around obviously you are going to get a response, the second time around, I think, as illustrated by these figures, show that there was certainly less of a response. There are many things that we have to look at here, should they be held on different days, should they be held at different occasions where it is more convenient? But I personally, Mr. Speaker, do not think it should be a matter of holding these conferences as a



Premier Moores:

convenience. I think what we are talking about in these conferences if youth are prepared to make sacrifice and make a contribution to their Province then they should also be prepared to make a sacrifice for one day a year to establish and to express their views in the vehicle they have to do it.

The next step, Mr. Speaker, was to devise an agency which would carefully evaluate the suggestions which youth presented, and to determine which ones could seriously be considered by government in the formulations of its policies and its programmes. Two aspects of the proposed agency that is being put forward in this bill were given special consideration. Firstly, it was important that the agency be able to pursue any resolution in order to ensure that all of those received from the various group receive serious study by the appropriate officials of government. Secondly, it was important that the new agency report periodically to the youth of the Province in order to indicate its achievements and that they had made progress.

All of the suggestions and views which were forthcoming from the regional youth conferences were then compiled on a proposal for the establishment of a Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Commission and a Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Advisory Council was formulated. This proposal was presented to the first Provincial Youth Conference which was held in November, at Gander, last year. The proposal was debated by the delegates, and it received their approval and support. And during the past six months the legislation which is now before this hon. House was drafted, revised and it incorporates fully this proposal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have very little else to say about this because, I think, the future of this bill, I think the fact that we establish it, is important. I think the future of it depends entirely on the youth themselves.

PREMIER MOORES: The principle, I think, is good. We have to see how it works as a government and as a people, I suppose. It is not just a programme for the convenience of youth. What it is is an opportunity for youth that have the impact on our society that they so often profess that they want to have. They should be given the chance.

Mr. Speaker, I think by setting up this mechanism whereby they have a vehicle directly to government, as I say irrespective of what party forms that government, the fact that they have a vehicle to government is of critical importance to ourselves and to them in the long run and to our Province in the long run.

The fact is, Sir, that our youth today, I suppose, are better educated, more open minded, more socially and politically aware than ever before. They are more knowledgeable about provincial and national and even international issues and the problems than those of any generation in our history before.

The fact is also, Sir, that youth have one ability, and a lot of us as we become older do not have, they have the ability to dream and they have the ability to ask for those dreams to become true. There is no perfect mechanism to allow that, but I think the establishment of the Advisory Council and the Youth Commission itself will be a step in the right direction to give them the opportunity to put forward those views.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I should like to have a word or two to say about this bill. As one of the youngest members of the House—I do not know if the youngest, but certainly one of the youngest—I think the principle of the bill is certainly a good one and on that grounds I think, speaking for my colleagues, we can certainly support the principle of the bill. In fact, I looked forward to the Youth Commission as a very positive thing and a very good thing for the youth of this Province and for this Province in general.

MR. RIDEOUT: The Premier made reference to the last series of youth representation conferences that were held around the Province only a month or so ago, and I think it was unfortunate that those conferences could actually be termed a failure in some cases when you look at them in terms of attendance. I do not know if that can be blamed or laid in the lap of the youth as such. I attended one of them and the story that I got was that we very much appreciated the opportunity to attend those conferences last year, we made what we thought were many good recommendations, and especially delegates who attended the provincial conference in Gander last Fall, but we have not seen anything happen as a result of our attending the conferences. We have not seen anything happen as a result of our participation.

Now that could be the key and that might be the thing that this Youth Commission will overcome. I certainly hope it is. Because I think the youth of this Province, Sir, are a tremendous resource of this Province. They are educated. They are full of ideas. They are dreamers. They want to take part in the future development of this Province and we must give them that opportunity and not only that but we must listen to them and this bill and the youth conferences that were held last year and this past Spring have provided that opportunity. But we are not going to listen to the youth of this Province unless we challenge them and just setting up a series of youth representation conference and saying come and sit down and let us hear what you have to say that is not enough. We have to challenge the youth. We have to challenge them in a meaningful way and I would hope that this Youth Commission that this bill sets up, Sir, would not become a paper vehicle. I think that if that happens it is sad. It should not become a paper vehicle. I would hope that it becomes a very vibrant and a very living and vital part of the government process of this Province. I would hope that it would be tapped into and be very conscious of what the youth of this Province thinks. I would hope it would take those ideas

MR. RIDEOUT: and bring them right to the seat of government, to the Cabinet room and to the various ministers. That is the only way, Sir, that this particular commission is going to do any good. If not I would suspect, and I hope this does not happen, if it becomes just a paper vehicle I would suspect that the Youth Commission will follow the same sad consequence of the last series of youth representation programmes that we saw in this Province only a month or so ago.

So, Sir, we support the bill. I think the principle is a good one. And I would hope that it works. I would hope it becomes a very vital link between the ideas of youth and government in this Province. As I said before the only danger is that it just might be something to look good on paper and not become active. I hope that does not happen. For our part, Sir, we support the bill.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. PECKFORD: I would like to have a few words to say on the principle of this bill. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very, very significant move on behalf of government and on behalf of the youth of this Province. I have been somewhat close to the people who have been involved with these youth conferences. I have attended some of the conferences myself and I spoke to their conference that they had in Gander last November and I know just about all the youth who are involved in this across the Province, personally.

I do not know how much attention is going to be given by various members of the House and how much attention is going to be given by the media, or how much attention is going to be given by other leaders across this Province. And it is extremely unfortunate and tragic that in the recent series of meetings that the youth held throughout this Province that the attendance was so low. And I know for my own part, in the district of Green Bay, and particularly in Springdale where the conferences were held, we had on the high school level - the vocational school level had to be cancelled because of lack of interest, even though

MR. PECKFORD: the proper promotion was done in the school per se - but at the high school level there were twenty-five or thirty -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the minister know why?

MR. PECKFORD: I do not know why. I am going to come to that and give my own views on it. There were twenty-five or thirty from all around the district of Green Bay, only twenty-five or thirty, and Mr. Speaker, of the twenty-five or thirty that were there on that Saturday I think there was only one teacher, one teacher, and the conference was held in the school, in the integrated high school, and that one teacher is a young lady who is one of the spearheads behind this whole movement; one teacher, and I think that is absolutely ridiculous, one teacher out of about I do not know how many teachers, sixty or seventy teachers or something more than that, in the District of Green Bay and high school teachers there are forty or fifty for sure. There must be that many.

We had at that conference for example, talking about challenging as the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) pointed out, the challenge - youth have to be challenged and in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, they are being challenged, every day that they wake up and listen to what we do or what we do not do as members of the Fouse, the kinds of policies that we are enunciating, whether they are good or bad, the kind of recreation programmes, their own curriculum in their own schools. There are challenges, numerous challenges being thrown out if you want for want of better phraseology right now, to the youth of this Province which they have to grapple with. There are challenges on a municipal level, on an educational level, on a recreational level. There are all kinds of challenges. What youth have to do now, and that is the challenge, and what I pointed out to the youth last November in Gander, the challenge for the youth now is to consolidate their numbers, to get their numbers and to get down

MR. PECKFORD: to brass tacks in looking at the issues that face this Province, both recreationally, energy wise, every other ways, and present - and this Commission now gives them the vehicle to present these views directly to government. This is a very historic, significant occasion in the life of this Province and youth have to take up that torch, that only a few of them started a few months ago, and if they do not they are going to fail the challenge that government have now put in their hands. The challenge is made. Here is the challenge, this bill, to the youth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not the government, it is the House.

MR. PECKFORD: The House, sorry, the House is now throwing out, now giving the youth of this Province, and it is up to the teachers of this Province, the educators of this Province, the municipal councils and mayors of this Province, the doctors of this Province, the lawyers of this Province, the leading citizens in every settlement around here to become involved and that is what bothers me, Mr. Speaker, that there is not enough leadership being - we have enough formally educated teachers in this Province now. We have enough mature leaders in many of our larger settlements in this Province now. What is needed now is that education to be applied and put to work and to get discussion going, to get dialogue going where it now does not exist.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ways of dynamics.

MR. PECKFORD: So they should automatically now, the law of averages dictates, Mr. Speaker, surely although it does not seem to be the case that throughout the Province now there must be dynamism from individuals in these various communities. There are all kinds of people around now. Look at any of the municipalities or settlements around that we all know of where there should be ongoing discussions among the youth.

We brought in, Mr. Speaker, out in Springdale, the

MR. PECKFORD: mayor of one municipality to talk about municipal affairs or local government on the local level, involvement, you know, the whole gambit of municipal government gambit of municipal level, the Sergeant of the RCMP detachment there to talk about the relationship of law enforcement in the area. Who also was there? There was two or three other individuals who were sort of leaders in their field in the district and had seminars and discussions on it and resolutions coming out of it to be sent to the main body when they meet now annually and it was an extremely fruitful day. It took up the whole day. We argued and we fought across the table with the youth there to try to hammer out sensible and good resolutions and I considered it to be very, very worthwhile and when I was at the annual conference last November, I got there, Mr. Speaker, about three o'clock in the afternoon or four o'clock in the afternoon



Mr. Peckford.

to speak that evening after a banquet. I never saw such interest. I walked in on the meeting that they were holding in the main room, and the place was alive with ideas and discussion and argument. It was absolutely fantastic the way the youth - the delegates from all over the Province were there then - were involved in the issues, and really involved. And they had invited various people in at times to give their interpretation or to give them knowledge on a given subject that they did not have before. So that then when they did have an opinion it was based on something worth-while, regardless of what the opinion was. And the place was electric. It was alive with discussion and debate, worth-while. And this is the kind of thing that has to continue. If this kind of thing fails, if this fails, you know, it is just as well for us to close the doors. You know, this is what democracy, Mr. Speaker, is all about as far as I am concerned. This is the essence of democracy, the pure essence of it, and we have given lip service over the past two or three decades all across the Western World to this business of the youth, oh, every kind of a bill that comes up that has any relevance to youth at all, you would say, we have to make sure that our society, that we build a foundation for our youth so that they can come along and take over - and the youth this and the youth that and the youth something else. Give them lip service to it, and talked about and verbalized about it, and now here is something concrete and tangible on which youth can build, and youth have a very real responsibility to accept this challenge, and to have their parents - it goes right back to the home again, the basic unit of society. It goes right back to the home again, and works it way up - from the home, to the school, to the leaders of community - right up to the House of Assembly, or right across or whatever - I do not want to put us on a pedestal in that sense, but just for the matter of trying to discuss it, and verbalize it.

That is the whole key to it. And it would be a shame, a tragedy of the highest order, and a sad, sad indictment upon our society if three years from now this became nothing. That would be a sad, sad day. I do not

Mr. Peckford.

know if I have written, but I was going to write - I do not know if I have done it yet or not - but it has been in my mind, Mr. Speaker, to write the school principals, because I know most of the teachers there, and indicate to them that I was profoundly, deeply hurt, not disappointed, hurt, that more teachers did not show up at that Youth Conference. And at the same time I would also indicate -

MR. HOUSE: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. HOUSE: I wonder did the youth want a teacher there? Sometimes because they are so tangled up with teachers, most of the time they do not want them there. I know that for a fact in some cases.

MR. PECKFORD: Well, I do not think that was true in this case, you know, but if it is that has to be bound together and the only way it can be done is for them to turn up and sit down, and have a discussion and get the things off their chest that they want so they can go on and do something.

I was going to write the principal and indicate to him how hurt I was not to see more teachers involved, you know, And then, talking about because so much is irrelevant in the curriculum and all the rest of this. It is all linked and lumped together. Because I am very disappointed as a former teacher and as now a member of this House and as a citizen of this Province that many schools have not gotten into the habit, the very good, worth-while, wholesome habit of sitting down with their students and having discussions on what is going on in this world and in this Province today. You know, that is a very vital curriculum item. But we can talk about the three attempts that Persia made to defeat Athens in 480 B.C., in 479 B.C., and you got to remember them - right! And yet no young man or young woman knows an iota about the energy policy of this Province in whether it is right or wrong, or to contribute towards it. You know, it is absolutely ridiculous. And the responsibility once again - and perhaps through this the youth of the Province can be able to influence government and leaders to become more involved in what goes into the curriculum in the schools.

Mr. Peckford.

That is one good thing that could come out of it. But there are so many things. And the challenges are already there for youth to take up with just a small amount of leadership.

MR. WM. MCNEIL: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. WM. MCNEIL: Is there a programme or curriculum that we have all from this Youth Commission entered or tested in the schools of community problems?

MR. PECKFORD: I am not aware of it.

MR. MCNEIL: I know in my area in Stephenville that in the school they have a special course of study, and it is community problems, and it relates to what the minister is saying, and they are getting a lot of feedback, and at the last Youth Conference they had it was very good, because the students were aware, because they received it on a week to week basis.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, I remember something about Stephenville. I think that Stephenville itself - was it not from one of the schools in Stephenville?

MR. MCNEIL: Yes.

MR. PECKFORD: There are a number of places, you know, there are some bright spots, but most of it is not too bright. There are a number of bright spots in the Province, as far as I am concerned, where there is a fair amount of work being done in the schools relating it to the outside world or to the community as it now is, the realistic day, but a lot of it is not.

MR. HOUSE: That is a Grade X programme

MR. PECKFORD: It is, is it?

MR. HOUSE: In most of the schools.

MR. PECKFORD: It is in most of the high schools?

You know, the Grade XI programme that always was there under part of the history course where they talked about current events, which, you know, that was a real laugh. That was a real laugh up until the time that I came out of the school system, because -

MR. HOUSE: They were all worried about the sixteen per cent.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, they were all worried about the sixteen per cent or how much it was towards the 100 per cent so they would get a pass. And, of course, the course came on there the tail end of the year. And from May to June 15 there was this flurry about getting all the Time Magazines and Telegrams, and all the rest of it and now memorize, will you, the date on which Queen Elizabeth announced, or Buckingham Palace announced the birth of a new child to the Queen, or announced - it was ridiculous! There was no emphasis on concepts and incorporating it into the curriculum per se so that it became an ongoing process of learning that was important, and that would be indelibly printed upon the minds of the students so that they would have a better idea of what was going on in their Province and in their world. It was completely irrelevant and crazy and foolish. It is something that I cannot talk about without getting very emotional. But in any case, Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very excellent piece of legislation one that throws a challenge out to the youth, to the leaders of the Province, to this hon. House and every member, and I hope that after it has passed which I am sure it will, Mr. Speaker, unanimously by all members of the House, that we can go on from here, that the youth will become involved, will get assistance from the leaders in their communities so that they can have a real, real impact upon the kind of government policy that will be formulated, that affects directly the youth of the Province and even all the citizens of the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, as one of the younger members of the House, one of my colleagues here is one of the youngest, but I am one of the younger members of the House, I applaud the government's decision to bring this legislation in, and I agree with the purposes that the legislation has in mind. I am concerned, however, on this question of motivational dynamics in the youth, in the young crowd in our Province today, and I wonder frankly, very candidly, I wonder, whether a movement sponsored by this House, and with the authority of this House, then organized by the government, is the most likely way to attract considerable numbers of young men and women into such a movement as this. I wonder if there is another way.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

You have now already in the Province a fairly considerable number of youth organizations. You have youth clubs. You have boys clubs. You have various organizations and they are formed by schools. They are formed by churches. They are formed by fraternal societies and they are formed by service clubs. But they do exist. You do not have to create them. They are there now.

How would it be if some movement were made to bring about a federation of existing organizations? You do not have to create them. You do not have to organize them. They are there now. They are functioning. The Catholic Youth Center was - I assume it still is - a very active - is it gone?

MR. DOODY: In St. John's, you mean?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. DOODY: Gone this fifteen or ten years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, it used to be a magnificent body.

MR. DOODY: I almost got thrown out of there, replaced by Confederation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well it deserved to go. Although I remember the House passing every year a grant to the Catholic Youth Center and to the club out in Whitbourne and to an Anglican club. They used to be on denominational lines; maybe they still are. There is the one on Bell Island, a pretty hefty body. And the Boys' Club up by Mundy Pond is possibly the most successful youth movement we have in the whole Province.

MR. MURPHY: Just to set the matter straight for the hon. member. The grant for the Catholic youth is not what the hon. member is talking about. That was the Catholic Youth Club. It is the Catholic Boys Club in the Knights of Columbus building that the grant was the one the hon. member refers to as one for Wabana and the Mundy Pond Boys Club. But I think they are possibly two different things, you know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Can the minister tell me if that boys' movement is still functioning?

MR. MURPHY: It is still going.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So some disreputable outfit, some fly-by-night outfit that the Minister of Finance belonged to, that fired him out -

MR. MURPHY: That was more of a social club.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - that one is gone as it deserved to go.

MR. NOLAN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. As a former member with the hon. member opposite who was a member of the organization to which the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) referred, may I say that the Catholic Youth Club was on Harvey Road just west of the old Paramount theatre. Just up from that in a building where I believe you have civil servants, welfare and so on established now and have been for some years for that matter, was a thing called the Co-ed Club.

MR. DOODY: That was in the YMCA next door.

MR. NOLAN: Yes. So we used to sneak, myself, surreptitious because that was -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where the girls were.

MR. NOLAN: Well it is the one where we were - no, there were girls in the Catholic Youth Club too. Where do you think we learned to dance?

AN HON. MEMBER: All we need is a member trainer.

MR. NOLAN: So we used -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I feel it is not a point of order but more of a point of explanation.

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. NOLAN: Oh but it was not a fly-by-night organization, Mr. Speaker. I mean it was firmly established.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Especially by night, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOLAN: Yes it was especially by night. Anyway we used to sneak occasionally up to the Co-ed Club where we always found a very warm and joyous welcome. Is that now the YM, you say?

MR. DOODY: It was the YM.

MR. NOLAN: Yes. Because I am a member of the Y.

MR. DOODY: I do not know where they are gone now. Another fly-by-night outfit.

MR. NOLAN: But anyway the fly-by-night outfit lasted for quite a while and did not have all the facilities that some people have in some organizations today.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, Mr. Speaker, let us agree at least on this, that there used to be and there still are in our Province a fairly considerable number of clubs and groups of young people, that these have been organized by churches and by other groups. The Boys Club up by Mundy Pond which has a building that must have cost well over \$500,000 or \$750,000 with which I think the Kinsmen Club were the sponsors.

MR. NOLAN: Al Clouston started it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Al Clouston was energetic in it. A band of grown-ups got behind it and built a tremendous thing up there. Well that is only one. You have them in Grand Falls. You have them in Gander. You have them in Corner Brook. You have them in Buchans. I have no doubt and I would guess that you have them in Labrador. All around the Province today there must be, oh, maybe 200 or 300 youth groups now. Would it not be desirable to use those as the foundation, build upon that foundation that is already there, that evokes a lot of enthusiasm, gets a lot of help, has a lot of loyalty, gives a lot of loyalty to the organizations that sponsor them.

If somehow they could be federated into a provincial council, if this legislation as it is drafted at the moment does not allow for that to happen would it not be a good idea if an amendment were added to the bill allowing it, permitting it, permitting existing organizations of youth to join federally in this youth council that is envisaged in this legislation here.

The first year these conferences were held they were quite successful the Premier tells us. I remember reading or hearing about it at the time and I remember being quite impressed by it and quite pleased.



MP. SMALLWOOD:

Now the second year comes and they are a failure.

MP. DOODY: No that is not true.

MP. SMALLWOOD: Well a good many are not even held at all and the numbers attending -

MP. HOUSE: Only in the vocational schools. All the high schools went ahead.

MP. SMALLWOOD: All right. Well then the vocational schools are pretty important. There are seventeen or eighteen of them. And the fact that they were a failure there is significant. Of what I do not know but significant without a doubt. This year, the second year, was a failure compared with the first year. Now it might be assumed that the third year would be even lower, even more downgrade than the second year. Would this be because it is sponsored by the government? Is the government the right one to sponsor a youth movement? Will youth be a little too cynical, a little too perhaps sophisticated, a little too blase to be, you know, attracted very much to a government organized and a government sponsored movement?

I would say that you might have the same difficulty if it were organized by schools. The Minister of Municipal Affairs expressed a little bit of chagrin that not more teachers attended. Well the Minister of Education said that in a good many cases they prefer, not the teachers but the young crowd prefer that the teachers shall not attend. That makes me wonder whether this movement if it were sponsored by the school authorities, by the school teachers, would be similiarly unattractive as when it is sponsored by the government.

It seems to me that there are two ways and only two ways that could create a widespread movement of young people. One is for it to grow up spontaneously from the ground up and not be organized from the top down but to be born spontaneously out in the field. Now that is not too likely to happen. The other, the second way is to use as a basis, as a foundation, the clubs that are already there. They

MR. SMALLWOOD:

are already formed. They are already functioning. They are all over the Province. They must take in a total of several thousand young men and women. If some way could be found whereby they would be not the recruiting ground but be the constituent bodies which organized federally would give you a Provincewide council. Now the Premier might think about that, think of the value of using - when I say using now I do not mean it in a disreputable sense of the word. What word could I substitute for using? Approaching the already existing bodies there are throughout the Province with a view - not the government approaching them because that again becomes too official, that again

Mr. Smallwood:

evokes probably suspicion, and a sort of blase sophistication, a certain amount of suspicion. But if only there was someone in the existing bodies who would initiate a movement toward federation of those various clubs, I think, the result might astonish us, because there they are, who was it who said it? was it the Premier who said it here today? They are there thousands of young men and women, they are there. We cannot doubt that, they are in the Province here, thousands of them, They are better educated than we were twenty or thirty years ago, there is no doubt of that. They are better informed than they ever were before. They know more than they ever knew before. They are more aware of what is going on generally in the world than they ever were before. They are a pretty blase, sophisticated crowd. But at the same time they do have a certain suspicious attitude toward grown-ups. They look upon grown-ups as hypocritical, as bluffers, and cheats and deceivers. They do not really look up any more.

MR. MCNEIL: So they have a just cause, most of them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What?

MR. MCNEIL: I say, most of them are that way.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I could not go so far as to agree with the hon. gentleman, to say that most grown-ups are frauds, and cheats, and deceivers, but they are often looked upon that way by the young crowd growing up, and there is enough justification for it to make it pretty awkward and difficult to answer.

The purpose of this bill is good. And the government, I think, are to be complimented for it. But whether this is going about it in the right way is something about which I have some considerable doubt. As a member of this party we have here one of the youngest members, I do not know whether he or the hon. member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) - how old is the hon. member from Baie Verte?

MR. RIDEOUT: Twenty-seven.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twenty-seven. The hon. member from Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) is also, I think, twenty-seven. Right?

MR. MOORES: Twenty-six.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twenty-six? He has beaten -

MR. RIDEOUT: When's your birthday?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The youngest member of the House I hope will give his opinions on it, and I hope he will not be too sophisticated and too cynical about it, because if he is he will be very typical of the youth of today, cynical, suspicious and out of love with the generality of the grown-ups.

Now I am going to vote for the bill and see what happens.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, in reference to the bill - before I start may I say that I am going to vote for it, that is item one. But there are a few observations that I would like to make. There has been some reference made to the cynicism of youth towards grown-ups and so on. Well, of course, the obvious answer as far as I am concerned is, yes, this is true, there is some considerable cynicism.

AN HON. MEMBER: And it works both ways.

MR. NOLAN: And it works both ways. But some of it is for a very, very good reason. For example, and I am surprised that the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) did not make mention of it, you know, can you blame the youth for being cynical? And I say that for this reason; let us go back just a very few years when we had a Royal Commission in this Province on Recreation and Youth headed up by Howie Meeker, and which involved any number of people from all over this Province. It seems to me that if I were a very, very young person today I would take a look at that, and I would take a look and see what recommendations were made and so on, and what, if anything came out of it in the last say ten years or nine years or eight years or whatever it was. And if nothing came from it, and if there is no explanation of any kind from those in positions of authority, then could you blame youth for being cynical? If you have not had even the grace to say that the recommendations are not worth the paper they are written on, how can you expect any respect and any people running forward to participate in what we are proposing now? I mean, that royal commission cost a few dollars, I would suspect, but not all that much.

Mr. Nolan:

But nevertheless there were young people involved on a very, very broad level. And here is a mistake I believe that all politicians, or a lot of politicians, governments make, we made it, and I think that the present crowd are making it - and that is this, that we start off on the wrong foot. We sometimes say, here is a royal commission or here is a Youth Commission or an Advisory Council and we give kids the impression, we do not mean to do this, that look get involved in this and this is going to solve many of your problems. But here is what happens, Let me give you an example; we do not explain to people, not only young people but people of all ages, that a royal commission or a commission such as you are now proposing is one devised to attempt to bring together the thoughts, the ideas, the energy of a group of people whether they be young or old, young in this particular case, and out of that will come a set of recommendations, suggestions to government, whatever government it may be. And from that government must decide whether they are going to implement one, two, three, not four, five, six, and seven, but we do not tell people this. We are not honest enough about it. I think we mean it, but the impression is left with the public through the press, and through political sayings -

PREMIER MOORES: These conferences will not work?

MR. NOLAN: Pardon? Well I am not saying that they will not work.

PREMIER MOORES: Did you say these conferences, the individual conferences would not work? Was that not the message you just stated?

MR. NOLAN: I cannot say that, Mr. Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are talking of the Royal Commission we appointed some years back.

MR. DOODY: The Royal Commission on youth.

PREMIER MOORES: Oh I see, I am sorry.

MR. NOLAN: Yes. I think it is very, very important that at the very outset, and I appreciate the Premier's interjection, maybe that

Mr. Nolan:

is exactly what was done. But we must from the very beginning say, look here every suggestion and idea that comes forward out of this may not necessarily be implemented. You must start from that point, because unless you start there many kids are under the impression that whatever they recommend now here is the latest salvation for youth, and we are wrong.

MR. PECKFORD: Can I make a comment here?

MR. NOLAN: Please.

MR. PECKFORD: I was to the annual conference. First of all, it should be clear that this is what youth, after a lot of conferences, and then an annual one, decided was the way to go. They decided it was we, the government saying this is what we are willing to give you as a framework in which you can work. They decided that they wanted to go this route, number one. Number two, throughout the whole conference that I attended, the annual conference, this was abundantly clear to the youth at the time, they were familiar completely with the ground rules that were being set out.

MR. NOLAN: I am very pleased to hear that. Very pleased!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where they expecting that everything they recommended would be adopted?

MR. PECKFORD: No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. PECKFORD: No. It kept coming up time and time again.

MR. NOLAN: Good! I am delighted to hear that, because I am not just referring to youth in this case, I am talking about if the government tomorrow had a royal commission on anything, I do not care what it is, all too often people believe when the royal commission is brought about that following that, that we are then going to have all the recommendations implemented. Let me give you an example, and I mentioned it here in the House the other day, the Royal Commission on Food, or the Commission, not the Royal Commission, but the Commission on Food Prices in Newfoundland carried out by Mrs. Plumptre sometime ago. A year before the recommendations were brought in we had people saying

Mr. Nolan:

on broadcasts, on radio, on television, political figures and the like, "Ah, ha! Wait until we get this commission report. Mrs. Plumptre and her team are investigating the cost of food and so on here in Newfoundland." But how many of the recommendations have that commission implemented? Now mind you two or three of them require Federal action. Do not ever forget that. And perhaps, you know, there should have been more pressure locally. Never mind if it is the Federal Government or what government it is, maybe they should have been implemented to bring about some alleviation of the problems the people are facing here in Newfoundland.

Now my advice to the Premier and anyone else who is interested is, if you have not read the Royal Commission report on Recreation and Youth take a look at it. See if there is anything there that is worthwhile. Because here is one of the traps that, I am afraid, that this group now, this latest effort might get involved in, and you must make this perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, supposing tomorrow you were to go into almost any district in Newfoundland, I am talking about a political district, let us take the district of, say, the hon. member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy); if you got a bunch of the kids together down there nine chances out of ten, and I am certainly subject to correction by the hon. minister, the first thing that many of them would come forward to is (1) we have nothing to do; (2) we have nowhere to go; (3) we need a youth club here.



MR. NOLAN:

Now if a youth club is what most of the kids want in every community in Newfoundland, you know from the very beginning that that is not what they are going to get right away. So it is just as well to be honest about it and often times it is not always the answer either. But there are so many, as the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs mentioned, so many challenges to young people who are in this Province, but we have failed to point it out to them of where the challenges are, how they can make the most of their day.

The hon. minister also referred to the fact that he was somewhat chagrined, I believe, about the fact that there are so many challenges offered daily here in the House of Assembly that they could apply themselves to. I strongly suggest with greatest respect, Mr. Speaker, that as you go beyond Road Deluxe you would be surprised at the lack of interest amongst many people as to whether the House of Assembly is open or not. Let me give you an example.

A few months ago I was coming up in the elevator with what you might call a senior civil servant and he said to me, "Is the House still open?" Now if a senior civil servant said that, what do you expect from the youth and other people outside, as I say, Road Deluxe, because perhaps we have a real failure in communication here. It is all right to say the kids are cynical and this, that and the other but I am wondering to what degree — You see, the danger here is this, the danger here as I see it is this — and I do not want someone jumping on me now for saying this, I hope not anyway — will the kids react by thinking that the Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Commission, Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Advisory Council, is this some way for those scheming politicians, whether they be P.C., Liberal, NDP, Liberal Reform, Independent Liberal, very Independent Liberal, very, very Independent Liberal or whatever, is this another act on their part to try to use us? Always be careful too that in a community you always have some people who are more aggressive than others.

MR. NOLAN:

Say, for example, there are some young people who traditionally and their parents have supported the P.C. Party or the Liberal Party if you like. Well they may rush to get in to head things up, but always remember too that all youth are not always right no more than all adults are always right. There are just as many young fogeys as there are old fogeys, and it is just as well for us to make up our mind to it. If you think that all kids agree with each other, you are crazy, out of your mind, and it is very, very important.

For example, the hon. the Premier made reference to the fact that there has been somewhat less than success insofar as the Youth Commission, Advisory Council and so on getting any kind of agreement insofar as the technical colleges are concerned. All right, fine. Why is the question I have to ask. Why? Do they have a good reason for looking with suspicion and refusing to participate? What if anything can we do to alleviate these fears and to get them involved?

PREMIER MOORES: Not to have it on a Saturday.

MR. NOLAN: Not to have it on a Saturday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: No, I am just wondering. Again I say - and I am not trying to be an authority on what for the technical colleges or anyone else I mean, who says not to have it on a Saturday? Does every kid in the technical college say not to have it on a Saturday or is it just one, two or three or four? I mean, have they had an opportunity to say? I mean to say that a few people in the technical college say no, does not mean they all say no.

PREMIER MOORES: Well it does because they had an opportunity to show up.

MR. NOLAN: I see, right.

Now the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) made reference to something that I think is very, very important. That is that there are already in place certain groups of one kind or another who have established themselves, and there are some people whom youth turn to, some groups, more than they turn to a stranger or some

MR. NOLAN:

highfalutin committee coming into the community. There are some people that they trust, certain groups that they trust. Let me give you an example. In my own district of Conception Bay South the service clubs have been extremely, extremely active in raising funds and so on and doing so in such a way that young people now have facilities and ball parks and so on, swimming pools that they perhaps would not have had had it not been for the participation of the service clubs.

Let me give you another example, one of the most outstanding examples that I can think of. If you look at the success that the Kiwanis Club has had, say, with their music festival. The music festival, I would think, I believe there were 10,000 involved this year, something like that. I mean a government department, if a government department had to do that you would have such a massive bureaucracy and such fantastic expense to the public that it would shock you right out of your skull. But the service club, the Kiwanis, the Kiwanians have done this as a public service project with which they have become identified over a great number of years. They put in a tremendous amount of effort and long, hard hours. These are the people we have got to capture. We have got to capture some of the young people who have participated. We have got to capture some of the young people, for example, who are involved in the Y. I mean the YMCA to me is just a most fabulous organization, fabulous. I was fortunate enough to be a member of the Y, and when you look at the facilities that they operate in down there compared to some of the other facilities that I see that are not used in certain areas - let me give the members an example.

When I think, for example, of a stadium in one part of Newfoundland which was built at great public expense, very rarely used and where the lights were not even turned out at night, there is something wrong. They were lacking in leadership.

MR. NOLAN: For example, there is obviously no lack of voluntary participation in the Kiwanians to put 10,000 together for the music festival. There is no lack of participation insofar - and I can only speak as I find - say the Lions Club that I know that operates in Conception Bay South. I mean these guys are out hustling all the time, believe me.

MR. FARRELL: Why is it in many areas as far as voluntary work is concerned today, there is less and less?

MR. NOLAN: Yes. The only thing is I think and I am sure the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs - look, why is it that there are some people who can come up to you and call you a lousy so-and-so and you laugh at them and you joke with them, and yet there are some people who come along and because of their mannerism or whatever they say hallo or good day and you feel like giving them a punch in the mouth. Now this is the situation. I would think that kids have got to be approached by the right people. If they do not trust you, forget it. You are wiped out before you start. I am sure the Minister of Municipal Affairs is aware of the fact that there are young people if you get to them and get them turned on, by golly they will run the legs off you. Just give them enough to do. I am sure the Minister of Public Works knows people such as the ones I am described out in his district as I do in mine.

But the thing is I am just wondering if - and I do not know as much about this perhaps as I should - if we are moving in, you know, who are the groups. Are we going to take a look at the recommendations that I mentioned in the recreation and youth? Maybe it is not worth the paper it is written on. If so, say so. Have enough guts to say so. Are there some things there that have been implemented? If they have been implemented, say so. Go to those young people and say, "As a result of this commission here is what has been done in the last five years. Here is what we intend to do, if we can," particularly in areas where you may not need massive amounts of money and so on.

MP. NOIAN:

So I do hope that someone will take a look at that report. Let us see what if anything is in there. Let us not try to kid anyone that we are going to have another investigation for youth and so on if we already have something that we have chosen for one reason or another to ignore. Let us take a look at it. I believe that there are out there a lot of young people who will become involved but you have got to give them a feeling that they belong, not that they are a glorified flunky for some local big-wig or something like that. They have got to feel that they are in there, that their input, that what they say is as important as anyone else. But you also have to tell them that if one of the recommendations is that they have to have a zoo in Foxtrap tomorrow with twenty-five elephants from Africa that they cannot have it, it is not at the top of the priority. Just tell them that this is not the way that the thing can go just now at least.

What do they want is what you have to establish. Then although we talk about cynicism, which is there, there are people, I am sure, who the Minister of Municipal Affairs can quite comfortably sit down with many groups. I know I have, and many other members in this House. If you lay it on the line and tell them yes or no they will go with you. They will come back at you though. Do not think that because you are the Minister of Municipal Affairs they are going to sit there like dummies and take it, because they are not.

MR. NOLAN: So if you want their respect you have got to start out.

Now let me just say one or two other things perhaps before I sit down. One, I appreciate the remarks of the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) that there are organizations out there which can help you. Believe me they have done ground work, they have been involved for so many years that it will take you years and years to get the kind of experience they have got there. Now get to work and use it. That is item one.

The second thing that I would like to refer to is the fact that young people seem to - not only young people, adults do as well - seem to move towards a figure that they are attracted to, for whatever reason, whether it be good or bad. For example, if the hon. the Premier were to come out tomorrow and say that this Commission is being headed up by Bobby Ore he would not be able to get a hall big enough to hold all the kids and adults who would be fighting to get in. Now there are people locally who have a very, very good reputation with young people and so on within the community. They have been active in hockey, they have been active in basketball, softball, any number of things. Now if you can find a way to get them in on the team, to make it a team effort, then I think you might have something going for you. You will find that often times when people are trying to sell something that they have what sometimes is referred to, as what I sometimes call, a grabber. You have got to have a grabber. For example, radio promo "Listen to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs tonight at nine-thirty," is not enough, But if you say, "Listen for the Minister of Municipal Affairs tonight at nine-thirty when it is expected he will outline a water and sewer project, or a new plan for youth," or some such thing, there you have your grabber. Why listen to the Minister of Municipal Affairs? Because! Now you have got to give the kids that because and if you do not do that then you might be into some trouble.

Well I do not mean to delay the Committee unduly. But there were a few things that I wanted to say on it. I wish the Committee

MR. NOLAN: well. I really do. I hope that, for example, the Committee might be good enough sometimes, maybe, it might be worthwhile maybe if they had a chat, some of them, with respective provincial members or federal members of the various districts. It might be worthwhile. Maybe the members might have various ideas and so on as to how things are going in their various districts.

So anyway I only mention these few things and I wish the Committee well. I hope that it will be useful, and I hope that all those involved will be very successful. But you are into a very difficult period, because you have kids today, you have a very serious employment situation in this Province right now. You have kids - I know I get phone calls every day - kids coming out of trade school, out of grade eleven, out of colleges, cannot get work and so on. They can be cynical as some people have mentioned. You know, what is going to be the answer you are going to give to them? Are they going to find it in this Committee? These are the things you are going to be faced with and that you have to watch out for. So thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I will not take up very much of the Committee's time on this but it is a bill that I am particularly interested in and one that I think deserves a considerable amount of attention. It is one which I would wholeheartedly endorse although I must admit when it was first introduced or explained to government by the Premier I had some reservations about it, partially for some of the reasons which were enunciated opposite, the thought that there was another chance for government to ram down some ideas down into the throats of people who perhaps were not given an opportunity to formulate their own.

That idea was quickly dispelled because at the first series of meetings that were held around the Province I was invited, as other members of the House were invited, to attend and speak



MR. DOODY: at the formative meetings in the various districts. We are quickly informed by the Committee, who were organizing the Youth Conference, that politicians were not welcome and were not allowed to attend and were not allowed to speak. So that quickly set my mind to rest in that particular area. These people were setting up their own conferences, they were setting their own terms of reference and what government is doing is a function I think that government has to do in many areas and that is open up avenues to offer opportunities for people to do the things that have to be done and do them on their own.

It is all very well and good to suggest that these organizations should grow full bloom from somewhere or other, but things just do not happen that way. You cannot get a blade of grass to grow full bloom unless there is a seed planted somewhere by somebody, somehow. And there are many areas of this Province where there are organizations, where there are service clubs and where there are youth clubs, but there are far many more areas in this Province where that kind of leadership or that kind of initiative is not in being. And by offering this opportunity to the young people of the Province to set this machinery in action, I think government is serving a very worth-while service and offering a very worth-while opportunity.

During the second session or round of meetings, the ground rules were changed somewhat and the political people were invited, they were allowed to accept invitations to attend and to speak at some of these regional conferences. I attended and spoke at the Youth Conference in Avondale for that particular area of the Province. Unfortunately, Sir, what I think was an error in organization, all these conferences were held on the same day and there was one held on Bell Island - there were two held on Bell Island on the same day as the one was held in Avondale. Since I had been invited to the Avondale one first, it was the one

MR. DOODY: which I had to go to.

Now as a sideline I would like to just speak for just a second on that Bell Island thing, and the hon. members of the House can appreciate perhaps some of the problems which we face in society today just by this negativism which seems to pervade anything, no matter how well meaning it is, no matter how hard people try. On Bell Island there were two Youth Conferences being held on that Saturday. There was one being held in the high school and there was one being held in the trade school. Now one of the local radio stations took it on themselves, and I appreciate their effort and really should commend them for it, took it on themselves to head to the Island to cover the Youth Conferences. They went to the Trade School. I listened the next morning on the radio with great interest to the report on the meeting on Bell Island, because I unfortunately could not attend, as I said I was up at the head of the Bay, but the reporter spoke about the fact that there were between eight and ten people (which to me sounds fairly close to seven), but he said there was between eight and ten young people attended the meeting at the Trade School on Bell Island and it was a complete disaster. And they interviewed one of the instructors at the Trade School and asked him to what he attributed the lack of attendance or the lack of interest in the youth on the Island in this opportunity to express their views on the current state of events and on the direction in which the Province should be heading.

Well, he went into a great negative spiel about the people on Bell Island who have been disappointed for so many times, they have been promised this and promised that, and the young people are just too cynical and not interested, they would not turn out, they could not go. Why should they go? They have been told over the years that this was going to happen and that was going to happen, and he went on for maybe four or five minutes on the radio station, and he was thanked and then -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: Well that unfortunately is the case in many of these instances. Anyway he went through this great spiel and the radio announcer thanked him. As I was leaving the House to come to the building, maybe ten or fifteen minutes later, the radio station interrupted its news bulletin and said that they had just had a call from the Reverend Sister in the Convent, there was a high school there, who informed the radio station that they had covered the wrong meeting. There were fifty or sixty kids at the high school who were very enthusiastic about the whole bit. They were kind of disappointed that the CBC, in this particular case, had not bothered to check with them and she felt that she owed it to the students who worked so hard to put the thing together to say that they were not all negative and they were not all despondent and despairing and they did see some future for the Province and for the people. And they covered that in perhaps a minute and a half and went on with the news bulletin. That to me, Sir, is one of the tragedies of the whole thing.

So to say that the Trade School efforts bombed out and the others did not maybe is an over simplification. I would suspect that quite a few students from the Island attended the high school conference but I do not know if that is so or not. The fact remains that there is a negative attitude that pervades many areas of society. No matter how good your intentions are, no matter how remote government stays from things, no matter how it tries to give people an opportunity to do things on their own, there is a negative attitude that seems to be, or

Mr. Doody:

a suspicious attitude that seems to be taken by people who should know better in instances and people who do not do enough research or do enough work on the effort.

The matter of the various youth clubs that are around the Province was raised, and I have got to mention just for a second with your permission, Sir, the CYC which the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) mentioned sometime ago which was the Catholic Youth Club which was very active in St. John's for a number of years in the late 1940's and the early 1950's -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the minister permit?

MR. DOODY: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that the one that is up on St. Clare Avenue?

MR. DOODY: No. The CYC was the Catholic Youth Club, and it was an organization that was open to high school graduates or people of that age group who were unmarried and hopefully were looking toward that status, or at least I would cynically suspect that perhaps the motivation behind it. However, I spent several, more than several, four or five great years there under the tutelage of - I remember the priests at the time who were the Board of Governors or Directors or Knights Templar and Spiritual in the effort - I think it was Reverend Father Connolley who is now in at Mary Queen of Peace, Reverend Father Kent who is now deceased, I think, the now Bishop McGrath of St. George's, Bishop Penny of Grand Falls, and I think Father Fennessey who is now Chaplain at St. Clare's. These were the guiding menators of the Catholic youth, of this age group at that time.

And as my hon. friend from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) mentioned, directly across that passage way that heads up to where now Fisheries Colleague is there was, under that government building there was a Branch of the "Y" in which there was another youth club, and we used to drift back and forth and got to know quite a group of people, and things worked out very well. But these were, I think, in that time, and that was as I say in the late 1940's and early

Mr. Doody:

1950's were about the only two youth organizations that I knew of in the St. John's area, and I doubt very much if there were very many others in the Province. But these youth organizations I think should not be confused with the other group that the hon. member from Twillingate mentioned, which was the Catholic Boys Club which was sponsored by the Knights, and I think which is still in operation up in that building, and it looks after a bunch of underprivileged kids, or kids who do not have too many opportunities for entertainment in other areas and are school aged kids, of high school level or perhaps a little beneath that.

Similar to the Youth Club on Bell Island, which is one that I have grown to know and appreciate and respect over the past number of months. I think the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is the Honourary Patron or the Honourary President or he certainly deserves a great deal of credit for the work that he did in organizing that. Well they have some 900 young people in that Club, it is the whole focal point, it is the whole social fabric, the whole cohesive force on the Island. Now if that Youth Club disappears over there they will be very little left to bind the whole outfit together, but that once again is not -

AN HON. MEMBER: Girls and boys?

MR. DOODY: Girls and boys. You know, I have been referring to it as a youth club, but officially it is still called the Boys Club.

MR. NEARY: Girls and boys, but it has not changed its name.

MR. DOODY: That is right.

But that serves a different sort of function. It is a social centre, it is an opportunity to get kids off the street, to get them interested in crafts, and in community projects. But these things are not the sort of things that were envisaged, as I understand it, when this Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Commission was put together. This was an opportunity for the senior youth of the Province, not to get involved in social activities, although that may very well spring

Mr. Doody:

from it, not to get involved in athletic activities, it was an opportunity for them to get together in various councils or groups to let government, and let the civic leaders and any other leaders or any other areas of progress or organization or opportunity in the Province, let them know what the feelings of the next generation are, to advise us and to instruct us and give us their opinions on what direction they feel the Province should be going, and what we are doing wrong. Because as I said at that meeting up in Avondale, it appears to us that each of us passes on to the next generation the world in a slightly worse condition than it was when we inherited it, and since they are the people who are going to be operating it in a few years from now then certainly they should have some opportunity to let us know what their thoughts are in this regard. And I think that that is the motivation of this particular bill. It is not an opportunity for government or for politicians or party people to organize groups; it is an opportunity to let these people organize themselves, and to present us with their views. And as I explained to the group that I spoke to in Avondale, the fifty or sixty kids from that area who were there, this bill that is being introduced is not going to be the panacea for all the ills and all the problems of the Province of Newfoundland, nor do we expect these people to be able to provide us with it. What we do ask them to do is to use this bill as a vehicle to provide government with the input that they can give us, some fresh thoughts, some fresh ideas. And there are only going to be two things that can come from this; one of them is the obvious one that was alluded to by my hon. friend from Conception Bay South, that government is going to bomb out and ignore it, which I sincerely hope does not happen, and I do not think it will. The other one is that these people will use this vehicle to band together and to come in with some constructive and reasonable ideas which we will be in a position to adopt, and when I say "we" I mean the people who operate and govern this hon. House. As I explained to them up there, and I am sure other members explained to their constituents, that we are not going to accept every suggestion that comes in, it is obviously going to be impossible. What we will do

Mr. Doody:

is respond and tell the people who go to the trouble of informing us of what their wishes and thoughts and ideas and intentions are. And that is all that we can be expected to do, but we can only do it if they provide us with that input. And this is what this thing is intended for, it is a channel of communication between government, which becomes very remote, between the people who make up this House, between the elected members in this House, no matter what their political affiliation is, an avenue of communication between us and these young people who are not as young as we might think that they are in terms of knowledge and appreciation and sophistication of what goes on in this Province and in this world. I do not think there is anybody here naive enough to think that a sixteen or an eighteen year old today is not a great deal more wise and a great deal more knowledgeable and a great deal more sensible in many, many ways than we were when we were that age, and I am now talking from my era of the mid-forties rather than the mid-twenties which I envy my hon. friend for inhabiting.

The fact remains that these people have a great deal of knowledge, and have a great deal of advice that they can give us, and I think we would be less than wise if we did not give them an opportunity to take advantage of it. As I said this bill is simply a vehicle to give them that opportunity. It is not a panacea, it is not the answer to everything, but it is a bill that I think is a big step and an important one, and one that I heartedly support and I suggest that this House support. And if it does not work it will simply be because (1) the young people in the Province did not provide the time and effort and energy to come in with reasonable and sensible suggestions or (2) that government reneged on the opportunity to take advantage of these suggestions and opportunities to respond.

Thank you, Sir.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I for one will be voting for this particular bill. But I do so, Sir, with some reservation, and my reservation is



Mr. Rowe:

based on my experience with one of these youth conferences that I had the pleasure of speaking to, or I was, at least, asked as guest speaker to speak to several weeks ago. In fact, Sir, I did not speak at the students involved or the youth involved, but I went out with a series of questions.

MR. NOLAN: I thought politicians were suppose to stay away from there?

MR. ROWE: I got an invitation, I heard when I got out there -

MR. NOLAN: That is what you said.

MR. ROWE: - that politicians were not suppose to go to it.

MR. DOODY: The second one we were, and the first one we were forbidden.

MR. Rowe: Right. Well anyway the fact is I was there, and I shedded my political coat anyway so it does not make much difference, Mr. Speaker.

Now I said I would vote for this with reservation, because Sir, and the reason is this, I think the government has sort of made a great leap in establishing this Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Commission so they can have feedback from the youth of the Province to the government of this Province. I think, if you could put it in a nutshell, that is one of the main purposes of the Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Commission. In fact, one of the explanatory notes says, 'The powers and duties of the Commission include the promotion, establishment, development and implementation of programmes which provide a forum for youth expression and provide an opportunity for dialogue between youth and government.'

Mr. Rowe.

Sir, if that works, if that function is fulfilled, then this commission is a good thing indeed. But I am afraid that that particular function or objective of this commission is not necessarily going to work. And I do not know if the Premier over there now on his desk has a list of some of the questions that were put to the youth - I understand that some questions were collocated or made up somewhere, presumably by Mr. Sullivan and probably some of his workers, that were provided to the youth - some questions that were put to the youth to answer during their sessions, and they were very general and vague sorts of questions

like, What do you think are the priorities that the government should follow? And they were very general. And the students and the youth who were at these sessions were at a complete loss, and in fact they were asking me, and some of the other guest speakers to answer the questions for them. So many of the answers to the questions, Mr. Speaker, that the government will get from the youth would have come from the adults who are asked to attend these meetings. These answers will not necessarily be coming from the youth themselves. Now what do I mean by the great leap up here in asking you to sort of give feedin or feedback to the government? And why do I have reservations for voting for this great leap and, therefore, this Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Commission?

My reservation is this, Sir. I asked these students or the youth at this particular meeting a number of questions. You know, What is your objective in life? Where are you planning to go from here when you get out of high school? I asked Grade XI students this, Grade X students, Grade IX, Grade VIII and Grade VII, and the vast majority of these students, Sir, had no idea in this world what they were going to do when they got out of school. They did not have an idea in the world what they were going to do. They had no idea in the world what they were going to face when they got out of high school, if indeed they got out of high school or graduated from high school. They had no idea in the world.

Mr. Rowe.

Sir, I asked them simple little questions like this: You know, they all know about loans in a credit society, but they did not know the difference between a demand note or a term note. They had no idea in the world. They had no understanding of the credit system in which we are living. They had, out of a group of forty students, Mr. Speaker, there were two students who knew what a mortgage was, two students who knew what a mortgage was, let alone a second mortgage or a third mortgage. There had no idea in the world what a mortgage was. I asked them questions concerning insurance, life insurance, retirement savings programmes, fire insurance, auto insurance, and there was general suspicion about insurance. I asked them about investment, and there was almost a healthy attitude towards investment, you know, if you invest your money wisely in stocks and this kind of a thing in the stock market, you can make money quickly, a general abysmal ignorance on the part of the students as far as these things which deal with money is concerned. There was unbelievable ignorance, Sir, with respect to government, provincial government and federal government. Many of them did not know the difference between an MP and a MHA. It is absolutely incredible - absolutely incredible!

Now, Sir, I am not blaming the youth of this Province or blaming the kids for this. The fact of the matter is is that our educational system has failed utterly, and I am not blaming the teachers, because the teachers are given a curriculum to teach. But the fact of the matter is is that our educational system is completely - oh, it is not completely - it is almost completely irrelevant to educate students to meet the challenges that they are going to have to meet when they graduate or get out of high school, almost completely irrelevant. They know nothing about credit society. They know nothing about politics, very little. I am exaggerating here. They know very little about politics, local government, provincial government, federal government. They know hardly anything about family planning, family - now I do not mean

Mr. Rowe.

when I say family planning I am not necessarily talking about birth control. I am talking about planning a family, and having to live with your wife and vice versa.

MR. RIDEOUT: And that is a job.

MR. ROWE: And that is a job and vice versa. Add the challenges that a husband or a wife has to face when they get involved in the family unit in bringing up their own children in society and getting hooked into mortgages on homes and having to -

MR. NOLAN: And bonuses.

MR. ROWE: And bonuses, my colleague reminds me.

But, Sir, what I am trying to say is this, is that we are putting our students through eleven or twelve years of education, and as the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing said, they may know an awful lot about certain dates of births of Kings and Queens and sons and daughters of Kings and Queens, they may know the dates of certain battles and wars, they may know a foreign language, they may know a few mathematical concepts and a few chemical symbols -

MR. DOODY: Listening to that I felt it might be a worth-while benefit to society to identify what these students are to relate to.

MR. ROWE: That is precisely what I am getting around to. I am going to come around in a circle to this. The minister has anticipated, more or less, what I am going to suggested. But what I am trying to say, Sir, is this, is that generally speaking our youth are not prepared to meet the challenges of society. And I think that the only way that this Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Commission can be successful is if the commission identifies specifically something for those students to relate to. Instead of coming out with the kinds of questions, general, vague questions that I have seen given to these students, which I had to answer myself at a particular meeting, they came to me for the answers, and they would write down my dictation. Instead of coming out with these general questions, as so-called feedback or input to government, why does not the Youth Commission and/or the government

Mr. Rowe.

state specifically what these students should relate to. And the Minister of Finance anticipated my suggestion really and that is that this Youth Commission should be given strict orders to find out from the youth of this Province what they want to learn in their educational programme. And the youth of this Province should be given a chance to indicate to the government, and obviously, therefore, the Department of Education, and, therefore, obviously the curriculum division of the Department of Education and, therefore, obviously the teachers who teach the curricula. They should be given an opportunity to indicate what they think is irrelevant in their curriculum. We may not, the educators may not agree with all of it. That is what we have educators for. But the students should have a direct input into the curriculum of this Province.

Sir, the number of students, Grade VII, VIII, IX, X, XI students who indicated to me that they, number one, smoke - well that is no great surprise to smoke tobacco, but smoked marijuana or hashish or who experimented with drugs; the number of students who admitted to me that they have experimented with drugs - and I separate drugs, by the way, the hard drugs from hashish and marijuana - but the number of students who admitted to me that they experimented with drugs and hashish and marijuana was absolutely unbelievable. The number of students, Sir, who admitted that they had drinking problems - I asked the question very indirectly. I did not ask them if they smoked or if they experimented with drugs or if they drank or if they were involved in sexual activity, I asked them indirectly, and very openly if they knew of other students who were involved in these types of things. And the admissions were quite unbelievable.

MR. F. ROWE:

Then I asked if they had any concern about it. They were extremely concerned, extremely concerned. They wanted to experiment with it simply because they wanted to be as big a man as the other guy, or as big a woman as the other girl - you know, I have to be as big as the next person, so they experimented with it or tried it. But the amazing thing is, Sir, a great number of these students have become involved in these things that we do not think, do not necessarily think are healthy for our youth, because some of them like it. Let us not kid ourselves, who does not like sex? It is a biological fact of life. This is the very reason why the human race perpetuates itself. If there was not that biological, physiological drive there we would cease to exist.

MR. DOODY: Could you elaborate on that?

MR. ROWE: I do not want to get into detail - excuse the pun, Mr. Speaker. But I do not want to get into too much detail on this. All I am saying is this, is that there are an awful lot of our students who think that our educational system, the things being taught in it, some of the things being taught in it are quite irrelevant. They would like to see, learn a bit more about the society in which we are going to live. They want to know more about government. They want to know more about running a family right from the bedroom to the bank. They want to know how to run a family. Now I am sincere and I am not trying to make fun about this. But they honestly do not know all the ramifications of taking on the responsibility of marriage. Running a family, Sir, in this day and age is a mini business. It is a big responsibility. Raising kids is a big responsibility. These students are not prepared for it when they leave school and our educational system is failing in that respect.

This is why I say, Sir, that I am for this bill but I think the bill is sort of taking a big leap in the sense that we have the

MR. ROWE:

youth commission advising government but we have not yet given the students an opportunity to advise the government or advise the educators in this Province as to what they should be taught. I would submit, Sir, that one of the first things that this government, administration should see to through the function of the commission is that the students be afforded an opportunity to have an input into changing dramatically the content of the curriculum in our schools so that the curriculum in our schools will be more relevant to the needs of our students when they get out of the school.

Now I have not articulated this very well, but I hope, Mr. Speaker, that hon. member got the general drift and idea of what I had to say here because I taught school for six years. I taught teachers how to teach for seven years, and I know that we have not taught the right things, all of the right things in school. I am not saying that everything that is taught in the school is wrong or irrelevant, but our curriculum can be much more relevant than it is and I think that this should be a priority of this youth commission. The government should lead and give direction in trying to get feedback from the students as it relates to the curriculum in our schools. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Carleton Place.

Before he starts so that I will not have to interrupt him I will point out to hon. members what matters are up for debate at five-thirty. I received notice of four, and none of the two were by the same hon. member, in which case I usually consult with him and eliminate one of them. So what I have done is I have taken them in the order in which they were received because from the point of view of importance, which is also a matter, I did not think it was really realistic to distinguish on that basis. They were all matters of some importance. So the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) as



MP. SPEAKER:

I informed him earlier, I received notice of his in fourth line so I am been obliged to drop it.

The order in which I received them, the order in which they will be called at five-thirty are: the first matter notice was given by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) arising out of a question to the hon. Minister of Tourism and the subject matter being the amount of control now being exercised with regard to big game poaching in the Province.

The second matter regards the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) arising from a question asked of the hon. Minister of Health and deals with the closing of twenty beds for children at the Janeway Hospital. The third matter, notice was given by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) arising out of a question asked of the hon. Minister of Health and deals with the closing of beds throughout the Province. The distinction between two and three being that the second one refers specifically to the Janeway Hospital and the third one -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker -

MP. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: - I do not know whether it is in order or not but seeing that my subject and the previous one, that raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) are somewhat similar, I would be prepared to withdraw mine and allow the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) to pursue his if that is in order.

MP. SPEAKER: I would see no reason that would not be in order. If no hon. member takes exception, then I shall presume that it is in order. Since no hon. member is taking exception then the third matter will be that of the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) arising from a question asked of the hon. Minister of Industrial Development regarding the make-work projects of a community nature. So those are the three matters which will be debated at five-thirty.

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I would like to start by saying that the Premier of this Province has taken a giant step today toward, I hope, equalizing the wrong that has been done to youth in the past. I believe that this Youth Commission will work but I am not sure that it necessarily has to just because the government of this Province has taken the initiative to introduce it.

The hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), Mr. Speaker, was talking about the reason why youth today are cynical towards government in particular, towards society in general. In the early 1960's and the mid 1960's the youth of the United States placed great faith in the politicians of that day, particularly John F. Kennedy and particularly Barry Goldwater. Goldwater, when he ran for the United States presidency as a Republican candidate, had one of the largest and most efficient campaigns ever organized and it was almost successful because it was made up of youth, generally speaking young people. John F. Kennedy was elected successfully because he had the support in general of just about eighty, ninety per cent of the young people in the United States.

Then something happened. All of the sudden the thing turns sour. Young people in the United States were being shot on campuses, they were told that they could not smoke marijuana, their heads were battered in by policemen. Government were imposing new laws and new restrictions upon their values and their attitudes and they rebelled. Here in Newfoundland they marched on the Confederation Building while the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) stood on the eighth floor counting them on the steps. They overthrew the establishment at the university and demanded their rights. In Montreal, they overthrew Sir George Williams University and destroyed the computer center.

These are all reflections, Mr. Speaker, of young people being confined, being suppressed by tradition, by the establishment and by the outmoded values of the adult population. Government confronted youth. Government represented the establishment and government

P. P. MOORFS:

unequivocally lost. They were defeated. It was a direct social confrontation between government and youth and government lost. That is today why young people not only do they not believe politicians but they just do not have any use for government. They have no use for politicians or leaders of any kind.

MR. R. MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, in saying that - and I hope the statements are not misconstrued because I simply do not have time to elaborate, to expand upon them but I think the general idea has gone through- has government changed? In 1972 when this government was elected to office I was one of the students at Memorial University who quite frankly voted for it. I stood with, I think, eighty-eight per cent of the population at Memorial University who voted for this government and who wanted to see a change. Did we get that change? Yes, we got it partially. In 1972, of course, I ran as a Liberal candidate myself. In 1972 we got it completely. I might lay my head on the line for a minute.

The first thing that government did, this government, was to wallop us at the university with cutbacks in student aid. I remember that I was one of the students with no money, and no hope of getting money, who had to pay part of my tuition. For the first time in my university career I actually paid part of my tuition. That was the return on our investment in a change of government. This government this year have decided that they are going to reduce the recreation grant for the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation by \$2.2 million. Now what grandeurous faith they have in young people!

The Premier of this Province has an acting minister for the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation. He is actually puzzled as to what he is going to do with the Department of Recreation. And we still do not know where the department of youth is. In 1972 when I ran as a leadership candidate, not seriously - I think that is accepted by everybody, as a serious contender - at that time I recommended in my speech which all the convention were in favour of, that the provincial government, be it Liberal or be it P.C., should establish a department of youth and recreation and have as the minister of that department, given of course certain flexibilities, the youngest member of the government. The reason why at that time that I recommended that was because I am twenty-six years old. Last year I taught in two of the largest schools in this Province. And quite honestly, Mr.

MR. R. MOORES:

Speaker, I was so much out of touch with them that it was frightening, absolutely frightening.

So I am not at all enthused with this government's presentation of a bill today on the Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Commission. It is nice to see that they have decided that it will be made up representative of the whole Province. Although they gave \$5 million to what the mayor of St. John's considers to be Newfoundland's Summer Games - I certainly do not, there are no arenas going up in Carbonear or no softball or soccer fields and I darn well think there probably will not be until the next general election.

I would like to go on, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that the crux, the essence of what I am saying will merely deteriorate in verbosity. I think I am getting my point through, that this government, indeed all governments in this nation, on this continent, the Western World, are confronted with a very, very demanding situation by youth. They want change and they want it rapidly. This government and its members on both sides of the House would hide under the desks if they were confronted by the youth of this Province to legalize marijuana. You would not - nonsense - and the same applies to our school system, things being rammed down their throats. There are school boards in this Province who tell them how long their hair should be, what clothes they should wear, how long they should stay out to a dance at night. Man, those values are back in the 1930's! You cannot confine the youth of today like that and expect them to respect you. You are asking them today for guidance. Well how can they give you guidance when you cannot give it to yourself. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Premier for one moment thought that I was going to let the opportunity pass without having a few words on what the Premier considers to be one of the major reforms

MR. NEARY:

of his administration, the setting up of the Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Commission. I have a few views, Mr. Speaker, and I have listened very attentively and tried to read between the lines of some of the statements that have been made by hon. gentlemen who have participated in this debate. I was impressed with some of the statements that were made. Others I thought laid too much emphasis on the material aspects of what the expectations of youth are today.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier's intentions and the administration's intentions in setting up a youth commission are sincere and genuine. But I could be wrong, Sir, and I hope I am, but I cannot see the setting up of this commission making a dent, having any effect, having any bearing whatsoever on the thinking of the youth of this Province. It is looked upon as merely a political vehicle whereby politicians are just trying to get another bite, just trying to win over the support of the youth of this Province. Now that may or may not be misconstrued. It may be construed accurately. It may be incorrect for anybody, maybe even somebody with a warped mind, to even think that the Premier or the administration would have this in the back of their minds when they introduced this Youth Commission movement, this youth movement across Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion probably the most significant remarks that have been made in this debate so far were made by the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores). Youth today, Sir, their values are completely different than the youth of twenty-five, thirty years ago. Their values are completely different. Their attitudes are different. Their thinking is completely different. The youth today are not interested in the material things of life. They would prefer to go around in a pair of jeans and a T-shirt or an old sweat shirt rather than go around -

MR. SMALLWOOD: And a ski-doo and a motor bike.

MR. NEARY: And a leather jacket and probably a motor bike parked out front.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What do they cost? \$1200? \$1400?

MP. NEAPY: Well, Mr. Speaker, how many, I would like to know how many of our young people in Newfoundland have skidoos of their own and have motor bikes of their own. I would say still only the sons and daughters of the wealthy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MP. NEAPY: Oh yes, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No!

MR. NEAPY: Yes, Sir. In the outports, in the rural parts of Newfoundland, skidoos are a necessity. You will find a skidoo parked outside of every home practically in communities along the Southwest Coast because they need the skidoo to haul water or wood.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They take the place of dogs.

MR. NEAPY: They take the place of dogs in Labrador and along, I suppose, the South Coast to a certain degree.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Great Northern Peninsula.



Mr. Neary:

But you will find, Mr. Speaker - I know my own kids, talking about the leather jacket and the motor bike, one of the favourite programmes of my children, and I do not know about other members' children, it is Happy Days on television. They love Happy Days. And the reason they love Happy Days is because they like the Fonz.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Fonz.

MR. NEARY: The Fonz is their idol.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does Fonz know?

MR. NEARY: The Fonz - and they love reading about the Fonz, and it is only lately that a lot of articles have been written about the Fonz. And if you read these articles, my kids read every article they see on the Fonz, they read it because they love and idolize him, and they tell me that the Fonz is completely opposite to the image that he portrays on television. The Fonz is a sort of an outcast in the Fanny Days, and people -

AN HON. MEMBER: That was in a T.V. programme?

MR. NEARY: That is a T.V. programme called the Happy Days and the main character in it is the Fonz. They even have now Fonz's sweat shirts. This is a big fad now down through the United States and across Canada. If you have not got a sweat shirt with the Fonz on it you are not in style now.

MR. SIMMONS: But you have to be in style now.

MR. NEARY: But the Fonz is completely opposite to the image that he portrays on television. He hates motor bikes, and yet on television his motor bike is always there, it is either parked outside of the House or it is in somebody's living room, and he is very, very sensitive about his image as a motorcyclists. And yet he will come out in magazine articles that I have seen and condemn motor bikes as being dangerous and hazardous and recommends that young people not have anything to do with them.

And, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could be wrong, perhaps there are a lot of children of poor families who have motor bikes in Newfoundland. There is the odd one who will go out and earn enough

Mr. Neary:

money to go out and buy himself a motor bike. And you will find the odd little gang of motorcyclists around Newfoundland, not too many, it is not quite as hazardous, it is not quite a menace and a nuisance as it is in certain parts of the world, the motorcycle gangs. But, you know, Mr. Speaker, I could be wrong, but I have a feeling myself that these are not the things that are concerning the youth at all today, that we laying too much emphasis on recreation and sport as far as the youth are concerned. These are things that are more or less now taken for granted. The youth expect stadiums and they expect swimming pools, and they expect track and field, and they expect gymnasiums and that sort of thing. They sort of expect that.

I do not know how much they are used, I am told that Newfoundland kids are not all that interested in swimming. I do not know, maybe it is because we are surrounded by water. But they tell me that after the first burst of enthusiasm that it is a job to get kids to keep up their swimming lessons and to participate in swimming programmes. You know, Mr. Speaker, I really believe that, and I have observed my own kids myself, I have four kids, and I can observe them at very close quarters, and I can see the - and it fascinates me sometimes the things that will attract their attention. Mr. Speaker, I am often driving my kids to school in the morning, for instance - well one thing - let me say this, first of all, I think I agree with whoever said it, I think it was the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), that not only are the youth of this Province and of Canada and of North America, not only are the youth disillusioned and disgruntled and browned off with politics and politicians, and browned off with this institution called the House of Assembly and the House of Commons and the Congress in the United States, not only are the youth fed up and discouraged and disgruntled, but everybody is losing their enthusiasm and their interest in our democratic institution. And this is the thing that is concerning, in my opinion, this is the number one thing that is concerning the youth of today,

Mr. Neary:

and I think it all started with the Viet Nam War, And it all started with the propoganda that is being pumped out by the United States that we should continuously have a confrontation with Communist China and with Russia, The excellent method of communications that we have today are showing our people, especially our young people, that the handful of people who control North America, who control Canada, and who control the world are just merely pumping out propaganada for their own selfish gains and their own selfish purposes in a lot of instances. And the kids can see through this. They can see right through it. And they know, and they are beginning to realize that this is just propoganda. And more and more of our young people are challenging today our democratic system, and our democratic system because they know that it is a very weak system. It is a very weak system, and it has let human nature down, and it has let society down, and they have no time for that. They know in their hearts that in this Province as well as in other provinces of Canada, and down in the United States they can look and see the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer. It is a class society, and the young people today cannot stand it. They have no time for a class society. That does not mean that they believe in Communism or they subscribe to the Chinese philosophy of the classless society. But they do not think, the young people cannot understand why there should be rich on one side of the street and poor on the other side of the street. They cannot understand this. They cannot understand why the wealth of the world, and of Canada, and of Newfoundland is not shared more equally among all of our people. They are disillusioned by the fact that every time you turn on your radio they hear that 500 million people are starving in the world. And you would be surprised how that tugs at the heartstrings of young people.

And when I am driving my kids to school in the morning I usually switch over to the CBC news, and when they talk about an earthquake or when they talk about tragedy or when they talk about

Mr. Neary:

starving children I dare not open my mouth while that news item is on. "Keep quiet, daddy" they will say, "I want to hear this." Why do they want to hear it? Because they are concerned about it, and they are thinking, and they are worried. And they will ask you to explain certain things that you cannot explain.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman permit?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Has he wondered to what extent the thinking and the feeling and the reaction and the emotions of the youth of today are the direct and immediate result of, not propaganda, but of things said by the teachers? I believe to a staggering extent, and if so, the teachers deserve a staggering vote of thanks from society.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand the hon. member's question, but I will say this that the thing that is having in my opinion the greatest impact on people's minds today is television. That has changed the whole thinking of society. Now whether or not there is any conflict between what they learn in the classrooms and what they hear and see on television or not, I do not know. I would say there may be a conflict. They may not, and from what they are taught and told at home does not coincide sometimes with the things that they hear and see on television.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And hear in school.

MR. NEARY: And hear in school. There may be some -

MR. SMALLWOOD: And practice in school.

MR. NEARY: And practice in school. There may be a conflict, I do not know, perhaps the Minister of Education -

MR. HOUSE: There are only twenty-four hours in a day, and only five or six hours at school.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Mr. Speaker. They only spend five or six hours in school and then they are subject to regimentation that they cannot stand. Bored! They are completely

Mr. Neary.

really bored with the whole system, with the regimentation. You have to this one minute, and this the next minute and that the next. So I would submit, Sir, that the propaganda that has swept across North America for the past thirty or forty or fifty years, mainly emanating and originating in the United States, has had a great impact on our Canadian youth, because they are beginning to realize since the Viet Nam war especially that it was nothing more than propaganda, and that thousands and thousands of lives were lost unnecessarily and only then did the youth of the United States start to challenge their leaders and stood up and said, "We are going to desert." And then you would be unpatriotic, and you would almost be shot if you deserted or if you became a - what is it they call them when you come to Canada?

MR. STRACHAN: A draft dodger.

MR. NEARY: - a draft dodger. They were prepared to give up their citizenship for their principles. That is what it is all about today, Sir. The youth of the day have more principles in their little finger, most of them, than most of the adults put together. When we talk to our children, we say to them, "Do as I say, not as I do." You tell your child, oh, you have to be in my a certain hour. You have to be in my ten o'clock, and you are not to take a drink, and when the child comes home at ten o'clock the old man is probably in the corner somewhere loaded drunk.

MR. HOUSE: Do you think the youth of today are different than the youth of the past?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is this technological age that we are living in. We have been living in an age of communications and television.

MR. HOUSE: But the basic make up, do you think it has changed; the basic values?

MR. NEARY: Well they have changed to this degree, Sir, that people have drifted away from their churches. One time, Mr. Speaker, the church

Mr. Neary.

had a tremendous influence on people's lives, more so than the politicians.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now it is T.V.

MR. NEARY: Now it is television. And if you want to tell your trouble to somebody you go to a psychiatrist. You do not go to your clergyman any more. One time it was, tell it to the padre, go tell it to your clergyman. Now today you go and tell it to a psychiatrist and he will push a few pills on you, hook you probably, nine chances out of ten, on tranquilizers.

MR. HICKEY: Very little faith in doctors.

MR. NEARY: No, I do have faith in doctors, Sir, but I do not have very much faith in some of these witch doctors, and I am talking about the psychiatrists now. If the Telegram is going to quote me, as they did the other day, they should quote me accurately. When I was talking about the doctors at the Waterford Hospital, I was not talking about the genuine medical doctors. I was talking about some of the witch doctors they have in there. If I had my way I would legislate them out of business. But they have had their impact on the youth, too. They have had their affect. They have done their damage. If they had their way, the psychiatrists would have taken over North America, and they would have imposed their morality and their thinking on the youth of North America. But fortunately people got wise to them, too. So what I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is this, that the youth of today, in my opinion now, and I could be wrong - I have known to be wrong before - are not interested in the material things of life. They are more interested in an ideology, a philosophy. They are interested - well, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I do not mind giving myself a little pat on the back. When I was went down to LaPoile district, Sir, as an independent, who does Your Honour think came out and bucked the system and the high mucky-mucks in St. John's and the party? A crowd of young men and women, a crowd of youngsters who would almost shoulder a gun to get the candidate of their choice and not have somebody foisted on them and shove it down their throats.

Mr. Neary.

When I went back to LaPoile district and saw the group that I had laid my political future on the line with, put it in their hands, when I saw the group who were completely inexperienced I almost had a stroke. But I will tell you that it did not take me very long before I got into the swing of things, because that is the crowd that went out voluntarily - I suppose the first time in the history of Newfoundland - they went out and they worked like Trojans, night and day, without one red cent. I never paid one agent or one worker during that whole campaign. That is something that no other member of this House can boast about. They were all volunteers. And it was a youth movement that started it going. And they loved that sort of stuff. They love independence. They love people to break away from the system, and to give the establishment a boot in the rear end once in a while. And that is what I think is happening today. The young people are fed up with the rat race. In a lot of cases they are opting out. They want to get out in the country. They want to get down on the little islands. I know, I have gone all around this Province. I was down in Grand Bruit the other day, and I met a young lady down there, a Memorial University student, a geologist down there collecting rocks for the Summer. This is her third year at Grand Bruit. She loves it down there. She is from Montreal. She loves it down there. She loves to get away from the pollution and the blowing of the horns and the traffic jams and the traffic lights. She just loves it. Young people today want to get back to the soil. They want to get back to nature, and they want to get away from this rat race, and they want to get away from this philosophy that we have of idolizing the almighty dollar.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman permit? The description the hon. gentleman is giving now was so completely true ten or twelve years ago, youth in North America was in absolute rebellion against the establishment. Is it true today? Or is it true what you hear, what you read now, that there is a return to conservatism among the youth,



Mr. Smallwood

that they are not now anti-establishment, that they now want to make money, they want to be successful, and they want to be respectable, and the great rebellion is over?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I would say that in a good many cases they have succumbed to the establishment. They figure it is better to join them. If you cannot beat them, join them. But the switch has taken place as far as drugs are concerned. They are going off drugs back to booze again. And I do not know what the reason for that is. May it is because it is more accessible.

May it is because it is legal. Maybe because

it is cheaper, I do not know. But the switch is back to booze. But, Sir, the feeling is still there, Mr. Speaker, the feeling to try and bring about change and reforms, although the kids have been disillusioned, completely disillusioned with the system, and with their politicians, and their leaders, and their churches, they have become very disillusioned, that they are still, as far as I am concerned, looking, grasping for straws, looking for reforms, as my hon. friend has talked about for so often. Reform, reform, that is what they are looking for.

I think in the last provincial election I would say that an awful lot of young people gravitated towards my hon. friend for the same reason, because he talked about reforming our political system, get rid of the patronage and the graft, bring in a law into this Province whereby if you want to run for public office, for elective office, you do not have to depend on the big shots. You do not have to depend on the likes of the Godfather in this Province to pay your campaign expenses, that it will be paid for directly out of the public treasury. And I am not talking about subsidizing politicians, because that would only make the professional people wealthier, that they would be able to save more by taking more out of the public treasury. Pay the full shot! That is the kind of reform that young people like to hear about, and I should know, because I get letters and phone calls and invitations from all over this Province to go and address young people.

MR. NEARY: I do not have the time nor the money to do it. I wish I did, because I guarantee you that I might be partly responsible for reforming politics in this Province, which in my opinion is badly in need of reform. And I heard a lot of people comment on my hon. friend's platform in the last election. One particular item in my hon. friend's manifesto was an idea that I had not thought of myself and I have repeated it a couple of times in the House - I do not know whether my hon. friend recognized that I stole it from his newspaper - was an on the job training programme for young people, that my hon. friend thought should be paid for, subsidized by the government, by the Provincial Government and by the Government of Canada. On the job training for our young people, they spend six months in university or in the vocational schools or in the College of Trades, then they go out and go to work and if necessary for a year or two the government would subsidize their employment in order to encourage the employer to take him on and keep him on the job and train him.

And, Mr. Speaker, we have let our young people down very, very badly. We have let our young people down in the field of employment and I do not know whether members of this House are aware of it or not but almost fifty per cent, between forty and fifty per cent of the unemployed in this Province today are in the age group between sixteen and twenty-five, and that is enough to stagger your imagination, in the age group between sixteen and twenty-five. And these boys and girls, these young men and women are worried about their future, they are worried about their careers, they are worried about their vocations and they are worried about their jobs. And is it any wonder then that they look upon the system with suspicion? Is it any wonder that they have lost confidence in the leaders and in the system?

MR. NEARY: I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that putting this bill through the House, although I am going to vote for it, I do not think putting this bill through the House is going to change that kind of situation one iota. I think it is just merely paying lip service. It is just merely a move on the part of all, and you will find that there will be unanimous agreement in this House because every leader and every politician for the last fifteen or twenty years, since the youth movement started, feels that if he has not got youth on his side he is doomed. Try to scabble a few votes, get another little chunk of the youth vote if you can.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is allowed.

MR. NEARY: That is allowed, Sir, of course it is allowed. It is a part of the system that the youth have lost interest in. And they are getting tired, the youth are getting tired of being chased around by politicians and by people who are trying to use them. They are getting fed up with being used. And I cannot say that I blame them very much and this bill is certainly not going to change that situation. As sincere as the Premier and the administration might be, actions speak louder than words, Mr. Speaker, and I would say that one of the best things that this government could do at this moment, if they are genuine and sincere, and that is to show the youth of this Province, especially those who are coming out of the vocational schools and the colleges and the university in the next few weeks, to show them that there is a future for them in this Province, that they will not be forced to go abroad and leave home. They are beginning to doubt if there is a future for them in Canada, let alone in Newfoundland.

You do not hear the young people complain too much about Prime Minister Trudeau's idea of reforming our system. You hear some of the capitalists and the big shots and the millionaires and the propoganda starts to be spread around, the poison starts to be spread around, by whom? Where does it originate from? It originates from the big shots and the millionaires and the capitalists.

MR. NEARY: You do not hear many young people come down on Prime Minister Trudeau for trying to reform the system by claiming that there is a weakness in our system, that we have failed as human beings, that we have failed society.

MR. MURPHY: Why do you not do something about it?

MR. NEARY: You do not hear many young people come down on him. Prime Minister Trudeau, in my opinion, is one of the most intelligent millionaires in the whole of Canada and probably the whole of North America for that matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: All he does is talk.

MR. NEARY: All he does is talk, Sir? In his New Year's Eve statement to the nation he talked about reforms and changes in the system that would spread the wealth of this nation a little more evenly amongst the people of Canada. And what happened? The Chambers of Commerce, and I remember Mr. Mercer, who was President of the Board of Trade here, I am sure every night when he went to bed he used to peek in -

MR. SMALLWOOD: He went into shock.

MR. NEARY: to see if a fascist was under his bed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He went right into shock.

MR. NEARY: He went right into shock. Well I am not a bit shocked because I happened to be one of these people.

MR. HICKEY: Ask him about the unemployment in Newfoundland. What is he doing about that?

MR. NEARY: Ask him about the employment in Newfoundland. I would like to ask this government what they are doing about the employment in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, if you want - I have got a few more remarks, I do not know how much more time I have left, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: At five-thirty I shall be obliged to interrupt.

MR. NEARY: Well I move the adjournment of the debate, Sir, so we can get on with the late show and then come back.

MR. MORGAN: No, carry on until five-thirty.

MR. NEARY: Carry on until five-thirty? Why how much more time do I have, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HICKEY: Ten seconds.

MR. SPEAKER: Approximately five minutes.

MR. NEARY: I only have -about how much time do I have left out of my forty-five minutes?

MR. SPEAKER: Six minutes.

MR. NEARY: Six minutes, well, Sir, I cannot clue up in a minute

and a half . This bill is not going to cure the ills, it is not going to cure the problems, it is not going to effect the thinking at all of the young people of this Province and that is why,

Mr. Speaker, the youth conferences that were held a couple of weeks ago, that is why they failed. And, Mr. Speaker, this bill covers young men and women in the age group from fourteen to twenty-five.

Well, Sir, I would say that if you are going to call a conference, a youth conference, if you are going to call a conference of our youth in this Province that you have to call it for a specific purpose, for a specific age group, and in order to motivate that group you have to give that group something they can crusade for, not just to call them together with purely academic and purely abstract nonsense that we saw on the programme. I was invited to go as a resource person to one of these conferences, unfortunately I could not attend, down in my hon. friend's district there in Springdale. I was supposed to be there as a resource person on creating employment for young people. I was invited by a young lady because of remarks that I had made on radio and television in connection with the problems that young people are having -

MR. PECKFORD: Was that the young lady I was just referring to earlier?

MR. NEARY: - finding employment. Sir, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It being five-thirty a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the Chair. The first matter for debate refers to the amount of control being exercised with regard to big game poaching in the Province.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLICHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I assure this House that in the next five minutes the debate coming from me will not be of such a high plane or have such great philosophical value as what we have heard in this House today. Apart from the speech made by my hon. friend from White Bay-Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) I would suggest to this House, Sir, that the rest of those speeches should have been reserved for United Nations.

So now, Mr. Speaker, I want to express a concern of mine and a concern of a great many people in Newfoundland, all the legitimate hunters and all the people who are concerned with the protection and the conservation of our moose population in this Province. That concern, Sir, lies in the fact that there is no evidence that there is any type of law enforcement of our game laws in this Province during the off-season. It seems that all the game laws, the game wardens, come out of the woodwork when the season opens. That is the time, Sir, I submit to this House, that we need them less. The licensed hunters in this Province are a deterrent to poaching in this Province.

The fact is, Sir, that game wardens in the on-season, during the hunting season, the only thing they enforce is the legalities of our game laws. The fact is also that when the hunters take to the woods in September when the season is open, Sir, it does not matter who shoots the moose from a conservation point of view because the fact is that if I go in the woods and I do not have a moose license and I shoot a moose, if I would not have shot it, ten minutes behind me comes a hunter who has a license and that moose is shot. Most of the moose in this Province are shot from access roads. From a conservation point of view it does not mean anything. There are enough hunters, there are maybe too many, but there are enough coming into the woods at any one given time that any moose that may be poached, poached in the sense that it was shot without a license, would have been shot anyway. So from a conservation point of view it does not mean a thing.

MR. FLIGHT:

Now is the time that the moose is being poached in this Province, Mr. Speaker. I will tell the Minister of Tourism and his department that I am personally aware, and other members of this House are probably aware, that there are moose being shot in this Province, more moose being shot in this Province-not so much this month the poachers are too smart for that, the moose are not ready yet. For meat purposes the best time in this Province to shoot a moose is August. And the hunters and the poachers will be out in August and they will shoot those moose and they will bring them home. And when the hunters go into the woods in September, moose that they had watched along the access roads during July and August will not be there. They will have been shot and poached. That is not good enough.

Sir, I would suggest to the minister that now is the time to have chains on access roads, and game wardens. Not chains, gates, game wardens checking cars going in and out of those access roads. I know of one incident, Sir, recently that on a fishing trip eight moose on one access road were spotted, eight different moose. I know that area well enough, Sir, to tell the hon. minister that very few of those eight moose will be alive for the legitimate hunters September 5 when the season opens. They will have been shot and brought out of the woods during the off-season. There is no question about that.

There are caribou right now in areas in Newfoundland where poaching is prevalent, being shot right now. Sir, for any person as far as I am concerned who has got concern over the conservation of our moose, who want to guarantee that we have, number one, a moose population to warrant a decent hunt in the Fall, anyone who is concerned with the legal rights of people who are prepared to uphold our game laws and buy licenses, then certainly we should protect, there should be enforcement of our game laws during the off-season. Without that protection the moose population will not stand. There is very little poaching done in this Province in the on-season. As



MR. FLIGHT:

I said, the hunters themselves, the licensed hunters are practically a deterrent to poaching, in the sense that we consider poaching, when we think of people killing moose in the off-season, I would submit that the minister would take that into consideration and have game wardens protecting the moose. It is now the moose are most vulnerable to people in Newfoundland who wish to poach them. I would hope something will be done about that.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MP. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my hon. friend, first of all that based on figures that I have I cannot agree. I might have been inclined to agree with him a couple of days ago, but on checking I find that that is not so that more animals are taken during the off-season or when the season is closed. Number one, somebody who poaches a moose or an animal during the open season, certainly one is not as quick to stop him as they would be during the time when the season is closed because there is certainly a greater opportunity for him to get out even where there might be wardens because that is the time of the year that licenses are issued. But if somebody saw a person take an animal out of the woods this time of the year, it is common knowledge, public knowledge there are no licenses, anyone would obviously report him or certainly would know that the animal was poached.

Now I might say to my friend that consideration has been given to doing something like what is done under the Migratory Birds Act wherein people who report incidences of taking the wildlife out of season, who reports it, their names are kept confidential and when that case comes to court if there is a conviction and a fine the person who makes available that information is given fifty per cent of the fine as handed down by the court. We might go into that but only, Mr. Speaker, if the present system that we have instituted does not show some signs of working. I suggest that we have taken some bold steps this year, changed the penalties from three years to five years, the first offence; the second offence

MR. HICKEY:

within a two year period of the first conviction, lifetime penalty.  
How far can one go?

I would like to tell my hon. friend as well that we have increased the wardens from sixteen two years ago to a present thirty-eight. We hired twenty temporary people who are not on only for the open season but who are on for the greater part of the year. I might tell him the figures. In Eastern Newfoundland there were 150 cases during the past year, Western, 191. In the central area, which he is interested in, eighty-eight. That is by my own staff. By the RCMP in the central area, sixty-three, in the Eastern area, twenty-eight, in the Western area, sixty-two. But I can see why my friend is concerned because - now this is the Island, this does not apply to Labrador - I can see why he is concerned because in the general area, Buchans area, the RCMP have fifty-three cases presently under consideration.

MR. FLICHT: Not one of those cases in the off-season? All related to the on-season?

MR. HICKEY: Not one of them in the off-season?

MR. FLICHT: How many in the off-season?

MR. HICKEY: I do not know exactly but they are for the whole year. But they are pending, fifty-three cases pending, and those are all from the RCMP and not from my own staff as such. I have not got the figures broken down in terms of how many cases my own staff might have rounded up, but this is just purely the RCMP. It would indicate to me that a number of them or a fair number of them are during the off-season.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to come up with a system which is going to be fair to all and one has to take into account that you cannot - there is only so far you can go and I do not think we can always go and penalize, you know, the total, and penalize everybody for the sake of the minority because this is usually what happens. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the measures

MR. HICKEY:

we have taken this year which are now effective certainly should go a long way to cutting down on the number of animals poached. And goodness knows that if anyone is going to poach an animal this year and run the risk of getting caught, he is penalized for five years and if he subsequently goes out and commits that crime again he is barred for life from having a license. I do not think one can go any further than that.

MR. SPEAKER: The second matter for debate concerns the closing of twenty hospital beds at the Janeway Hospital.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: I do not know if my voice will hold out, and I do not know who is going to answer for the administration, the Minister of Health is not here, Sir. But, Mr. Speaker, to cover the only children's hospital in Newfoundland and Labrador with the same blanket ruling to eliminate hospital beds as applies to other hospitals in the Province, Sir, in my opinion, is cruel, inhuman, and unrealistic. Common sense, Mr. Speaker, would indicate a strong possibility that there are chronically, but not critically ill patients in other hospitals who required a minimum of nursing care and medical care and personal care. Beds presently occupied by such patients, Mr. Speaker, can certainly be eliminated, and the patients themselves can be removed to much less costly nursing care homes, if they are available, where they can get the personal care and treatment needed at considerable savings to the Province, both because of the lower cost of such beds and because, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada through the Canada Assistance Plan will pay 50 per cent of such costs. With children however, Mr. Speaker, the situation is completely different. There are no chronically ill children at the Janeway, Sir. Children are there at the Janeway Hospital either because of accident, and, Mr. Speaker, I might remind the House that within days when school closes that we will be at the peak of the children's accident season, and they are also there at the Janeway, Sir, because of diseases and illness requiring round the clock medical care and all the facilities and all of the equipment available.

Mr. Speaker, in all humanity and with an eye on the obvious waste and extravagance of expenditures in other departments of government, which we have seen approved by this House during the last minute jet steam of Budget non debate that we saw recently, surely, Mr. Speaker, all of us by now must accept the fact that in the Provincial departments that there are all kinds of examples of extravagance and waste where money can be saved to save these twenty beds at the Janeway Hospital. For instance, Sir, an example, would be the Norma and Gladys. Another example is the under cover

Mr. Neary:

increases given to top flight civil servants recently up to as much as \$5,000 and \$6,000. And what about the cost of operating the Churchill Falls jet, Sir? And all the other examples of extravagance and waste that I could mention, Mr. Speaker, but I do not have time in the five minute period that I have at my disposal.

But the point I am trying to make, Sir, is surely that when we think of all these examples of waste of taxpayers dollars, Sir, that we in this House should unite to persuade the Minister of Health to exempt the Janeway Children's Hospital from any move to curtail twenty beds that are so very necessary for the sick children from all over this Province. Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough for the Minister of Health to state in this House that his department will be keeping a close watch on the Janeway Hospital. Should even one life, Mr. Speaker, of one child in this Province be lost, or one child be given less than full medical care needed and end up a cripple or an invalid for life just because there is no room at the inn, Sir, every member of this House will bear his share of the guilt.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I appeal once more to the administration, and especially to the Minister of Health, to reconsider this proposal to close twenty beds at the Janeway Hospital that, according to the reports that we have had from the Administer and the Boards needs expansion in the worst kind of a way rather than curtailment of services of any kind at that institution.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Have you checked it conscientiously?

MR. NEARY: Yes I have.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. NEARY: And it is not a bit funny, by the way.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: If that is so -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: - why throw up such garbage?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. minister only has five there. There are strict time limits so it would be improper to interfere.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health has asked me to reply in his stead. The position is, Mr. Speaker, that these closing of hospital beds which were announced in the Budget have been carried out in the closest consultation and acting on the advice of the authorities who administer the various hospitals, not only the Janeway Hospital, but all the other hospitals that are involved.

Now nobody would deny the importance of the Janeway Hospital, it is our only children's hospital, and it is vitally and extremely important. But nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, the closing of beds in that hospital has been carried out not by the government without consultation, but with the fullest consultation with the authorities in the hospital. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the bed closings are monitored by a committee set up for that purpose, and if there is any indication whatsoever that any child would suffer, or anybody or anyone would suffer as a result of these bed closings then it is so closely and carefully monitored, Mr. Speaker, that remedial action could be taken before suffering took place.

So the government is concerned of course at having had to do this, but it has been necessary. It has been done carefully. It is being carefully monitored. And I can assure on behalf of the Minister of Health, I can assure this House that there is no danger of a child dying or suffering because of this, and that all proper precautions are being taken and the thing watched very carefully, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The third matter for debate, and this is made possible because the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) withdrew his, is the make-work projects of a community nature in the Province. The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. W. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to thank the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) for bowing out in my favour. And perhaps in advance I could - well, number one, I should thank the Minister of Rural and Industrial Development for the answer that he gave to a question that I posed last Thursday at this time, and I hope that the answer that I will get today will be less of a circular nature.

Mr. Speaker, everybody in this Province knows of the high degree of unemployment that exist throughout the Province. As I said yesterday, each day it seems to be getting a bit worse. The Gull Island project was forced to be closed down a few days ago. In my own district the Come By Chance Refinery has been closed down now for several months, and if it is reopened, of course, it will probably take several more months yet.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, work can be made available to many of the young men, and some of them not so young, and women too for that matter, who live in our various communities, thirty-six in the district of Bellevue, thirty-six communities, young men who are walking around with nothing to do. And I referred yesterday, and I refer again now, to the Local Initiative Programmes or the OFY, or OFYO as I mentioned yesterday, the opportunities for young and old to do a day's work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how bad off and how much welfare there would be existing in the district of Bellevue. I speak specifically of the district of Bellevue and the thirty-six communities which comprises it - I do not know how bad off a lot of the people would be and how much welfare there would have been if a LIP project, for example, was not approved last Fall for Old Shop, Whitbourne, Sunnyside, Little Heart's Ease, and many other communities. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that possibly the LIP grants that were rejected because of lack of funds by the Federal Government, if the Provincial Government had some sort of plan to take over these projects and put these projects that were turned down on the Board, then we would have the make-work projects, the community projects which would, I believe, at least



MR. CALLAN: alleviate some of the unemployment problems that we have. And in every community, Mr. Speaker, not in every district, but as I say I speak particularly of my district, in every community I am sure that there are community projects which could be done for several thousands of dollars. I speak of my own community of Norman's Cove where a LIP application was put in last Fall and was refused because of, again, a lack of funds.

These jobs could be created and could be carried out by the Government of the Province. Now the hon. minister says that his department does not have a mandate for creating jobs of a community nature. The mandate for his department, he says, is for business type things and so on. But the simple question that I asked in answer to that is, why does not some department, if not the hon. minister's department, why does not some other department of government take this as a mandate and put it on a drawing board and do something about it.

Mr. Speaker in closing, as I said, I hope that I do not get the circular answer that I got on last Thursday afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural and Industrial Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is a very reasonable man normally. I have watched him stand up in the House on occasions and present some good arguments. The last time I responded on behalf of the Acting Minister and the House Leader and his argument was kosher, is that the word?

MR. DOODY: A good word.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Reasonable, and very difficult to defend against. His argument today is not a serious one. I know that he is not serious. He is serious about the problem, as every Newfoundlander is serious about the problem of unemployment. We have got an unemployment problem. We have had one since 1497, and we will have one a hundred years from now, and I do not know if there is anybody in the House

MR. LUNDRIGAN: who has had as much exposure to the problem from the point of view of being in politics as I have had. I spent six years in the House of Commons as a spokesman for the national party on the unemployment issue, and I have really gotten over the years quite a feeling and a commitment to the resolution of that problem. In this Province of course the challenge is much greater than anywhere across the country. The unemployment is no less pleasant in any part of the nation.

The member stands up today and expresses, first of all in his initial comments, his gloom and his concern about the problem worsening and the depth of the problem. I do not know if I should say it, but I do not think that the problem in the Province is as gloomy and the future is as gloomy as the members sometimes indicate that it is. I sometimes feel they would almost like it to be worse so they can talk about it more or that it can be dramatized more. We have got a serious problem. We have got a lot of people out of work. As long as there is one Newfoundlander that has trouble finding a job the government has to have a concern. We have got a number of programmes that we are trying hard to utilize to attract industry. We have got a development corporation. We have got our development funds in the small department that I am involved in. We have got our minister who has made several good announcements. We will be making more good announcements. I am tempted very strongly today to rob him of one or two but I will resist the temptation. The Minister of Fisheries has his programmes, our Minister of Mines and Energy, our Minister of Finance, the rest of the departments, all of the departments, the various line departments in Transportation, Municipal Affairs will announce programmes to stimulate the economy, to have money flow into communities in the way of service development and various other ways.

But for the member to say, and we have got all kinds of types of government assistance to try and attract industry.

MR. MORGAN: Rural Development Authority

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The Rural Development Authority the Minister of Transportation and Communications reminds me of, which is a small little programme that has a minimal effect but it is important.

From the point of view of the government trying to make the climate right for people to come forward to receive some stimulation, some assistance, some help in developing the industries in the Province, we are very excited about it. But I will not accept the recommendation of the member on two levels that we try to pick up LIP projects that the Federal Government have rejected as an answer to the unemployment problem. My feeling is that one of the biggest weaknesses we have had over the years in our economic development plans is that we have just thrown money at the economy. We have jumped into situations which were not well thought out, that were nothing less than ad hocery. The result is that we have had a relatively continuous, relatively weak economy.

It is our challenge as a government, as long as we are in power to try to build a broad foundation to make reasonable decisions and to try to out-plan an economy that will grow and become stable. Now that might mean we will have periods such as we have today, and these periods are not brought on by actions of the government, they are brought on by circumstances much of which are of a national nature. If the member will allow me to continue in my five minutes: And everyone has always said that the problems of a Province like Newfoundland become very critical when you find a national problem of an economic nature. And I can go on and talk that language for hours and I understand I believe a little bit about what it means. I was brought up under Bob Stanfield's tutorship in terms of understanding the essence of these types of problems. And we have had a major national problem the last number of years and we have said ourselves that if

MR. LUNDRIGAN: the Canadian economy becomes weak the Newfoundland economy becomes almost diseased. And it amazes me that members like the hon. gentleman, of course he is only a new member, can stand here today and not recognize that the depth of the problem is largely a result of the deterioration in the national economy.

Mr. Turner's or his successor, Mr. MacDonald's suggestion a couple of days ago to the national economy was to wait for the American economy to develop so that we could have the Canadian economy brought along. We do not think that is good enough but I will reject categorically in the last sentence, Your Honour, any suggestion that we should carry on the programme which the Federal Government are suggesting that they should curtail or even discontinue. Perhaps he should have made his remarks to his hon. colleague, I believe it is Mr. Rooney he is called, who occupies a seat, or did occupy a seat in the House of Commons, I regret to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is that this House do now adjourn. Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour "aye", contrary "nay", I therefore leave the Chair until eight this evening.

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WELLS: For the information of the House I thought I would indicate what we propose this evening. We did not finish the bill that we are on, the Youth Council Bill, and what I propose, if it is agreeable, because I had certainly undertaken yesterday in consideration of Private Members' Day being given up to government business, that I would call the Address in Reply this evening. What I would propose doing, as we are still on this Youth Bill, is to finish it up. I do not know if many more members want to speak. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is speaking now. I do not know if he has much longer.

MR. NEARY: Five to six minutes.

MR. WELLS: Five minutes or so. I do not know if many more members want to speak on that bill, but assuming that we can finish it up fairly quickly, I would like to call the Forest Fires Act, the short amendment to the Forest Fires Act, which would not be controversial, and I am told by the minister that it would be desirable to have that act passed. And then so I would call that for second reading, and then go into Committee on these two bills and then into the Address in Reply, as I undertook, if that is satisfactory.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile adjourned the debate, and he has five minutes left.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose for supper we were talking about the young people today not being as radical as they were, say, ten years ago. They seem to be a little more conservative now, with a small 'c'. I think this is true, Sir. But they are still not going to be deceived. They still look upon people in authority and the establishment and people who run the system as being frauds, and they can see through the humbug. And so, Mr. Speaker, although there are not as radical as they were ten years ago, and not protesting just about everything, and sometimes when they were protesting they did not know what they were protesting about, although we have passed

Mr. Neary:

through that phase; and I remember reading in, I think, Time Magazine some time ago where a group of high school students were interviewed at their graduation, and I think that it is fair to say that they are now behaving in a more responsible manner than they were heretofore by going out and protesting and mashing up buildings and so forth that we heard about today, but they are still not going to be deceived, Sir. And if I can end up by just offering the government, Sir, one piece of advice, it is this; that I sincerely hope - I am going to support the bill - it is not window dressing, because it is too important a matter, Sir. The future of Newfoundland is in the hands of our young people, and the future of Canada and of North America, for that matter, is in the hands of our young people. And by just bringing in a piece of legislation and holding a conference say once or twice a year is not going to do any good at all or give the young people an opportunity to have input in government. If government are genuine and sincere there must be follow-up. And the young people have been let down too often, they have been taken up a country lane too often. And unless the government is prepared to follow-up and to perform and to implement the ideas of our young people, then I would say, Sir, that this Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Commission will fail. I hope it will succeed, because it is in the hands of the young people that the future of this Province depends.

And we have taken a considerable length of time on this bill. The Premier was anxious to wind it up. It is too important a matter to rush through the House, Mr. Speaker. I hope that other members will participate in the debate. There is no hurry. It is a very important matter, very important to this Province. We have to regain the confidence of the young people of this Province and the only way to do it, Sir, is by performance and by follow-up and by showing the young people that we really mean business, that we are listening to them, and we are going to implement their ideas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George's.

MRS. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, with respect to this bill, the Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Commission, I must say that I am very interested in the establishment of the Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Commission in this Province. I think that it could, if handled properly, do a lot for our youth, and possibly provide for tomorrow's youth what is not available today and has not been available up until this time. I have a lot of concern and respect for our young people. I think that they are quite intelligent today. Their opportunities today are much greater than ours were. They have the ingenuity to make it in this world. They are the leaders of tomorrow. And the youth of today are looking to us, to the members of this Legislature, they are looking to us for leadership, looking for assistance to develop their opportunities, looking to us for jobs. We are the people who should and must be setting the pace, who must give the example.

Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the youth of today do not know where they are going, as some hon. members stated here today. Do we know where we are going? I submit that this government at this particular time is not quite sure where they are going.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MACISAAC: I know where our young people are going as soon as their education is completed. They are going elsewhere. They are going to other provinces to seek for employment. That is where they are going, and it is up to this government and up to every member of this Legislature to do everything in its power to make it possible for those young people to stay in our Province, and find useful occupations here. I am interested again from a recreation point of view. When we speak of the youth of our Province, we must bear in mind that the youth of this Province are faced with completely different situations in their respective areas. The opportunities available to the youth in St. John's or Corner Brook or in the larger towns or communities of the Province are a far cry from the opportunities available to the



Mrs. MacIsaac.

youth of the smaller communities of the Province. There are areas which in my opinion are completely neglected, areas where the young people have never seen the inside of a recreation centre, a stadium or indeed even a school gymnasium. The youth in certain areas of this Province have absolutely no recreational facilities. They are disadvantaged and neglected, ignored by the government, not only the present administration but the previous administration also. This government have not afforded the opportunities to these rural areas that are afforded to children in the urban areas, for instance, here in St. John's or Corner Brook, again as I stated before. And I submit that the government has, and any government has, an obligation to make these facilities and opportunities available to each and every area of the Province, to all the youth of our Province. I am not saying to each community. I say each area. And an example of that would be in my own particular area. I feel that the youth in my area, the young people of my area, have been neglected for years, many years, much too long. For instance we have a stadium in Stephenville, and I am pretty sure that there is one in Port aux Basques. In between there we have nothing. We have miles and miles, and we have dozens of communities who have nothing, not even a school gymnasium. And when the doors of the school are locked even in the few communities that do have a gymnasium, when classes are out in the evening, the doors are locked and that is it. And whatever recreational facilities are available are available only during the school hours, possibly for a half hour a week, not a day even. And this is something that I am quite concerned about, and I hope that this bill will establish a Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Commission and with it maybe open up opportunities for our youth, Province wide. I hope that this will not be confined just to certain areas. It says that the council, it is to be representative of the whole Province and shall consist of twelve members to be elected. Members of the council are to be elected on a regional basis. I hope that it will be done this way to give the people in the

Mrs. MacIsaac.

rural areas an opportunity to participate in this and probably make our Province a better place for our youth to live, a place where they can grow up and also find employment and stay here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I promise to be extremely brief in commenting on this bill. But I would say - I say this from the depth of my heart - that I think this is one of the most important, if not the most important, item we will be discussing in this hon. House of Assembly during the present session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Now a lot has been said about it, and there is even some fear that we are wasting time. But I do not think that one minute of time has been wasted on this bill, and I furthermore feel - and this has been indicated to me by members on both sides of this hon. House - that every hon. member would like to have a go at this bill. Because, after all, almost every hon. member has a family of his own, and in this very peculiar age that we are living in, they must be concerned. I am sure that they are concerned. And I do not feel that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who spoke on it, I do not think he wasted one minute, because he really brought it out into the open or as he said, he took grips with it. And I think that that is really what we have to do. We have to get our fingers into the meat of the problem, because what I had down here, and I did not make any long preparation for this, I am more or less speaking from past experience, I believe today that a lot of our youth are - to use the saying - "They are lost in the wilderness." They do not know where they are going. And I see this. In fact I have seen it especially over in the city of Corner Brook where I lived, for the past ten years, at least, where young people gather on what is commonly known as West Street. They have no place to go, and

Mr. Woodrow.

I recall now in 1944, I guess it was, I was in Loyola College in Montreal, and probably a lot of you remember the late Daniel Lord. He dealt a lot with youth. He wrote many pamphlets on youth, and I heard him say one time, I heard him say, he said if he had his time back again, he would speak to the parents and not to the youth. Because I believe what has happened down through the years - I know when I was a boy and, of course, many of us were boys here - it seemed that the parents took the control in the homes. Well this control over the past, say, probably two decades has been shifted. It has been shifted from parents to school teachers and so on and more or less the authority in a sense, to my mind, was kind of stolen from the parents. They did not actually realize that this control was going, and finally it disappeared altogether.

And I also think that the late Pope John, believe it or not, I think that he certainly had a great bearing on youth. In fact, even though he was young himself in all his years as head of the Roman Catholic Church, he certainly showed himself to be in with the times.

Now I also recall - in fact I could go back maybe twenty-five years ago, when I was constantly, in fact, day in and day out, night in and night out, trying to work for youth, trying, for example, to maybe show them a movie or trying to find a place for them to gather, a dance hall or something of that nature. In fact somebody had to be concerned about them. And no later than in 1969 I recall over in the United Church hall on Clarence Street in the district of Humber East, we set up a committee then. It was composed in fact of, I believe, Dr. Murphy, who was at the time the Mayor of Corner Brook. He was the chairman of it. We had concerned people on it. We had school teachers. We had Mounties on it. And we had other intelligent people in the community on it, on the committee. And what I suggested during

Mr. Woodrow.

my years in council was that we should try to establish youth centres, and we succeeded to a certain extent in the city of Corner Brook. For example, we could if we wanted have established one big youth centre. But Corner Brook, in fact, say, I suppose, it extends may be from Riverside Drive down to the boundary, down to the boundary on the West End to Mount Moriah. You are probably thinking of something like fifteen miles altogether, at least between ten to fifteen miles. So my idea was to try to establish three youth centres, one in the West, one in the Centre and one in the East.

Now, really, Mr. Speaker, I think the point that we are probably missing - and this was really brought out by the hon. member for St. George's (Mrs. MacIsaac), you know - there are more places in this Province besides Corner Brook and St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: And really what took a bearing on the whole of the Province - in fact this was mentioned by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) - is that television has gone into every home and it has changed the youth altogether. In fact, more or less now we are all in a sense, we could all perhaps be placed as, say, living in cities and towns for example. And, of course, the intervention of good schools and transportation, communication and so on, all this in fact has taken to my mind a great bearing on the youth of this Province, and really what makes it important to me is that today the hon. Premier of this House got up and he led off this debate. If the hon. Premier did not see the importance of this debate, I am sure he would not have gotten up and led off the debate on it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I, therefore, feel that it is a very important bill that is before the House, and we better, in fact, we better before it is too late, we better try to get our fingers into the meat of it and just see what it is all about. Not, in fact, to laugh it off maybe, I think that there is a problem. The problem will not go

Mr. Woodrow.

away by itself. The problem is going to remain unless we, as legislators, unless we in fact try to grapple with it. Sometimes I think we are inclined to laugh it off and say that the youth have no problem whatsoever. But take today, how many, for example, say today, those of you who have maybe young people in your family, anywhere between fifteen and, say, twenty years of age, they do not know what they want to do in life. In fact they just do not know. They say- should I do this, should I be a doctor, a nurse, priest or whatever the case may be. They just do not know any more. So I think that we have, in fact, to take hold of it. We have to try to see what the problem is, and it is only by debating it in this hon. House of Assembly and realizing that there is a problem that we are going to come up at least with some solution.

MR. WOODROW: Once again I repeat that I am extremely happy, in fact I do not think that really if this administration did nothing else during this session of the House of Assembly but introduce this bill and find an answer to it, actually I think by doing that alone it would be doing a great thing for the Province and a great thing in fact for the Canadian nation and for the Canadian people in general.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on longer. There are probably other members who want to speak on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Continue.

MR. WOODROW: No, I do not think. I could go on I say but there are probably other members who want to speak about it but I once again repeat that it is a bill of major importance to this hon. House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: First I ask the hon. gentleman, is he speaking to close the debate?

MR. WELLS: Yes, the Premier has asked me if I would speak in his behalf to close the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister Without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Well, Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very brief and we have had the benefits of a debate which lasted all afternoon and in the early part of the evening on this subject, and it is interesting and we are pleased to note that there appears to be unanimous support in this House for this bill. There has been much said that has been certainly worth hearing and worth noting, Mr. Speaker. I would make one comment, though, in respect of young people and this House, government and the institutions which we have in our society, it is I think unfortunate that more and more government in Canada, government in this Province, and I think this

MR. WELLS: is an accelerating trend in the last few years, more and more government is passing laws which regulate our society. And somebody has said that very often this House is not relevant to society in general and the people who are living in the Province. I think very often that is true, Mr. Speaker.

I remember one of the magistrates saying to me once, who had served as a magistrate for a great many years in Newfoundland and was one of the best men on the bench of the Provincial Court, and he said to me, "It is too bad," he said, "that rather lead people and rather than show people an example," he said, "we seek mainly to regulate their conduct." And I think that is unfortunate and I think it is a trend that is with us and it is not just with us but it is all over the Western World. It is a pity that it has to go to the extent that it is going and I suppose most members at one stage or another have read books like Brave New World and Nineteen Eighty Four. It is about twenty years ago that I read Nineteen Eighty Four, and now 1984 is not that far away and the degree of regulations in our society, regulations of our lives is such that sometimes I think that Nineteen Eighty Four is here, not the year but the concept in the book. I think it is very unfortunate.

I think that the whole question of dealing with young people, and I think this act is a good act and a good concept, but I think we have to lead them, Mr. Speaker, young people, lead them to believe that we are relevant, lead them to believe that we are capable of making a contribution and not give them the impression that we are in here simply shooting off our mouths or beating our gums, as they might put it, day after day after day, with things and concepts and ideas and notions that are not really relevant to this Province.

Talking about what is relevant to this Province, Mr. Speaker, I heard on the news in the car the other day, the people around Conception Bay, not just Conception Bay but all



MR. WELLS: over this Province, have started and you know they are working at the fishery but this specific item was that the people of Conception Bay who go north to the Labrador fishery were being picked up last week by one of the coastal boats and taken down there. And I could not help but think, you know, my family for generations were Labrador fishermen, and when I thought of these people going down there to catch fish I thought, my God, this is something productive. If you only caught a few thousand pounds of fish it is something productive, it is something that adds to the economy of Newfoundland. And you are not down there talking all day long. You are down there doing something. And I contrasted that with the role of so many of us in society, in the life of this Province. It does not seem to be a practical matter of doing something any more but simply a matter of talking. I thought "How Sad" because I sometimes wonder if we in fact are productive in the way that the man who goes out and works with his hands or works at his job, however lowly it is, in our society.

So if we are going to do anything for the youth, to help the youth of this Province it has to be a two way street I think, Mr. Speaker. It has to be a case of us showing in example and showing leadership and asking them to pick up the challenge and to show responsibility, to show ideas and to show something that would help us of this generation, of our generation, working with them to develop this Province because I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is not government that develops a province. Governments and Houses of Assembly are sounding boards, they are debating societies; they have their vital role, yes, but it is the ordinary person of Newfoundland, whatever his role, be it great or small, be he a businessman or the lowliest man on the job, be he a professional of any kind, whether teacher, doctor, whatever, it is these people, the sum total of their individual efforts which makes any country great. And if we are going to be a great Province, and a have Province,

MR. WELLS: but more important than to have a Province, if we are going to be a great Province that is going to keep its self-respect and contribute something to Canada, then Mr. Speaker, more of us and all of us have got to make that individual effort because on the basis and the sum total of these individual efforts lies the greatness, I feel, of any Province or any country.

Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in moving second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

On motion a bill, "An Act To Establish The Newfoundland And Labrador Youth Commission," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 22.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Forest Fires Act," (Bill No. 68)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, just to answer a few questions posed today. The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) posed the question about the forest fire protection in Labrador and as I made a statement in the House last week, but I did not have the information here today, we have fourteen men based at Goose Bay. We have a unit at Cartwright of three men and a unit at Labrador City of three men.

The unit at Labrador City and Cartwright have enough equipment for routine fire fighting work and there is quite a storage of equipment at Goose Bay should either the area along the coast or Central or Western Labrador need any extra equipment. So we have sufficient equipment.

Also we will have one water bomber stationed at Goose Bay. We will have two helicopters stationed in Goose Bay although that is with the Department of Transportation and Communications. The first priority on the helicopters will be for forest fire protection and in addition to that we have a float equipped Otter in Goose Bay to keep surveillance

MR. ROUSSEAU: and so on during the forest fire season. So we think we have -

MR. STRACHAN: Float equipped Otter?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Float equipped Otter will do surveillances and so on for the Summer. So in equipment we have a water bomber, two helicopters and a float equipped helicopter, fourteen men at Goose, three at Cartwright, three at Labrador City, plus sufficient equipment to keep the situation under hand.

I have here an answer for the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) but he is not here now and I will get that for him tomorrow probably.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the House that they would give me the opportunity to have this bill tonight. We think it is important that we get this bill through and I will try and be as brief as possible and explain the bill and then any members who have any comments I will certainly undertake to answer them.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. STRACHAN: We wish to hear the speaker and there is an awful lot of noise.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall have to ask those hon. members who are making noise to please cease.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, the first section there, section 6 of the original bill, "The Forest Fire Act of 1970," allow certain discretionary powers to the Minister of Forestry in respect to fire fighting. And sections (a), (b), (d), (e), (g) and (h), whereby I can require employers to make their

MR. ROUSSEAU:

people available, I can require employees and anybody else to fight a forest fire, I can requisition a building, accommodation, machinery equipment, vehicles, food and anything else you need during a forest fire, a, b, d, e, secure accommodations for and relocate persons who have been evacuated; e, g, have any trees, buildings or other structures cut down, pulled down or removed, this sort of thing that the minister has the power to do, what we are doing now is that I have now the power to pay for this sort of thing, to suggest to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council what pay should be given to have this power in order to take the buildings or the equipment or the individuals to fight a forest fire. And I think that is very necessary, you know, Governments in this day and age just cannot walk in and requisition anything and not make any recompense to the people for doing that. This will now enable the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to decide, but also it goes further in the sense that if the person who has a building requisitioned, or machinery or employees and so on, to apply for arbitration, if they are not satisfied with the amount as set forth by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. And that arbitration will be the same as under the arbitration procedure under The Expropriation Act would be the plaintiff suggests one, the government appoints one, and both of them together appoint a neutral independent observer - or an independent Chairman. So this will enable the minister to make restitution for any of the things that would happen during an emergency situation, and also give the ability of the person who is being taken advantage of for the ability to have his case arbitrated if he were not satisfied with the amount set forward.

The second section, Mr. Speaker, is a new one, and it empowers the Lieutenant-Governor in Council by regulation to require an owner or a leasee or a licensee and other persons having the possession or control of land within the Province to pay all the costs incurred by Her Majesty in extinguishing forest fires from those lands, or such part of those costs as may be prescribed by regulations.

Mr. Rousseau:

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if an owner of a property, or if it is leased to a mill or so on, and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council decides that they should incur a cost, the cost having to be prescribed by regulation then the method of payment in the next Subsection says "That the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may cause that amount of money spent in extinguishing that forest fire to be a debt against Her Majesty and obtainable in the Courts of the Land."

In addition to that, in order to be fair as well, because the person again has to have some right of recourse, we say in Section (3), "Nothing in this section or the regulations shall be construed to prevent any such person from raising as a defence in any such action the averment that any or all the circumstances made under this section did not exist." In other words, you have the ability to go to court and appeal the case. If he is charged any amount that he does not think he should be charged, or is charged too much, he has the regular route of the courts and his regular route of appeal.

And in addition to this "Any regulations made under this shall be published in the Gazette", and people will know it and the form prescribed thereof.

Section (3), Subsection (1), Mr. Speaker, is a section in which the minister can regulate any logging operations and so on on Crown lands in the Province. And what I am asking for in this amendment is that we strike out the words "Crown lands" and insert the word "woods", so that the minister in effect will be responsible for all of the land in the Province whether it be Crown land, private land or company land. So this will, of course, give very broad powers.

And Subsection (2), Mr. Speaker, sections (h) and (i) to be repealed. And I have given that some thought and I am asking that it will be deleted in the Committee stage. This repeals really the discretionary power that the minister has, and I am afraid that we may have a bad season, but I will give an undertaking to the House that I will look at this section over the Summer, and we will take a

Mr. Rousseau:

look at it and see if it does not hamper us in our operation.

What I am afraid of under this section is that if tomorrow I imposed a fire ban, not a ban on travel, but a fire ban, that I may not - and I do not know this, and I have not really had an answer sufficient to allow me to let this go through - that I might close down the economy of the Province because everybody, everybody may be banned from the woods, including logging operations who are in there, by the way, under very specified conditions, that they had to have so much equipment, and there has to be so many men and so on and so forth.

So rather than take the chance -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: - Mr. Speaker, welcome - I suppose if I am on my feet, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure on behalf of all the members of the House, welcome back and we hope your little accident was not too grave, and it looks like it is not; you look cheery and happy and we wish you the best.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: But I am asking that that section be repealed or deleted in the Committee stage with the undertaking of the House that I will look at it again for the Fall session. And any questions that any members may have in respect to any of the points I raised I will certainly make every effort to answer them when I close the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. I. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, if I can leave the bill for just one second, and refer to the initial statement that the minister made, in response to that, and a little explanation of my questioning, I have seen, for instance, in the Labrador Coast, for a number of years I have flown past forest fires for a number of year in which the forest fire has burned for a week, two weeks, three weeks, as long as three weeks in which the fire has been allowed to burn. On two occasions the aircraft and the equipment was taken up elsewhere, and I could see the reasons for it; the aircraft, the water bomber and

Mr. Strachan:

the ground crews were involved in far more serious fires elsewhere, but on one occasion I remember reporting the fire for a considerable period of time and nothing was done with the water bomber sitting in Goose Bay. And my reasons for bringing it up was not that the commercial stands were being destroyed, it was small stands at the head of bays and so on, but the wild life is extremely hampered or destroyed by these fires and that was the reasoning for it.

To get on to the points raised here, I agree essentially with the powers that the minister possesses through this bill. There are a couple of small things that I see here that may be open to question. The minister has the power to ask people or command people, essentially in emergency situations in fire, to work fighting forest fires, and to be compensated at a later date for their time and trouble, and they can take this to arbitration.

The only additional point that I wish to add here is that should any of these people become injured or, for instance, in some cases it may happen they lose their life, I wonder if there is anything built into this Act which allows them to be compensated in an adequate way, and I do not mean by any minor kind of thing, but to be adequately compensated for the loss of life or for whatever disability they have suffered fighting the forest fire.

Secondly, another point in this bill, the question I had there was whether in charging people who leased forest lands for part of the cost of fighting forest fires, whether the minister would assess the amount of blame? In other words, if the person who is leasing that land, or the company who is leasing that land was not in the slightest blameworthy for the forest fire, would they be therefore assessed with the cost, which could be extremely high, the cost of trying to put that fire out? I could think of a number of cases in Labrador, for instance, where fires are mostly caused through lightning rather than on the Island where fires are caused more by people themselves being careless in the woods. And I would think that in this situation here there might be some question as to exactly the amount of charges should be laid against



Mr. Strachan:

these people who lease land, since in many cases they may not be at all blameworthy for the cause of the forest fire.

So these are just a couple of the points that I see initially in the bill and would like to raise to the minister.

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

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this bill.

Recently there have been two serious forest fires in my district, and I must say there is not much forest land in the district. What is there I presume is privately owned. There is some timberland but not much timberland all over Conception Bay. Sir, one of those forest fires, the one which caused quite a bit of damage, was a direct result of blueberry bush burning and it did cause a lot of destruction to private property. I know one person who has lost about 1,000 feet of fence and so forth and I presume he is, I know for sure he is in contact with the forestry people.

Also this fire last week there, Sir, last Sunday, in the vicinity of Harbour Grace. There were several homes threatened in both cases. But for the good work of the water bombers and the people concerned, and all voluntary fire brigades in the area, probably the town of the small community of Bristol's Hope would have been wiped out. Sir, I do agree with this bill and support it. Probably, Sir, - I am not sure, I did not hear all of the opening remarks of the minister, but does this contain some of the things that we have been asking? The people who had their own private land, timberland destroyed, will they be compensated for the forests and especially their fences and so forth, Sir? Thank you.

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

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, having returned from the district last Sunday and driving past three forest fires in two hours I can see why the minister would like to get this amendment to the Forest Fires Act through the House as quickly as possible. I am glad to see it come up and we will be supporting this particular amendment to the Forest Fires Act.

However, Sir, as is the case in so many pieces of legislation, we are a little bit concerned about one aspect of it. That is section 2, subsection 1, section 3 here. "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may by regulations require owners, lessees, licencees, and other persons

MR. ROWE:

having possession or control of lands within the province to pay all the costs incurred by Her Majesty in right of the province in extinguishing forest fires from those lands or such part of those costs as may be prescribed in the regulations."

It is unfortunate, Sir, and I suppose it is not unusual, it is unfortunate we do not have these regulations before us to see under what circumstances the owners or the lessees or the licensees would have to pay all or part of these costs. But I am glad to see in the next section, or the third subsection of that clause that the owners, lessees and licensees do have recourse here through an appeal to the courts. So they are at least afforded that particular protection.

So, Sir, I cannot see anything particularly controversial about the amendment in this particular bill. However we would have liked to have seen the details of the circumstances under which individuals or owners or a group of people would have to pay the costs of the forest fires, or the fighting of the forest fires. The only thing I can say is we hope, and I am sure, the minister and his department will use their wisdom and their good discretion in setting out these particular regulations. In passing, Sir, I might add that when we turn to clause 3 here in the amendment in the bill that the minister is now responsible for all the lands when it comes to forest fires.

We saw the other day when we were looking at other pieces of legislation the minister has under his jurisdiction practically all the land in the Province for other reasons than forest fires. So it looks very much as if now the minister owns the Province, almost outrightly, Sir. But that is just a lighthearted comment, Sir, and I commend the government for bringing in this particular piece of legislation. We cannot see anything difficult to support here at all. The minister could probably indicate to the House, Sir, when these regulations will be forthcoming because we are into the forest fire season now and obviously we would like some indication as to

MR. ROWE:

when the regulations themselves will be coming out relating to section 2, subsections 1 and 2 of the Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, just a few words in support of this particular bill and amendment. First of all I am all for the Minister of Forestry having extraordinary powers to deal with forest fires. If possible I would only wish that his powers were even more extraordinary because the fire season is upon us, as hon. members have said. I think it is important to use this part of the debate to emphasize that although we have a good squadron of water bombers that water bombers are only a stopgap measure and that there is still a need for an effective ground crew to go in and mop up the hot spots and also to make sure that the ground is thoroughly saturated so that the fire cannot break out again.

The need for the removal of slash by woodcutters so that you do not have a tinderbox situation is certainly a very pressing one. I would hope that the minister will use whatever powers he has not only during the fire season but during the off-season to see that these hazards are removed. Another important factor of course is that all our woods have easy access, that is to say paths, bridges, proper maps, and the woods themselves should be reasonably easy to travel in. To that end I must say I disapprove myself very much of the present method of clear-cutting as opposed to selective cutting. Because what happens is when you clear-cut, you cut everything, and then the new growth comes back quite quickly in our climate but it grows very thick and matted and it is very hard to get through the woods, and if a fire starts it is almost impossible for a crew to get into it.

I can say with personal knowledge that the woods are extremely dry at present and likely to get drier. I well remember the fire of 1961, or the fire season of 1961. According to my memory the woods are

MR. J. CARTER:

even drier now than they were then. So I think it is a good time to reiterate the need for extreme caution. If the government decides to close the woods to all travel I would certainly support it. I hope it does not come to that but if the dry season continues it may well require that kind of drastic action. So I certainly lend my support to this bill.

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

MR. FIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I should say from the beginning that I support the principle of this bill but I have to say to the minister that without the regulations I am very much worried in my own mind about clause 2. I see-not intentionally, I know-but I see inherent problems built into clause 2 that, you know, the owners, lessees or licensees could become liable for all the costs of extinguishing a forest fire. I think that is a very broad discretionary power given to the minister without having seen the regulations. I have no doubt that the intention of it is good and we should probably support the intention.

Even though those people would have recourse to the courts, Sir, if they felt they were not properly dealt with under the regulations, I submit that that for a small company or a small owner could very well be a costly action. I am thinking in terms of a small operator who might only have a skidder or two and four or five people in the woods and unfortunately a fire happens in the particular block of timber that he is working, maybe through some liability on his part and maybe not. But even if there were, the block of timber would be lost and that would mean that the financial resource that he was exploiting would have been done away with and the business would probably be in jeopardy.

Mr. Rideout.

Of course, if he is financially liable for incurring the cost of extinguishing that fire he is doubly damned. So I am very concerned, Sir, about Section (2). I can see the principle of it. I agree in principle with the bill, but I would like the minister, and without having seen the regulations - if I could see the regulations I would probably feel a little bit more easy about it, but the regulations are not attached. And I feel sort of quammish about giving broad discretionary powers to anybody to institute that type of thing having not seen the regulations. So I say to the minister I am concerned about it, and I would ask him to address himself to it before he closes the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: I simply want to endorse the reservations that my colleague from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has just indicated. And I would like to see the minister when he stands to indicate just what will constitute liability on behalf of the lessee or the owner, or what will constitute his being liable to pay the cost of extinguishing fires that may occur on property leased or owned by him? And that is about the extent of it. With that type of information then I, for one, would certainly be prepared to support this bill, Mr. Speaker, but I have reservations until those regulations are either made public or since they are not going to be presented apparently to the House, would the minister elaborate on what indeed will constitute liability?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just have one or two questions I want to put to the hon. minister. First of all, as the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) has already indicated, these are extraordinary powers that are being bestowed upon the minister. They may be absolutely essential. But, Sir, I do not think the minister in his introductory

Mr. Neary.

remarks made it clear, at least I did not hear the minister, say why it was necessary to empower the Lieutenant-Governor in Council by regulations to make it compulsory for people to go out and fight forest fires. As I understood the minister, this amendment would give the minister the power to order people to go and fight forest fires. What I would like to know, Sir, is whether there have been any problems in the past in getting people to go out and fight forest fires? If there has not been any problem then why is there a need for this kind of legislation? My understanding - and I have seen a few forest fires being fought - is that all you have to do is call for recruits, the unemployed will come down, people looking for a shift and so forth. There has never been any problem that I can see in getting people hired on to go out and fight forest fires. I would like for the minister to put my mind at ease in this connection as to why it is necessary now to sort of draft them like drafting them into the army to go out and fight forest fires? Why is this necessary? Could the minister not just call for recruits as the minister's officials always did and get people to go and fight forest fires?

And the only other thing that concerns me about it, of course, is the wide-ranging powers that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council will have by regulation to require the owners and lessees and licencees of land in the circumstances prescribed in regulating the costs incurred by the Crown in extinguishing forest fires. The member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) made an excellent point in this regard. Under what circumstances will people be compelled to pay for fighting forest fires? And will the companies, big or small involved, will they have to pay for the water bombers? Will they have to pay for the ground crews? Will they have to pay for the emergency equipment that will be brought in? On what basis does the minister arrive at a cost? Does he just take the cost of the bomber for a year and prorate it over that particular fire? These are very important questions that have to be answered by the minister, Mr. Speaker, when he is closing this debate. And I particularly will be interested in hearing what the minister has to say about drafting people. Why is that necessary



Mr. Neary.

when before we could recruit people and apparently they were satisfied to go anywhere in Newfoundland to fight forest fires? But it may all be very necessary, Sir. Perhaps the minister can persuade me that I need not have any fear about giving the minister such wide-ranging powers as called for in this bill.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for St. George's.

MRS. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to bring up one little point that I am concerned about. For instance, in a fire like we had last week where some homes were destroyed; in a case of a forest fire and maybe four or five homes being destroyed by fire, people who do not have any type of insurance - I know this is neglect and their own responsibility as far as that goes - but suppose they do not have insurance on their homes and they are completely wiped out, would this liability extend that fire to cover the personal loss to those people? Or what would happen to those people if they lost their homes through carelessness on somebody's part? This is my only question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: Would the hon. member tell me now? There used to be a clause that you were not responsible for the insurance if it was the result of a forest fire, is that still in effect do you know?

MRS. MACISAAC: I am not quite sure. This is why I am wondering what would be the outcome of it.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): If the hon. minister now speaks he closes the debate.

The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I accept the points raised by the hon. members of the House, but I would like to start off by saying that forest fires are becoming very serious. It is not any more just a matter of things that we accept every year. And I said in the House about three or four weeks ago that we expected a normal season. Right now the way things are looking, especially

Mr. Rousseau.

in Eastern Newfoundland and Central Newfoundland, we may not have a normal season, and that is unfortunate. I would think that the powers that many members have mentioned, the extraordinary powers that a minister has -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): A point of order has been raised.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear the minister at all.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Hon. members are asked to note that the hon. minister's words are not getting across to other hon. members as they should.

The hon. minister.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, it is not very often we heard you asking for silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: And it might be a very serious season. I think that people have to understand the very important nature of forest fires. When you are looking at an industry in this Province second perhaps only - it is not second perhaps only - it is second only and maybe not even that if we used it to its full utilization, to our fisheries, the industry; and it is becoming more and more important now to the many people who would like to be involved in that sort of industry, and a government or the minister in right of the Province, the people's land has to protect that land. Now the sort of thing that I have discretionary powers to do are not the sort of things that politicians like to do to win votes. You know, if I have to impose a fire ban and allow nobody to light a fire, or I have to ban travel in the woods for the Summer, that is not a smart political move. So it is not the sort of power that you want to have. It is the sort of power that a minister feels he should have in order to protect the forests for the people of this Province. So it is not something that you are going to get any pat on the back for if you have to exercise these powers, and Newfoundlanders being what they

Mr. Rousseau:

are used to between May and September, of going into the woods and all of a sudden the minister stands up and says, "You are not allowed in the woods any more." That is not a very popular thing. So these extraordinary powers are used with discretion, and I know they are extraordinary, but they are necessary. Last year, as I suggested, we lost four million acres of land. We cannot afford to lose four million acres of land a year. It is just that simple. We are trying to keep three mills going, the Labrador Linerboard Mill, Bowaters and Price. We are trying to keep sawmills and other operators going, and we cannot do it with the amount of wood that we have in the Province if we are losing four million acres a year.

First of all, if I may, to answer the individual questions. The fires in Labrador, that is a matter of priority. We have one water bomber up in Labrador. If there were more fires in Labrador than there were on the Island part of the Province, we would have no hesitation in moving the water bombers up there. We have five only, plus the helicopters. If there are no more vehicles available than we have in Labrador for a particular fire in Labrador, then unfortunately we have to use all of it on one fire, or if there is more than one fire, then we have to try to spread it out in a priority list. And we had the other day, as the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) mentioned when he was commenting, I went out Monday night to take a look at the fires.

MR. ROUSSEAU:

I saw the fire in Western Bay, in Old Bonaventure, in the Port Rexton area, in the Rodney Pond area, in the Grand Falls-Bishops Falls area and the Windsor area. The smoke from the fire at Rodney Pond came from just South of Gander, five, six miles South of the town of Gander, Southeast almost out to Conception Bay. When you got up in the air - we were at 3,000 or 2,000 feet - the air was just full of smoke. That was not cloud on Monday night, that was smoke all over the Eastern part of the Province from the fires.

I went down and watched the one at Witless Bay, which was a very bad one. When you get in a situation like that it is very difficult. You have so much equipment, you attempt to use it as best you can. For example, the water bomber was working on Old Bonaventure and not in the Port Rexton area. There was not one at Witless Bay where we should have had one. But the people down there who are expert, Joe Doyle and his group down there, plus the committees who work, had to determine what way they were going to use the vehicles, the airplanes, the helicopters and the men that we have available to us. So it is a matter sometimes that we would like to have a water bomber on an area, but if it gets bad enough of course we always have Nova Scotia and Quebec. In an emergency situation, we can call on them. This is why we had a water bomber up in Nova Scotia for a while, and we normally leave it up there for a while at the beginning of the season because their season comes before ours, and we have an understanding that way. So in that sort of situation we are able to get bombers back and forth from other provinces, and we also would send them to them if we were not in the same situation.

The question of compensation for fire fighting, I might answer a number of members on this one. What we do, it is not a matter of drafting people for fire. This is used only when a fire breaks out and all of the sudden we get a unit of three men in there, or one man, they can then requisition people who are there still our people come, or until volunteers come, or until our own people come. For example,

MR. ROUSSEAU:

we might call on the paper companies, who have been more than co-operative with us in supplying people to help us. This people are not conscripted for the duration. They are just conscripted for as long as people come. They are not paid, by the way. Normally they are not paid the first day; the fire starts at noon and they work until six or eight o'clock, they are not paid for that. But if they are asked to come back the next day, they are then paid at a rate of thirty dollars a day for fighting fires. So it is not a matter of conscription or drafting into an army, it is a matter of until we can get enough forces there to fight the forest fire. Then we will ask people to stay and we have the power then. Like the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) says, nobody will say no. There is not question about that. But in the event of an emergency that power again might be necessary to use. I hope it never is. Knowing Newfoundlanders like we all do, it never will be. But if they are asked to come back, if they are requested to come back after they have originally been requisitioned on the fire, then they are paid at a per diem rate of thirty dollars a day. In most instances if we do not call them back we have our own people, and we use the paper companies to assist us.

The other day on the Rodney Pond fire we had ninety people there, I think seventy from Price and twenty of ours—or seventy, which was fifty from Price and twenty of ours, one of the figures. But there is not that need. But where the need does occur it is important that people in the area have that authority to do it.

Now the question of this Lieutenant-Governor in Council by the way, I do not think it would be unusual if it was a minister who decided. But you know Cabinet in its wisdom decided it would not be fair for one man to decide that. So the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is deciding it on the amount of compensation and the amount of assessment and so on for these fires. That is not meant to put anybody in dire debt. We are well aware of the fact that many people are people who are not well off. But we want that power and

MR. ROUSSEAU:

really what it will apply to are people who maliciously start a fire. We would like for them to know that that power in there in the government if they maliciously start a fire.

It says, by the way, the cost or such part of the cost as may be described by regulation! You know, I am quite aware of the fact that not even many smaller companies but many larger companies probably would not be able to pay the cost of a large fire. But still in all we have to let people know that they are playing with a very, very important resource. We want to let them know that we are serious. I am prepared to say that my responsibility in this government is to make sure that that resource is utilized and not burned down.

It is like the ban now on travel. I have not banned travel. People are saying when are you going to ban it. I am going to ban it when I think it is necessary and when the advice is to ban it. But I have that power now to say, no more in the woods for the Summer. But again a minister has to use discretion, if it reaches the point - for example if this weekend, the warm weather coming, if this weekend fires start to break out again, I can say it may be the last weekend people may be in the woods this Summer. Because, you know, I am hoping that the message that I tried to get across in the past week or two has got across to people. I think it has, and I have had many calls and I have had many people come up to me and say, you know, they understand what we are trying to do and so on. I hope they will co-operate because it is in the people's best interests to co-operate because recreation is very important to them. But the land is also very important to them. If we have an outbreak again in the next few days then I will have to look - I do not have to look very seriously, I can say pretty well now that I have made up my mind what I am going to do if I have another situation like I saw last Monday night. I do not want to do it. I said I do not want to do it. It is a reluctant move on my part. Nobody wants to bar anybody from the woods in the Summer but I may be left with no alternative. If I have to do it, I will do it and I will do it

MR. ROUSSEAU:

hastily and I will do it decisively and that will be it. You know it is in the people's hands right now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The minister will not be the first to do this.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No.

MR. FLIGHT: You have indicated two or three times now that if you had a reason that you would ban travel in the woods for the Summer and the minister has emphasized the word 'Summer' on three or four occasions. I want to have it clear in my mind that supposing the minister had to bring about a ban next weekend because of the high fire hazard condition in the woods or because of fires, would that ban not only last while the hazard existed.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I am sorry, excuse me. I could do it for a day, a week, a weekend or any amount of time. I say the Summer - that is a long time - or any part thereof really depending on a given weekend. If the fire hazard is extreme, you know, maybe. But the funny thing about it, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion and the opinion of the officials down in the department, there is enough now if people followed the regulations to stop the forest fires; fifty feet from woods and four feet from water and four feet in diameter, circumference or whatever it is for forest fire.

MR. WELLS: Four square feet, I believe.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Four square feet. What did I say? Four cubic feet?

MR. DOODY: No diameter.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am sorry. Okay. That one plus no smoking, no walking and smoking. You know, any man with any common sense, people who follow those regulations, we would not have the forest fires we have. We are looking at the causes of some of the forest fires as well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are a lot of people without common sense.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Unfortunately. It is unfortunate that a very small -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Look what happened on polling day.



MR. ROUSSEAU: I would not say that. But a very small number are causing this and we are looking into the causes of these fires.

The hon. member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) mentioned about the fires he has had out there and he has brought them to my attention personally. One of them was started by an incinerator, as we understand, in the town. The other one was a blueberry fire in which, you know, we are doing our blueberry programme and we let out a contract for burning and unfortunately it got out of control. Now whether this sort of thing will apply retroactively or not I do not know. But we are having Justice check it out. And I would say this too for the hon. member for St. George's (Mrs. McIsaac) the liability and so on, because this is a legal matter, just what the liability is, this would not of course apply retroactively. It will come into force when it is given royal assent.

MRS. MACISAAC: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MRS. MACISAAC: Is there a possibility that maybe those fires are being deliberately set? I ask that because in the town of St. George's two or three weeks ago children were in the habit of lighting forest fires and had the fire trucks and the town fire truck running. I think they made seven trips on one particular Sunday. This is something that goes on continuously in our area and something that should be looked into.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will not answer. I am going to be evasive and I am going to say to the hon. member this, that I am going to ask my officials that I want to know the cause of every fire that we have had so far. I am not saying that you are right or wrong. All I am saying is I want to know what the causes are because I have an open mind.

But anyway the Lieutenant-Governor in Council determining the cost, the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Powe) as I say, it is better. Normally the minister could have that under regulations under an Act in a department but the Lieutenant-Governor

MR. POUSSEAU:

in Council, one has to - you know, this is not something that you are going to send somebody bankrupt with. You have to use reason and again in this sort of situation reason will be used. I do not know when the regulations will be out. Shortly, I suppose, and they will be public and the whole Province will know them.

As the

MR. ROUSSEAU: member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) says the extraordinary power - very thick growth. By the way, I might mention one thing here; we are hoping to do some preliminary work this year on thinning because we know that thinning helps in the forest. The member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), the problem I think is in the cost too. Well I think I have mentioned that. It is meant to have a power that can be imposed, and it is meant in negligence, when somebody is negligent they could pay the cost or part of the cost at the discretion of the minister, depending on the circumstances.

MR. STRACHAN: Could I ask a question? Is that going to be the practice in the regulation, that it will be malicious or -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Right. Well that is the case now and tomorrow when I answer the question for the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) in respect to the liability of the companies, the same sort of thing will exist when I answer that tomorrow. That answer will come out.

Well that is about it. Pay the cost of fires - how the costs are determined? The costs are determined by the cost of the water bomber and the crews that are associated with it, the total cost divided by the number of hours I guess would give us hourly cost for the year.

MR. NEARY: What would be the cost of the water bomber?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I can only guess right now.

MR. NEARY: What would be the cost of the water bomber?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I can only say right now, I can make a guess and the boys are trying to figure it out. They could not get hold of Captain Piercey today at the office to determine exactly, but it is somewhere in the area of \$500 to \$700 an hour.

MR. NEARY: An hour?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes. That is counting the fuel, the maintenance, the people on the ground and the whole thing, \$500 to \$700 an hour.

I move second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. STRACHAN: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. STRACHAN: Would the minister permit a question? On the question of someone becoming hurt or sustaining disability or dying trying to fight a forest fire, could you cover that point?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I cannot cover the point unless the Minister of Justice can. I would have to take that as notice and give the hon. member a reply. Would the hon. Minister of Justice like to say a word on that?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, he would not.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No. Would the hon. Minister of Justice like to give a word on that? Anybody who was hurt or in danger, do you have any idea? No. The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) asked me whether if anybody in fighting a forest fire, somebody that we had requisitioned to fight a forest fire was injured or death occurred because of it, what liability would the Crown have in respect of requisitioning that person?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, that is a question that ordinary prudence dictates that I not answer without first giving it very careful consideration. The law, as it applies to volunteers, is somewhat different from non-volunteers. But I am not going -

MR. MURPHY: Is a draftee a volunteer?

MR. HICKMAN: I do not propose to answer that question tonight. I am sure that hon. members will not expect me to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: It is my understanding the question has been moved. Is it the pleasure of the House that the said bill be now read a second time? Carried.

On motion a bill, "An Act To Amend The Forest Fires Act," (Bill No. 68), read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, before moving into Committee, two points; one having regard to the time, which is now quarter past nine, I would move that this House sit beyond its usual hour of eleven o'clock this evening, and secondly, Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Clerk that in a bill which was passed yesterday, which was the bill amending the Workmen's Compensation Act, that there was an error in the printed bill when it referred to the 1st. day of January, 1977, instead of the 20th. day of January, 1977. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, this has to be corrected because it will mean a hiatus of some sort in the Workmen's Compensation payments. In one part of the bill, the 20th. of January 1977 appears, in another part the 1st. day and that has to be corrected, Mr. Speaker, and when we move into Committee now to consider these other two bills I would ask leave to recall that bill, correct that error and then we would move out of Committee and into the Address in Reply.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved that this House do not adjourn at eleven. If there is unanimous consent then there is unanimous consent -

MR. ROBERTS: You do not need unanimous consent.

MR. SPEAKER: Not for the motion, no, but whether to put the motion or not.

MR. NEARY: Is it a debatable motion, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: I will adjourn for a couple of minutes to check that or to hear arguments.

MR. ROBERTS: Before Your Honour adjourns, my understanding, and I think there are precedents when the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) was the House Leader -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is debatable.

MR. ROBERTS: - it is not a debatable motion. I mean, I know that with some force because I argued at that stage that it was a debatable motion and the ruling of the Chair then, Mr. Speaker Russell, was that it was not a debatable motion. Indeed I think, Sir, if you go back to the time of Mr. Speaker Clarke, if it is debatable well and good, let us debate it. But my understanding for what it is worth is that that is not a debatable motion in itself, a motion to adjourn the House - I am sorry, not to adjourn the House at eleven but instead to extend the hours of sitting. But if it is debatable I am all for it. Let us debate it.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other hon. members wish to make a submission on that?

The hon. Minister Without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: It is my understanding and contention, Mr. Speaker, that it is not a debatable motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Since it is something on which I wish to be absolutely sure then we will adjourn for a couple of minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The ruling on this particular point of order is somewhat more, or the question is somewhat more complex than it appears originally. There is no doubt that we have a Standing Order, Standing Order (8), which sets the time of closing, and which states in a mandatory manner what is to happen at 11:00 o'clock. Obviously unanimous consent can, I think, change most Standing Orders, I am not sure each and every one of them, the right of members to speak or that type of thing obviously I do not think can be changed by unanimous consent even, but that is not the point here.

There is a Standing Order, and certainly I think there is, going through the House of Commons Standing Orders, there is one that a motion for the suspension of a Standing Order is debatable. So we are really in a situation where there is, in my opinion at least, a conflict between our precedent and the general principle that the suspension of a Standing Order is debatable. Now I can only assume that when the precedent, and the precedent is clear, the precedent states that this motion is not debatable; that when the precedent was made it was done with full knowledge of the fact that there is a general principle that suspension of a Standing Order is a debatable motion, that the precedent was established in that full knowledge. And I think that the rule here perhaps should be clarified in our Standing Orders as such, but there is no doubt that the precedent is established, and according to the precedent this is not a debatable motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Your Honour, does it have to require unanimous consent of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: No. It is not a debatable motion, which I shall have to put, and the majority vote would determine the outcome of the motion. If it were done without motion an hon. member could ask, do we have unanimous consent for this or that? Then if one did not have unanimous consent. But the motion is not debatable, and has been proposed and which I shall now put. It has been moved that this House not adjourn at 11:00 o'clock. Those in



Mr. Speaker:

favour "Aye", contrary "Nay". In my opinion the "Ayes" have it.

Now I think there is another motion with respect to recommittal of a bill. It is moved that Bill No. 47, "An Act To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act" be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, and that third reading be rescinded.

Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", carried.

On motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of The Whole, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Bill No. 37.

A bill, "An Act To Establish The Newfoundland And Labrador Youth Commission."

On motion Clauses (1) through (20) carried.

On motion that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 68

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Forest Fires Act."

On motion Clause (1) carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Clause (2) carry?

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I wish the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture were here. I certainly appreciate it if he would be brought into the Committee. Sir, we on this side do understand the concern of the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture with respect to the urgency of bringing this amendment to the Forest Fires Act before the House of Assembly and now in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Rowe.

But, Sir, we do have some very grave reservations about Clause (2) particularly, Subsection (1) and (2) in that the minister or the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is empowered to have the owners or the lessees or the licencees pay all of the costs incurred by the Crown in the case of a forest fire. And our concern Sir, is that we do not know the specifics of the regulations. Is the minister around?

MR. MURPHY: I think he went downstairs with a delegation.

MR. ROWE: The minister, if he could at this Committee stage indicate to us specifically what is planned for the regulations, we may be able to go along with Clause (2) of this amendment.

MR. COLLINS: Can you not read?

MR. ROWE: Just listen! What is wrong with the hon. Minister of Health, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: Why does he not use the facilities of his own department?

MR. COLLINS: Read the bill.

MR. SIMMONS: You read it to us.

MR. ROWE: If the hon. Minister of Health, Sir, read the bill, he would see that Clause (2) Subsection (1) is dependent upon certain regulations that have not yet been formulated.

MR. COLLINS: Read the bill.

MR. ROWE: And three of my colleagues have brought to the attention of the House during second reading - and I wish to bring to the attention of this Committee - that there is a possibility that some, say, small owner of land, besides losing his resource, would have to pay the cost of fighting the fire on the particular land in question which would put him into a very awkward financial and desperate situation. And we have not heard from the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture the specifics of the regulations.

Mr. Rowe.

And he said, you know, where there is a case of malicious setting of fires, obviously, they would require the owners to pay. Well we would certainly agree with that. But we still do not have the specifics, or any indication of the specifics of the regulations. And for that reason, Sir, we have talked it over, and we are concerned about it, and we cannot vote in favour of this particular clause and I wish to move - unless the minister could indicate what the regulations are to be. The fact that they are not printed is one thing, but the minister may be prepared to indicate to this Committee what regulations are planned. If the minister can indicate to this Committee what the regulations are, or are going to be, and we find them satisfactory, we would vote for this clause. But without that particular information, Sir, I would move and seconded by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) that Clause (2) be deleted from this bill until such time as we have had an opportunity to see the regulations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: Now I do not think that puts us in a position of having acted irresponsibly, because it still gives the minister the power that he is asking for in the other parts of this amendment with that one exception. That one exception basically is making the owners or the lessees or the licencees liable for the cost of fighting the forest fire. So, Sir, I accordingly move the deletion, You know, it is unfortunate, because I have been sort of carrying on here hoping that the minister would turn up.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations is aware of the answer.

MR. ROWE: Oh, well, in that case, Sir, we would be prepared to hear what the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations has in mind with respect to the regulations, and if we think -

MR. COLLINS: Do you know how to read?

MR. RIDEOUT: What is wrong with the Minister of Health tonight?

MR. COLLINS: Why did you not listen?

MR. RIDEOUT : We know how to read, and we can listen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. COLLINS: You are debating the principle of the bill.

MR. ROWE: We are not doing any such thing, Mr. Chairman.

I am -

MR. COLLINS: You are debating the principle of the bill.

MR. ROWE: I am talking specifically to Clause (2) which has just been called by Your Honour. And I have moved the deletion of Clause 2 until such time as we see the regulations or we get from some hon. minister opposite what regulations are planned for this particular clause, and then we will act accordingly. I will give the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations an opportunity to answer that question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I can give the answer as to what the regulations will contain exactly. It has been a couple of years since I dealt with this particular matter. But at the time that we were considering the amendment to the Forest Fires Act, when I was minister of that department, we considered it to be absolutely necessary that the Crown be able to recoup some of the expenses of fighting forest fires, especially in areas where persons or companies may have large operations and may not be using the appropriate equipment, may not be making the appropriate equipment available as per the regulations that already exist under the Forest Fires Act. It may seem like there are broad powers to give the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to make regulations in this regard, but when we are talking about forest fires, the destruction of a natural resource, when we are talking about trying to control forest fires and the destruction of that resource, I think we have to have some fairly wide powers. And the minister has to have a lot of discretion. And the House will have to trust the minister to use that

Mr. Maynard.

power very wisely and trust the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to use it very wisely. The regulations, as I understand them, have not been finally formulated as to how they will be made or what circumstances will be set out in Section (2). But in the main the principle of the regulations, as I understand them, will be that the costs will be charged to the person who was operating in the area or who had a licence to that area if it is found that the person was careless or was not following the Forest Fire regulations to the full extent of the law that exists. And the person, of course, under Section (3), I believe, and my legal colleagues can correct me on this, has the recourse for appeal on any decision that is made by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council in that regard.

MR. RIDEOUT: If you appeal, what much does it cost?

MR. MAYNARD: Well, fortunately, it does not cost money while the appeal is being heard, because if you appeal any decision to the court, as I understand it, that it does not cost you money until the appeal has been heard. And, therefore, it may cost you a bit of time, but, of course, if the stand of timber that you are working in is suddenly burned out, it is going to cost you some time anyway.

MR. RIDEOUT: If you lose the appeal?

MR. MAYNARD: Well if you lose the appeal, obviously, then you must be liable for the costs, and rightly so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, you know, this is putting us really in a very difficult situation. I can understand everything the minister has said.

MR. ROBERTS: There is no doubt about it.

MR. RIDEOUT: No, there is no doubt about it. Since large companies are involved, large firms are involved, large operators are involved, fine.

Mr. Rideout.

But we have to be very concerned, Sir, when we are passing laws in this House, we have to be very concerned about the small operators as well as the large ones. And there are many, many small forest operators in this Province. I know there are many, many small woods operators in my own district, and we have to be very concerned about them. They might be liable in some cases, and then again they might not be. But before we leave a wide-open clause in a bill of this sort, you know, there are no provisions in this Clause (2), like the minister said, to deal with malicious intent to damage our resources. There is nothing like that in there. It is just a wide, open-ended clause saying that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council can do this or that if they feel that something extraordinary has happened to the resources. It does not protect the individual. It does not protect the small companies. It does not protect anything. So if that is the case, if that is what the minister is saying, why not specify in this particular clause what it is all about or why not, in fact a little better, have the regulations available to go with the bill. We have an obligation in this House not to - and we are not questioning the minister's assurance of the House that he will do this, that or the other thing. We have an obligation to protect the rights of our people when we are passing laws. And

Mr. Rideout:

passing open-ended laws like this, I think is wrong and shameful. And while I support the bill in principle, and would like to give the minister all the powers he needs to protect the forest resource of this Province, I also have an obligation as a member of this House to protect the rights of the people who sent me here, and I cannot support that open-ended clause that way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion, this bill should not have been - the Minister of Justice indicated that we are debating the principle of the bill. We are not debating the principle of the bill.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: One of the principles of this bill is to empower the Lieutenant-Governor in Council by regulation to require from the owners, lessees and licencees of land, in the circumstances prescribed costs incurred by the Crown extinguishing fires. That is one of the principles of the bill. And I submit that we are now debating that principle.

MR. FLIGHT: No, we are not.

MR. HICKMAN: And the rule -

MR. FLIGHT: No.

MR. HICKMAN: - is clear, unambiguous that the principle of a bill, or principles of a bill, cannot be debated in Committee. Hon. gentlemen can get up and move the amendment, but not debate it.

MR. FLIGHT: To that point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman. I submit, Sir, that the members who have spoken on this side in Committee stage have related specifically to Clause (2) of the amendment. We are not debating the principle of the bill whatsoever. The only thing we said about the principle of the bill is that we agree with it in passing.



MR. RIDEOUT: Right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: Now we agree with the principle of the bill ; however we disagree with Clause (2), and we are debating and speaking to Clause (2) only. So we are not debating the principle of the bill, Sir. It is as simple as that. We are debating Clause (2) which empowers the minister, or the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to make the owners or lessees or licencees liable to the government for the cost of fighting a forest fire. That is related to Clause (2) only, and that is what we are debating at this present time in the Committee of the Whole.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well if that is the case we should -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Before I pass a decision on the point of order I will adjourn and take it under advisement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Out of May, page 507, "Amendments may be made in every part of the bill whether in the clauses or in the schedule. Clauses may be left out, new clauses added, Amendments to the preamble and title are also admissible when amendments have been made to the bill which render them necessary." The main part of this is the clauses may be left out and new clauses and schedules added. I feel there is no point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does it have to be Committee of the Whole?

MR. CHAIRMAN: At any stage. I feel that there is no point of order and would ask the hon. member to continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have got no desire to prolong this debate, Mr. Chairman, but I arose in the first instance with the belief and the feeling that the government should not bring in a bill into this House and expect it to be approved or expect this approval if that legislation depends on regulations. If the government is not prepared to submit the regulations on which the legislation is based, then certainly the legislation should never have come to the floor to be approved anyway. In my mind this is giving the government or Cabinet - and I want to make this clear, that I am not questioning the sincerity or the integrity or anything else of the minister. I am sure he is as concerned about the destruction of our resources, our timber resources as any hon. member on this side of the House. That is not the point. The point is that if this legislation is passed as is that power will be invested to an individual over which nobody else has got any control and over which right now nobody knows the type of power and the type of regulations we are approving to give the Minister of Forestry the type of power we are giving him. For that reason, Sir, this legislation should not have come in unless, as the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde has indicated (Mr. Rowe) that if an explanation or the regulations are not tabled then certainly this subsection 16(a) should be deleted. If it is

MP. FLIGHT:

not deleted then certainly I propose to vote against it.

MP. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I am a little puzzled. I would like so much to agree with my hon. friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) but I cannot help remembering literally hundreds, maybe a couple of, well many hundreds of pieces of legislation brought into this Chamber under my administration providing authority, giving authority to the minister or to the Governor in Council to make regulations. Then there is usually a requirement that these regulations have to be published in the Newfoundland Gazette. There is usually a requirement that they have to be tabled in the House at the next ensuing session within so many days of the opening of the House. Now that has happened on untold hundreds of occasions. What is different in this situation now? Is it different from the normal procedure that we have had from time immemorial?

The idea of making regulations, giving authority to the government or even to a particular minister - usually it is the Governor in Council, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, not the Lieutenant but the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is normally given the right to make regulations, to carry out the act. Otherwise you have to have everything in the act now when it comes before the Committee. That is not practical, that is not really feasible. The types of regulations may vary from time to time under varying circumstances.

I would like so much to find myself in agreement with the hon. member and with, in fact, all the hon. members on this side of the House but I cannot violate my own reason. I think I would have to do that to refuse the government authority to make regulations under the legislation because I, myself, asked this House on many hundreds of occasions to do that very thing, and the House always did it and the government made the regulations and gazetted them in the

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Newfoundland Gazette and then tabled them in the House at the next ensuing session. Unless there is something different here then, I mean, I will have to vote with that side of the House though I would infinitely prefer to vote with this side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could add a word. I think the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) has raised a point that is a good point and certainly he is right. You know, there is hardly a bill goes through this Committee, Sir, or a bill adopted by this House that does not have in it the power to make regulations. Indeed it would be literally impossible to have legislation that had in it all of the matters that are dealt with in regulations. Every bill would be the same length as, say, the Labour Relations Act, which is a massive piece of legislation. That is not what we object to. Nobody could possibly object to a clause giving the Governor in Council the power to make regulations. We have participated in adopting hundreds of bills in this and earlier sessions of this House.

But that is not the point here, with all respect. I think the point made by the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) while it is relevant or while - I am sorry - it is correct is irrelevant to this particular point here. Because the point in this is that we are not just enabling the government to make regulations if this were to be adopted. We are giving the government power to make regulations that will have the effect and that are enforceable in law. I would point out, Sir, that subsection 3 of this proposed section 16 (A) makes these debts that can be recovered in a court of law. We are giving the Cabinet, the minister concerned and his officials, but the Cabinet as a ratifying and enacting authority the power to levy sums of money which are recoverable at law.

Now, Mr. Chairman -

MR. MURPHY: We would not need them here at all only for that reason.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, you know, I do not argue with the principle of recovering the sums of money. Indeed I am all for it. I do not see why Bowaters or Price or anybody else should expect us, as a people, as a government, as the House of Assembly to fight fires on their lands, which we do in the public interest, and expect us to pay the shot or for that matter anybody else. I mention Price and Bowaters because they happen to be two of the larger land holders in this Province but there are many others.

This clause, this proposed 16A, the clause 2 in the bill, the clause now before the Committee, give the Cabinet power to make a regulation to say that all costs can be recovered.

MR. MIPPHY: Or.

MR. ROBERTS: No, there is no 'or'. It says - I shall read the clause for the benefit of the Minister of Provincial Affairs. "There shall be specified in regulations made under this section the circumstances in which payment is to be made in respect of costs incurred in extinguishing forest fires including, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the location, cause, extent and duration of forest fires."

Then we go back to subsection (1) which says, "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may by regulation require owners, lessees, licensees, and other persons having possession or control of lands within the Province to pay all the costs incurred by Her Majesty in right of the Province in extinguishing forest fires from those lands or such part of those costs as may be prescribed in the regulations."

So the Cabinet could pass an Act saying that millions of dollars could be levied against anybody owning land. There are no provisions for appeal.

MR. WELLS: Yes, under courts.

MR. ROBERTS: Where?

AN UNN. MEMBER: In the main Act.

MR. ROBERTS: There are no provisions in here. In the main Act are there provisions for appeal? This is an amending bill and when

MR. ROBERTS:

it came in two or three years ago, this clause, we fought it then for the same reason. If you look -

MR. HICKMAN: The main act covers it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I have not got the main Act in front of me, I fear. It is the Forest Fires Act. If the clerk perhaps or one of the pages could bring it we could settle the point. But the fact remains that this gives the minister power to levy what amount, any sum of money. That is what we object to .

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, of course.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not read it, To be frank about it I have not read it, There may possibly be more to it than I realized, But may I ask this question; is the authority given in this clause to impose fines or just to collect costs, which is it?

MR. ROWE: Collect costs.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well then how can we know the costs until there are incurred?

MR. ROBERTS: The power is to pay all the costs incurred by Her Majesty in Right of the Province in extinguishing forest fires from those lands or such part of those - there is no limit on what those can be, and I am not prepared as a member of the House, nor my colleagues, that is what we are saying, we are not prepared to give the Cabinet this much authority. We think it is too much authority. I could see putting a limit on it. I could see a section that if the minister brings in regulations, what are costs? Is the annual cost of running the forest service chargeable against this? It could be argued, Mr. Chairman, that it is, and if it costs us - I do not know what does it cost us? - \$3 million, \$4 million, \$5 million to run the forest service and that it could be argued that a large proportion of that - Let me go further, we have in this Province five water bombers, and we have eight helicopters which when they are not ferrying around people on joy rides are available for fire fighting, That is their priority, fire fighting and health work.

Now they are on standby. If we are lucky, if in God's good grace we do not have many fires this Summer, as we hope we do not, then we shall not have to use those machines to extinguish forest fires but we shall still incur those costs. And supposing we have only one forest fire and it burns only one acre, it can be argued that since the machines will be used to extinguish that one acre, that forest fire on that one acre, all of the cost of maintaining all of those services for the Summer can be charged against that



MR. ROBERTS: one acre of land. There is nothing to prevent that in this Act.

Oh it could be said that is an absurd proposition.

MR. HICKMAN: It is.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister says it is. I have learned about the Minister of Justice's word in this Committee and I am not prepared to accept his word. We all remember what happened on the Redistribution Bill when the Minister of Justice made a solemn commitment, and we remember what happened when the test came. All I say is that if it is an absurd proposition, and I put it forth as being an extremely unlikely proposition, why are the Cabinet asking for a grant of power in excess of what they need? Why do they not bring in an amendment? Why do they not bring in an amendment that says, "We are only asking for a certain grant of power." They are asking for a grant of power that is unlimited. I put a state of facts that could occur. The minister can only say it is absurd, and I agree it is absurd, but it is not unlawful. If this law passed it is not unlawful, and a Cabinet- forget this Cabinet. Maybe these group of men are sensible. Their successor will be even more sensible but maybe the group of men who will succeed us will not be as sensible. They will pass a regulation saying we will take the entire cost of operating the forest fire service for the whole Summer, the whole year and we will divide it by the number of acre-days that are involved in fire fighting and if there are 100 acre days and it costs \$100,000, that is \$1,000 per acre day and if you had 10 acres and we fought for three days that is 30 acre-days, you owe us \$30,000. They could do it under this. The government say they will not use the power. Well then I say why did the government ask for power if they are not going to use it? Let them accept a limitation on it. That is what my colleague is arguing for. That is what I am arguing for. Let the bill stand over.

I am prepared to sit down with any official or law officer to try to work out some words. Let them accept a reasonable

MR. ROBERTS: limitation. I am just against, and I am strongly against, unlimited power in the hands of the Cabinet. I do not think they need. Let us put a dollar limit on it. And if it came out, Mr. Chairman, that the dollar limit was not adequate this House meets once a year— it must by law, by the British North America Act, it must meet once a twelve month— the House could be asked to pass an amendment, or pass an act for that matter, dealing with a specific situation and if the circumstances were reasonable, and the case in support of the request was reasonable, the House would adopt it. So all I say is this is unnecessary. Let me give you another example. We maintain in St. John's, the Minister of Justice administers it as the responsible minister, a fire service, a very good one, with five or six fire stations and 300 or 400 men and machines and equipment and what have you, We do not say to the man whose house burns down that you must pay the shot, and we do not take the number of houses that burn and the buildings that burn, businesses and houses that burn in a year and divide that into the total cost and, say that it costs say \$8 million a year to maintain the St. John's Fire Department I do not know what the figure is, I have not looked it up and I do not have the estimates in front of me— but let us say it costs \$8 million a year, and let us say there are 800 fires in the area, we do not take 800 and divide it into \$8 million and get— what is it?— \$10,000 ( I may have dropped a zero, but I think it is \$10,000) and say, all right, the bill for each person who had a fire is \$10,000. And yet that is what we are doing here.

MR. MURPHY: No.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Provincial Affairs says no. I tell him that is what the act says.

MR. MURPHY: They are not paying any taxes -

MR. ROBERTS: Hold on now, Then we go on a little further, now okay, now we are getting to the nub of the argument, now we go to the nub of the argument, The Minister of Provincial Affairs has a house I believe on LeMarchant Road here in town, just a little above Flowers Hill,

MR. ROBERTS: no Carter's -

MR. MURPHY: Flower Hill, not Flowers Hill for God's sake.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, actually I think the hon. gentleman lives just on the bottom of Prince of Wales Street.

MR. WELLS: MR. Chairman, a point of order.

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

MR. WELLS: This is not relevant. We are getting entirely away from what we are supposed to be discussing.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order, Sir, it may not be relevant to discuss where the minister lives in detail, and I agree with that but I am merely responding to his interjection. The point I am making, and I think it is relevant, is an analogy. And the analogy is this, Sir, that the minister has a house and he pays taxes on it. He pays whatever the lawful assessment is. He pays it and in return he gets the services that are available. It can be said that a lot of landowners do not pay taxes. Indeed we have a problem, well know to all, with Bowaters and Price, because under the original legislation enacted by this House, in one case if I remember it correctly in 1904, and in the other case in 1936 - was it the Bowaters Act, the present Bowaters Act, 1936 or 1937? - well before Confederation. You know, we are very much restrained in the taxes we can levy, but I have always understood we can levy a fire protection tax, and I understood when the great forest reform so-called was brought in two or three years past that was one of the things to be attended to. We would levy a special levy for forest fire protection services. We would say to these companies, and to the Reid people, and to anybody else whose interest we are protecting, that if we are going to protect your interest there is no reason the taxpayers should pay for it, pay your share. But that is one thing and if the government want that authority they should come before the House and I would be prepared to vote for it, if it is a reasonable request, But not here, Sir, and I think this clause gives the government too much power. It gives them the power to do what I have

MR. ROBERTS: outlined and which we all agree is an absurdity. But if there is no need, Sir, for them to have a power why should they have it? This House should not derogate, nor delegate its authority unduly. It should not give the Cabinet power the Cabinet do not need. It should not give the Cabinet an excess of power. And the argument here, I would say to my friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), is not about the power to make regulations, no quarrel at all with that, it is an inexcusable and I do not find it a particularly offensive feature of legislation. But, Sir, I find this particular power of regulation too great a one. I find it excessive. I find it abusive. I find it open to offence and I thus find it offensive. And that is why, Sir, my colleagues and I wish to have that section deleted. Alternately, if the government feel the principle in this particular little clause is a necessary one that they want to recover some costs, then I say to the government, I do not find that offensive provided there are some limits placed upon it and I would say to the minister that let the clause stand and let the law officers be put to work to see if they can devise words that will meet the need. And for what it is worth I will, if I can help I shall help, gladly. But to put it through in this form, Sir, I think is offensive. I think it is an unwise grant of power because it is too great a grant of power and thus I shall speak against it and I shall vote against it, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I accept the argument of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, and unless someone on the other side can answer it I am going to accept it as a pretty powerful argument. It is not an argument, as I put it, of the need to have the right to make regulations, I gather now that is not in dispute. We all agree. Governments must have the right to make regulations and the right must be given them in this, that and the other bill, the other act. But here there seems to be authority to be very unfair. It is unlikely that the government would be unfair but

June 3, 1976

Tape No. 3190

NM - 6

MR. SMALLEWOOD: if a fire takes place on - I remember when half the Bale Verte Peninsula was burning down, and it was mostly Bowater land and the Newfoundland Government spent the best part of \$500,000 to go out and fight that fire. We never collected a dollar from them. Now suppose this clause had been in effect then

Mr. Smallwood:

and we had regulations made under such a clause as that, we could have done exactly what the Leader of the Opposition just suggested might be done, I am not saying that it would have been done, but it could have been done, We could have charged Bowaters a fantastic - we actually spent half a million about on the actual fire fighting on that Peninsula in that one fire. Now we would have been justified to charge them that money under this Clause, under the regulation that would be made under this Clause, to gather the cost.

But suppose the argument went as the Leader of the Opposition put it that the fire fighting apparatus is there, the organization, the equipment, the personnel, the salaries go on and on and on twelve months, and we are going to charge them the prorated cost, not just the actual operating cost while the fire fighting is going on. It is not likely that they would do it, it is highly unlikely that a government would do a thing like that. That would be vengeance, they would have to have venom and they would have to want to inflict vengeance. It is highly unlikely. But if it is unlikely, why should they have the right to do it? I do hope that someone on the government side will put the case for the government in this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. P. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, just a few words about this. The argument made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition is essentially this, and it could be applied as I see it to any set of regulations or to any act which allowed government or Cabinet, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, power to make regulations. And that is that there should be in the act a severe or at least a clear limitation on, for example, the amount of any penalty.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not the limitation, a definition.

MR. WELLS: A definition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is meant by cost, recovering the cost.

MR. WELLS: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Define that.

MR. WELLS: Yes. But the argument as I see it, and we have all seen -

MR. ROBERTS: I wonder would the minister permit?

MR. WELLS: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: He said a limitation on the penalty, but I could cite for him, and I ask him if he could cite to the contrary, act after act, in which the penalty is specified in the act. That is one of the things that has always been said in the act that, you know, regulations may be made, I mean lower down in the legislation it says, if you are convicted of a breach of regulations a penalty should be levied of not more than \$1,000 or, you know, whatever the - that is always specified by the House, as I recall it. Now there may be an exception, and I ask the minister to cite some if there are. But my understanding is that the maximum penalties are always specified by the House. The regulations may specify a lesser one, and then of course it is left to the courts as it is here. No, I am sorry, as it is not here.

MR. WELLS: No.

MR. ROBERTS: It is left to the courts to apply the penalty.

MR. WELLS: What the hon. member is talking about -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Please define the cost.

MR. WELLS: - when he talks about a penalty is a quasi criminal offense, in other words, a fine. But this is the recovery of cost.

MR. ROBERTS: What are costs?

MR. WELLS: What are costs?

MR. ROBERTS: There are no definitions.

AN HON. MEMBER: It stinks.

MR. WELLS: Presumably they are expenses incurred.

MR. ROBERTS: But the expenses for the whole year to fight my one acre?

MR. WELLS: Well as it reads, "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may be regulations require owners, lessees, licencees and other persons having possession or control of lands within the Province to pay all the costs incurred by Her Majesty in right of the Province



Mr. Wells:

in extinguishing forest fires from those lands -

MR. ROBERTS: Would the minister agree that -

MR. WELLS: - or such part of those costs as may be specified."

MR. ROBERTS: - if we only had one fire for the year, and it costs us \$10 million to maintain the forest fire protection service for that year -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is protection -

MR. ROBERTS: - it could be argued that the bill could be -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. ROBERTS: - \$10, million.

MR. WELLS: No. The hon. Leader of the Opposition advanced that argument.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS: And I think it will not be clear until the regulations are worked out.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then produce the regulations.

MR. WELLS: Now this is what the government -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS: Oh the minister is back, I will finish. The point is that regulations are empower - all manner of acts empower a government to make regulations.

MR. ROBERTS: But not to levy unlimited amounts of money. Name me one.

MR. WELLS: I cannot think of various acts at the moment.

MR. ROBERTS: I ask the minister responsible to name me one.

MR. WELLS: But the point is that the government is asking for this power which is not repugnant or unusual to our system.

MR. ROBERTS: We find it repugnant, and we find it unusual.

MR. WELLS: And it is in, I suppose, there must be a hundred acts -

MR. ROBERTS: Name me an act.

MR. WELLS: - giving a similar sort of power where government could do something outrageous against a citizen by way of regulations.

MR. ROBERTS: I invite the minister -

MR. WELLS: Highway Traffic -

MR. ROBERTS: I invite the minister to name me a power granted by this House at the request of any administration to levy an unlimited amount of "costs".

MR. WELLS: I cannot.

MR. ROBERTS: Name me one.

MR. WELLS: I cannot pull out of memory such a thing, but I know from familiarity with acts and regulations that there are many cases where government could, if it were to be so unwise or so foolish or vindictive or whatever it is, go overboard on the matter of regulations.

MR. ROBERTS: But why will not the minister accept an amendment to define costs.

MR. WELLS: Why? If we were to be limited in making these regulations then we would have to have similar limitation in practically every set of regulations,

MR. ROBERTS: So we should.

MR. WELLS: - to be made under the hundreds of Acts under which government operates in this Province.

MR. ROUSSEAU: May I say something about this, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the minister not agree that if he is asking, or the minister is asking this Committee and subsequently the House itself to give the government authority, to give the minister authority to recover costs, to make regulations empowering him to recover costs, now that is in there, that is what is in the bill now, authority to make regulations to recover costs, would he not agree that it is a level-headed thing to define the word "costs", not in the regulations but in this Clause?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is in the bill, too.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it is not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: It is. It is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where? Where is it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe the minister will explain it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Chairman, and if you will please, you know, I am sorry, but at 9:30 I decided I should have something to eat, and I went out for a sandwich with the -

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, but I just say that, no -

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROUSSEAU: I went down -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The minister ought not to eat between meals.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I went down to a Father and Son Banquet at 6:00 o'clock, and my son did not get there until about quarter after seven, and I could not even eat, so I had to get back here at 8:00 o'clock, so after the bill was over, and I thought the Address in Reply was on, so I went down for a sandwich. So I would like to tell the House that so they will know where I was, with the consent of the Whip by the way.

MR. ROBERTS: We are not prepared to dock the minister's salary because of this.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No.

But anyway, Mr. Chairman, first of all this Section (16) (a) is a 'may' Clause, of course, it is an attempt according to my understanding, and I will give certain undertakings here that are in the verbatim -

MR. ROBERTS: What Clause?

MR. ROUSSEAU: 16 (a).

MR. ROBERTS: It is not mandatory.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is not a mandatory clause, number one. It gives - as I mentioned previously by the way, you know, forest fires are becoming a matter of concern. You know, I think everybody in the House could agree to the fact that under the Forest Fires Act as it now stands the minister in actual fact has dictatorial powers in the event of a forest fire or a -

MR. ROBERTS: Not to levy an unlimited amount of costs.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, but I say again, I think through the administration of this Province since 1949 up to this time no minister has abused that, and many ministers have wide ranging powers. It is not meant to hurt anybody. As I said today, by the way, these are not powers that are politically acceptable to people. You know, a minister would not like closing off the forests.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not what we are talking about here.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, but I am just - I do not know if the hon. Leader of the Opposition heard some of the things I said before.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes I did.

MR. ROUSSEAU: So you heard that? Okay.

What we are saying here is that the minister-or the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, not the minister, but the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may set the cost or any part there of. Now, you know, one has to assume that nobody is going to go overboard in that, look, I understand, and I -

MR. ROBERTS: .... accept the limitation in law. If the minister would permit, in Committee, Mr. Chairman, and we can go back and forth, I mean I agree it is unlikely, but why is the minister asking the Committee to vote him a power which he says he will never use? Why will he not accept a reasonable and a reasoned limitation? That is all we are asking. If the minister or his colleague, because the minister cannot amend his own act, his own bill, but if they will put in some words to restrict this clause somewhat, then I would be prepared to ask my colleague to withdraw the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Sure. We are not trying to take away -

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is -

MR. ROBERTS: Oh sure, but all we want is a reasonable and a reasoned limit. And the minister says he is not going to use the power, I do not doubt him.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, no.

MR. ROBERTS: Then why not accept the limitation, why ask for power that will not be used? That is our whole answer.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Excuse me one second. The minister did not say he would not use the power.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, not use it unreasonably.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Okay.

MR. ROBERTS: And all I am talking about, Mr. Chairman, is a reasonable and a reasoned amendment, I am not saying do not - I am all for it. I wish we made the people who - I would like to go further, I would like it if we could find a way if some fellow flicks a match in and it costs us several hundred thousand dollars to put it out -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Okay.

MR. ROBERTS: - I would like to see some way he could be made, you know, he could be stuck with part of it. I am all for it. But I do not think the House of Assembly should give any Cabinet unlimited power. And that is what I am saying here. Let the matter stand, let it stand until tomorrow or until Monday, and let us see if we can work out an amendment, a reasonable and a reasoned amendment, and if so, let us do it, then we will support it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The alternative -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman,

Mr. Rousseau.

If I may a few words . Mr. Chairman, if I may say a few words?

Mr. Chairman, remember what we are talking about here. We are talking about the cost of a forest fire. Now let us say, for example, I had become very reasonable and say, "Yes, I will accept the limit of \$200 or \$2,000." I do not know what a forest fire is going to cost, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not limited in dollars, not that kind of a limit, no. I am thinking whether it is the actual operating cost of putting out that fire and not the whole year's -

MR. ROUSSEAU: One second now, Mr. Chairman.

The hon. member prides himself on one thing, you know, and I pride myself on the fact that if I say something normally people believe it is going to be done. If I am not certain it is going to be done, I do not say it. But I will say this: on the record of this Province, that what we mean in government, what I mean as minister, and what my officials mean by this section is that we are talking about an individual forest fire in which an individual person, company, licenced owner, lessee or licensee is involved. We are not talking about the cost in the Province. We are talking about an individual fire in a specific place. For example, the person who sets the fire, for example, who is responsible for the fire, who owns the land in a certain given area, be it any area . Now I cannot make it much clearer than that. I give that undertaking on behalf of government. I am not talking about the total forest fire bill in the Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But who may succeed the hon. minister?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am talking about an individual forest fire in respect to an individual owner, lessee or licensee, and I am talking about all or part of the cost, but I am not talking about the total forest fire cost of the Province.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, with all respect to the minister, and while I accept his word without hesitation, I would say two things: First of all that is not what the act provides. The words the minister has asked us to enact into law are not what the minister has told

Mr. Roberts.

the Committee. I am not suggesting that the minister is misleading the Committee. I am not for a moment. But what he says he wants is infinitely less than what he would get if this were passed. Secondly, I would say - I have just looked quickly through the Forest Fire Act, which is 141 of the Revised Statutes, and there is in it no provision for an appeal to any body from any order made under the act, and there is nothing in this bill before the Committee,

Mr. Chairman.

MR. COLLINS: Oh, no!

MR. ROBERTS: No! I have the act in front of me.

MR. COLLINS: The Opposition wants to get you out -

MR. ROBERTS: No, it does not give you an appeal. It is far from it. It says "That if the Cabinet levy an amount that they can go to court and sue as a debt. Now there may be defenses to it.

The defense may be, in my view, Mr. Chairman - I can see it," My Lord - my client feels that the amount is unreasonable" And the court

will look and say, "There is nothing in the act saying it has to be reasonable." If it is costs incurred by the Province, that is it.

And I invite the hon. gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells), who is a member of the bar, to quarrel with that argument in law, because

he cannot. The court will not look to reasonableness. The court will look to the act. So you want to draft an amendment. Put in

an appeal provision. Put in a provision that if a person against whom a charge of cost is levied under 16 A does not agree with it,

he may appeal to a judge of the Supreme Court or a judge of the

District Court on the question of reasonableness of cost. Put that

in. But there is nothing in the Forest Fire Act. The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Wells)-

MR. WELLS: Section 3.

MR. ROBERTS: Section 3, where?

MR. WELLS: Subsection 3, the last page.



Mr. Wells.

"A payment required to be made by a person pursuant to any regulations made under this section may be recovered by action in any court of competent jurisdiction as a debt owing to Her Majesty in right of the province; but nothing in this section or the regulations shall be construed to prevent any such person from raising as a defence in any such action the averment that any or all the circumstances referred to in regulations made under this section did not exist. "

MR. ROBERTS: Sure, you can say the circumstances did not exist. The fire did not exist or I did not cause it or it did not exist on my land.

MR. WELLS: That is right, or the cost, or the cost.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, why is the government - that is not, first of all, sound in law. I would say to the minister, he is making the best argument he can on the words. But I would put it to him squarely. If the government are willing to allow an appeal, it is a very simple matter. There are thousands of precedents in our legislation, that the draftsmen have worked out to allow an appeal from an order by an administrative authority, thousands of them, maybe more than thousands. Add a new 16 B. Let the bill stand in Committee, the amendment could be ready for the morning, A new 16 B saying there is an appeal to a judge of the Supreme Court on the question of reasonableness.

MR. WELLS: Reasonableness of ?

MR. ROBERTS: Reasonableness of the cost. All I want is to ensure that the Cabinet -

MR. WELLS: That is the intent of it.

MR. ROBERTS: It may be the intent. I do not doubt that it is the intent, Mr. Chairman, but it is not the words.

MR. WELLS: My argument is -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, we lawyers - now I do not practice.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, I am arguing with lawyers now in the middle -

MR. ROBERTS: Now I do not practice downtown, but I have a licence. I paid \$200 for it which says that I can practise, and I say that lawyers - we are not talking criminal law, we are mens rea.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You are not talking the intent, you are talking -

MR. ROBERTS: The courts do not look at intent.

MR. COLLINS: You have never practised.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course, I have never practised.

I am like the hon. gentleman in Health. The difference is I know more about health than he does.

MR. COLLINS: And you have admitted it a thousand times.

MR. WELLS: It is irrelevant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Of course, it is irrelevant. The hon. gentleman should speak to his colleague who is harassing me and interrupting me.

Mr. Chairman, the point I put to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture is that the courts do not look to intent. They look to the words of the law. And if the Cabinet have acted under the authority conferred upon them by the words of the law, the court will not go to Hansard and say, "Oh, well, the minister in introducing the bill said the intent." You know, it does not matter. I do not doubt the minister. As I said earlier, the minister's intent - and I believe it is his intention - is not adequately and accurately reflected in this bill. Why will they not accept an appeal? The fact that they will not - and I hope that that is not a fact - but if they will not, then that in itself makes me even more suspicious. We passed bills in this session, in this Committee earlier this session, Mr. Chairman, to provide appeals. Why will not the minister accept an appeal?

MR. SMALLWOOD: And what is wrong with accepting it? What is wrong with it? What is wrong with accepting an appeal?

MR. WELLS: If I may on the point of accepting, look, it would be absolutely wrong and senseless for us here in Committee to try and draft appeal sections.

MR. ROBERTS: Let it stand overnight.

MR. WELLS: That would be senseless.

MR. ROBERTS: I agree.

MR. WELLS: If the minister feels that he would like to consult the law officers of the Crown on the point, then that is fine, I would agree to let it stand over. But I certainly will not agree to draft regulations, or appeal provisions here in the Committee. That would be stupid in the extreme.

MR. ROBERTS: Let it stand overnight.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You know, it is a funny thing that this thing comes up, because as a matter of fact -

MR. RIDEOUT: You were saying all this two years ago.

MR. ROUSSEAU: As a matter of fact when this bill was brought up in its form for discussion, departmental and committee levels, certain reservations were given by Cabinet or by the Committee or whatever have you that people would have the right of appeal, you know, that previously was not there. And the intent of that article, Section 16 A, subsection 3 was, "But nothing in this section or the regulations shall be construed to prevent any such person from raising as a defence in any such action the averment - or whatever the word is under legal, - advice I take it, averment - that any or all of the circumstances referred to in regulations made under this section did not exist," is the advice that I have from the people who drafted it, that the person who does not agree, number one, that he should not pay anything, or number two, that he should pay something but not exactly what he is told, gives him the route to the courts to appeal the debt against Her Majesty. That is the intent of the section that we have.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt the intent.

MR. WELLS: That is the advice of the law officers of the Crown.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I do not for a moment doubt the intent. And I do not doubt the minister when he says that that is the advice he has. I do not doubt that either. All I will say is - and I have checked with two or three lawyers who have practiced at much greater length - that these words do not carry out that intent. They do not. And I say to the government that if they will not accept - and the Minister without Portfolio says, we are not going to have drafting on the floor, well I could not agree more. There has been more trouble caused by members with the best of intention trying to work out amendments in Committee, more trouble caused. Let it stand. We are not being unreasonable. We are fighting for a principle that we believe to be eminently reasonable and eminently fair. Let it stand, and let us have a talk to the law officers, and let us see that it is protected. What have we got to lose? The House is going to be here tomorrow, next week, next month. What have we got to lose? This bill comes up today. If it were urgent it could have been brought in weeks ago. So let it stand, and let us have a look at it. But if not, if not, the government do not have to let it. We can only ask. And if they do not accept our request, then I shall draw the obviously inescapable inferences and I shall do what I can to prevent it which means that I shall vote against it, and I shall speak against it. And the majority will have their way if they wish.

MR. ROBERTS:

Of course they will. That does not make them right. All I say to the minister is let the matter stand, have a talk to the law officers. I have infinite faith in our draftsmen but the draftsmen do not make laws. We make laws. I have seen more legislation in this House put through without any of us looking like the famous six week clause. We had to clean up the Supreme Court Act last night or the night before to remedy some difficulty about possible judgements being weak or not being acceptable because they had been filed longer than six weeks after the division of the Courts of Appeal from the Trial Division. Yet that was done under authority of this House. Some draftsman put in a clause saying six weeks. It was accepted by Cabinet, adopted by the House and now it caused the trouble. The draftsmen are not perfect. There is nothing going to be lost by letting it stand overnight. What is the rush? What is the urgency? The minister has made no case that I have heard for urgency this night. He has made no case for this grant of power. He has made a case for a grant of power, much less than is allowed here.

That is all we are saving, Mr. Chairman. Now if the government gets stubborn, pig-headed, then we cannot stop them. We can only speak and vote according to the rules, and we shall do that. So I say again to the minister let it stand. That is my request. If my apprehensions are ill-founded - and I am prepared to admit that - if better words than can be found, I do not want to move them. Let the minister - oh the minister cannot for procedural reasons. Well let one of his colleagues move them, let the government move them and put them in. Why not? Let it stand. That is all I ask.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, just a few words on this bill. I am not going to talk in courtroom language style as the practicing lawyer. But the bill to me reads quite simply that if a fire occurs on land owned by a private owner or a lessee of property,

MR. MORGAN:

that by this bill here that owner could be held responsible for all the costs of the fire and the costs of putting out that fire or - and that is where the key is - or by regulations based on the circumstances around that fire. For example, the circumstances could be location, cause, extent and duration. Now think about it for a while. Unless the minister had some regulations or power or authority and not a blanket power to say to that company or owner, "You must pay all the costs of putting that fire out", unless he had some means of being more lenient, less than the maximum - the bill was the maximum. There must be a minimum, and a minimum, in other words something less than the maximum is by means of regulations put forward by the minister which will look at circumstances. Circumstances could be weather conditions.

For example if a forest fire occurs on somebody's property and it is an extremely dry season, weather conditions are going to be a main factor. These are the kinds of circumstances that have to be looked at. The cause is another reason, for example. The cause has to be looked at. If the minister or the Governor in Council looking at the cause of that fire, if the fire could have been caused by, take, for example, one of our own government planes or government employees in the area on that man's or companies' property, why would the government then ask that company to pay the total costs of extinguishing the fire.

So these are the kinds of things, the circumstances are the things that are going to evolve around the regulations. So the minister is going to have one authority by means of the bill. You pay all the costs of fighting that fire on your property or, number two, by means of regulations put forward by the minister because of the circumstances around the cause of the fire, the duration of the fire, the extent of the fire, these circumstances, then will the minister by means of regulations make the costs less than the maximum total cost. That to me is a clear explanation without being a courtroom lawyer of that bill, and it makes sense.

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

MR. POWE: Mr. Chairman, I originally moved the amendment that clause 2 be deleted because of subsection (1) and subsection (2). Now my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, has questioned the meaning of subsection (3) and has placed a legal interpretation upon that clause which raises some doubts and therefore he has indicated and suggested that the minister let this bill stand for a day or two until that subsection (3) can be reworded or straightened out.

Now, Sir, I am - where is the minister? Oh good - I am prepared, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw the motion to delete clause 2 if the minister is prepared to let this bill stand over until such time as subsection (3) of clause 2 can be reworded to satisfy the legal interpretation and the weaknesses as indicated by the Leader of the Opposition. Also, Sir, -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Try that again. I am sorry.

MR. POWE: I do not know where the minister wants me to start.

AN HON. MEMBER: You withdraw and the minister gives us -

MR. POWE: I am saying to the minister, Mr. Chairman, that I am prepared to withdraw the motion to delete clause 2 of this particular bill if the minister is prepared to let the bill stand until such time as he can look at and possibly reword subsection (3) of clause 2 of the particular bill as a result of the questions raised by the Leader of the Opposition, which I think are very well-founded and which we did not recognize at the time I moved the deletion of the particular clause.

But also, Sir, I would ask the minister if he would undertake, if he lets the bill stand over and he reintroduces the bill say tomorrow or the following day, that the minister indicate to the Committee the circumstances in which payment is to be made in respect of costs incurred in fighting such forest fires. If you remember, that was our original concern and our original worry. The minister does not necessarily have to bring in the draft regulations that are referred to in Clause 2. He does not have to.



MR. POWE:

But if the minister could indicate to the House and have written into the record of this House and recorded in Hansard the circumstances in which payment is to be made in respect of costs incurred in extinguishing -

MP. MORGAN: He does not know.

MP. ROWE: No, but the minister, Mr. Chairman, does not have to bring in the details. He can bring in some indication of what these regulations are likely to contain. This is the sort of thing that we are concerned about.

MP. WELLS: Is it equally what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is concerned about?

MR. ROWE: Now that is what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is concerned about. But quite frankly, Sir, not being a lawyer I am a little confused myself as must be some other hon. members who are not lawyers. As a matter of fact the hon. the House Leader was tending to agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he was making this point with reference to subsection (3), was agreeing with the Leader of the Opposition.

MP. WELLS: The question of appeals. I feel there is an adequate appeal. Another member may not. I think the law officers of the Crown are the ones to advise there.

MP. ROWE: Right, right. So it might be an idea if the law officers of the Crown have another look at this in light of the argument that has been brought forth by the Leader of the Opposition. Okay, that is one reason for letting this particular bill stand over. But what I am saying to the minister, Mr. Chairman, is this: If the minister in reintroducing the bill could give some indication of the nature of the regulations - not specify word for word what the regulations are going to be, but can give some indication of the nature of the regulations we might find it quite satisfactory and vote in favour of this particular clause and therefore the bill as a whole. As a matter of fact we are voting for the bill in principle. I have

MR. POWE:

mentioned that before. But we are asking now - I am prepared to withdraw the motion to delete clause 2 if the minister will let the bill stand over and look at these three subsections of clause 2. But if the minister is not prepared to let the bill stand over, I have no other choice but to let the amendment stand, Sir.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: If I may have a few words on this particular clause. This clause does particularize to a very large extent the type of thing which should go in the regulations dealing in section two with respect to the circumstances. May I direct the Committee's attention to the fact that in preparing and passing regulations, the Lieutenant-Governor in setting forth the circumstances in which payment may be required and without limiting the generality of the foregoing must show the location, must make regulations in describing the circumstances, the location, cause, extent and duration of the forest fires. Now the Lieutenant-Governor is going to be in Council -

MR. NEARY: Where is that?

MR. HICKMAN: There shall be specified.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Shall. Shall.

MR. HICKMAN: Shall, mandatory, not permissive, shall is mandatory, not permissive. There shall be specified in regulations made under this circumstances, in which payment is to be made in respect of the cost. And that, I submit to this Committee, is far more particularization than we find in most clauses with respect to regulations, giving the Lieutenant-Governor in Council power to make regulations.

Now the concern of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is with respect to the right of appeal. But let us take a look again at subsection (3). Subsection (3) says a payment may require to be made by a person. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council has passed regulations setting forth the amount and the circumstances under which payments can be required. And then a fire occurs on a person's land and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, through its agents say, "We want to recover from you a portion of the cost because the fire occurred in the following circumstances." The owner of the land says, "I am not going to pay it. I am not liable." This director of whatever he is, forest fires, says, "You are liable." He says, "Okay, if you want to recover it from me according to that section to have the right to sue me in any court of competent jurisdiction as a debt owing her Majesty." That gives that

MR. HICKMAN: person the same rights as any prospective litigant in Newfoundland. So we go into the Supreme Court and action is taken in the Supreme Court, the defendant, namely the landowner, has the opportunity to call witnesses to show the circumstances surrounding this fire, such that he should not be required to pay that money.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow a question?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the judge not have to decide what was what, would he not have to decide what was the proper definition of cost? The government is putting in a bill alleging to be the cost to the Crown, this is what it cost the Queen, this amount, Must the judge not decide if that was, what is meant by cost? There is no definition in the bill is there?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. No definition of cost.

MR. HICKMAN: The costs incurred by Her Majesty in extinguishing forest fires from these lands.

MR. MORGAN: All costs -

MR. HICKMAN: Now that relates it to the land, or a portion thereof if the regulation so provides. Now the judge having decided this, the landowner says, "I do not agree with it. I just do not agree with it. I think that the trial judge was wrong." So he can appeal it to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not a question of whether the trial judge was right or not.

MR. HICKMAN: He has this right of appeal that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has been expressing some concern on.

MR. ROBERTS: No. No. No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: And he has the right in such action to use as a defence any or all of the circumstances referred to in the regulations made under this section as if they did not exist. Now what greater right can a litigant, can a citizen of this

MR. HICKMAN: Province be given? And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is a very proper section and there is the very protection that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has expressed so much concern about.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the minister—well we do not rise at eleven anyway, so we have all night to talk about this. Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Justice's words if anything only make me more uneasy, because the one question that is relevant to the Committee, to our whole argument is whether the costs as they are assessed by the Cabinet are fair and reasonable and that is the one thing that the judge may not look at. All the judge may look at is whether they have been assessed properly under the regulations.

MR. MORGAN: That is just talk.

MR. ROBERTS: Look, I say to the Minister of Transportation and Communications that in this argument he had best stay out of it. It is not a political argument. It is a legal argument. He comes ill equipped, God knows, to a political argument, but to a legal argument, Sir, he is utterly out of it. Now we do not need his view. I would be quite prepared to have the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) because he knows a lot about the law, but the Minister of Transportation and Communications -

MR. MORGAN: You know it all.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not know it all. Just compared to the hon. gentleman on legal matters I know a little more.

MR. MORGAN: You know it all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the point I make to the Minister of Justice -

MR. MORGAN: Legal jargon and arguments.

MR. ROBERTS: We are making laws. That is why we have legal arguments. Mr. Chairman, we are not playing pinochle. We are making laws, laws

MR. ROBERTS: under which citizens or corporations in this Province can be assessed thousands and millions of dollars, and we should have legal arguments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to come back to the point. There is no question that the judge can say that your defence is sound. The fire did not occur on your land, or that the costs have not been assessed according to regulations or that the regulations have been improperly drawn. All of those things could be said. But, Sir, there is still nothing that would say that you can use the defence that the cost is being unfairly assessed. And I say again to the minister that there is nothing in this bill that would in any way prevent the admittedly absurd but nonetheless entirely possible, under this bill, position that if we only had one fire in a year, all of the costs of running a forest service could be attributed to fighting that fire on those lands and if the Cabinet so wished they could do it.

MR. HICKMAN: Do not forget the word extinguish.

MR. ROBERTS: Extinguishing the fire on those lands and if we only -

MR. HICKMAN: Having a man sit out here in an aeroplane for twelve months is -

MR. ROBERTS: Of course they are available to extinguish the fire. What else are they doing except to extinguish the fire. They are not causing the fire. They are not making it spread.

Mr. Chairman, I say again to hon. gentleman, and I say to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, who is sponsoring this bill but who is in the hands of law officers, and so he should properly be on legal matters, but this is a simple matter of principle. Why are the government being so stubborn? Why are they? Why are they not saying, "All right, we will allow an appeal on the grounds of - Are the regulations fair and reasonable?" The judge may not look at that. You could argue it. You can argue anything you want, provided you do not run into a contempt of Court situation, but you

MR. ROBERTS: cannot argue, if the regulations are properly made, you cannot argue that they are not fair and reasonable. The courts do not concern themselves with those questions in these matters. They concern themselves with whether the regulations have been made under the act, and if they have been properly made under the act then they concern themselves with the question of are the penalties assessed under the regulations. That is straightforward. Why will not the Cabinet simply allow, why will they not put in words to say a fair and reasonable - I am not proposing to draft amendments, but why will they not stand and why this stubbornness? What are they trying to hide? I am getting more and more suspicious as the evening goes on, because every argument that is advanced by the Minister of Justice is either weak or specious, the same for the points made by the Minister without Portfolio. And the minister tells of the intent and I agree. I do not doubt the intent. I do not doubt the intent of any of the hon. gentlemen opposite on this matter. But I say the words go far beyond the intent.

I do not think this House, this Committee as a part of this House, should authorize a grant of power beyond the intent. And there is nothing in all the words just used by the Minister of Justice that would prevent or obviate the situation which I have described. That is all we are saying. I have said it ten and twelve times. The minister had not dealt with the argument head on. He cannot. Oh he can get up and say his opinion and mine are different, and so be it. I have no doubt he would say that and I have no doubt he would believe it. But that does not make it right. Let it stand. Why not? What is the urgency tonight? If this bill, it is important, but if it is urgent it should have been brought in days past.

MR. MARSHALL: May I ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition a question?



MR. ROBERTS: I would welcome a question. If I can answer it I shall.

MR. MARSHALL: I have listened with a certain degree of interest to it, is not all of this presupposing, is the hon. Leader presupposing that the regulations themselves will not be fair and reasonable?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, yes it is.

MR. MARSHALL: This is really what you are saying.

MR. ROBERTS: I mean it is and that is possibly unlikely, but I would say to the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) that would he not agree that under this act regulations that were unfair and unreasonable could be adopted and would be proper.

Mr. Roberts:

That is the whole argument.

MR. DOODY: That would be tabled and changed.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh the government say they would table and change it.

Mr. Chairman, I could go through things, you know, that this government have done that are - you know, they have no sense of shame.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, Mr. Chairman, you know, look let us not get into - if the Minister of Finance wants to get into that sort of argument, fine. We can have a lot of fun on that, but let us keep it back on the legal point. I would say to the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) that would he not agree under this section as it now stands, the Cabinet, if they so wished, now they may not so wish, but if they so wished they could adopt unfair and unreasonable regulations.

MR. WELLS: All such regulations -

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir! No, Sir! I will come back to the Minister without Portfolio, And I say, the second part of my argument which I say to the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is that since the government say they do not want to adopt unfair and unreasonable regulations, and I believe them when they say that, and since they do not need that power, why should they have it?

And I say to the gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells), the Minister without Portfolio, that he cannot produce in the entire revised Statutes of Newfoundland and Labrador, the six or seven volumes, plus the annual volumes that we have added to it since one single clause comparable to this, not one, under which the Cabinet may make regulations levying unlimited amounts of money, not one single clause. He cannot show one.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are not unlimited.

MR. ROBERTS: They are unlimited.

MR. R. WELLS: They are not! The amounts, the penalties of all sorts, all sizes -

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Chairman, the penalties - let me show about penalties. The penalty clauses in the Forest Fire Act, and comparable clauses are found in almost every single Act, and this is not a penalty, by the way. This is not a penalty -

MR. WELLS: I know -

MR. ROBERTS: This is a debt to the Crown. The minister is saying it is a penalty. I am not. I did not say that, I said that we in penalties set maximums, Section (29) of the main Act sets the penalties.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Section (6) of 1970.

MR. ROBERTS: Section (29) of the RSN's 1970, Chapter 141 is what I have in front of me, that is the main Act. It may have been amended since I have not looked up 1973, Nos. 22 and 37, so you know I do not -

MR. ROUSSEAU: What Chapter are you on?

MR. ROBERTS: Section (29) - no, hold on now, (28) I am sorry, (28), "A person who violates any provisions, " I am reading Subsection (3), "of regulations made under Subsection (1) is guilty of an offense and liable upon summary conviction" whether it is before a magistrate, they do not call them magistrates, Provincial Court judges, "to imprisonment for a period of not less than two weeks and not exceeding two years", and then "or a fine of not less than \$200 and not exceeding \$10,000." So there are limits placed. They are wide limits. We have given the magistrates wide jurisdiction. I do not argue with that. No argument at all. But why the stubbornness? The Cabinet are not going to make unfair and unreasonable regulations, they say. I believe them. But why do they want the power to do it? There are no - I do not pretend to know all of our statutes, but I know a fair bit because I have been ten or twelve years in this House, and reading statutes, and hearing people talk about them and discussing them, and discussing them in Cabinet, discussing them as a minister. You know, I know a little about them. I do not pretend to know everything. I do not know as much as the gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) or the

Mr. Roberts:

gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), or possibly even the Minister of Justice. But I say I know of no comparable clause that gives the Cabinet power to levy any sum of money, and there are some, you know, restrictions, they have to be "all the costs - here are the restrictions - incurred by Her Majesty in right of the Province in extinguishing forest fires from those lands." And it could be argued in law, and I think credibly - it may not be accepted. Far be it for me to predict what the courts would accept in any given case - but it could be argued credibly that if we had only one fire in a year, all of the costs involved in providing the forest fire protection service in that year were involved in extinguishing that fire. That could be credibly argued.

MR. WELLS: No, no. That cannot be.

MR. ROBERTS: The member from Kilbride - well the member from Kilbride disagrees.

MR. WELLS: Let us stop for a minute, Let us stop for a minute and you or me, I do not mind who, read the words out loud.

MR. ROBERTS: I shall read - what does the minister wish me to read?

MR. WELLS: Starting with Section (2) which is the guts of the thing.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, no.

MR. WELLS: No.

MR. ROBERTS: I shall start with Section (16) (A) (1) which is the -

MR. WELLS: Well all right that is Section (2) of the amendment.

MR. ROBERTS: "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may by regulations require owners, lessees, licencees and other persons having possession or control of lands within the Province to pay all the costs incurred by Her Majesty in right of the Province in extinguishing forest fires from those lands or such part of those costs as may be prescribed in the regulations."

MR. WELLS: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the grant of power.

MR. WELLS: Those lands of the occupier -

MR. ROBERTS: Right. And I say that if we have only one fire a year, and it costs us \$10 million to maintain the forest fire service for the year, all of those costs are attributed to extinguishing that one fire.

MR. WELLS: If we maintain out here, what is this pond outside of St. John's?

PREMIER MOORES: Paddy's Pond.

MR. WELLS: Paddy's Pond - Are you suggesting then that if there is a fire near Corner Brook -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. WELLS: - that the whole cost of the forest fire service for the whole year -

MR. ROBERTS: It could credibly be argued. Sure it could be.

MR. WELLS: - could be applied against putting out that one fire at Steady Brook?

MR. ROBERTS: Of course it could be. Of course it could be.

Mr. Chairman, look the minister thinks - the minister thinks he -

MR. WELLS: Look, we are so far apart in our thinking.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not make sure with the simple amendment.

MR. ROBERTS: And the minister thinks he has a flaw in the argument. But let me say to him that in forest fire after forest fire is not uncommon for men from Paddy's Pond, and aircraft, well there are no aircraft there now, but men from Paddy's Pond and trucks and hoses from Paddy's Pond to be moved in to extinguish a fire. It is not uncommon at all. Indeed the whole basis of our forest fire fighting service, as the Minister would confirm. Forestry and Agriculture, its mobility. We have aircraft, we have one here, and is it two at Gander? one at Deer Lake and one at Goose Bay. But if we get a bad fire tomorrow on the Labrador and the forest fire hazard is low here we will have maybe four aircraft moved into Labrador tomorrow afternoon, and only one left to cover the Island, the one at Gander will cover the Island. You know, that is the whole basis of the fire operation. The minister gave us the figures, what? 150

Mr. Roberts:

men full-time in the fire fighting force? I do not know what it is, but let us say it is 150, eh? maybe more than that, and if we get a bad fire tomorrow in Gander every piece of equipment we have will be moved in there.

MR. ROUSSEAU: One hundred and eight.

MR. ROBERTS: One hundred and eight. I thank the minister.

MR. WELLS: Is the hon. member against the principle of the bill?

MR. ROBERTS: I am not against the principle. I have made that clear.

MR. WELLS: Well that is what -

MR. ROBERTS: What I am against is an unlimited grant of power to the administration, and it is unnecessary, it is unwarranted. All I said, and I say it again, and I will say it again, and again and again, let us fine some words to limit that grant of power. It can be limited by giving a right of appeal to the court on the question of whether or not the procedure for assessing costs in the regulations is a fair and reasonable one.

MR. WELLS: In other words, the hon. member is saying let the court decide whether the Cabinet is sensible or not.

MR. ROBERTS: Essentially yes.

MR. WELLS: Surely that when the Cabinet -

MR. ROBERTS: Whether they are fair or reasonable in assessing amounts in setting the regulations.

MR. WELLS: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: Now I prefer the House to do it.

MR. WELLS: Yes, but it is not the courts, if the hon. member would permit:-

MR. ROBERTS: I will, sure.

MR. WELLS: - that will decide that. You see, these regulations will not be secret documents. They will be made. The processes will be gone through, and one of the processes is that they be gazetted in the Newfoundland Gazette and published. So if the regulations are outrageous, if they are crazy, if they are stupid, if they are punitive, they are part of the material that is before

Mr. Wells:

this House. It will be available to every member of this House, to the press, to everybody. And that is the pressure, not the courts, which determine that the government make sensible regulations.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir.

MR. WELLS: If that pressure were not present, if that safeguard were not present, then any government could use any power to make regulations of any weird sort, which is not done, and that is the safeguard.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, regulations are public, but they are not laid before this House.

MR. WELLS: Well, no.

MR. ROBERTS: They are public. I mean the Gazette is - any court will take judicial notice of the Gazette. Most lawyers I would think get it and read it each week, or at least look through it to see if anything is of any interest to them, and if it is they will read it. I am not suggesting that Cabinet will act secretly.

Heavens know that this House cannot change the regulations.

As a point of constitutional law we cannot change a regulation. The House cannot. We can overrule it by statute. You know, we can pass a statute saying a regulation is void, but we cannot, you know -

Mr. Chairman, to come back again, it is too late then; once the regulation is made it is in effect until such time as it is rescinded, and that is a classic case of locking the barn door after the horse was stolen. And in any event, Sir, I keep coming back, if the Cabinet do not intend to use this power, and I do not believe they do intend to use it, you know, not to this extreme, not unreasonably or unfairly, why will they not accept an amendment? We have been now, what, two hours arguing this one point. And I shall go on arguing it because I believe very strongly of what I am doing.

MR. SIMMONS: We want the government position.

MR. ROBERTS: We have had a half dozen government positions, and they differ, All I want is an assurance that the government, the Cabinet, will let the matter stand, and let us have a look at it.



Mr. Roberts:

Now if the government insists on putting it through, then in the long run they will have their way, They do have a majority, and they will have their way. I cannot stop that. But I can certainly argue against it. I say to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, will he ask the bill to stand overnight, and let us have a look at it? That is all I ask.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Chairman, before I answer the hon. Leader of the Opposition's questions, there are a few things I would just like to say. I said them before when the bill went through, and I think it is repetition sometimes is

Mr. Rousseau.

either necessary and/or useful. Number one, I have indicated that the government believes, and I am sure all members of the House believe, and I would hope that the majority, the greater, the far greater majority of the Province believes that the question of forest fires in this Province has become a very serious situation, that we cannot afford to continue with the devastation of last year into the future.

MR. ROBERTS: This will not prevent any devastation.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, but I am trying to set a rationale for what I am going to say, okay?

This Bill came up from people who have been involved - not the bill, the principle involved - and with the department in things that the department felt were necessary to assist it in combating the forest fire situation in any given season. Now I mentioned, when I stood to speak the last time, that the bill came up in effect, and I would say it, and I have no hesitation and, no, I am not ashamed to say it, without the section regarding the appeal only because -

MR. ROBERTS: There is no section in there regarding appeal.

MR. ROUSSEAU: One second now, you know.

- only because it was understood that a person would normally have an appeal to the courts anyway. I am just saying, you know, I am just telling you the facts as I see them or as they were discussed. There was not the necessity of an appeal in there in the opinion of the department. You know, people had the right to appeal to the courts. Everybody is not a lawyer. But when it reached it reached a committee stage to be certain, to be absolutely certain as in Clause (1) where it is an arbitration procedure, the same principle applied. It is the same sort of thing. It is the same sort of intent, the same sort of intention, to be absolutely unequivocally, unambiguously certain that the person would have

Mr. Rousseau.

a right to appeal against any assessment that the Lieutenant-Governor by regulation may assess all or part of the cost of a forest fire, that it would be spelled out as it is spelled out in this second portion of Subsection (3) of Section 16 A. That is the full, complete, unequivocal, unambiguous intent of the government, that a man would have the right to appeal any assessment made by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council under regulations. Government feels that on the advice of its legal officers who drafted this bill that indeed that is the situation and government is not prepared to amend or hold over this bill.

MR. ROBERTS: If you are going to be pig-headed and stubborn, we might as well vote on it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: One second now. I am not finished yet, Mr. Chairman. It is in our opinion, the intent is there. Of course, I can appreciate what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is indicating that, you know, the regulations may or may not be. I do not think - I hope he is not, and I am sure he is not questioning the fact that government would make regulations that would hurt anybody. I know, as all members of the House know, that there are people in this Province who cannot afford the assessment. How are you going to do it? How are you going to get it from them? The law is there to enable people to show some concern for the fact that forest fires occur because of negligence. It may or may not be used, and I have never said, although the Leader of the Opposition has said time and time again that it is not needed, I have never said on my feet tonight that it is not needed. Nobody has said that or will not be used.

MR. ROBERTS: What?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Did you not say that it was not needed or would not be used?

MR. ROBERTS: The granting of power it well beyond what is needed.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: This is not.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But, Mr. Chairman, government's position is that the intent is there that a man would have the right of appeal to the courts. The bill was sent down to the Department of Justice to draft it. The draft is back. Government feels that it is satisfactory in the form it is now and we are prepared to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Government feels that the intent is there. The fact that the regulations are to be gazetted is going to be made public knowledge. I indicated today, as I am sure every hon. member indicated when they spoke tonight, that it is not government's intention to unduly affect the financial situation of any operator.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The crowd are in now.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am waiting for the count. I do not know if everybody is in or not. Have we got enough?

But anyway the position is, quite frankly, that the government is not prepared to make any changes in this bill except those as stated by me in closing the debate today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The ministry are being pig-headed and stubborn, and so, you know, we will test it, and they will carry the day, as they have a majority, at least, of the House. I am not going to filibuster it. The matter has been thoroughly debated. And once it has been thoroughly debated, there is no need to carry it on. I just want to say one or two things. First of all, there is no appeal in this act. Subsection (3) preserves some defenses, and if the Crown sues a man to recover some debts, there is no appeal, some defenses may be raised. That is not an appeal. That is a defense. It is a shield, not a sword, to use an old legal maxim. Secondly, the minister just now spoke of negligence. There is nothing in this limiting it to negligence. There is nothing in this saying that these regulations shall apply only when a lessee or a person in control of land is negligent or his agents are negligent.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is the point we raised.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the point we raised way back at the beginning. There is nothing in it restricting it to this. If the minister owns an acre of land out in, on Rodney Pond - I mean, let me just say to the minister, let me give him an example - if he owns an acre of land on Rodney Pond, and a fire breaks out there, and supposing today it was caused by me, I am in there, and I have a cigarette, and I finish it, and I flick it away, and it causes a fire, and it burns right up through from Rodney Pond up along the Northwest Gander, and then out to the sea, across forty, fifty or a hundred miles of our country, you know, the minister under this as owner of that acre of land could be found liable. There is no question of negligence. The idea that the minister brought there is not - you know, it is included in this but so is everything else that could be thought of from malice to negligence to criminal intent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And finally, I just make the point because it is a relevant point. And I would say to the minister that I do not doubt his intent. I do not doubt it nor do I doubt that of his colleagues. I do not even think the Minister of Transportation and Communications would do something that foolish. What I do say, Mr. Chairman, is that the authority which the Cabinet are determined to take and to seize, are determined to take and to seize, that authority is far greater than that necessary to implement the intent of which the minister has often spoke. That is all I need say. It is far greater than that. Now the matter has been debated. I do not have any desire to go over it again. I have made my points. My colleagues have made their points. The minister has made his, and his colleagues have made theirs. So the matter has been thoroughly aired in the Committee. And if the ministry are not prepared to accept an amendment, well that is that. All I will say is that their successors will, but that is another story. So let us put

Mr. Roberts.

it to a vote. The Government Whip has done his job. Our Whip has done his job. The vote will decide the matter, and then we can go on to something. But I still think the government are wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Committee ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde and seconded by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay that Bill No. 68 be amended by deleting Clause 2. All those in favour "aye." Contrary minded "nay." I declare the "nays" have it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, now in our case, we are entitled to ask for a standing vote. Could we have a standing vote, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: A standing vote.

All those in favour of the amendment, please stands. Those against the amendment please stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Those against the amendment.

The amendment is defeated fourteen to twenty-one.

On motion Clause 2 carried.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour was supposed to count before that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I did.

MR. ROBERTS: At no great number though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes I did, fourteen to twenty-one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. WELLS: Paragraph 2 of section 3, paragraphs should read paragraph, and (h) should be deleted and the clause should read paragraph (i) of subsection (1) of section 28 of the said Act is repealed.

On motion clause 3 as amended carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the bill with amendment carried.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, Bill 47 which was brought back into Committee by leave.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act."

MR. WELLS: Section 7, subsection (3) by changing the effective date from the first day of January, 1977 to the twentieth day of January, 1977.

On motion clause 7, subsection (3) as amended carried.

Motion that the Committee report having passed the bill with amendment carried.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bill No. 37 without amendment and Bills 68 and 47 with some amendment, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have directed him to report progress and have reported Bill 37 without amendment and Bills 68 and 47 with amendment.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion amendments read a first and second time.



On motion bills ordered read a third time presently by leave.

On motion a bill, "An Act To Establish The Newfoundland And Labrador Youth Commission," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 37)

On motion a bill, 'An Act To Amend The Forest Fires Act,' read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 68)

On motion a bill, 'An Act To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act,' read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 47)

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, the Address in Reply, the adjourned debate on the amendment thereto. It was adjourned by the hon. member for St. John's North.

MP. J. CAPTEP: Mr. Speaker, the hour is late. I do not imagine what I say will be long remembered. However it does get into the record and for the sake of that record I will make my concluding remarks. I am not particularly proud of the House of Assembly tonight. For a while it seemed to be working as a real legislature, and although the galleries are now empty those people who were in the galleries would have seen a lot of coming and going, a lot of consultation and law almost being made. Unfortunately we ended up in what I can only call a Mexican standoff and entrenched positions were hardened. I do not think the matter is of earth-shaking importance because I have a fundamental belief in the reasonableness of men in general and I do not think that unreasonable actions that the Leader of the Opposition suggested will actually occur. However it is a danger and I am disappointed that perhaps a more reasonable attitude could not have prevailed.

However it is not a matter of earth-shaking importance. It is not enough to defeat a government. And unfortunately it was put in the form of a vote of confidence and therefore party lines predominated. But it is still unfortunate that it had to come to

MR. J. CAPTEP:

that pass. My remarks when I adjourned the debate, I think it was on Friday, when I adjourned the remarks I was saying that the procedures in this House were not satisfactory. They were antediluvian and in my view unworkable. I was trying to think of a number of synonyms for this House of Assembly. The nearest one I could come to was sort of purgatory, with apologies to my seat mate, the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow).

However I do think that over the Summer if this committee on procedure does meet and will accept submissions, that perhaps a more workable procedure can be evolved. Most importantly of all I think that there should be machinery for changing the procedure in this House. I cannot think of a superior procedure at the moment but I do think that there should be machinery for discovering our mistakes and changing them in the light of that discovery.

MR. J. CARTER:

The Premier has very unkindly placed my seat opposite the head of the former government, or the former head of the government, and it is rather difficult to have to listen to the hon. gentleman justifying the unjustifiable and excusing the inexcusable.

I would hope that both he and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I believe it is, will not see fit to filibuster any more in this session. However, I predict that they probably will make a few amendments to this Speech from the Throne.

MR. NEARY: Go on you big galoot.

MR. J. CARTER: The hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has for the sake of these secretaries who may be trying to record this has been using the same refrain for the last five or six times. I do not mind. Sticks and stones may break my bones but words will never hurt me. But I would hope that the hon. gentleman could vary his refrain.

MR. NEARY: Overgrown.

MR. J. CARTER: Well, we might as well bear the unbearable and tolerate the intolerable. This is what it is all about.

Now since I am speaking for the record, I have the following point to make. The member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) criticized the fact that myself and one other member in this House, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), had and have and are going to continue to refuse the proffered raise in salary. I took the position when this matter first came up that the Province could not afford it. And since it is closing hospital beds, I think my predictions were more than correct, more than justified. I do not think that the Province can afford a raise at this time. If they can afford it, why are they closing hospital beds? It is as simple as that.

MR. NEARY: What about the deputy ministers who got about \$5,000 or \$6,000?

MR. J. CARTER: Now it would have been very easy for me to have taken the position, "Oh, I am against this salary raise, but I will go along with the majority," I could be accused of playing cheap politics.

Mr. J. Carter.

I am not playing cheap politics. I am playing expensive politics. It is extremely expensive politics. And I feel that my position would be quite untenable if I were to have voted against this raise and then to have accepted it. I know the Province cannot afford it. I do not intend to accept it, and neither does my colleague from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

Now I would not have raised the matter again, but the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) did raise it and, therefore, I do hope to put it to rest.

MR. NEARY: Send it down to Mount Cashel orphanage.

MR. J. CARTER: I can use the money. Anyone can.

DR. FARRELL: Can you use the money?

MR. J. CARTER: Sure.

Since this is an amendment to the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, we are permitted to cover a wide-range of topics and, therefore, I do not feel apologetic for jumping around. There has been some suggestion that our erst-while friend, John Shaheen, will re-establish the Come By Chance refinery. Well, I only hope that if he does it will be with his own money and not another cent will be guaranteed or offered by this Province. I think that the record shows that there has not been a more expensive bankruptcy since the South Sea Bubble some time in the eighteenth century. And there are enough Newfie jokes circulating on the Mainland now without us adding to them.

MR. ROWE: The ultimatum of the Quebec election.

MR. J. CARTER: Yes, Well, not the ultimatum but the Quebec situation. It does not give me any satisfaction to remind the House that we voted against the Lower Churchill expenditure. We felt at the time that without an agreement with Quebec it was not feasible, Myself and the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) voted against the Lower Churchill expenditure. We felt that out that without an agreement with Quebec it was not feasible, and that if we did not have an agreement, either to buy power at a

Mr. J. Carter.

reasonable rate, or to let it go through the Province of Quebec, or to purchase Churchill power that without this agreement it was not feasible. But I fully support the present attempt to settle this matter in the courts. The only thing I would like to say is that I would like to see us make progress on many fronts. Because Canada is not a country while we are still a collection of petty, squabbling states. If petty squabbles, or relatively petty squabbles between Quebec and Newfoundland can go on and Ottawa remain neutral, then Canada is not a country. Canada is just a collection of different interests. We cannot expect Quebec to be friendly with us. Provinces and countries do not have friends, they have interests. But surely it is to Ottawa's interest that this dispute should be settled. The point was made that a pipeline can cross provincial boundaries. I asked the question, the question is not for the first time, but I asked the question, why cannot transmission lines cross provincial boundaries? And this is where Ottawa comes in. Now there happens to be a Liberal Government in Ottawa. The main Opposition happens to be of the same political persuasion, and I would suggest to the Opposition that they use whatever offices they have with their federal counterparts to pressure or bring as much pressure as they are able to bear against the Liberal Government at Ottawa to insist that power lines be declared in the national interest and be permitted to cross provincial boundaries. I think this is vital. And then when that time comes, then the Lower Churchill and the Upper Churchill, then it becomes an asset that we can use, and we can send the power westward, we can perhaps bring it eastward, but we can certainly go to the financial markets and develop this potential. It is said that it is a very expensive development, and so it is. But with the price of oil rising all the time, even though the cost of bringing in the Lower Churchill in twenty years time might be \$4 billion or \$5 billion, still it is a renewable resource. If once developed it continues on an on, and I suggest that it will always be

Mr. J. Carter.

worth-while developing provided we can send the excess power East, West or South. There is not too much more I can add. Other speakers have covered a great many topics. However, the amendment that I am now speaking to reads, "To amend the motion by striking out all the words after 'that' and replacing them with the following, 'that this House reaffirms its faith in the future of Newfoundland and Labrador and calls upon the ministry to present to the House and to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador a detailed and a specific outline of their goals for the development of this Province and the means by which they plan to achieve them.'"

Now this is a reasonable sounding amendment. But, of course, I cannot support it, because to support it would mean that I was trying to bring down the government, and it is not my intention to try and bring down the government for any quixotic purpose. The day may very well come that I and the government may part ways. Certainly if the government were to give away any of Labrador to the Province of Quebec, I certainly could not support such a government, and I think there are many on this side that could not either. However, for the time being until that unlikely event occurs, and I do not think that this government, and I hope no other government would ever consider giving away -

MR. NEARY: For the time being.

MR. J. CARTER: - well I think it is worth mentioning - that this government and any other government should not presume upon the loyalty of its adherence to take it upon itself to give away -

MR. NEARY: A vote of confidence for the time being.

MR. J. CARTER: I think that the warning should be given by every hon. member on this side that this government and any other government that succeeds it -

MR. DOODY: Could the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) get somebody up probably and buy him a department to help clean his desk?

MR. NEARY: Send me over a department.

MR. J. CARTER: Well that is about it, Mr. Speaker. I presume that I am the last speaker in this debate. I hope that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the hon. member for Twillingate (MR. Smallwood) will not see fit to filibuster and to prolong debate. Most of the



Mr. J. Carter.

remarks that the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) is about to say are in print in his book and the price is constantly being reduced, I understand. So it is quite easily available and, therefore, I would suggest that he not have anything more to say.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? This is the question on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour "aye." Those against "nay." In my opinion the "nays" have it.

MR. ROBERTS: On division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the House divide.

DIVISION:

MR. SPEAKER: Do all hon. members agree to call it three minutes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Those in favour of the motion please rise:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hodder, Mrs. McIsaac, Mr. Strachan, Mr. Rowe, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Flight, Mr. Lush, Mr. Rideout, Mr. McNeil, the hon. Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Dawe, Mr. Neary.

Those against the motion please rise:

The hon. Premier, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications, the hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, the hon. Minister of Health, the hon. Minister of Social Services, the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment, the hon. Minister of Justice, the hon. Mr. Wells, the hon. Minister of Finance, the hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development, the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services, the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the hon. Minister of Education, Dr. Collins, Mr. Young, Mr. Goudie, Mr. Windsor, Mr. Dinn, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Carter, Mr. Woodrow, Dr. Winsor, Mr. Marshall.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, it is 196 days ago that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, the Queen's representative in this Province, delivered his Speech from the Throne, about six and one-half months ago. I have never heard the like of that in my life; never saw it, never heard it, never read it. I think it is entirely unprecedented that the Queen's representative comes to this Chamber and delivers a Speech from the Throne and six and one-half months later we have not answered him. We have not made an Address in Reply to that gracious speech. It is offensive. It is insulting. It is scandalous. It has never happened before, I believe, under the British Crown. I do not believe that ever in history it has happened under the Union Jack. We have created a precedent, something very, very new and very, very wrong. Four months after the Speech from the Throne was delivered, I began my speech. That was on March 12 for a few minutes.

Now at quarter to twelve, quarter to midnight, six and one-half months after the Lieutenant-Governor delivered the gracious speech, at quarter to midnight we are so pressed for time, it is so urgent that we should debate the Address in Reply, that at quarter to twelve, six and one-half months after the speech was brought down, we are debating the speech from the Address in Reply which in effect is the Speech from the Throne.

I say I have never heard such management of the affairs of a Legislature under the British Crown, but look at some of the strange things that have been happening. We had a budget speech, and we had estimates, and we twisted and distorted our handling of both. It was appalling. It was scandalously appalling, the mismanagement, the bad management of this House, of the affairs of this House, the way that was done. Then one of the greatest things that ever happened, not good things, but big things ever to happen was the collapse of the great refinery at Come By Chance, and the loss

Mr. Smallwood.

of their jobs by 500 Newfoundlanders, well-paid Newfoundlanders directly and twice that many indirectly, the ancillary jobs, the multiplier jobs. We were promised a debate on it, and the debate indeed was begun. The Minister of Mines and Energy spoke for two days on that, not all of two days but on two separate days, and then the Leader of the Opposition began his speech and that is the last we have heard of that debate, and that is weeks ago. We have had virtually no debate, and I would say perhaps properly so as yet on the Churchill Falls catastrophe, that is to say the question of getting power, getting energy from the Upper Churchill for our own use in this Province. We were able to close the Legislature for two months, all of January, and all of February and the first week or so of March. Now six and one-half months later we are still debating the Address in Reply to the gracious Speech from the Throne.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

IF the government had set out consciously and deliberately to insult the Queen's representative they could not have gone about it in a better way short of using abusive language toward him. If the government had set about deliberately to insult this legislature, the **people's House**, they could not have gone about it much more effectively than to call us together in the Fall of the year just after the election, and meet here - what was it? - one day or two days; and then on the Monday following bring down a budget with no more notice than that, and then keep us here until close up towards Christmas and then dismiss us for the rest of December month, all of January month, all of February month and the first week of March. Then, having called us together then, are now insisting that we shall debate the Address in Reply at quarter to midnight, six and a half months after the gracious speech was delivered by His Honour, the Queen's personal representative, the representative of our **Monarch**, our Queen, the Queen of Canada and the Queen of Newfoundland.

I have asked myself why, why was the business of this House, the order of business, managed the way it was? Was it to get the minimum amount of attention from the Newfoundland people? Was it to make sure that the minimum amount of attention would be paid to our proceedings here by the media, the newspapers, radio and television stations? The normal and the regular and the proper and the correct way to treat the gracious Speech from the Throne is to appoint three members of the House to draft an Address in Reply. They do so and bring it before the House. "We thank Your Honour for the gracious speech with which Your Honour opened the present session." A very brief Address in Reply but it is the occasion for a dressed debate. Remember, Mr. Speaker, a dressed debate, a dressed debate which attracts attention in every legislature under the Union Jack throughout the world.

There are two great debates at least always in every session; the debate on the Address in Reply and the debate on the budget. Now necessarily we had a debate on the budget last Fall because unavoidably the government had to bring down a budget last Fall and it had to be

MR. SMALLWOOD:

debated. And necessarily a new budget had to be brought down this year before the commencement of the new financial year and it was brought down and necessarily therefore there had to be a debate on that. But, Sir, the House was first called together last November by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, who delivered the gracious Speech from the Throne. Now the first business on that occasion last Autumn could not have been the debate on the Address in Reply because of the urgency there was to bring down a budget and the urgency there was to debate that budget. That was a good reason why the debate on the Address in Reply would not go forward at that time.

Now the House did not meet after that until up in March, but we did meet in March and except for a fortnight, another fortnight, we were dismissed from the House for the Easter recess. But, Sir, the very first thing that ought to have been done was then in common courtesy to the Queen's representative, and common courtesy to this House, was then to have the debate on the Address in Reply. It certainly looks as though, it has the appearance of a government that did not want a debate and though constitutionally they cannot avoid it - the House has to be opened, the legislature has to be opened by the Queen, or in her absence by her personal representative, the Lieutenant-Governor and he has to do it by reading a Speech From The Throne to which there has to be a reply. That reply, that Address in Reply has to be debated. But it has not been debated. It begins now tonight at quarter to twelve to be debated, the Address in Reply.

There was an amendment on which we voted a few minutes ago having heard a speech, a witty speech, from the hon. gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) and then we voted and the House defeated the motion. Now we begin the debate on the Address in Reply, the main motion brought forward by the ministers, by the government, at quarter to midnight when there is no one present from the press, when it is morally certain that nothing that is said

MR. SMALLWOOD:

tonight if we go on until one o'clock or two o'clock - and I can go on; I have the energy and the strength and the stamina, I will outtalk everyone in this House. I will wear you out. You will sit there quietly and I will talk and I will wear you all out. Do not think you can wear me out. It cannot be done. If you want me to speak four or five or eight hours I can do it. I have the intellectual capacity and I have the stamina and the physical strength to do it. This is the way perhaps the government would like to see it done here, with no one in the galleries, no press, no radio, no television, almost like a secret session.

After the events of this day and this night in this chamber I know full well without waiting, I know full well how much attention will be paid to anything I may say. And the government know very well how much attention will be paid to any remarks of mine after all the various affairs and subjects and debates and discussions there have been since two o'clock today, from two to six and from eight to quarter to midnight. You might call it clever, that there is still no debate on Come By Chance. That is clever! There is still no debate on the Address in Reply beginning at quarter to midnight, clever! But shabby, shabby politics, not the conduct of statesmen, not statesmenlike. There has been no stately debate yet in this House on the Address in Reply to the Speech **from the Throne**. There has been no stately debate yet in this House on Come By Chance, the greatest tragedy to overtake Newfoundland in a long time; and there has been no debate in this House yet, and perhaps properly so, on the question of power that we need and must have from the Upper Churchill. Instead of which we have been surfeited here tonight and today and yesterday, Private Members Day, yesterday and last night, Private Members Night, surfeited with dozens, literally, quite literally, several dozens of little bits and pieces of legislation, all more important, we are told, than a debate on the gracious speech made six and a half months ago. It is contemptible. It is beneath contempt.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

The name of the party with which I have the honour to be associated is Liberal, the Liberal party with another word, an extremely urgent and fundamental word attached to it, Liberal Reform Party. Mr. Speaker, the greatest single constitutional and political reform needed today - that is saying a lot, the greatest reform. What word follows that? The greatest single constitutional and political reform needed today in Newfoundland, and not only in Newfoundland, is that



MR. SMALLWOOD: of purging and purifying the system of elections, the system that brings men and women to seats in this Chamber and the other similar chambers throughout the nation and throughout the democratic world. The House of Assembly no less than the Supreme Court, no less than the Supreme Court or perhaps even more than the Supreme Court, should be absolutely independent of all people, of all property, of all private money, independent of all private material wealth or power, absolutely independent of all but the people of Newfoundland, the people who by their votes send us here to represent them and to represent nobody but them.

We in this House should be answerable only to the people, under God answerable only to the people. We in this House should, of course, be as one in our desire and our determination to allow no other interest to influence us. In our debates and deliberations as we discuss and enact laws for the Province, as we debate the estimates of expenditure and the Budget, as we let contracts for the purchase of supplies for the departments and agencies of government, as we transact any public business whatsoever our minds, our loyalties, our concern should be for the people of the Province, the public good, the common good, the commonweal of all, and no other. Anything, any influence, any interest that might sidetrack our single-minded concern for the common good we should strike down, we should immobilize, we should set apart.

The single greatest danger to our independence in this the people's House is private money donated privately and secretly. Let me repeat that. The greatest single danger to our independence in this the people's House is private money donated privately and secretly by companies, corporations, organizations and rich men and women, donated to our respective political parties to pay our election expenses.

There is not one member of this House who got in here without the benefit of those private and secret donations. Even a member who dug

MR. SMALLWOOD: down in his own pocket and paid his own way in his own personal election campaign is still here largely because of those secret donations to his party. When his party advertised in the newspapers and on radio and television, using those secret donations to pay the cost, every last individual candidate of the party was helped into his seat in this House.

This is wrong in principle and damaging in practice, damaging to the purity of government conduct, wrong as wrong can be, damaging as damaging can be. Every member of this House should come in here with one creditor and one creditor only. Every member should get in here a debtor, in debt to one creditor alone in the world. That one creditor should be the Newfoundland people. Each one of us should come in here owing nothing to anybody, nothing politically to anybody but to the Newfoundland people. When we come in here now we have two creditors, the people who gave us their votes and the private, secret interests who gave us our election expenses. We come in here now and we take our seats in debt to two benefactors, the people and the secret contributors.

Now we should owe no one but the people for anything. We should be absolutely independent of everyone but the people. We should be under no kind of obligation to serve anyone but the people. We should have no employers, no masters, but the people. This is the next great political reform in the democracies. It is urgently overdue. Number one, we should outlaw all contributions of cash or equivalent monetary value from any person, company or organization to party worker, candidate or anyone or anything connected with an election, or in between elections at any time under any conditions. That is number one: Outlaw under the severest possible penalty, short of capital punishment or anything like that, outlaw all contributions of cash or in any monetary form, all contributions to every party, candidate, party worker, canvasser, party

MR. SMALLWOOD: official, party officer, from any person, from any company, from any organization in the world. Number one, outlaw all that.

Number two -

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. MARSHALL: What penalties have you in mind?

You say 'outlaw,' you know, but -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, I do not know, but very heavy penalties especially for companies and especially for rich men. I do not know - \$500,000?

MR. NEARY: Ten years in the pen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or a jail sentence. To purchase by secret contributions to a political party, to purchase a government is almost a capital offence, almost a capital offence.

MR. MARSHALL: If the member would permit another question, what about members and what about people seeking the government itself and members of the government itself, would you extend -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I cannot hear.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. member extend the penalties to the -

MR. SMALLWOOD: People who receive it?

MR. MARSHALL: To the people who received it and who are elected by it and who send people out to collect on pain of getting government contracts or -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course. Absolutely. That would be part of the prohibition and the penalties would cover them.

MR. MARSHALL: Right. Okay.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Those who give and those who receive.

Number two - that is number one - number two, we should place the most stringent limits, most stringent limits, on what a party

MR. SMALLWOOD: or party worker or candidate or anyone else in an election may spend, a stern limit and every person or body receiving even as much as a dollar from a party or a party worker or from a candidate should be required to report such receipts. Anyone in Newfoundland who receives even a dollar from a party, a candidate, a party supporter, a party officer, a party canvasser, a party worker, even a dollar should report it to the authorities. This means every radio station, every television station, every newspaper, every printing office, every owner of a hall, every owner of a taxi, every owner of a boat that serves a political party. The party should be limited sternly in how much it may spend or any of its officers, members, canvassers, or candidates may spend, and everyone in the Province receiving even as much as a dollar from a party or any part of a party should be required under heavy penalty to report every dollar so received and for what, the purpose of the dollar.

Number three, every party should be permitted to spend between elections, or on elections, only

MR. SMALLWOOD:

the amount of money that the general public out of the public chest donates to it, and every party should be permitted to spend between elections or on elections only the amount of money that the general public out of the public chest donates to it and each party must apportion its donation amongst the candidates and for general, overall, party purposes.

Now, let me summarize these points. First of all, very stern limits would be put on the amount of money that could be spent by any party or candidate or anyone else in their behalf. Second, everyone receiving even as much as a dollar from any party or politician, or anyone in their behalf, would have to report the amount to specified authorities. In the third place, no money would be received by any political party for candidates or for anyone in their behalf from any company, corporation, organization or person under the severest penalties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the House will see at once that even if a political party or candidate is severely limited in the amount of money they can spend, and they are not allowed to receive any money whatsoever from any companies, organizations or persons, then the parties and politicians would be up against it indeed to finance their election activities. To permit candidates themselves out of their own pockets to finance their election campaign would obviously give a terribly wrong and unfair advantage to rich people as candidates. The solution, of course, is for all political party expenses for elections, and even between elections, to be paid out of the public chest.

What would it cost? Not more than some figure ranging from \$500,000 to \$750,000. This with a general election coming every four years on the average would amount to an average of less than \$200,000 a year. This great reform should cost the public chest no more than \$200,000 a year on the average with a general election being averaged once every four years, and anything from \$500,000 to \$750,000 being contributed out of the public chest to all political parties and

MR. SMALLWOOD:

they allowed to spend no other money and to receive no other money. It sounds perhaps like a lot of money, \$500,000 to \$750,000 but in fact it would not be large in a budget running, a yearly budget of \$700 million, \$800 million or \$1 billion. That yearly burden on the public chest of an average of less than or about \$200,000 a year would be saved, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, would be saved over and over again each year many times in large contracts awarded by the government, road building, paving, construction contracts, running each of them from a couple of million dollars up to \$8 million and \$10 million and more.

There would then be no construction contractors, consulting firms, breweries, distilleries, engineering firms, general suppliers of all kinds, to please, none of them to please, for they would not have made secret donations to the political party in power. No member of the House, no minister of the Crown, would owe anything to such hitherto normal, even conventional secret benefactors of the political parties.

Based on my experience and knowledge of these matters between 1949 and 1976, an experience, Mr. Speaker, that includes the financing of eighteen elections in Newfoundland, an experience never equalled by any other political leader in our history, I believe that our annual saving to the public chest could be at the very least \$10 million each year. Not only would the public chest be saved a lot of money but political parties, members of this House and ministers of the Crown would be rescued from the ignominy of having to pay public dollars to the donors of private dollars. This happens now. It has always happened, regardless of the party in power.

MR. MURPHY: Is the hon. member making that statement -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am making that categorical statement.

MR. MURPHY: That you repaid, that the hon. member repaid people because they donated to his party from public funds?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Every administration in Newfoundland from at least

MR. SMALLWOOD:

the year 1900, without exception from 1900 to now, tonight, with no exception in between, every government has paid out public dollars to the donors of private dollars to their political parties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let Newfoundland lead the way with action in this and every province in Canada will follow suit. Let Newfoundland lead the way and the parliament of Canada will have no choice but to follow Newfoundland's example. This would be the greatest single, constitutional and political reform thus far in the twentieth century anywhere in any land including the mother of parliaments. It would cost the public chest a net amount of nothing at all, but on the contrary save it many, many millions of dollars. And above all, supremely above all, the people's House would be truly independent for the first time. How can any democrat oppose it?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I intend to move an amendment to the motion seconded by the hon. member for Port De Grave (Mr. Dawe) that all words after the word 'that' be stricken out and that the following words be substituted therefor, "That the House deplores the extent to which after twenty-seven years of Confederation the economy of the Province depends upon grants, gifts, contributions and special concessions received from the Government of Canada".

Twenty past midnight and we are debating the Address in Reply, six and a half months after the speech was delivered by the Queen's representative.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It has been moved and seconded that - moved by the hon. member for Twillingate, seconded by the hon. member for Port de Grave - that all words after the word 'that' be stricken out and the following words be substituted therefor, "The House deplores the extent to which after twenty-seven years of Confederation the economy of the Province depends upon grants, gifts, contributions, and special concessions received from the Government of Canada." I would rule



MR. SPEAKER:

that this amendment is in order.

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before I move on, Mr. Speaker, from this vital matter, allow me to pay tribute to the creative minds of two personal friends and acquaintances of mine, Gregory J. Power and John W. Pickersgill, to both of whom I owe so much inspiration in this very matter. Nor, Mr. Speaker, should I fail to note the fact that the original champion of this idea, this proposal that all election expenses should be paid out of the public purse was the great Teddy Roosevelt in 1907. His name has special interest for us in Newfoundland from the fact that a Newfoundlander, John McGrath, was his secretary when he was president of the United States.

MR. NEAPY: He signed the Atlantic Charter down in the --

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, that was president Franklin D. Roosevelt. This is president Teddy Roosevelt.

MR. DOODY: He led the Bull Moose party.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He did indeed. Yes, he did. He was one of the great statesmen that the United States has produced, a very great American and a very great man.

But, Sir, this matter of election funds, purging, purifying the electoral process -

MR. J. CARTER: Would the member permit a question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course. Yes.

MR. J. CARTER: How long does the member intend to speak, because we can adjust our period of attention, you know, accordingly?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I fear I cannot tell the hon. gentleman. I do not think that time means anything if the House starts the debate on the Address in Reply to the gracious Speech from the Throne at a quarter to midnight, six and a half months after the speech was delivered from the Throne, I do not think that hon. members are very particular. We might go on to two, or three, five o'clock in the morning.

But, Sir, this matter of purging elections, election expenses is only one of the many reforms that are needed in our Province today. We need a new, a genuine, a truly searching conflict of interest law. Let me repeat that. We need in Newfoundland a new, a genuine, a truly searching conflict of interest law. We need legislation to end strikes in the public service. We need to repeal the quite unjustified

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Would the hon. member -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will repeat the sentence.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Please.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will repeat it so that there will be no human possibility of misunderstanding it. We need to repeal the quite unjustified - no, I am ahead. We need legislation to end strikes in the public services.

MR. DOODY: Strikes or the regular strike?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Strikes, end strikes. And the way to end strikes is to end the right to strike.

MR. DOODY: You feel that the public service or any part of it should not have the right to strike.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Should not have the right to strike any more than the army, or the navy or the air force or the police; that anyone who comes to work for the people of Newfoundland, the state, should come on the clear understanding that they have not got the right to strike that other workers have in private employment.

One of the great blunders committed by Lester Pearson was the blunder he made of bringing legislation into the House of Commons permitting strikes to take place in the public service. It was a great blunder and rapidly now, more every day, people are coming to see it and realize it. There are other ways of settling questions of wages and conditions of employment without strikes.

MR. DOODY: Would the hon. member perhaps help me? What makes a clerk in the public service more essential than a clerk in some office building.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not arguing as to the essentiality or the degree of essentiality. I say that when you come to work for the public you must not strike against the public.

MR. DOODY: But everybody works for the public.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, everybody does not work for the public. If you work for the public you ought not to have the right to strike against the public. We need again to repeal the quite unjustified limitation that has been placed on the period of time and the number of hours within which the people's House can debate how the people's money will be spent each year.

The one, great, cardinal, fundamental, basic right of Parliament, that is to say the people's House, the House that is elected by the people to represent them, the one basic right

MR. SMALLWOOD: that Parliament has and the one basic duty it has is to debate and thrash out and analyze every dollar that the government asks permission to spend. That means the estimates. That means the budget. There should be no limitation at all or if any two or three times as much time should be given as is now permitted.

Mr. Speaker, we should end for all time the system of paying money to persons who now receive short-term social assistance, commonly known as welfare, formerly known as dole. I do not refer here to our fellow men and women who, because of illness or other good cause, adequate cause, are receiving long-term social assistance, but only to able-bodied people who receive short-term assistance because they have no jobs. This system should be ended and ended for all time, and in its place every man or woman who fails to get or to continue to have a job in private enterprise should be absolutely entitled to a job in public enterprise. And that job should be paid for at regular trade union rates and operated under regular trade union conditions.

In other words, where today a man fails to get a job or loses the job he has in private employment now can come to the government and get social assistance, short-term. It used to be called welfare and before that again it used to be called dole. The Government of Canada pays half of the cost. The Government of the Province pays the other half.

I say that system should be abolished completely for all short-term persons concerned.

MR. NEARY: No, it is all the same now.

MR. MURPHY: No short and long now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, I would make a distinction. I would make a distinction between a man or woman who is in good health and able and willing to work and cannot find work. The private system, capitalism, the private capitalist system, the private profit-

MR. SMALLWOOD: making system, the balance sheet economy, the profit and loss system has no job for him or had it and takes it from him and he is now without a job; instead of his going to the government and getting social assistance he goes and gets a job. The job that private enterprise did not or would not give him, the state, society, must give him, but at trade union rates and under trade union conditions.

MR. WELLS: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. WELLS: The idea appeals really to anybody who wants to see the people of any country engaged in useful work. What I would ask the hon. member's thoughts on is, should this work that would be done and paid for be devoted to public projects, or should the public, the government, or whoever administered it - it would have to be a government or a government agency - such a programme, compete with private enterprise. This is the -

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, certainly not. If the government at any time for any reason feels that it ought to compete with private enterprise, let it do it in the normal way and not as part of a social welfare programme.

The jobs at trade union rates, under trade union conditions that should be made available to people who cannot find jobs, or who had them and lost them in private employment should be jobs at socially useful public projects.

MR. MURPHY: Not breaking rocks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not breaking rocks, no.

It is my profound conviction that the fifty-one men and women elected to this House to represent the 500,000 people of this Province

Mr. Smallwood.

and to make the Province's laws should be not only as independent as any judge in the Province, but almost, if not entirely, as well paid. I do not begrudge, rather I applaud the fact that electricians make their \$23,000 to \$25,000 a year in this Province today. I applaud the fact that plumbers make \$23,000 to \$24,000 a year in this Province. I despise any talk that you hear, and you do hear it, begrudging a salary, a decent income for members, the lawmakers, the fifty-one men and women out of 550,000 Newfoundlanders, a bare little handful of them are elected by all the population to come in here and make the laws and rule Newfoundland, and then to hear them despised on the open lines, and radio, hear them condemned and sneered at and despised because (a) they expect to get a half decent salary, say a decent going trade union rate, and a half decent pension scheme. I have nothing but contempt for the people who are so narrow-minded and so lacking in vision as not to see that the legislators of their land should be at least as independent as judges. The judges carry out the law, but we make the laws. The legislators who make the laws of the land should be as independent as the judges, and should be probably as well paid as the judges, if not better paid. Now it is easy - if the minister will allow me - to see that these words are coming not from a man who is entering politics and hoping to make a long political career. They are coming from a man who has spent a long time in politics, has some little regard for this Province, and some little concern for the future of this Province, and some considerable concern for the welfare of the people's House.

MR. DOODY: If the hon. gentleman would permit. The point I was trying to make, Your Honour, is that I agree with every thing that the hon. member said in terms of the income and the independence that members of this hon. House should have. I agree completely. The only thing I wanted to mention was the fact that perhaps the comparison may be a little bit off when you are talking about

Mr. Doody.

electricians and other construction workers, \$24,000. You multiply their hourly rate by a weekly rate and give them twelve months work-and that very rarely happens in Newfoundland- It is a little bit of an unfortunate situation, but they do not get \$24,000. Very many of them with the huge rates get maybe \$ 7,000 or \$8,000 or \$10,000 a year. Maybe we should talk about other professions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well,let us talk about doctors. Let us talk about lawyers. Let us talk about engineers. Let us talk about all kinds of people. Let us talk about teachers. There is a member sitting on this side of the House who is in here representing the people as a lawmaker, as a legislator, drawing from this House, from the people of Newfoundland as a legislator \$10,000 a year less than he was making. I mean,do the people of Newfoundland seriously think that their legislators should pay for the privilege of being their legislators. This man is paying \$10,000 a year for the privilege of coming in and helping to govern Newfoundland and make its laws, and get abused in doing it, and being accused,no doubt,of lining his pockets and becoming a rich man.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: So I say, I repeat it, I repeat the words, my profound conviction that the fifty-one men and women elected to this House to represent the half million people of this Province and to make the Province's laws,should be not only as independent as any judge in the Province, but almost if not entirely as well paid. I wrote to the Minister of Justice in Ottawa, and I asked him for the salaries of all the judges in Newfoundland, the judges of the Supreme Court and the Appellate Division, the Appeal Division, and the judges of the Central District Court, and I already had the salaries of the magistrates that are being paid by the Newfoundland Government,



Mr. Smallwood.

and it is a wonder that those judges would condescend to be seen in company with poor legislators. It is a wonder any doctor would look at us, and it is a wonder to God that any lawyer would pay any attention to us. I often think that the hon. Government House Leader in this Chamber here today, I often wonder how profound must his ambition be as a public man to come in here at what for a lawyer is pocket money and give up the time that he could be devoting to making say \$150,000 or \$200,000 a year, and the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) coming in here day after day for months instead of going out and earning his \$150,000 or \$200,000 a year and any lawyer today who is not making \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year is looked upon by his colleagues in the law profession as a poor unfortunate creature.

MR. NEARY: A failure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A failure, yes, a failure.

Any little commission agent starting a little commission business making his \$60,000 or \$70,000 or \$80,000 a year, no word of that, no talk of that, no condemning that, no sneering at that, but sneer at the fifty-one men and women in here who make the Province's laws, sneer at them, a bunch of grafters lining their pockets! The minute you go in the government and so many people in Newfoundland, I am sorry to say, draw no distinction between the two sides of the House - if you are in here you are in the government. A woman phones me from a settlement in Twillingate district the other day, and asked me to do something. "Well," I said, "I cannot do that, you know. I cannot do that." She said, "Why can you not? You are in the government." I said, "No, I am not." "Oh yes, you are. We put you in the government." "Well, I am sorry ma'am, but I am not in the government. I am in the Opposition." But many people draw no distinction. The minute you are elected, you are in the government, and the minute you are in the government you start to get rich.

Mr. Smallwood.

Well I will tell you one thing now, Mr. Speaker. I was Premier of this Province for twenty-three years. I was a Minister of the Crown for those same twenty-three years. I was a member of this House for twenty-three years, and today if I had to pay my debts the court would have to declare me insolvent. Now thanks be to God those to whom I owe it are not pressing me. That is all that keeps me from being declared insolvent. And the first one that does press me-I am not going to suffer the tortures of hell - the first one that presses me down I go to the court and apply to be declared insolvent. Then I have to lose my seat in the House. At least that is the way it used to be. The Legislative Disabilities Act still cites insolvency as the reason for losing your seat in the House. I would have to lose it.

MR. DOODY: It will never happen. People would not allow it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, I do not know about that.

There is another reform that this Province needs today and that is the sternest possible system, the sternest possible system of awarding government business on tender. Now I will pay the present administration the tribute of saying that as far as I can notice they do advertise extensively and heavily in the newspapers when they have contracts to award or orders to place, and I would say from superficial appearance, and that is all I know about it, they are doing their business on tender. But I would go a step further. Does the House realize, Mr. Speaker, the almost unbelievable amount of commercial business that the various departments of the government do in the course of a year, the vast amounts of goods they buy, the many thousands of orders they place each year, the tens of millions of dollars worth of orders and contracts they place for many kinds of construction? Now hear this. The great Canadian National Railway system is pretty big in Newfoundland and so are Canadian National Telegraph, and so are the great Bowater firm in Corner Brook and the great paper mill company in Grand Falls. The government of this Province does more business each year than all those great concerns put together.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

It is staggering. It is simply staggering. Hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars a year. I dread the thought of the present government being like the government that they succeeded, being in debt to rich men, private companies, corporations, organizations, for the funds they needed to conduct the general elections. I dread the thought of it. If the Liberal Party had been elected, it would have been precisely the same. And as a matter of fact probably to a large extent the same donors. I could give you their names. I could give you a pretty close approximation of how much each donated to each party.

You know, I did not organize the collection of funds for sixteen or seventeen elections, election campaigns, without knowing something about it and without knowing the names of the donors and without having a shrewd idea of how much they donated.

MR. NEARY: Well what was the technique? Did you just merely ask or was there any arm twisting?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No need of arm twisting. Sometimes the arm twisting had to be done to keep them out, to keep them from beating their way in.

MR. NEARY: Any attempt at extortion or shake-downs or anything like that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. NEARY: Nothing like that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. NEARY: Did you receive any funds in the last election?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did our party? Yes, we did. And someone asked me during the campaign when I was denouncing the system of financing election parties in their electoral campaigns, someone asked me, what about your party. Well, I said, we are getting it from the same people, only not as much. We are not getting it from all the same people. We are getting it from some of those people and getting it in much smaller amounts. I must say that custom is - and it is understandable - the party

MR. SMALLWOOD:

in power gets the big slice and it is still so and it will always be so as long as donors are allowed as private donations, secret, private donations are allowed.

Mr. Speaker, if this thing were not so venerable, if this had not been the practice for so long, your blood would turn cold at the thought of every member, including Your Honour, every one of the fifty-one of us is in here in part because of the secret donations by secret donors. No one had better press me too hard or if I am forced - take me in court, have a royal commission on it, and I will spell it out. I am the one who knows how to do it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: But what is wrong with that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is wrong with it? It is wrong as hell, that is what is wrong with it! It is as wrong as wrong can be!

MR. MURPHY: After twenty-three years?

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right! All right! All right! After twenty-three years, after three years, after three minutes, why did you not do it three minutes ago, three hours, three days, three weeks, three years ago? Can you never change? Cannot you reform yourself? Cannot your own ideas become different? Cannot you have learned from your own experience? I have. I have learned.

MR. MURPHY: Circumstances alter cases.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They sometimes do, yes. To reform the existing system of doing this vast amount of business, these hundreds of millions of dollars each year, could save perhaps \$10 million to \$15 million a year to the public chest. By that I mean that the donors are receiving \$10 million to \$15 million a year out of the public chest in return for their private donations which did not amount to that much, of course. They donated during or leading up to a general election. But they received the payment, they get their money each year after the elections are over until the next one comes up.

MR. MOODY: How does that follow under our public tenders system?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman should smile when he asks that question.

MR. DOODY: No, I am serious. I mean if there are secret donors and it is a public tender system, how can that be?

MR. NEARY: You mean the hon. minister does not know?

MR. DOODY: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not know if I have in my notes here but I advocate strongly that the tenders be opened on television.

MR. DOODY: That was when Jonathan Livingston Seagull was -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right. That idea came from Geoff Sterling.

It is a good idea and many good ideas have come from Geoff Sterling.

Not all of his ideas are good, but many of them are. Any young fellow in this Island of ours who with hardly two dimes to rub against each other can rise up to be one of the principal television and communications magnates of all Canada and he worth \$25 million or \$30 million -

AN HON. MEMBER: You have to be a crook.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Crook? Well is everybody who has made \$25 million or \$30 million a crook? In that case there are a few other crooks.

MR. FARRELL: In services alone last year there were 42,000 tenders opened in the Department of Public Services, 42,000 ranging from one hundred dollars to half a million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, this is perhaps not the time to spell out all the reforms that are needed.

MR. NEARY: Not all over. Not at the Health Sciences Complex, they were not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - to spell out all the reforms that are needed in Newfoundland today, reform, for example, in the fisheries, reform in the industrial and commercial life of our Province, reform in some of the basic aspects of our whole social structure. But of course these reforms are needed everywhere, not in Newfoundland alone. There is not a member of this House who does not know of the reforms that are needed. Can any member in this House tonight say truthfully that he knows of no reforms that are needed? We all know that the reforms are needed. There is scarcely a thoughtful person in the

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Province who does not know of needed reforms.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly well aware, so much aware that I question whether anyone else is more aware, that there is a political way, a party way of looking at what I have been saying here tonight about politics and parties. That way frankly would really consist of a loud horse laugh from a certain type of allegedly tough practical politician, a horse laugh or a raspberry or other well-known rude sound of jeering. I am absolutely well aware of that, for I know that type of politician with almost painfully familiarity. I have had a lot to do with politicians who regard politics as being a rough, tough, practical, down-to-earth game—and the word is game—and in which idealism and cleanliness and so on are just a laugh, just for the birds. That kind of politician would describe everything I have said in this speech tonight as highfalutin', as bookish, as theory, as hypothesis, as far-fetched, unreal, visionary, impractically idealistic. I know that. What I have said in their view would just not be practical stuff for practical politicians, but only bookish stuff for impractical theorists, for idealistic, visionaries who are living in a dream world of their own.

Well I am not living in any dream world when it comes to politics, believe me. I am not living in a dream world when it comes to politics in Newfoundland. To such politicians politics is a very practical thing, earthy, sensible, practical, no nonsense, a little humbug here, a little hypocrisy there, relished by the best of politicians. Politics is the down-to-earth business of knowing all the tricks of the trade in winning party nominations, winning elections, knowing all the little campaign tricks, knowing how to kid the voters along, knowing the smart newspaper advertisement, the slick television short repeating within the ranks of the faithful, the campaign jokes, put him down as doubtful, a business for practical toughies, not theorists, not idealists, not political philosophers.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

I know all the tricks of the trade in politics, in elections. I know them. I invented some of them. I know them. I am familiar with all the tricks of the trade in politics. I dare say I could teach some of the politicians who fancy themselves as practical down-to-earth campaigners.



Mr. Smallwood.

Do not judge me by the fact that three weeks before polling day I launched a political party with no money. Do not judge by that, and do not judge me by that, and do not weigh me and do not measure me by that as time perhaps will tell before the present calendar year is over. It may tell. What the practical down-to-earth politicians, the toughies, do not always understand is that politics is not merely a matter of winning constituencies, winning a majority of the constituencies. You could have a party made up of excellent, practical, constituency winners. They could win a safe majority of the constituencies. As the victorious party they could take over the government. But while each elected member of that party and that government might know what should be done, provided the money and other means were there to do it, to keep the people of a constituency happy or at any rate reasonably satisfied, or in all events not violently dissatisfied - I repeat, that while the practical district winners might have a very shrewd idea of how to please each individual constituency, the party and government as a whole could be hopelessly inept and unsuccessful in giving the Province the quality and quantity of overall good government that the times and the people as a whole need and want. A political party made up of smart, practical, earthy, individual politicians, district politicians, district winners, but lacking a sound overall provincial programme, would be a sure and certain failure. I know the politicians of that kind, Mr. Speaker. Of course there are no politicians of that kind here in this House now, none. We are all idealists. We are all theorists. We are all philosophers in this House. There are none of those toughies here.

But what I am saying tonight is that there is a new ball game. You better believe it. There is a new ball game. There are new horizons, new needs, new ideas, new hopes, not that I believe that in place of hardheaded, down-to-earth earthy politicians we must now look for saints, for selfless patriots, for opinionated

MR. SMALLWOOD:

ideologues in the parties, not that I want the Liberal party to become a saintly religious fraternity or the alleged Tory party either. What I want is really a modest, a most modest change. I want the Liberal party to be again a champion and practitioner of Liberalism, which is the other word for reform. I want the Liberal party, not the NDP or any other party, I want the Liberal party to be the party of Liberalism, the party of reform. My dearest ambition in this life is to help save the Liberal party for Liberalism. I do not know whether it can be done or not. One can try.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most thrilling, romantic exciting dramas ever enacted in the world, to bring the blessing of political democracy to man, is the drama unique in the world of making the Parliament of Great Britain what it is today. That drama is one great unfolding epic of reform. I suppose that the House of Commons at Westminster is today the most democratically elected and democratically operated parliamentary body in the world, but it was not always so. Before the passing of the great Reform Act in 1832, which itself, by the way, in the circumstances was one of the greatest pieces of reforming law in man's history, before that the House of Commons in England was one of the most undemocratically elected and undemocratically operated lawmaking bodies in all the world. It did not even pretend to be democratic or representative. For example, the great cities of Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Bradford, and Sheffield were not allowed to have any representation whatsoever in the House of Commons, not even one citizen among them. Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Bradford, Sheffield, not even one citizen among them was allowed by English law to vote in an election. Whereas Old Sarum, which is in Wiltshire, and Midhurst in Sussex and Gatton in Surrey were each represented in the House of Commons by one M.P., notwithstanding the fact that not a soul lived in either of the three places. These

Mr. Smallwood.

great cities did not have even one voter or one M.P., but those three places, without a soul in them, each had one M.P. The three places were Old Sarum in Wiltshire, Midhurst in Sussex and Gatton in Surrey. Winchester, with a population of 9,000, had sixty voters who elected one M.P. to represent that place. Scotland, with a population of two million, was permitted 3,000 voters. There were 3,000 voters in Scotland in a population of two million. Three hundred and nine - there were 513 M.P.'s for England, not counting Scotland or Ireland. Ireland came into the House of Commons after the dissolution of the Irish Parliament in 1802 - was it? - or somewhere around the year 1800. England had 513 M. P.'s and 309 of them owed their election to the nomination either of the treasury - there is a way to get members in the House. This is something for the Minister of Finance to take notice of - in England at that time out of the 513 M.P.'s from England in the House of Commons, 309 of them owed their election to the nomination either of the treasury or 162 powerful Lords and Earls and what have you.

In 1801 seventy-one of the one hundred and sixty Irish members owed their seats to the influence of fifty-five patrons. You know what the patrons were? The patrons were all absentee landlords. The House of Commons, the whole House of Commons, consisted of 658 members. Of those, 425, well over half, were returned either on the nomination or the recommendation of 252 patrons.

In 1793 approximately one-half of the House of Commons was returned by 154 patrons of whom forty were peers and they returned, forty peers, returned 307 members. Cornwall had twenty-one boroughs with two members each, and two county members, only two less than the whole of Scotland, and those forty-four M.P.'s were elected by 453 electors. In one Cornish

Mr. Smallwood.

borough in which eleven persons were entitled to vote, ten of the eleven were civil servants. The Younger Pitts said, "This House - the House of Commons - this House is not representative of the people of Great Britain. It is the representative of nominal boroughs of ruined and exterminated towns, of noble families, of wealthy industries, of foreign potentates." That was the House of Commons. I say making that House of Commons the most democratically elected parliamentary body in the world, the most democratically operated

MR. SMALLWOOD:

parliamentary body in the world is the greatest epic of democracy -

MR. DOODY: Mr. Fox and Mr. Burke had more to do with that, two fine Tories.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman will listen instead of showing his little bits and scraps of knowledge here and there, I must confess to the House that I have been surprised more than once, and pleasantly surprised, by the evidences the hon. minister has given of having a fairly well-stored mind. You would expect to find it more in the Minister of Education or any other hon. gentleman who had been teaching school than you would expect to find it in a dry-as-dust financial man.

MR. DOODY: When compared to you, Sir, I am a veritable cesspool of useless information.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Even the famous 1832 reform act liberalized the voting qualifications only to the extent that it permitted a mere five adults out of every hundred in the country to vote. The great Reform Bill made it possible for five adults out of every hundred to cast a vote. How many were there before the Reform Bill? That Act was nevertheless one of the truly great reforms in the whole history of politics.

Now if hon. members think the speech is too long, why did they not let me speak at three o'clock or four o'clock or five o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am enjoying it, and to have such an appreciative audience on this side especially, the very people I am trying to cure, the very people I am trying to help, the very people -

MR. MORGAN: What about -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, he is a dear personal friend.

AN HON. MEMBER: When did he come back?

MR. MURPHY: They are all on the Kentucky Fried, Colonel Saunders -

MR. DOODY: More interesting than Mary Brown.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that Britain was wonderfully lucky to have some great and noble-souled men in the period from late in the eighteenth century, men of great mind and spirit, high idealism and a powerful desire for reform. They were called and called themselves by a variety of names, **Whigs, Radicals, Reformers, not Liberals.** That came later.

MR. HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the word Radical was spelled with a capital R and the Whigs with a capital W and the Reformers with a capital R. The great essayist, Lord Macaulay; Joseph Hume, the great radical; Sir Robert Peel, the Whig; Lord Byron, the poet; John Wikes, the great radical; Sydney Smith, the founder of the Edinburgh Review; Henry Lavessoir, a magic name in Newfoundland, author of the Lavessoir Dispatch. That was our charter in Newfoundland for long years. Under the Lavessoir Dispatch sent from England to here the borders of Newfoundland could not be changed except with Newfoundland's consent. That was our sheet anchor and Henry Lavessoir, The great Richard Cobden, the great John Bright, the famous John Stuart Mill, Lord Grey, the Whig Prime Minister; Thomas Carlyle, Edmund Burke, the Whig; David Ricardo, the Economist; Francis Place, in some respects the greatest reform agitator in modern English history; Sir Charles Mills, Joseph Chamberlain, and of course the immortal William Ewart Gladstone; the Liberal Prime Ministers, Henry Campbell Bannerman, Herbert H. Asquith, David Lloyd George, names that are mountain peaks in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries of Western peoples.

The names of those British reformers read like a part list of the greatest men that Great Britain produced in nearly 200 years. They were variously known, as I say, as Whigs, Radicals, Reformers, until after the death of Lord Palmerston in 1865, just over 100 years ago, when the old Whig Party was transformed into and named the Liberal Party and Gladstone became its leader. That historic event was almost simultaneous with the passage of great reform legislation, workmen's compensation, old age pensions,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

better education facilities, public housing, improved sanitation. But, Sir, reform itself did not have to wait for 1865 and for the adoption of the name Liberal. The influence of the Whigs, Radicals and Reformers was able to get many reforms. In 1802 a law to protect apprentices and other young workers; 1806, the slave trade abolished; 1816, the flogging of women in jails abolished; 1820, an act passed to prohibit cruelty to animals; 1823, the death penalty ended for over 100 different offenses though still leaving another 100 or more other offenses that continued to be punishable by death.

In the 1820's a whole spate of reforms were brought into parliament the greatest of which were the final repeal of the Test Act. Now those here of Irish descent please pay attention to this. In the 1820's a great spate of reforms were brought into parliament, the greatest of them being the final repeal of the Test Act and the abolition of the corn laws. This latter, the abolition of the corn laws, made England a free trade country. The Test Act was the one which prevented British subjects who happened to be Roman Catholics from holding any office of state, to be a member of parliament, to be an officer in the army. Catholic emancipation was one of the noblest works of Liberalism and Reform.

DR. FARRELL: The armies were all Irish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. In 1832 came the immortal Reform Act, 1833 the first effective factory act which took steps to humanize working conditions in England. The year 1834 saw sweeping amendments to the Poor Law.

MR. MURPHY: Could I ask the hon. member a question? Was that any coincidence in 1832 with Carson here and the great reforms you are talking about in England?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Carson came here in 1806. In 1832 we got Representative Government as a result of the great Liberal Carson's work and the great Patrick Morris, another great Liberal.

MR. MURPHY: But there was no tie in with the 1832 reforms?



Mr. SPALLWOOD: Well yes, because Carson was in constant communication with Lord Holland, with Sir Richard Mackintosh and the great leaders of the Radical Reform movement and the Whig movement in England. In fact he himself was a Scot who grew up in the school of the Edinburgh Review School.

The period of Gladstone's dominance saw the establishment of a national system of education, 1870, the extension of democracy by the enfranchisement of agricultural labourers, 1884; **imagine**, before 1884 agricultural labourers could not vote; **the** legalization of unions, 1871; abolition of the purchase of officers' commissions in the army, a complete reorganization of the judicial system and the abolition of religious tests for admission to the university. You could not get into university until that great Liberal reform was brought in.

The year 1867 brought another Reform Act which liberalized voting qualifications by reducing property requirements to five pounds sterling. You still had to have five pounds to be allowed to vote, but before that it was a lot more. In 1872 the secret ballot was introduced, one of the cardinal reforms in the history of democracy. Before 1888 in the United States parties printed their own ballots. How would you like that? How would a political party like **that**, to have the right to print their own ballots? In the United States before 1888 - and that is not long ago - parties printed their own ballots.

In 1883 Gladstone's **Corrupt Practices Act** brought at least some purification of elections. Election expenditures by political parties was by law dropped from one pound sterling for every elector to three shillings in 1885. Today the amount is approximately seven pence, fourteen cents. In fact seven pence is not now worth fourteen cents.

Other reforms included payment of salaries to MPs, **an end** to plural voting in elections, changes and improvements in conditions for both sailors and passengers in freight and passenger ships.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

In 1884 came the third Reform Act which further democratized elections and parliament. In 1918 Representation of the People Act brought further democratic reforms increasing the electorate in Britain from 8 million to 21 million. How is that for a constitutional reform? One act of parliament increased the electorate from 8 million to 21 million. Another reform was the distinction made in the rates of income tax on earned versus unearned income.

Mr. Speaker, spectacular reforms were carried out by the British Liberals in the early years of the present century, this century now. Universal workmen's compensation, a system of old age pensions, state insurance against sickness and unemployment, the establishment of a network of labour exchange, the establishment of trade boards for the fixation of wages in sweated trades. The means for carrying out these reforms were found in a system of progressive taxation of the rich through graduated income tax, super tax and death duties which involved a substantial redistribution of the nation's wealth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: These financial methods became a part of the established system of British Government. That particular era saw the first reforms of the House of Lords, that aristocratic institution in which the hereditary land owners of the kingdom exercised control over the popularly elected House of Commons.

MR. NEARY: Would the member excuse me for a minute?

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to stay here we may as well have a quorum in the House, Sir. Can we get the members out of the back room, wherever they are hiding out, come in here and listen to this excellent speech.

MR. SPEAKER: I will ask the Law Clerk to count the House.  
A quorum is present.

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I want to be fair. It would be wrong to claim that absolutely everyone of these and numerous other reforms, constitutional, political, social, educational reforms were brought in and made into law exclusively by the Whigs, Radicals, Reformers, and Liberals.

AN HON. MEMBER: We Tories did our share.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was just coming to that. A few of them indeed were in fact introduced into Parliament by Tory governments, especially by Disraeli's influence, if you could call Disraeli a Tory. He called himself a Tory and nominally he was a Tory, but Disraeli was one of the great reformers in English history.

In many if not most of these instances where it was a Tory Government that brought in a reform in England, in most if not all of those cases it was a fact of a Tory Government adroitly seizing the privilege and political advantage of being the party that actually introduced reforms that had long been advocated and sought by the Liberals or their Whig, Radical or Reform predecessors.

MR. DOODY: Like the Liberals in Ottawa and the NDP.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, much the same thing. They stole their

MR. SMALLWOOD: clothes while they were in swimming.

MR. DOODY: Desraeli was too smart for them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What does it add up to, all this? It adds up to the simple fact that the one common denominator of liberalism is the word "reform". Take reform from liberalism in England, in Canada, in Newfoundland and what you have left is a shell, a shell that is sometimes noisy, but all the louder because it is empty. Liberalism without reform is not liberalism, whatever else it is.

MR. DOODY: It did all right for twenty-three years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We had reform in twenty-three years. I could keep this House here for several hours describing the reforms for which I, as Leader of that administration was responsible. It was the greatest period of reform. Indeed there were more reforms in those twenty-three years than in all the other history of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was terrific, terrific. The reform-constitutional, political, educational, social, economic, reforms in every direction. And I give credit to the present administration. They are not without a record of some reform too. I am not ignoring it, and I am not sneering at it. Wherever reform is brought in, I applaud it.

MR. DOODY: Yes, but you call it liberal as soon as it is reform.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well liberal and reform are interchangeable words.

MR. DOODY: It happens to come in under conservative and liberal reform, however.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No thoughtful person anywhere, I suppose, can fail to mourn the present sad decline of the great Liberal Party of Great Britain, not merely the decline, the virtual disappearance of that historic political force. Today in a House of Commons

MR. SMALLWOOD: of over 700 members- I forget the precise number, 740 or 750 M.P.'s in the House of Commons at Westminster - in that great House the Liberals number, unlucky number, unfortunate number, number precisely thirteen. There are thirteen Liberal M.P.'s to speak for the great principles of Liberalism.

The Liberal Party in Britian lost its way. It lost its way. It ceased to be the torch bearer of reform. It became a party with no higher vision, oh I must repeat these words, The Liberal Party of Great Britian which ruled Great Britian, which made Great Britian the greatest nation the world had ever seen up to that time, built a vast empire, that great Liberal party in England is down now -

MR. DOODY: - remained under Disraeli.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. To thirteen M.P.'s because the Liberal Party in Britian lost its way. It ceased to be the torch bearer of reform. It became a party with no higher vision than the appetite for office and power. God save any political party that loses its great divine afflatus, its Messianic fervor, its idealism, its torch-bearing demand for change and improvement and reform and degenerates into just an outfit that wants to get in an office. God protect us from them and God save them!

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. DOODY: I just hope it never happens again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Liberal Party's place in Britian was taken by a new reforming party - now notice this, every politician in Newfoundland would be wise to notice this even if it is twenty past one in the morning - the place of the British Liberal Party was taken by a new party, a reforming party, the British Labour Party and they now are the government with 318 Labour M.P.'s in the House, that is 305 more than the Liberals have. That is a sad story.

MR. DOODY: It is not, because one half of the Labour Party are Liberal while the other half are Radicals.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. That is right. Some of them are Tories, some

MR. SMALLWOOD: notable Tories went Labour. Some very notable Liberals went Labour. A whole new crop have grown up that were never Tory, never Liberal, they just grew. They were born and raised as Labourites.

Mr. Smallwood.

That is in the last, say, twenty-five years. How sad now, Mr. Speaker, are the words uttered by the Prime Minister of the last Liberal Government in Britain. Does the House remember who that was? The last Liberal Government Prime Minister was Herbert Asquith, H. H. Asquith. In his farewell speech as Leader of the Liberal Party, how sad these words in 1926; just hear the words of the last Liberal Prime Minister of England, the great H. H. Asquith. He said in his farewell speech, "No rational observer believes that Liberalism is, or is likely to become, an extinct or negligible factor in our national life. The fortunes of the Liberal party may fluctuate."

"We have seen it as in 1906 so strong as to seem able to defy any conceivable hostile combination. We have seen it in 1918 so battered and mutilated as to appear to be on the verge of annihilation. But there is only one way in which it can ever be killed, and that is by suicide." How sad these words, How fondly we may hope that that sad end will never come to Liberalism in Newfoundland. How can a democrat's heart not thrill to that grand march of democracy, the march from rule over all by one man, the King, to the creation of Parliament; the slow but inexorable broadening of the base of popular representation in that Parliament; the wondrous success of Parliament in getting control of the public purse away from the King so that thence forward it was not the monarch but Parliament that had the sole right to impose taxes and determine public expenditures; and then the further broadening of the basis of representation of the people in Parliament, the institution and steady strengthening of Responsible Government meaning that the King's ministers became responsible and answerable to Parliament and only to Parliament and not to the King, and could continue in office only so long as the majority of the elected members were willing for them to do so; the shortening of the life of Parliament between general elections thereby requiring more frequent appeals to the electorate for renewal of authority; the still further broadening of the franchise; the



Mr. Smallwood.

secret ballot, red letter day in history; manhood suffrage, a cardinal date indeed in democracy's progress; the Corrupt Practices Act for the purifying of elections; the limiting ever more severely of the amount of money that political parties and individual politicians could spend to get elected; the reform of the House of Lords and the removal of that unelected House's control over the budget; the payment of members of Parliament so that persons other than rich men could afford to sit in the House; woman suffrage; conflict of interest legislation aimed at purifying membership in Parliament. What a glorious story of the birth, the broadening, the strengthening of democracy! What a noble epic of political power shifting inexorably, implacably from the few to the many! What an inspiring epic of purifying elections and making elected members ever more independent.

And, Mr. Speaker, how stupid, or at any rate how obtuse, how imperceptive we should have to be not to thrill to the golden threads that run through those centuries, the golden thread of reform, from autocratic rule to aristocratic rule to democratic rule, the most thrilling and the most inspiring example the world has seen of the march of political democracy and reform! Is this the end? Is there no room left for reform. Have we reached political Utopia? Are politicians reduced to the misfortune of that Alexander who wept because he had no more worlds to conquer? Are we not still confronted by a mass of wrongs and injustices? We Liberals in Newfoundland would be well advised to keep these facts in the forefront of our minds and in the inner most recesses of our hearts. And we all of us in this House-Liberals, Reform Liberals, Independent Liberals, Tories, if there are, so-called Tories- we would all we wise to remember that time really does make much ancient truth uncouth, that the annals of history are full of the names of men who would not

Mr. Smallwood.

grow, who would not change, who grew old in their minds before their time, who turned not eager countenances but uncomprehending faces and deaf ears to the call for reform. The reforms are needed. They are needed now, and there are ardent spirits out there in Newfoundland to give eloquent voice to that call.

Beware lest history dismiss us who are in this House today with the brief curt verdict, "They dealt in trifles and so we are swept into the ash can of history." Remember those words. Look around in Newfoundland and see what is going on and remember those words; do not get swept into the ash can of history.

Mr. Speaker, the two largest political parties in this House are the Government party and the Opposition party. They go by different names, and they sit on opposite sides of the Chamber, and they go aboard each other, but is there any real difference between them?

MR. NEARY: Merchants and lawyers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is there any real difference between them, I mean real difference? During the Easter recess I clipped a piece from a paper in Florida. I spent the two weeks in Florida. Can the hon. gentleman read that headline?

MR. DOOHY: I can barely see the paper.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will read it out. It is a piece from Washington by Marquise Childs, a well-known United Features Syndicate correspondent. The heading is, "Give the voters a true choice." Now that struck me: Give them a true choice. And so I ask is there any real difference between these two parties? Is the present party that glories in the name Liberal actually in fact pragmatically and practically more Liberal in philosophy, in purpose, and in programme, more Liberal than the present so-called Tory party, that party that presently has possession of the government of our Province? If so, how and in what respect?

MR. DOODY: The social conscience is on this side of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not mind the hon. minister joking, he is witty, and he is joking, and he is much more erudite than I had ever imagined, but, you know, keep it at a certain level, do not be silly. It does not become the hon. gentleman to be silly. Be witty, yes. But to say that the social conscience is over there, all of it, and not over here. That is just being silly.

MR. DOODY: The preponderance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not even the preponderance. Well, there are more hon. gentlemen over there, so in sheer weight, put all the hon. gentlemen over there in the scales and weigh, and they will come to a certain weight more than the weight, the combined weight over here.

MR. DOODY: The preponderance makes sense.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no! In that sense there may be a preponderance of social idealism. Note that I do not deny the presence of an active and an energetic and an aggressive social conscience in the big majority of the hon. gentleman on that side of the House. I am not a fool. I am not blind. I see it. I recognize it. I see many cases of myself over there, younger additions. Indeed I do.

MR. NEARY: Pocket-sized.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, all right.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a real difference in the two major parties in this Province today, I ask you if there is any real difference, have not the people the right to know what that difference is? Do not the people deserve to know the difference? Is it not the duty of the parties to explain the difference, if there is one? What are the basic differences, the differences in principle, if any, today between the Liberal Party and the so-called Tory party, in roads and paving for instance, in hospitals and public health generally, in fishery development and mines, offshore gas and oil, 200 mile fishing limit, in forestry development, in education

MR. SMALLWOOD: development, in economic development generally, in tourist development, municipal development, housing development, in social welfare, a dozen other matters of vital importance in all these things, what if any is the difference between the politics and philosophy of the Liberal Party and the so-called Tory Party as we find them in this Province today?

AN HON. MEMBER: A good question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that a fair question?

MR. MURPHY: A good question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that a pertinent question? Is it apropos? Is it germane? Is it just, you know, the sort of thing that bookish theorist -

MR. DOODY: A bit of rhetoric.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A bit of rhetoric, is that what it is?

MR. DOODY: I just thought I would throw it in.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman has never had the pleasure of having me open up on him. He has never had that, and I know when I am being kidded.

MR. NEARY: He is after you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And I know when I am being patronized. I have done enough of it myself to recognize it when I hear it. Beware. Beware.

MR. DOODY: We are all equal members of the hon. House here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. That is right.

How are the general public to know the difference if there is any difference? If there is no difference, or but little difference, on what principle are the people to judge between the parties, to choose one above the other? Are they reduced to the futility of choosing the one that they dislike least or the one that is least successful in turning them off? Both parties are quite successful in turning the people off, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, both parties have had enormous success. One has had more success than the other in turning people off, and is that how we choose between our two major

MR. SMALLWOOD: political parties in our Province today?

Well I pose the question to hon. members: Is it reasonable to suppose that virtually the whole Newfoundland population sways massively back and forth, being truly Liberal now, truly Tory then, truly something else some other time? For example, in six consecutive general elections, beginning in 1949, the Newfoundland people voted for the Liberal Party in six consecutive general elections. Then in 1971 a majority of them voted Tory, so-called Tory, and in 1972 an even larger majority of them did so. Then in 1975 a majority of them voted anti-Tory or Liberal. Does this mean that the people were by conviction Liberal, then by conviction Tory, then by conviction Liberal again? Or does it not rather mean that being Liberal or being Tory had little or nothing to do with it, that the people did not at all vote for Liberalism or for Toryism, but only that they liked the government of the day or disliked them more or less than they disliked the Opposition. Are we sunk to that? Is that all that politics means in Newfoundland now? If this is indeed the case then it is pertinent and important to ask how many Liberals and how many Tories are there in this Province or indeed in this Country of Canada today? Authentic Liberals I mean, authentic Tories, not counting as Liberals merely the people who vote for the Liberal Party today and the Tory Party tomorrow and some other party the next day, or as Tories those who vote for the Tory Party today and the Liberal Party tomorrow and so forth. You cannot realistically call them Liberals or Tories. They are floaters. And political floating is now a common way of political life in our Province.

I asked a moment ago what difference there is today between the Liberal and Tory Parties in the country as a whole and that reminds me of the Liberal Leadership Convention of

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ontario in late January of this year. The newly elected Liberal leader was Dr. Stewart Smith, by a forty-five vote majority. He gave Canada a very good idea of his Liberal philosophy in a press conference held just after his election and I quote him precisely; here is what the new Liberal leader said the day after he was elected leader of the Liberal Party of Ontario. He said, "Philosophically I suppose there are not too many differences between the Conservatives and the sort of Liberal Party I would like to see shaping up under my leadership." Philosophically he could see very little difference. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party of Ontario now comes third in that Province after the Tory Government and the NDP, official Opposition. No wonder! If the Liberal Party now has a leadership which sees no difference, or virtually no difference philosophically between the two great parties, Liberal and Tory, no wonder the Liberal Party is being rejected by the people of Ontario who have put the Tories back in with a very slender plurality, not a majority, just a plurality, and made the NDP the official Opposition. No wonder that only three of Canada's ten Provinces have Liberal governments today, three of the ten. No wonder that a Paul Hellyer can run for the leadership of the Liberal Party of Canada and then run for the leadership of the Tory Party of Canada, that Claude Wagner can run for the leadership of the Liberal Party of Quebec and then try for the leadership of the Tory Party of Canada and come within sixty-five votes of getting it; that the Leader of the Liberal Party in British Columbia is now a Minister of the Social Credit Cabinet of that Province; that Rene Leveque can be number two man in the Liberal Cabinet of Quebec one day and leader of an altogether new party the next. No wonder that Mr. Choquette can be a prominent Liberal one day and leader of a new party the following day, and not a Liberal party.

Is Dr. Smith's explanation the correct one for all those and

MR. SMALLWOOD: many similar cases? "I suppose there are not too many differences," he says, "between the parties today."

No wonder Joe Clarke on March 29 in a public meeting he addressed in Ontario referred to the public's growing cynicism and mistrust of politics and politicians, the public's growing cynicism. In God's name how credulous would people have to be if they see Paul Hellyer in a great campaign running for the leadership of the Liberal Party, and then in a great campaign running for the leadership of the Tory Party! If they see one man after the other switching from one party to the other, back and forth, how can people take that seriously? How can they take the professions, the statements, the arguments, the debates of politicians seriously? They would have to be wonderfully credulous, would they not?

Now perhaps fifty years ago or thirty years ago, really before radio was anything of any consequence, before television came in, before roads had been build and newspapers were able to get a staggeringly great circulation, before the explosion of knowledge, before this fantastic fall-out of information that we see in the world today, before all that happened it could be that the average innocent citizen could be a loyal Liberal throughout his entire life and regretted when some prominent Liberal went Tory. A man could be a loyal Tory all his life and have great faith in his Tory Party as he had in his church and could take it in his stride if some prominent Tory switched over and became Liberal. That, in another age, could happen and it did happen. But when it happens now what Canadian citizen did not know that Paul Hellyer was a prominent Liberal and a Liberal M.P., a member of the Liberal Cabinet, a contender for the leadership of the Liberal Party, what Canadian did not know that and what must have been the thoughts of any thoughtful man or woman, what kind of respect would he have



MR. SMALLWOOD: for political philosophy, political names, political titles, political tags, Liberal, Tory, Progressive Conservative, Liberal. No wonder Joe Clarke said on March 29, "The public's growing cynicism and mistrust of politics and politicians." How in God's name could the people fail to have mistrust and suspicion of politics and politicians? How could they fail to have it? How could they be expected to take politicians and parties and party labels and party names seriously? How could they be expected to do that?

Mr. Speaker, in the 144 years since the House of Assembly was first opened has there ever been even one constituency in Newfoundland that never voted Liberal, one that never voted Tory. Not one. Every constituency in Newfoundland and Labrador has voted Liberal one time, Tory another. Even Labrador, look at Labrador, which only elected men starting in 1949. Labrador has elected Liberals, Tories; right now Labrador is represented in this House by Liberals, Tories, so-called Liberals, so-called Tories.

MR. NEARY: An independent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who is the independent?

MR. NEARY: Charlie Devine.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well he was elected. Devine was elected as an independent. Mr. Martin was elected as a New Labrador Party.

AN HON. MEMBER: NLP.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. St. John's East, now the most Tory district in the Province, was for years and years the most constant Liberal district in all Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

I suppose for forty years, forty-five years, St. John's East was not capable of electing anything but a Liberal. That is not so now. Green Bay and Trillington districts, hailed for decades as Liberal citadels, have both voted Tory. Fortune Bay and Hermitage Bay, Liberal strongholds, voted Tory. The great Tory district of Ferryland voted Liberal several times, as did the great district of Harbour Main. Harbour Main at one time was looked upon as a Tory citadel. There was no way, it was impregnable. But it elected Liberal after Liberal. Now it has got an alleged former Liberal now an alleged Tory, a pretended Tory, a pseudo Tory, a masquerading Tory -

MR. DOODY: Perhaps an NDP, but never a Liberal I do not think. We had a pseudo Liberal running there for awhile. Mr. Lewis was very conservative.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How examples could be given? The same voters vote Liberal, vote Tory in different elections. It is pretty obvious that they were not voting as Liberals, not voting as Tories. They were just voting for the government that they liked, or for the Opposition that they liked more, or for the leader or against the leader. That does not make you a Liberal. The people who will vote in the next general election who do not like the present government - and there are quite a few of them - will be voting against the government. They will not be voting against the government because they, the voters, are Liberals and the government are Tories. They will just be voting against the government because they do not like the government, and a lot of them do not and a lot of them did not in the election in September.

MR. MORCAN: A lot of them do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well a lot of them do. But the majority do not. Even on polling day a majority did not. I would not say that the government have added all that many to their supporters in number since the election.

Mr. Speaker, what are the philosophical or ideological differences today that distinguish the Liberal Party from the so-called

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Tory Party in our Province? What are the differences of policy of programme or platform, that enable people to see how, wherein and why one party is significantly different from the other? In short what are the political differences between them? In earlier times the differences were easy to see. The Liberal Party advocated Liberalism when out of office and practiced it when in. Liberalism wanted judicial reform, constitutional reform, economic reform, social reform, political reform: Liberalism when in office built hospitals, roads and houses, encouraged co-operatives, trade union organizations, built railways and airlines and fish plants and factories, helped to develop agriculture and mining and forestry, instituted social welfare assistance, practiced free trade wherever practical.

Torism opposed all those things, stood steadfastly against reform and development, fought the establishment of the railway, of Grand Falls, of Corner Brook and Churchill Falls and Stephenville and Holyrood and Bay d'Espoir and Marystown and Cove Bay. Liberalism was creative, constructive, innovative, eager to develop, eager to reform. Torism was negative, narrow, class conscious, on the side of wealth and commercial selfishness. Liberalism was the people's movement. Torism was the merchant's messenger. So it was, so it used to be, and so the people saw and understood it to be. That is why the people, in the main, the people were Liberals. So it was. But is it so today?

Now let us each in his own heart give an honest and sincere answer to that vital question.

MR. DOODY: Both questions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To all these questions. Is it so today? It used to be so. Everybody knew it. Everybody recognized it. You knew what it meant to be a Liberal. If you called yourself a Liberal you knew why. If you called yourself a Tory, you knew why. You do not today. Is it true and fair to say today that the Liberal Party has a virtual monopoly of liberal ideas, liberal ideology,

MR. SPALLMOOD:

liberal programme, or to say that the Tory Party is today opposed when out of office to development, to improvement, to housing development, to judicial development, to economic development and when in office refuses to practice these policies? Is that true? Would anyone have the brazen face to say it? Is there anyone so dishonest and so brazen in Newfoundland today as to say these two things; that the Liberal Party has a virtual monopoly of liberal ideas, liberal ideology, liberal programme; that the Tory Party is today opposed when out of office to development, to improvement, to housing development, to judicial development, to economic development, and when in office refuses to practice these policies? Is that true?

If it is not true, then what is the difference, what are the differences between the Liberal Party and the Tory Party? Is the Liberal Party now, this day, this night, at ten minutes to two any more the party of reform and development than the Tory Party is today? The answer is all too obvious. I say it as a Liberal. Remember, I am no Tory. I am a dyed-in-the-wool Liberal, inveterate and unrepentant and unchanging. I am a Liberal.

MR. DOODY: An all seasoned servant.

MR. NEARY: The hon. minister is having a bad day, I think.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It would be a travesty of the truth to describe the two parties in those terms today. Today the Liberal Party and the so-called Tory Party are very similar, first cousins, if not indeed half brothers, hard to tell apart. Now both parties will hate me for saying that. The party over there do not like to hear me saying that they are not very different from the party over here, that they are half brothers, they are cousins, they are hard to tell apart and I am sure the hon. gentleman over here will hate my very guts!

MR. NEARY: Kissing cousins.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But is it true? That is what is more important. Is it true? That situation, Mr. Speaker, that political and ideological vacuum spells the inevitability of a realignment of politics in our

MR. SWAINSON:

Province. That situation that I have described, that vacuum spells the inevitability of a realignment of politics in our Province. Will it be NDP? Or will it be a determined rebirth of **Reform Liberalism**? Will the Liberal Party return to reform, or will it blindly refuse and so disintegrate and die to make room for the NDP? Remember that a much -

MR. HON. MEMBER: What about reform Toryism.

MR. SWAINSON: Well reform Toryism had a noble history in Great Britain. MacMillan, 'Super Mac', Harold MacMillan, the Prime Minister for - I have just been reading - what is it called? - His newest book, The Past Masters Of British Politics. By past masters he is not referring to persons or fraternal societies. Past masters, the great prime ministers.

MR. DOOHY: Chess players.

MR. SWAINSON: Well, yes, all right. The great Prime Ministers of England. MacMillan, a Tory, was close to being a Socialist and in many headings a Liberal, but a loyal and devoted Tory. But he was a Tory Democrat. Churchill's father, Lord

MR. SMALLWOOD: Randolph Churchill, Joe Chamberlain, there are a whole host of them, Tory democrats, Disraeli was a Tory democratic and there is a great tradition in the Tory Party of England for reform and democracy, but that is not the characteristic, typical stance of the Tory Party of England. Today the Tory Party of England you might almost say is no more Tory than this party over here is Tory.

MR. MARSHALL: Now that is your opinion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is my view. I cannot express anyone else's. If I do I will quote them. I will copy down the words and say, "As so and so said," but until I do that I am only giving my own opinions.

MR. MARSHALL: The Tory Party under British tradition many people would say, including myself, has been the party of reform in Britain.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. MARSHALL: Okay?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. But history does not say that. Maybe some people, but not the historians.

MR. MARSHALL: It depends on who is writing the history.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman would like thirty, forty or seventy or eighty or a couple of hundred books on it I will lend them to him. It is one of my pet subjects.

I say that nature abhors a vacuum. There is a vacuum today and that vacuum spells out the inevitability of a realignment of politics in Newfoundland and I ask the question, will it be NDP or will it be a determined rebirth of reform liberalism? Will the Liberal Party return to reform or will it blindly refuse and so disintegrate and die to make room for the NDP, and then I would like to say that true indeed is it that the blood of martyrs fertilizes the soil of freedom, but is it martyrdom that the Liberal Party is seeking?

Before asking what is a Liberal, Mr. Speaker, it is useful to ask what is Liberalism? A Socialist is one who believes in Socialism,

MR. SMALLWOOD: but what is Socialism? A Buddhist is one who believes in Buddhism but what is Buddhism? Perhaps we ought to clear the ground by saying what Liberalism is not. It is not a religion, although it draws some of its inspiration from religion and we must never lose sight of the dictum of the great Liberal philosopher John Morely, "Those who would treat politics and morality apart will never understand the one or the others."

Liberalism is not a science, although it draws some of its strength from science. It is not a school of economics, though it learns much from the dismal science. It is not a system of ethics, though it faces real danger if it removes itself very far from such a definition.

A genuine Liberal Party is not just a grouping of careerists, of opportunists, of determined office seekers. It is not a faction, not a sect, not a band of political fanatics, not mere visionaries, not one-track minded theorists, not superior patriots, but rather a group of ordinary men and women with ordinary habits and outlook on life, with perhaps little more than ordinary interests in public affairs and a little more than ordinary love of native land, and supremely with strong sympathies toward the common people, and an unquenchable desire and determination to introduce and carry out the reforms that are needed to make politics cleaner, society more wholesome and social justice more triumphant.

I sincerely hope by the way, Mr. Speaker, that nobody supposes that a genuine Liberal interests himself in nothing but reform. Fanatic indeed would be such a person. Reform is indeed the inner, the fundamental meaning of Liberalism, its pivot, its grand purpose, but this by no means signifies that a Liberal must not be deeply concerned with all of the many very ordinary aspects of public life.

What has being a Liberal Reformer meant in Newfoundland? It means supporting the policy of William Carson and Patrick Morris when they advocated the right of people to live in



MR. SMALLWOOD: Newfoundland, just the simple right to live here, the right to have a chimney in your house, the right to own and fence a piece of land. You were against those things if you were a Tory. If you were a Liberal Reformer you supported Carson's demand that the governor of Newfoundland, who at that time was the only government in the colony, should be required to live in the colony all the year instead of for just a few months in the Summer. If you were a Liberal Reformer you supported Carson's and Morris' fight for a reformed judicial system and you rejoiced with them when that successful fight gave us the reformed Supreme Court. If you were a Tory you opposed and you did not rejoice.

This is true. This is the history of Newfoundland. All the great reforms, constitutional and political were advocated by the Liberals and just as staunchly opposed by the Tories. By the way, the Liberals then in those days were nearly all Roman Catholic, nearly all Irish, and the Tories were nearly all Protestant and English or Scottish and merchants. The Tories were the property class, the mercantile class and they were nearly all of them Protestant and mostly English. The Liberals were nearly all Irish and nearly all Roman Catholic. Now there were exceptions. Patrick Morris was Roman Catholic but Dr. William Carson was a famous Presbyterian and so it went. There were exceptions. But broadly speaking the population of St. John's where politics happened were two-thirds Irish. They had come in here from Ireland as immigrants and settled here. They were born in Ireland in 1798, 1799, 1840, 1841, 1842, 1843, in the great days of political battle in St. John's two-thirds of the people here were Irish and had been born in Ireland and brought with them their flair for politics.

MR. DOODY: All Liberals.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And all Liberals, every one of them. They turned Tory.

MR. DOODY: They had to. They got nowhere with the other crowd.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman, I do not know what to make of him.

MR. NEARY: He is having a bad day today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that what it is?

If you were a Liberal Reformer you supported Carson's campaign for agricultural reform, for municipal reform, for health and hospital reform, for road building reform. Above all, if you are a Liberal Reformer you gave your support to Carson's and Morris' great campaign for the institution of representative government, 1932, and if you were a Tory you opposed it fiercely.

Now I have written a complete life of Carson. I am hoping to have it published within a - so I am advertising my book, if you like. Anyway when I talk about Carson, the greatest man who ever lived, the great man who ever trod shoe leather on our soil, Dr. William Carson.

AN HON. MEMBER: You believe.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He was. I do not believe it, I know it. And when the hon. minister reads my book a year or so from now when it comes out, "The Life And Letters Of William Carson" he will agree, too, the greatest human being that ever lived in Newfoundland.

MR. DOODY: Do not send an advanced copy to Diefenbaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me, a note has been handed to me suggesting that I suggest to the House that you might care to have another four or five hours of this tomorrow and maybe the day after or will I go on and on?

MR. SMALLWOOD:

The fact of the matter is that I will not need more than another hour, I think.

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no. I do not need leave, I do not think. I think the rules allow me to go on. No, the question is, I have about another hour and would the House prefer me - I would personally prefer but I would be just as well contented to go on tomorrow morning. Tomorrow is Friday, is it not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tomorrow morning or go on now until three o'clock or whatever the -

MR. DOODY: Do you mind going on now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not mind one way or the other. Afterwards, Mr. Speaker, after those glorious days in the 1810's, 1820's, 1830's, 1840's, 1850's and so on the Liberal Reformers fought and won the battle to bring the secret ballot to Newfoundland and soon after that, just soon after they had won it in England. By the way, I had a fantastic experience in England. Edmund de Rothschild - the Rothschilds, by the way, were traditionally Liberal. Today I would say they are probably Tory. Well, there is no Liberal Party now -

MR. DOODY: They are probably right of center.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Rothschilds were always famous Liberals. The Bowring by the way, the Bowring family here, in England were Liberals. But in those days, you know, over half of England was Liberal, over half. And when the Liberal Party disappeared, the Liberals, the more prominent ones, either went Labour or went Tory. I would imagine that the Rothschilds today are probably conventional Tories in England. To be a Tory today in England is to be ten times more radical than a Liberal was, say, thirty years ago. We are living in another world.

But Eddy de Rothschild took me to lunch one day in the famous club, Whites, I think. It is either Whites or Brooks. He took me for

MR. SMALLWOOD:

lunch and there in the middle of the floor of the main assembly room of the club was a wooden stand and on the stand was a box, a little box, the first ballot box ever used in England. I do not know how they got it. When the Ballot Act was brought in and people voted by marking a secret ballot and folding it and pushing it into the ballot box to preserve its secrecy, that was one of the great political reforms of all time and the Liberal Party, that famous Liberal club somehow or other managed to get the actual box, the first one, and it is there today.

MR. BOOBY: They were all down there to count the ballots before -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe so. Maybe they did that. I may say that I have in my possession - it will go, I do not know, to the museum, maybe brought back into this chamber - I have the desk at which I sat for two years as a member of the National Convention and for some twelve or fifteen years as a member of the House of Assembly, the same desk. But I bought it and paid for it and I have it home in my house now. That one day will become an interesting souvenir to look at, the desk at which Confederation was proposed and all the speeches for it were made.

MR. HON. MURPHY: You did not sit there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I stood at it. Then for twelve or fifteen years as Premier I sat at it and it is all written underneath the drawer as other members did. That is one thing we lost when we came in here. **These new desks are so new they have no tradition.** It will take another hundred years before they get a bit of tradition marked on them. When three or four other Premiers have sat in that corner seat there, then that seat will begin to be a bit notable.

After the Liberals in England won the secret Ballot, the Ballot Act, so the Liberals here did. Then came Whiteway's great campaign for the building of the railway. Does the House realize that probably the most courageous thing ever done by a public man in all our history was the building of the railway by Whiteway? The population of Newfoundland was about 150,000, not quite 200,000 souls, not much more

MR. SMALLWOOD:

than St. John's has now, that was the population of Newfoundland. They lived in 1,300 little settlements along the coast line. The only place there was in Newfoundland out of sight and sound of the Atlantic Ocean was, I think, Whitbourne. A tiny little handful of people, poor, no industries.

MR. NOLAN: What was the population of St. John's at that time?

MR. SMALLWOOD: St. John's then had about twenty-odd thousand people. I can remember when St. John's population was 30,000.

The Evening Telegram sold for one cent. Then it went for two cents. Then it went to five.

MR. DOODY: And then it was over-priced.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In a poverty stricken little island with fewer than 200,000 people, with a revenue of around \$1 million a year and no industries and a rather hefty public debt for the size of the country, that man had the unbelievable, altogether unbelievable courage to build a railway across this Island, an empty Island, birds and rabbits, an occasional moose or caribou, and trout in the ponds, an empty Island and he builds five hundred miles of railway across it. God in heaven, what courage! What nerve, what courage! And what faith he must have had in Newfoundland! What a great Liberal Sir William Whiteway was! What a superb man! What a magnificent Liberal! What a great reformer! What a vast and wonderful leader of Liberalism in Newfoundland, the great Sir William Whiteway.

MR. DOODY: And how the Tories told him he was going to go broke and bankrupt the Province!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is true. Do not forget too, you know, that the government did go broke. Do not forget that the other great Liberal leader, Sir Robert Bond, who was a very wealthy man in the terms of those days - Today he would not be. Any little commission agent down on Water Street, any lawyer, any doctor would look down on Sir Robert Bond as a poor relative. Sir Robert Bond was regarded as a fairly wealthy man. He inherited it from his father.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Even Newfoundland could not raise a single dollar of money in the world to save a run on the bank, Sir Robert Bond raised it by pledging his own personal fortune. There was a great Liberal for you, a very great Liberal indeed.

DR. FARRELL: He was Newfoundland born, was he?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Carson was a towering mountain peak. Carson was Mount Everest as Bond was Mount Peyton out near the hon. gentleman's district. I will go higher than Mount Peyton, higher than Blomidon out on the West Coast. Bond was a superbly great gentleman. I knew him. I may be the only person in this House who did know Bond. I met him on a number of occasions at his home. As a boy of thirteen, as a boarder in Bishops Field College, which is just down the street from the Colonial Building, I used to sneak up after I would get out of school and sneak into the gallery, the big alpine gallery up there, and listen to the great Sir Robert Bond. I am the only one probably in this House today who knew Sir Robert Bond and who knew the great Lord Morris, Sir Edward Morris and who knew Dinny Lloyd, the great Sir William Lloyd and who knew Coaker and knew them all.

MR. DOOHY: Was Morris a genius or something?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, he was a political genius if ever there was a political genius. But a political genius in the sense of being a superb manager of men, manager of his party followers, his party members in the House and his party friends and committee men and canvassers and campaigners. His superb management of men was incomparable. Squires learned a lot from it and Squires practiced the arts that he learned from Morris. Morris was incredible. He was unbelievable. Morris would make a list and get his friends to make lists of every enemy he had in St. John's West where he ran and he would make a list of them and he had until next election to win them over.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

One Sunday afternoon, walking for a stroll apparently by accident, but no accident, for a stroll Sunday afternoon down the Southside over on the other side of the harbour and passes this house where this inveterate opponent of his lived, and heard a piano being murdered, being butchered and stopped and listened with rapt attention and then had the courage to tap on the door and the mother came out and recognized him instantly. He said, "Madam you must excuse me for intruding but I am a dear lover of good music and hearing this music I just had to stop. Would it be asking too much if I could come in." And she invited him in all flustered and out of breath and calling, "Henry, Henry, Henry, Sir Edward is here." And Henry came out, you know, very suspicious as Morris knew he would be, and Morris pretended he never heard of him. But this little girl, could he hear her play?

He sat with rapt attention on his face listening to her murdering the piano. When it was over he said, "Madam you have a treasure. You have a treasure here, nurture it, cultivate it, give her every chance to get all the tuition and lessons she can, and who knows, we may have a great Newfoundland pianist. Give her every chance." He ignored the husband. He did not pay any attention to him. He was the one he was after. The women did not have a vote in those days but the husband did. That man is voting for Morris yet. At least if he is living yet he is voting for Morris yet. And there are countless stories of Morris's consummate ability as a politician of that kind, a winner of elections, a manager of men. Whether he was a statesman is another matter. That is another matter. I have my doubts about that. But that he was a great personality - I met him here and I met him in London, and we talked and yarned and gossiped and talked politics and he reminisced and told me the - I cannot refrain from telling this story.

When he told so many stories I said to him, "My Lord, you sound to me, telling all these stories of the old time in Newfoundland,



MR. SMALLWOOD:

you sound to me like a lonely man. Are you lonely?" "Well", he said, "Mr. Smallwood I will tell you how it is. When I was in St. John's I knew everybody. Everybody knew me. I would leave my house on Pennies Hill Road and walk out to Paulins Cross and then walk down Prescott Street, and I would turn West and walk up Duckworth to the Courthouse and go in the Prime Minister's office. When it came lunch time I would walk out and walk down East to the foot of Prescott Street and then walk up Prescott Street, and I would walk across Paulins Cross and into my home and every step of the way. 'Good morning, Sir Edward.' 'Good morning, Pat.' 'Good morning, Sir Edward, how have you been.' 'Good morning Sir Edward.' 'How are you Mike.' I knew everybody and everyone knew me."

"Well", he said, "I have come over here. I have a very responsible position." This company owned their own building, it is not a big building, on New Bond Street. In the office next door is His Grace, the Duke of Devonshire. The next office to that His Grace,

MR. SMALLWOOD: the Duke there, and here is the Earle of this and there is the Marquis of that." So he said, "I am in good company and I have a very responsible position. I have a seat in the House at Lords, and I have a good income. The climate over here is pleasant. But," he said one day, "You are a much younger man than I am and one day you will probably write my obituary when I die." He said, "Whatever you say, say, but end it up with this, "He was an old tree transplanted.'" I have never forgotten that. He put it magnificently himself, and surely enough when he died I did repeat that, I wrote it or broadcast it or something of that nature. He was a very great figure, a very, very great figure.

I knew every politician, every member of the House of Assembly from 1900 to the last one. There were two or three in the last House that I did not know. I forget who they were but there were two or three here that are not here now. Except for them I have known every member of the House of Assembly elected from 1900 on. I knew them all.

Well more recently, Mr. Speaker, I have talked about the reforms that the Liberals brought in down through the years here in Newfoundland, the great reforms. But more recently to be a Liberal Reformer meant that you believed in and you gave strong support to the creation of the University, that was pure Liberalism, and to the building of seventeen trade schools, that was pure Liberalism, to the starting of the Technical College, the starting of the Fisheries College, the starting of the regional and central high schools, all pure Liberalism, all good reform. If you were a Liberal Reformer you agreed to the introduction of the school bus system, to the strengthening of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, to the -

MR. MORGAN: The Trade School was Toryism under Diefendbaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, never mind where we got the money. I am talking about the money we spent.

MR. MORGAN: It is in this context.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. That is not so. We built seventeen trade schools, partly with our own money, but mainly with Ottawa money, and there were trade schools before that -

MR. BOUFE: The Opposition argued against it at the time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If you were a Liberal Reformer you believed in the instituting of scholarships and bursaries. When the Liberal Government took office in 1949 there were three scholarships in Newfoundland, given by the Government of Newfoundland, three scholarships. When I went out of office there were 1400 scholarships and bursaries in Newfoundland. That was pure Liberalism.

If you were a Liberal Reformer you supported the new Department of Labour and the bringing of the new Workmen's Compensation Act and the formation of the new Workmen's Compensation Board. You were for the formation of fishermen's unions and co-operatives and the Fishermen's Loan Board. If you were a Liberal Reformer you approved and supported a programme of building new roads all around the Province, of putting in dozens and scores of water and sewer systems, of starting dozens of public libraries and several new Arts and Culture Centres.

Now in fairness I must say that not all of those particular reforms were opposed by the Tories. Some of them were, but not all. In short, Mr. Speaker, if you were a Liberal Reformer you wanted and you supported two things, development and reform.

MR. DOODY: Does the hon. member suggest that many of these programmes are now part of our problem in current account operating expense?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course they are. Yes, of course they are.

Now let me ask, Mr. Speaker, this question; will the need for reform ever end? I repeat the question; will the need for reform ever end? And I answer my own question;

MR. SMALLWOOD: yes, it will end, but it will end only when the perfect society comes on earth and no imperfection remains.

The great Liberal Laurier put it in magnificent words, now if the hon. members, especially the hon. the Minister of Finance, who is a thoughtful and somewhat erudite hon. gentleman, if he particularly will listen to the words of Laurier, "The principle of Liberalism," he said, " is inherent in the very essence of our nature, in that desire of happiness with which we are all born into the world, which pursues us throughout life and which is never completely gratified on this side of the grave. Our souls are immortal but our means are limited. We constantly gravitate towards an idea which we never attain. We dream of good but we never realize the best. We reach the goal we have proposed to ourselves only to discover new horizons opening up which we had not before even suspected.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We rush on towards them, and those horizons, explored in their turn, reveal to us others, which lead us on even further and further, and thus it will be as long as man is what he is, as long as the immortal soul inhabits a mortal body. But his desires will always be vaster than his tears and his actions will never rise to the height of his conceptions. His work always finished has always to be begun again."

These are noble words. The English essayist William Hazlitt put it very well too when he said, "It is essential to the triumph of reform that it should never succeed." Let me repeat that, "It is essential to the triumph of reform that it should never succeed." That is to say that it should never end, that it should never suffice. It should never be complete, that it never ends. As Laurier said, "As you reach the far off horizons you see horizons still farther off."

Mr. Speaker, my dearest wish is that the Liberal Party, of which I happen to be the founder—the present Liberal Party of this Province I founded. There was no Liberal Party. There was no party in Newfoundland. All the parties disappeared in 1934 with the coming of the Commission system of government. There was no House of Assembly. There were no elections. There was no Cabinet. There were no M.E.A.'s. There were no political parties. From 1934 to 1949 political parties disappeared off the face of the earth in Newfoundland. There were none. And when I became Premier of the Province on the 1st. of April 1949 and formed a Cabinet I was a Liberal, and most of the gentlemen I invited into my Cabinet were, I believe, Liberals; if not all, most of them were Liberals. But there was no Liberal Party. And there had to be a general election. The Terms of Union laid it down that there had to be a general election held in Newfoundland not later than a certain date. But there was no political party with which

MR. SMALLWOOD: to fight the election, so I decided I had to form a party, and I formed one. I formed the Liberal Party.

How did I do it? I sent Harold Horwood and I think Greg Power and one or two others to Port aux Basques where I had chartered a train, a train with ten or eleven passenger cars and she came from Port aux Basques stopping at every station from Port aux Basques to Topsail and then landed in St. John's with a trainload of delegates. They came in from Conception Bay and Trinity Bay by rail and by bus and by car and by truck, by dump truck even. They came into St. John's by coastal boat from Labrador and from all parts of Newfoundland, and we had a three day convention in the CLB Armoury where my resolutions were adopted unanimously and we constituted ourselves the Liberal Party, and where by secret ballot two leaders were elected, one to lead the Party federally, that was Gordon Bradley, and the other to lead the Party provincially, and that was myself. I was the founder, the organizer of the present Liberal Party. I was the founder, the organizer of the present Liberal - well not the present Liberal Association, but the Liberal Association.

MR. MURPHY: Who was the great benefactor for all that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I formed the Liberal Association because imbued as I was with the English style of politics, which appeals enormously to me, and what appeals to me is the fact that the Liberal Party of England and the Labour Party of England, and Scotland and Wales, and the Tory Party, all the parties are not just parliamentary parties. That is all they ever were in Newfoundland, they were parliamentary parties.

The Liberal Party consisted of those who got elected on the Liberal ticket and had seats in the House. The Tory Party were those who had been similarly elected but as Tories. They were the parties. There was no organic organization. There was no grass-roots movement. We had what we called the Liberal

MR. SMALLWOOD: Association of which Eric Cook, the present Senator Cook, was appointed by me to be President. I appointed him President. And I continued to appoint him yearly to be President for eight or ten years. It was a name, it was only a tag, it was a label, that is what the Liberal Association was.

And so I came to the conclusion, having it very strongly in mind then to get out of politics - I did genuinely want to get out. It was palling on me and getting on my nerves and I was getting fed up with it anyway - but I wanted to leave behind me a powerful grass-roots, people's movement, a movement of card-carrying Liberals, who would pay a fee to join and get their membership card, and then pay an annual fee as a membership fee, not for the sake of the money but on the double theory that if a man has got his membership card and kept paid up annually it gave him a sort of stake in the Party, it gave him a feeling of proprietorship that he was one of the owners of the Party. It gave the Party a widespread, democratic foundation. This was my hope. This was my theory.

Now what happened? What happened was - well, I called the meeting in Grand Falls and 1400 men and women turned up at the meeting.

AN HON. MEMBER: I was there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who was there?

AN HON. MEMBER: I was there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: As a delegate?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: By my invitation. Every one of the 1400 was invited personally by me. I sent each one a personal invitation. 1400 came to that great meeting.

AN HON. MEMBER: I still got the letter that you sent me.

MR. MURPHY: 1949?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. No.

AN HON. MEMBER: How come I did not get one?



MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman's seat mate had one, and he was present and he had his membership, his Liberal membership card.

AN HON. MEMBER: I still got the box.

AN HON. MEMBER: Any others? Any others?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. No. I do not want to embarrass anyone.

DR. FARRELL: Do not embarrass him. Do not embarrass him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. minister who just spoke and said, "Do not embarrass him," that is the hon. the Minister of Public Works. He was never so far as I know a Liberal unless it was back in his native Island, that other island. He was probably a Liberal over there. But he was not a Liberal here. He once came to a Liberal meeting -

DR. FARRELL: That is my routine, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - with me. That is what he did in Bay of Islands.

DR. FARRELL: I was not a bit afraid or ashamed to do so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, and I was delighted to have the hon. gentleman there.

MR. NEARY: He would not be ashamed to do it today either.

DR. FARRELL: No, Sir, that is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I am sure of that too.

MR. NEARY: That is one thing I will say about the hon. gentleman he is -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would say the same thing.

We formed the Association there in Grand Falls. Then I called the next one in Clarendville and another 1400, we had the Armoury there; And then I called the third one at Corner Brook and another 1400. There was a slight bit of overlapping, some were at all three meetings.

MR. NEARY: I was at all three of them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes,so was I.

Well a great battle ensued shortly after that. I wrote a letter to the President of the Association asking him to call a leadership convention to elect a new leader of the party,and my dear friend, Dr. Fred Rowe, whom I had consciously and very purposefully groomed, and groomed, and groomed and groomed to be

MR. SMALLWOOD:

my successor as leader of the party and Premier of the Province. My plan was that the Leadership Convention would be held. I would resign that day; the same day, they would elect a new leader. Now there now being a new leader of the party, I still being Premier, I would wait about a week and then resign as Premier and recommend the new leader for the Premiership and the Governor would have no choice but to accept that recommendation.

MR. DOODY: What year was that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: 1968. Well this was my plan for Dr. Howe to become leader of the Liberal Party and to become Premier. Unfortunately for that purpose he had no money. He got a little help here and there. One man gave him \$100, another man gave him \$500, another man forked out \$1,000. But it was pitiful the amounts of money that Fred Howe had, and it appeared very soon after the contest started that he was not going to make it, that he was going to be out-moned fifty to one, hundred to one, five hundred to one, fantastic sums of money were going to defeat him. So he and I talked it over and we agreed that something had to be done. His suggestion was that he should withdraw and that I should offer myself.

MR. ROVE: Whose suggestion?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Dr. Fred Howe's.

MR. ROVE: He suggested that he should withdraw?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. And for a very good reason. The good reason was that he was being swamped, inundated, swamped with money, not money for him but money against him, fantastic sums of money. I could tell that story, how much it was and where it came from and how it was gotten. That was quite a story. That was quite a story.

However, I said, "All right", and I ran -

AN HON. MEMBER: You could not get the money to help him, could you?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I helped him, yes. No! I could not get the money, no.

MR. ROVE: I am glad that you are the one who said that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. I could not get the money. So the drive went on for the leadership. Now here is what happened. There were perhaps as many as 8,000 or 10,000 persons who had paid their dollar and had their membership card, perhaps 10,000. But when the Leadership Convention was held there were 45,000 members. Who were the 45,000 members? I will tell you who they were. They were the people whose names were put in and the dollar put in for them. The dollar did not come from them. I know where the dollars came from.

The result was that a tug of war, a great battle started for membership cards, because it was only the members who could send the delegates in and in came the delegates. I took it two to one. So I am not proud of the Liberal Association. It is no longer a card-carrying organization. It is like the Tory Party. The Tory Party would say they are an organized party, but they are not. If they have a nominating meeting anyone who likes can come along, anyone. It is not like that anywhere else in the world. If you are a member of a party it has a membership, it is an organization and it has membership.

In Newfoundland anyone can come along and attend a Leadership Convention. Well, not a Leadership Convention but a convention to elect delegates to go to a Leadership Convention. Anybody can come along.

MR. MURPHY: Providing you live within that particular area, I think.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. Well, mostly so, yes. Normally, yes. The Liberal Association today is a fraud. It is an empty, hollow sham. That is what the Liberal Association is, and I would venture to say so is the Tory association, a hollow fraud, a sham.

MR. LUNDPIGAN: Open and democratic.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, open and democratic, yes. But it is a fraud. It is a hollow fraud, a hollow sham, in my opinion and I know something about it. It is not the idea that I had in forming the Liberal Association. So when I say that I formed the Liberal Association I should take that back and say not the present Liberal Association. I

MR. SMALLWOOD:

did not form that. I would not be proud to say that I had. The one I did form I was sort of proud that I formed that. It was a pretty big effort.

Well, here I am. I left the presently existing Liberal Party. I left it.

MR. POWE: After losing the leadership.

MR. SMALLWOOD: After losing the leadership. Does the hon. gentleman want me to tell now the inside story of that convention and how I lost it? Do you want to hear it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was the rottenest, it was the filthiest, it was the foulest piece of business ever to happen in any political movement in Newfoundland. It was that, that is what it was, rotten, filthy, foul, indecent and the overwhelming majority of the delegates who were there, 600 or 700 men and women, perfectly decent, honourable, fine people, fine citizens, it was not they who were guilty of the filth and the rottenness. I will also say this; it was not the gentleman who was elected leader of the party who is the present Leader of the Opposition, it was not he who committed the filth and the foul, dirty play. I attribute none at all of the blame to him, none of it. But it was a filthy, filthy game.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. gentleman should have thrown his delegates behind the member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) in that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons)? No, I would not have been able to do that.

I have been a Liberal longer than most of the present Liberal MPs have been alive in the world. I cast my first vote in 1919. I should not admit that because if you remember when I was born

AN HON. MEMBER: You were too young.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was too young. But those were the days when the slogan of all parties was, "Vote early and often", as the hon. member

MR. SMALLWOOD:

for St. John's Center (Mr. Murphy) will remember, "Vote Early And Often". And the big way to win St. John's West was to get out the Poor House vote. Then also to win Harbour Grace and Carbonear was to hire a boat to bring them over from Bell Island, and then hire someone to make the engine break down if the crowd on that boat were against you. Politics was a pretty rough game.

AN HON. MEMBER: But they were not sins in those days.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not sins, no.

MR. PECKFORD: You voted early in 1919. How many times did you vote in 1910?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, just once. I did not break the law.

MR. PECKFORD: I was wondering.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If you voted early and often you broke the law.

MR. WELLS: Where was the hon. gentleman living then?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In St. John's.

MR. WELLS: In St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. But that vote was not cast, my first vote was not cast for the Liberal Party. The Liberal candidates in St. John's West were Sir Richard Squires, Dr. Alexander Campbell and H.J. Brownrigg. Brownrigg later became Minister of Finance. Dr. Campbell became the leader of the House. He was defeated. So he went in the upper House and became leader of the government in the upper House and Sir Richard Squires became Premier.

The Tories had three candidates in the West End. It was a three man seat, as St. John's East was. Six men, two threes. The Tory candidates, I forget -

MR. MURPHY: Cashin and Funt.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Cashin, Charlie Hunt and Mullally?

MR. MURPHY: No Linegar.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Billy Linegar, right. But there were three other candidates that I voted for,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Linegar, Cadwell and Foley. Linegar was not a Tory. He became a Tory candidate in a subsequent by-election. But in the general election in 1919, November 2, the Linegar, Cadwell and Foley - John Cadwell up at the foundry, Michael Foley who was my commissioner when I became Premier. I had him there until he died, ten, twelve years, Mike Foley. Linegar was Billy Linegar the president of the Coopers' Union. That was the Workingmen's party, the first Labour party in Newfoundland.

MR. DOODY: All Irishmen, from the sound of it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not hear that.

MR. DOODY: They were all Irishmen, shocking is it not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, John Cadwell was not.

MR. ROWE: Who won?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Neither one of them won.

MR. MURPHY: Two Catholics and one non-Catholic.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. There were two Roman Catholics and John Cadwell, I do not know what he was. He was -

MR. DOODY: I was wondering if you could keep him in the grave, you see.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but he was in between. He was squeezed in between.

In less than a year the Labour Party having just simply vanished, we were left with two parties, Liberal and Tory, and I went Liberal. If there had been a Labour Party I think I would have stuck with that. So I have been a Liberal since 1920. How many years is that?

MR. MURPHY: Fifty-six.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Fifty-six years. There are not many hon. members on this side of the House who are fifty-six years old. I have been a Liberal longer continuously, without any deviation or break, for longer than mostly, all of them in fact, have been alive.

MR. ROUSSEAU: May I ask the hon. gentleman a serious question?

MR. ROUSSEAU:

If the Progressive Conservative Party had been in power in Canada in 1949 would the hon. gentleman still have formed the Liberal Party?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. No question at all about that, no.

MR. MURPHY: I asked that in 1962.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And I gave you the same answer. Well, there is no doubt about it. In Newfoundland—the only doubt I had was should he affiliate with either of the parties in Canada. I had my strong doubts. And for a while the Tories had their strong doubts here in St. John's as to whether they should link with the Tory Party of Canada or be an independent Newfoundland Tory Party. I considered that, too.

MR. DOODY: You thought it over?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, yes. Well, I am very glad that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland is still in communion, if that is the word, with the Liberal Party of Canada. I am very glad that they are followers of Mr. Trudeau as I am myself. There is no man in Canada today that I can even imagine being Prime Minister of Canada in place of Mr. Trudeau. I cannot think of anybody that I could even picture as Prime Minister. The others are not even in the same class as Mr. Trudeau.

Mr. Speaker, I want to —

MR. HOUSE: You have ruined your speech now. You have ruined your speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I have not. What I have said is said. Nothing is going to change that. I meant every syllable of it. It came right right out of my heart.

MR. HOUSE: I would like to ask you for the definition of a Liberal now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Good Lord, I have spent half the night.

MR. HOUSE: No, you cannot tell me. You have not told me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You mean in one sentence?



MR. HOUSE: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not think I could, no. I could improvise one and say a Liberal is a political reformer, but that is not very satisfactory, not adequate. There are reformers who are not Liberals. There are Liberals who are not reformers. But the combination of the two is pretty good.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who are the fellows who are guilty of this foul, dirty game?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman would like to hear then would he not? Well, I do not know that it would do any good. My ambition is not to be regarded by the Liberal Party of this Province, the Liberals of this Province who are perhaps twenty or twenty-five per cent of the people - in the main they are fifty years or age and older. The young crowd are neither Liberal, nor Tory, nor anything - I do not want the Liberals of Newfoundland, whether they are in the House or out of the House to regard me as a traitor to Liberalism or to regard me as an enemy of Liberalism, to regard me as a lapsed Liberal. I do not want anyone to think that. It is not true. I am as much a Liberal if not more a Liberal than at any time in all my life. I am afraid that it is dying off the face of the earth, though. It has died in England. In Canada there are only three provinces with Liberal governments, only three in the whole of Canada, which is not an encouraging fact. I am afraid it may disappear. I am afraid that its place will be taken by a more virile, more energetic, more idealistic reformist group, namely the NFP.

MR. DOODY: Is the Liberal Party in Quebec a reform party?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I would not say so. I would say that a man that I disliked very heartily brought some reform into the governing of Quebec, Jean Lesage, the Quiet Revolution was a veritable revolution and there were some very good reforms brought in there, though I detested the man himself - not in the beginning. In the beginning -

MR. DOODY: He reigned, though.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, King Jean I.

MR. DOODY: The present administration is a very conservative one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Bourassa? I do not know that conservative is the word. I would rather say nondescript. I think they are neither fish, foul nor good red herring, the government of Quebec at the present time.

MR. DOODY: They have thrown a few red herring across our low on tires boundary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, smelly ones, not Scotch cured.

MR. DOODY: No, nor medium -

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, right. My hope and my ambition is to see the Liberal Party take what I have said here tonight to heart, to believe it, to accept it, to accept the definition of Liberalism, and to become passionately devoted to reform. It is their only hope. No, they have another hope. The other hope is that the government will become so unpopular that the people will take anything rather than the crowd that are in. Now there is that hope. I am not saying that this is impossible. I am not saying, (a), that the government would not become that unpopular and (b), that the presently existing Opposition party by default, almost automatically would become the government, not by their being elected but by the government being defeated, which is sad to think of. That is a sad state for the great party of reform.

Ninety-nine per cent of the reforms that have ever come in politics in Newfoundland were brought by the Liberal Party, ninety-nine per cent of them.

MR. DOODY: They were in power ninety-nine per cent of the time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, the reason they were in power so long was that the people were Liberals, and the people were Liberals because they believed in Liberalism and Liberalism was the people, the people were Liberalism. The Liberal party were the people, the people were the Liberal Party. They were one and inseparable. Everybody in Newfoundland knew down to, you might say, Squire's time, and then they began -

MP. SMALLWOOD: Politics in Newfoundland began to be accursed in around 1920. It did. You might say when J.N. Kent went out, and even Sir William Lloyd went out, and certainly Sir Robert Bond before them, when those great Liberals went out and the newly formed Liberal Party, the Liberal Reform Party it was called, incidentally - you know how it was formed? The war was over, the war weariness, the disgust, the anger of people with everything that had happened during the war, their desire for a change. Sir Edward Morris who had a great following and great strength had accepted a seat in the House of Lords and was gone, and his followers were angry with him, so angry that when he came back years later and went down to the Regatta he got the cold shoulder.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Even men who had gone out and almost shed their blood for Sir Edward Morris gave him the cold shoulder because they said he deserted them. He was gone and the government were unpopular. There was a coalition. They broke the coalition and Sir Richard Squires, who had never cast a Liberal vote in his life, who had never been a Liberal candidate in his life, but who had run as a Tory candidate and been elected once but defeated and then appointed to the Upper House and was Leader of the Government in the Upper House, the Tory Government, and the Coalition Government, both, Sir Richard Squires was politician enough to see that the handwriting was on the wall for the government. But there was no Liberal Party. It had died. Sir William Lloyd had seconded the motion. He was Prime Minister, and a motion, want of confidence in the government, was moved across the floor and he seconded the motion, the Prime Minister seconded it, and it was put and carried and the government fell and he took a job as Registrar of the Supreme Court.

So Lloyd was gone. J. M. Kent had gone on the bench. Bond had retired. And the Liberal Party was dead. So Squires called his famous cock loft meeting. This was a meeting in the cock loft of The Daily Star building. He owned The Daily Star, on the corner of Adelaide Street and Middle Street.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where Tiller is now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is not Tiller on the Western corner? He is moved now to the Eastern corner, right. That is the building.

MR. DOODY: Adelaide Motors.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. He called a meeting in the attic, the empty attic of The Daily Star building and so his opponent promptly christened it the cock loft building.

In that meeting he was fortunate enough to have Charlie Udle,

MR. SMALLWOOD: who is the famous old Liberal, and he had five or eight or ten well known Liberals, Jack St. John, he had him there, he had the man from Bay Roberts, Bill Dawe, W. R. Dawe, who was the great war veteran. Everybody remembers W. R. Dawe, he was there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is he alive?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not know if Bill is living or not. Anyway he had a meeting of sixty or seventy people in the loft of The Daily Star building and there and then that night they launched the Liberal Reform Party. That is how parties were formed in those days. You could form a party in your own backyard or in the front room or in your kitchen.

MR. MURPHY: In the basement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Basement? Where is that? You mean the K of C building in - What basement? Where?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: In Freddie's basement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, oh yes.

MR. MURPHY: That was an historic occasion. What did you launch that day?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nothing. I try. I try.

MR. MURPHY: A torpedo launched -

MR. NEARY: She aborted, that one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I tried. I tried sincerely. It since turned out to be completely right, what I advocated was absolutely and completely right. However, that is another story.

Squires formed the Liberal Party, the Liberal Reform Party in fact, that was its full name. He made a coalition with Sir William Coaker. Now Coaker was a very powerful figure. He could command thirteen seats, including his own, on the Northeast Coast. Squires was not too sure he could win an election, so he wanted to form a Liberal-Union Party ticket, Liberal-Union, Fishermen's Protective Union Party and the Liberal Party, the Liberal-

MR. SMALLWOOD: Union Party. Coaker did not want Squires. He was very much opposed to Squires. He had attacked him endlessly for years in his newspaper, attacked Squires. Squires had attacked him. But Squires wanted Coaker and Coaker not, but Coaker wanted Willie Warren, W. R. Warren, who was a Liberal and also a Tory. He was a mixture in those days.

MR. NEARY: A convertable.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Willie Warren and Coaker talked it over and Coaker said to him, "You have got to get a paper, you have got to get yourself a paper." So Warren did not have the money to start a newspaper and there was not time anyhow, so he went to see W. J. Herder, the owner, the proprietor, the sole proprietor of The Evening Telegram, and The Telegram was the great thunderer, the old thunderer, it was the great Liberal paper. The Telegram from its founding in 1870, around there, until about 1920, The Telegram was the great Liberal paper of Newfoundland, powerful, ardent, enthusiastic Liberal paper. It was the organ of Liberalism in Newfoundland.

Warren went to see Mr. Herder and asked him if The Telegram would support him. Herder said, "For what?" "Well," he said, "for the election." He said, "Who is in it?" He said, "Well I am going to be in it." "Yes, who with?" "Squires." "No." So Warren could not get the support of The Telegram and he had no newspaper support. Squires had his own paper, The Daily Star, which was a very excellent paper, good journalistically speaking, it was a good paper. And so because Squires had a paper Coaker agreed to form the coalition with him and it was the Squires-Coaker Party.

Coaker was a Liberal. He was a union man. He was an FPU man, but all his ideology, his whole approach to life was Liberal and he had been a Liberal all his life. His votes had been given to the Liberal Party. But now he had the Union

MR. SMALLWOOD: Party started and it was the Liberal-Union Party coalition. From that day until the Liberal Party was reborn in 1949 the Liberal Party of Newfoundland was not a truly Liberal Party. I supported it. I worked for it. I edited some of its -

MR. HOUSE: Why was it not a Liberal Party?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not realize that it was not a Liberal Party. I know now that it was not. I did not know then.

As a matter of fact I thought of getting printed as a pamphlet -

MR. NEARY: Boys, what have you got in the back room tonight?

AN HON. MEMBER: Chicken. Chicken.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I wrote in a paper that I edited, a Liberal paper, The Daily Globe, I wrote a series of articles called, "What is Liberalism?", and it ran every day for about two weeks. I remember that Sir Robert Bond wrote me from Whithourne congratulating me and Judge Kent, J.M. Kent, wrote me, a member of the Bench, and congratulated me and I received a lot of congratulations because they told me as far as I knew it was so, but they told me that it was so, namely that it was the first time that Liberalism had ever been defined in Newfoundland in print.

I have those clippings now and I thought it might be an interesting thing if I got them reprinted as a pamphlet, "What is Liberalism?" Now the fact that I was asking the question showed that I was discontented with the Liberal Party as it was. I did not understand as well then as I do now. I did not understand the whole philosophy of Liberalism as well as I do now, and I did not understand the Newfoundland people as well then as I have come since to understand them, so now I am better able to appraise the Liberal Party of 1910 to - when did the Commission come? - 1934, from 1920 to 1934, those fourteen years of the reborn Liberal Party.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There have been three Liberal Parties in Newfoundland. The old original Liberal Party, which died when Bond went out. The new Liberal Party that Squires formed and promptly went into coalition with the EPU, with Sir William Coaker, and the present Liberal Party which was formed in 1949 by me, of which I am not now presently a member. I do not know whether I ever will be. I never will so long as it continues to be what I think it is now.

MR. MURPHY: You are not even an honorary member of the Liberals?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I am not. No.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. I am a Liberal. Remember that the definition of a Liberal is not one who is a member of the Liberal Party. That is not a necessary definition of a Liberal. There are many, many Liberals



MR. SMALLWOOD:

who are not members of the Liberal Party. I would not say there are many Liberals who vote Tory. But there are Liberals who have suspicion of the present Liberal Party, who are out of love with it, who are disenchanted by it. There are lots of Liberals, and there are lots of Tories in Newfoundland who are disenchanted with the alleged Tory Party. As a matter of fact perhaps it would be true to say that the only political ideology we have in Newfoundland today is the NDP. They have got an ideology. I share some of it. I am thinking of the NDP here in our own Province, here in Newfoundland.

MR. ROOBY: They think they are the trade labour movement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. I do not believe I could imagine myself joining the NDP. I do not think so. I share many of the things that they believe, they advocate, and who does not?

MR. ROOBY: Motherhood.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. My hope, my dearest hope is that I can play some part - it can be a humble part. It does not have to be a leading part - some part in having the Liberal Party regenerate. Who was it said that every generation needs regeneration? If the Liberal Party is just the alternate Tory Party, is just the crowd that are out hoping to get in, if the Tory Party are just the crowd that are in and want to stay in, if those are the differences - I have listened to the members. There are so many members on this side of the House that I admire intensely. I have listened to every word that has been uttered here. I do not think I have missed a speech by any hon. gentleman. I must say that I respect the improvements I noticed in the leader of the party, in his speeches. He is a better speaker now than he was in the House when I was in the House before. But he has got with him a number of magnificent young men and I have listened intensely.

Over there across from me are some magnificent young men, and some not quite so young, but splendid and I admire and respect. Now I ask myself - the financial critic of the shadow Minister of Finance over

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Here is the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). He is the shadow Minister of Finance. I have listened to him and I have listened to him and I have listened to the Minister of Finance and I have read his budgets. And I ask myself: If the present shadow Minister of Finance became the Minister of Finance -

MR. DOODY: God forbid!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Never mind, God forbid! That is not generous at all.

MR. DOODY: I would like to leave it out for the electorate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Leave it out. The shadow Minister of Finance becomes Minister of Finance and the Minister of Finance becomes shadow minister, he comes over here. Now I ask myself what would the new Minister of Finance do, what would his policy be -

MR. DOODY: He is going to be jumping around.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I know that the Premier is the real Minister of Finance in any government whether he has that title or not.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, oh!

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, he did not say that.

MR. MORGAN: He would spend, spend, spend.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, no.

MR. MORGAN: Oh yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not the shadow Minister of Finance.

ALL HON. MEMBERS: He echoed it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did he? Did he echo it? Well not the hon. gentleman is talking politics. He is talking little small peanut politics. I am trying to talk politics on a broader canvas.

MR. MURPHY: Since eleven o'clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Okay. I can talk little stuff, you know, but I have not done it. Have you noticed, Mr. Speaker, since I came in this House last November I have not indulged in any pettifoggery, picayune, peanut, trifling, piddling politics?

MR. DOODY: You never mentioned Liberalism since you came in.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, yes but that is on the broad scale. That is on the broad brush, the broad canvas.

MR. MURPHY: You probably mellowed like myself.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I am not mellowed. However, he becomes the new Minister of Finance. In what way and in what respects and in what programme and in what policy, in what philosophy is he different, would he be different from the present Minister of Finance? Now I will put it another way. An hon. gentleman for whom I have come to have enormous respect - I spoke of him earlier tonight - he is one man who is paying \$10,000 a year for the proud privilege of having a seat in this House. He is the only one in the House, unless it be the government House Leader and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). But here is an hon. member who is lashing out \$10,000 a year, which he cannot afford to do, for the privilege of being a member of this House. He is an educator. He is a school inspector and he is an authority on education. He becomes Minister of Education tomorrow in place of the present Minister of Education, to whom I have listened with great interest and great respect. The present Minister of Education in my view is a fine Newfoundlander, he is an excellent member, he is an excellent minister and I believe that he commands the respect of every hon. gentleman in this chamber on both sides.

I would say that the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) more than most of us respects the present Minister of Education. But now they change places -

MR. HOUSE: I have my troubles, too.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They change places and he becomes Minister of Education. He will certainly be as good a Minister of Education as the present minister is, no doubt of that. In their personal qualities, in their personal qualifications, you know, it is six of one and half a dozen of the other. But how could you tell which was the Liberal and which was the Tory?

MR. BOOTH: The Liberal would want to spend \$25 million more.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If there is such a thing as a Liberal policy on education that distinguishes the Liberal Party from the party over there - it is habit for me to call them the Tory Party, but when so many of them are lifelong Liberals, you know, how can I call them Tories? and furthermore as they are, in fact, not Tory, not Tory in philosophy, not Tory in outlook, not Tory in policy, not Tory in Programme. The only Tory I think who is over there is not here at the moment. He spoke earlier tonight. But he is probably the last of the Mohicans.

MR. MOONEY: He is wrestling with the problem.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. What I am trying to examine and ask especially the hon. members on this side of the House, I am asking them to examine with me the essential differences there are, and if not ought to be, the essential differences between the Liberal Party and the Tory Party so-called, the essential differences. Not the difference that one is in and wants to stay in and the other is out and wants to get in, not that difference. That is not basic. I do not find any difficulty, Mr. Speaker, I do not find any difficulty at all understanding the anxieties, the eagerness of the gentlemen across wanting to remain in the government. That is easy to understand. No puzzle about that. I can well understand the desire, the anxiety of hon. gentlemen on this side to be in the government and to be doing things rather than criticizing the people who are doing it. This I can understand. That is not enough difference. There must be more difference than that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: or the parties will disappear and be replaced by other parties. And remember that the creation, the growth, the expansion of a genuine Liberal Party will inevitably result in the creation of a Tory Party. What is the philosophical term that describes that? Thesis, synthesis, antithesis. How does it go? It does not matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: Metamorphosis.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, maybe so. It does not matter. The House knows what I mean. To have a good Liberal Party, passionately devoted to Liberalism, which is the long way of spelling the word "reform", have a Liberal Party passionately, consciously, proudly, devoted, dedicated to reform and God in Heaven, Mr. Speaker, was there ever a place that needed reform as much as Newfoundland needs it. Am I trying to ram down the throats of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House an unpopular, an unsound, a stupid idea, something that is not wanted, something that is foreign? Never was there a time when reform was so desperately needed as it is need now in Newfoundland and Labrador and you cannot tell me one side of life, one aspect of life, one branch of life in Newfoundland and Labrador where reform is not needed. You cannot tell me anything that is okay as it is.

We were talking here in the debate on a bill brought in by the Premier. Today was it? Yesterday, today -

AN HON. MEMBER: Yesterday.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yesterday, yes the day before today. And the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) told us, some of us knew and realized and are a little bit dismayed and a little bit discouraged and a little bit disconcerted about it, namely the present state of mind of the tens and scores of thousands of young men and women, the younger crowd in Newfoundland up to thirty years of age - who are over half the population remember? - they are over half our Newfoundland people today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do you think, Mr. Speaker, is there anyone unimaginative enough or complacent enough to imagine that the young crowd growing up today, many of them better informed that we are ourselves here, more alert minded, more curious minded, does anybody imagine that they are going to fall for the guff, Liberal Party, Tory Party, Progressive Conservative Party, PC Party? They are not going to fall for names and titles and tags. They are not. But whether the NDP has the skill to attract the youth, the young blood, the young idealism there is welling up like an ocean in Newfoundland or not I do not know. I rather doubt that they have.

In the Liberal Party there is one deposit that they have inherited, they have got a certain natural instinct for politics that the NDP has not got. The Tory Party has the same thing. I would say that the Liberal Party, if it reforms itself by becoming the Party of reform, can not only win the next election but stay in office for the next twenty-five years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twenty-five years.

MR. SIMMONS: The Liberal Party, come on over.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Liberal Party if they become the party of reform, the party of reform.

MR. MURPHY: The day of miracles has not passed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am glad to see the hon. gentleman with his hat on. I was powerfully tempted to do it. I enquired as to whether the tradition was carried on in the four years I was absent.

MR. MURPHY: Your old buddie Rossie.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Carried on?

MR. DOODY: Have sense now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, I am glad it is on tonight. And let us try to forget, pretend that it did not happen that four years passed without it being done. It is done tonight.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) did it.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it was done, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was it done?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Good. Let us at least keep that tradition going.

MR. MURPHY: Trying to establish a record.

MR. SMALLWOOD: At least once in every session. It would be a good idea if everybody wore his hat but tradition is you cannot stand in the House covered. You must uncover to stand. I would see Sir Michael Cashin stalk into the Chamber and go over to his place and sit down and slam his boulder hat on. I can see him now when he stood up to speak, take his hat off and lay it on the desk, Mr. Speaker, and as soon as he finished he sat down and put his hat back.

In the House of Commons in Westminster they used to wear their silk hats. All the members on both sides of the House with their silk hats on, except when they spoke and then they had to uncover, of course. And we were letting that tradition die out here, which is a little stupid.

Let us not ever reach the point where we merit the definition of the mule or the donkey, no pride of ancestry and no hope of posterity. Let us take pride in the traditions of this House because if we lose our traditions I think we lose everything.

Mr. Speaker, in this present calendar year, 1976, 1,000 young Newfoundlanders will graduate from the College of Technology, having spent one, two, three, four years in that College, 1,000 will come out as graduates. And from Memorial University 1,500 will come out, having been there a year, one, two, three, four, maybe five years, 1,500. From the College of Fisheries, Navigation, Deep Sea Engineering, Electronics, 3,500. Now most of those 3,500 will not have been there more than a year, some a bit less than a year but some two years or even three, 3,500. And from the seventeen trade schools, 5,500 will graduate this year, and from grade eleven 6,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So there you have 14,500, round it out at 14,000 young Newfoundlanders coming on the labour market this year. You had the same last year. You will have the same next year.

If I were the Premier, and I guess he has his moments when he does it too, if I were the Premier I would sweat blood at the thought of 14,000 or 15,000 smart, bright, ambitious, young Newfoundland men and women pouring out this year, 1,000 from the Technical College, 1,500 from the University, 3,500 from the College of Fisheries, 5,500 from the seventeen trade schools and 3,000 grade eleven. 14,000 young Newfoundlanders coming out, full of life, full of giner, full of vim, full of ambition, want to get ahead in life, the world at their feet, the world their oyster, 14,000 of them and 14,000 last year is 28,000 and 14,000 next year is 42,000.

I had a terribly sad experience of seeing 1,100 jobs lost down at Fort Pepperrell when the American Base closed, and I had the sadder experience of seeing 1,200 jobs lost, civilian jobs at Stephenville, and 2,300 jobs at Bell Island, and 2,000 jobs at Argentia, and 2,000 jobs at Goose Airport and 1,500 longshoremen and 10,000 loggers. I was looking at a letter today, I was look through some stuff, a letter today from the President or the Vice-President of Bowaters. He gave me the figures in reply to a letter I wrote him. How much pulpwood did you have in 1940 and how many loggers? In 1945 how many loggers - fifty, fifty-five, sixty and so on.

Bowaters, I have forgotten the figures at the moment, but they have 100,000 cords more in the latest year than in the earlier year, 100,000 more cords of wood and 6,000 or 7,000 fewer men,



MR. SMALLWOOD:

the chain saw, so on, mechanized operation. Five thousand fishermen, and 500 at Come By Chance - that was not in my time - leave them out and you have 25,000 jobs lost. They were there and they are not there. They are gone. But they were there, 25,000 jobs, 2,300 over on the island where the Minister of Finance now is the member, 2,300 men.

MR. NEAHEY: I was one of them who lost his job.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twenty-three hundred men, 25,000 jobs that disappeared while I was Premier. There were some new jobs in that same time. There were 5,000 new teachers. There were 5,000 new teachers the day I went out of office, 5,000 teachers more than there were the day I went in office. There were 5,000 new civil servants jobs, provincial, and 5,000 new federal civil servants, 10,000 more shop and office jobs and 3,000 more garage and service station, gas station jobs, and 15,000 new truck driver jobs and 3,000 new jobs in banks and finance companies and insurance companies.

MR. MORGAN: Fifteen thousand truck drivers in how many years?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, this is the additional jobs. I am listing here the additional jobs there came to be under those headings in the period during which I was Premier; the jobs that were lost during the same period, 25,000 jobs lost; and gained banks, finance companies, insurance companies, 3,000; and hotels and motels and lounges and taverns, etc., etc., 3,000. That is 49,000 new jobs. That is very good arithmetic, 49,000 new jobs and 25,000 jobs lost. So not so bad.

But, Mr. Speaker, when you consider the numbers of Newfoundlanders that came of age, of working age, who came into the work force or at least wanted to come into the work force. They did not come into it unfortunately; there were no jobs for them. But every year of those years a great number of additional persons became available for work. This year as I have just said, 14,000. Last year 14,000. Next year 14,000. So when you look at the new jobs it is pretty wonderful that today we have 8,000 teachers. The minister told us

MR. SMALLWOOD:

around 8,000, between -

MR. HOUSE: Seventy-seven hundred.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Seventy-seven hundred rounded out, 8,000 teachers.

The day I became Premier there were 2,400 teachers. Now that is fine. That is 5,000 or more than 5,000 new jobs for teachers. God bless Newfoundland, but God bless the Minister of Finance too. He needs it. Then we have got now 5,000 more provincial civil servants than we had. That is 5,000 jobs, but again pity the Minister of Finance. Then again federal civil servants, 5,000 more than we had and so on. Some of these jobs are productive jobs, not many. The teachers are not productive, I mean in the economic sense. They are productive of much good but they are not productive of wealth, of goods that you can weigh and measure, physical goods. In the economist's language the teachers are not producers nor are the civil servants, provincial nor the civil servants, federal nor the shop and office workers nor the garage and service station. The truck drivers, I would say, yes, they are part of the economic productive process.

Banks and finance, 3,000, no. Hotels, motels, no. So out of the 49,000 there are about 15,000 who are in the productive economy of the Province. If we had not had the drainage that we did have on our population by out migration we would be in an awful condition tonight. Mr. Speaker, in the eleven years, from 1962 to 1973 - I have not got the figures for later than that - the labour force increased by 71,000. From 1962 to 1973, eleven years, the labour force increased by 71,000, an average of 6,400 a year in that period. But the net loss by out migration in the same period was 49,000, an average of 4,400 a year. So the gain of the labour force after we lost so many by out migration is actually 4,400 from 6,400, that is 2,400 added on to the labour force. Now if it had been all of them and no out migration, God in heaven, what kind of state would we be in tonight?

MR. WELLS: These figures on migration, are these DBS figures?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, they are. Now it is called Statistics Canada. Look ahead - they say a politician looks ahead to the next election and a statesman to the next generation. Let us look ahead one generation, say ten years, to the next ten years in Newfoundland. I want to break the Premier's heart.

PREMIER MOORES: Not again!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Never mind hiding behind that. Now listen to this and get heartbroken. In the next ten years from the the education world we are going to have 14,000 a year, that is 140,000 in the next ten years coming out, ambitious, eager, eager swears, wanting to go to work, 140,000 young Newfoundlanders. The labour force, if it increases at the same rate in the next ten years as it did in those eleven years, that is 6,400 a year, that is 64,000. Now if the emigration should be the same as it was in those eleven years, that is 4,400 a year in the next ten years that is 44,000. If half of those who go out, who emigrate, are not workers, you know, their wives, their children, if half of them are workers, that is 22,000. So in the next ten years just to stay even you have got to create 4,200 new jobs each year, 4,000 new jobs.

I sometimes think of young Parker. Remember the statement that young Parker - I think of that when I look at these figures, our birth rate, the growth of our population, the numbers pouring out of our schools and education institutions, the number that emigrate, the increase in the labour force. I do not mean jobs but labour force. Let us say people who are available for jobs, if there are jobs. When you look at that picture for the next ten years, you would almost jump over the wharf. That is what I meant. I did not mean literally I wanted to break the Premier's heart, not for a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I lashed out about \$48 million while I was Premier to help start new industries. Some of those industries have flopped, have been awful failures, have flopped, failed, closed down and proved to be a dead loss on the treasury. But, Sir, the capital that we put into them, the government, came to \$48 million.

Mr. Smallwood.

The cement mill, the gypsum mill, the plywood mill, the partical board mill, the machine plant at Donovans, the battery plant, the rubber plant, the cut and sew plant, the chocolate factory, the shoe factory, the glove plant, the tannery, the leather clothing factory, Atlantic Films, the magnesia plant out on the West Coast, the steel mill, the woollen mill, the shipyard, the two Clarenville plants, cresoting and asphalt - \$48 million. Those plants, Mr. Speaker, have paid back into the treasury \$15 million. So we are out \$33 million. That is the sad story. We are out \$33 million. But, Sir, that is the story of twenty-five years. Of those plants, the cement mill and the gypsum plant and the plywood mill and the partical board mill and the machine place at Donovans, the cut and sew plant, the shoe plant, Atlantic Films, the shipyard and the two Clarenville plants, ten of those are still operating, and they have received out of the Newfoundland economy through the hands of the government, the government took it out of the economy and handed over to them \$48 million. They got back \$15 million so that the economy is out \$33 million at my instigation.

But, Sir, it is not all loss. They have paid into the economy a very substantial sum of money running to about \$200 million. What did they pay into the economy? Well what they have paid into the economy, the cement mill has a number of men working, and they have received wages. The cement mill makes certain purchases within the economy. The cement mill pays certain rates and so on in the economy, and I dare say they pay some taxes into the town council out there. Similarly with the gypsum plant and the plywood plant and the partical board plant and so on, they employ people, they pay wages. And if you add up their wages for the twenty-five years that they have been operating, and all of the money that they have paid into the Newfoundland economy - I do not mean into

Mr. Smallwood.

the Newfoundland Government, I mean into the economy of Newfoundland - it comes to \$200 million. Suppose the present Minister of Industrial Development - he is not here - had an opportunity to lay out \$48 million taking a chance on this industry and that and the other, on this promoter and that promoter and the other, on this entrepreneur and that entrepreneur and the other, taking chances, as I did, today, he had chances now to start to help to finance forty-nine plants, industrial enterprises, knowing that some of them were going to flop, some were going to fail, some were going to survive, some were going to succeed, but he was going to pay out \$48 million, and he was going to get back by the end of the twenty-five years, he was going to get back \$15 million, so he would still be out \$33 million at the end of twenty-five years, but those same industries had paid at the end of the twenty-five years \$200 million into the Newfoundland economy, and they were still there, and they were going to be there for still another ten, twenty, thirty years. - the cement mill will be there another twenty or thirty years, the gypsum plant will be there another twenty or thirty years, at least, to come and so on - and as of now they have paid in this huge sum of money, if he had that chance would he say no to it? Would the Minister of Finance say no to it? If he had that opportunity would he say no to it?

MR. DOODY: I do not know. I cannot really say. The rubber plant, the chocolate plant and all these things were not successful.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of all these plants, some survived, some died. But altogether those that lived, those that died took \$48 million; \$15 million came back into the Treasury so it was a net of \$33 million. That is what it cost the treasury. Some will still come back, you understand; the cement mill is still paying some back, and the gypsum plant, and other plants are still paying the minister. The minister gets it every year.

MR. DOODY: The hardwood plant is a good industry.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And other plants will keep paying money in but already -

MR. DOODY: The asphalt plant only pays because it has a captive audience, the government of Newfoundland buys the asphalt to pave the roads.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But if the Government of Newfoundland did not have that plant the Government of Newfoundland would have to buy its asphalt from outside the Province.

MR. DOODY: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right. So it is a good thing to have it.

So I say frankly, if I had my time over again - which, of course, I will not - but if I were back now twenty-five years ago, knowing what I know now, would I have been willing to risk lending money to those Germans and Englishmen and Canadians and Latvians that came in here, would I be willing to lend \$49 million to them if I knew then what I know now, that some of them would fail, the rubber plant would fail, the leather goods plant would fail, the tannery would fail, the battery plant would fail and so on -

MR. DOODY: The machine plant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, the machine plant is going great guns in there, not as good as we had hoped.

MR. DOODY: McNamara Industries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well whatever you call them. They are there.

MR. DOODY: The chocolate plant failed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And they are going, and they pay money into the treasury every year.

If I had the chance to do that over again, knowing that at the end of twenty-five years one-third of them would be gone, but two-thirds would be operating, money would still be coming into the treasury, but they would still be employing Newfoundlanders, they would still be paying millions each year into the Newfoundland economy, and they were good for another twenty-five years, I would not hesitate to take that chance again.



Mr. Smallwood.

That is why I said to the Minister of Industrial Development and Rural Development, never mind, take your chances, lend \$10,000 to this little enterprise and \$40,000 to that, and you are going to have failures. You are going to have flops. But every job you create in Newfoundland is a victory. Every job is an accomplishment. Every job is a triumph. By that is logical we should close up shop in Newfoundland. Nature is against us, and so it is a struggle just to stay here. It is a titanic struggle to keep our people from pulling up stumps and getting out of Newfoundland. It is a tremendous task for a government to keep people cheerful, to keep them hopeful, to keep them confident, to keep them optimistic, to keep them from going sour and saying, "To hell with Newfoundland, I am going to get out of this place. I can make a better future for myself and my family in Ontario or British Columbia or Manitoba or Alberta or somewhere else." The struggle we have in Newfoundland to give our youngsters an education, to give our people hospitals, to build roads, to do paving, to give water and sewerage, the struggle to do that, the struggle to get jobs for unemployed young Newfoundlanders coming up is titanic. It is incredible. And you might almost say it is impossible, but it is not impossible. It is "Paddy Keefe" to it. It is pretty close to it. It is a gigantic task. And the more you look at it in the round and try to project the figures into the future, the more you are inclined to be pessimistic, but, of course, it is never say die. You do not give in. You do not surrender. You keep on. You keep on battling and fighting.

True, if you are Minister of Finance and you have got smart young fellows down in the Treasury Board, you will be a Jeremiah in cabinet, and you will be throwing cold water on every suggestion that every minister makes, and they will all make their suggestions in scores and hundreds of the money they want to spend in their district and in their district, and in their district, and my district, and my district, and your district, the money we want to spend, and the

June 3, 1976

Tape no. 3222

Page 5

Mr. Smallwood.

Minister of Finance seeing this picture in the round, and I hope he does, I hope he sees it in the round, I hope he is not budgeting just from year to year - the law requires us to budget from year to year.



MR. SMALLWOOD:

The Exchequer Act - I think that is what it is called, is it not?  
What is the name of the Act?

MR. DOODY: Financial Administration Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - requires annual budgeting, sure, but while you have to budget annually you have to think in longer blobs of time than just twelve months ahead. Anyone who does that in Newfoundland today, there is only one way he can prevent becoming a complete pessimist. That is to become realistically and savagely determined to curb spending and above all to curb borrowing, not what it is alleged somebody said on this side of the House, borrow and borrow and spend and spend. We could borrow and borrow as long as they will allow us to borrow, as long as they will lend any money to us.

MR. DOODY: Like Canadian banks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the minister has discovered that that is the trouble.

MR. DOODY: No, that was not a great revelation. It was not a striking one. We learned that in 1939 and now we are square.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. This year he has got a little bill of \$125 million to find and ship it out of the Province. Does the minister remember, does he know, of the \$125 million, how much of that has got to go out of the Province. Of the interest, how much has got to go out? And how much is paid to bond holders who live in the Province? In other words, by what amount has he got to drain our economy this year?

MR. DOODY: As the hon. member well knows if we were dependent on our own local investors, we would all be out in dories tonight.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If you had the dories. The trouble would be where would you get the dories.

MR. DOODY: The merchants would not even provide the money for the dories.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right.

MR. DOODY: But charge them to your widow.

MR. HOUSE: The red Tory is it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Paul Kellver.

MR. DOODY: That is what he called me to his everlasting chagrin. The amount of the - the question the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) directed to the hon. Minister of Finance - the amount of the funded public debt owed within the Province and the total amount of interest paid thereon in the latest year available. Answer, \$1,315.5 million public debt, \$84.4 million interest in our latest year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is that first figure?

MR. DOODY: \$1,315.5 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$1300 million.

MR. DOODY: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is what?

MR. DOODY: Is the public debt, the funded public debt owed within the Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Owed within the Province.

MR. DOODY: That is what it says here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, nonsense!

MR. DOODY: That is what I would say.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is nonsense, \$1300 thousand, \$1.3 billion. No, no!

MR. DOODY: That cannot possibly be.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is outside the Province. In fact it is more than that.

MR. DOODY: Owed within the Province. I guess -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well it is all owed -

MR. DOODY: I misinterpreted your question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is all owed within the Province. It is owed within this House.

MR. DOODY: Yes, I know. You meant how much had we borrowed from people -

MR. SMALLWOOD: But the bond holders live outside and the interest

MR. SMALLWOOD:

has to be sent out to them and our economy has to be drained and weakened by that amount.

MR. DOODY: I would probably suggest somewhere in the nature of fourteen or fifteen dollars or something. You know the usual largess of the Newfoundland financial community and their faith in our future.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Out of our grand total funded, net funded public debt I would guess that not three per cent of it is held by Newfoundlanders in Newfoundland.

MR. DOODY: I think that is a very Liberal estimate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the rest of it is a fantastic sum of money that has to be found by the minister every year and shipped away to bond holders, lenders, money lenders who lent us the money by buying our bonds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend an hour or two -

AN HON. MEMBER: Next month.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not necessarily the next hour or two, but an hour or two to discuss something which is the second dearest thing to my mind, to my heart, the dearest being the Liberal Party and the need, the desperate need, the fatal need to get it to become a genuine Liberal Party again. But the next to that is, what in the name of God are we going to do in this Province to keep our people here? I used to say, you know, develop or perish, and I used to be criticized for saying that the choices we had were those two, to develop or perish.

Then someone said to me, "What do you mean perish? You mean if we do not develop the people will perish?" "Yes. Well, Newfoundland will perish!" "Well how will Newfoundland perish?" "By loss of blood." "Well, do you mean the people are going to be shot or wounded or slashed with knives and they are going to bleed to death?" "No, I do not mean that the people will bleed to death but I do mean that Newfoundland will bleed to death." "Well how can Newfoundland bleed to death?" "I will tell you how.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

"If you take a smart young fellow or a girl and put that youngster in school and right on up to Grade XI and then on into the university by the time that youngster comes out at the age of eighteen or nineteen or twenty that child has cost Newfoundland at least \$25,000 or \$30,000. Now if that youngster goes off to Toronto and gets a job and if 10,000 go off and if 20,000 go off, if 100,000 go off that means that Newfoundland is bleeding to death. That is the way that Newfoundland could bleed to death. The blood would not be spilled on the streets. The blood would be in the veins of our people who would carry it with them to Toronto and Newfoundland would bleed to death!"

How in God's name, how are we going to organize things that there will be jobs for our people? Jobs, jobs, jobs, when you are asleep you should be dreaming it, "Jobs for our people!" Because if you do not get jobs they are going to quit. They are going to leave Newfoundland. Do not overlook the possibility of a terrific slump, a slump that would come that would hit us like a sledge between the eyes, a sudden emergence, a sudden uprising of the out migration. If the younger crowd that are growing up today in Newfoundland, that is over half the population, if ever they get it in their minds that there is no future in Newfoundland, there is no future here, Newfoundland has no future, what are they going to do? If they have any emption at all, what are they going to do? They are not going to stay in a place believing it to have no future. They are going to get out. They are going to get out while the going is good. They are going to get out and make a career, make a life somewhere else.

That is the peril, that is the danger we live in in this Province. We are always in danger of going down the drain, a terrific danger. We are fighting up hill all the time. We are fighting against gravity. We are fighting almost against nature. We are fighting against the laws of economics. It is a desperate battle in Newfoundland!

MR. SMALLWOOD:

to develop the Province. I do not mean develop schools. All you need to develop schools and hospitals and roads and paving and water and sewerage is money. But to develop the Province productively so as to have productive industry and productive jobs, remembering always that funny term of mine that used to arouse such amusement - it does not anymore - the multiplier effect of jobs.

If you count up all the industrial workers, the productive workers in Corner Brook and count up all the people who are working in Corner Brook but not working in the pulp and paper industry, not working in the foundry there, not working in the cement mill and not working in the Gypsum plasterboard plant, not working in the productive industries, count them and then count all the others and you know what you will find in Corner Brook. For every productive worker there are two and a half other workers. Who are they? School teachers, doctors, nurses, shop keepers, shop workers, office workers, taxi drivers, beauty parlor people, hotels, motels, taverns, restaurants, snack bars, movie theaters, everything you can think of. Two and a half jobs in Corner Brook for every one job in industry and there would not be any there without the one job in industry, would there?

So the multiplier effect there is two and a half. In Grand Falls it is two. In Buchans it is half of one to one. The hon. gentleman is not here at the moment. If you take the Province as

MR. SMALLWOOD: as a whole, you will find in some places the multiplier is three to one, in other places two and a half to one, in some places two, and the more you get away from the coast line, the more you get interior, land locked interior, the smaller is the number of multiplier jobs. But taking the whole Province it is two and a half. Therefore if you have 500 men working in the refinery at Come By Chance you can figure two and a half other men that are working, earning their living that would not be but for the refinery.

You take the cod fishery. What has a codfish got to do with a biscuit factory or a bakery here in St. John's? Some of the products of that factory, the margarine plant, you can think of different plants here in St. John's where the people working in them you know do not think there is any connection between them and their industry on the one hand and say the fishery or the mine in Buchans or the mine in Labrador City on the other hand. But the fact of the matter is that some of the wages of all of the workers in all of the factories here in St. John's come out of the mines in Buchans and Bale Verte and Labrador City and the City of Wabush, come out of the construction jobs around the Province, come out of the fishing industry, come out of all the productive industries of the Province.

There may not be one person in the biscuit factory here all of whose pay comes from those industries, but some of the pay of all of them. And you have an equivalent of two and a half persons who get their pay out of the industries that employ one person.

If somebody comes to the government and wants to start an industry, or the government goes to someone and says, "Why do you not come and start an industry?" there is a question of whether or not the government will put some money in it. Number one - may I say this - there is not a government in Canada, of the ten Provincial Governments, not one, there is not one Government

MR. SMALLWOOD: of the fifty American States, not one, but pumps money as loans or gifts.

In Ontario they give a lot of gifts called non-repayable loans, a loan that is non-repayable. It is non-repayable provided when you receive the loan you employ the number of people you agreed to employ. Then you do not have to pay the loan back, non-repayable loans. But every State in the American Union and in Canada pays.

So now the question arises, under what condition should you pay money to an industry? What should be the basic term and condition of doing it? We had to settle on that and we worked out a methodology of doing it. I worked it out. I personally worked it out. I was at it for weeks and months. And after I got it worked out a man who is presently Assistant Deputy Minister of Industrial Development, Mr. Sandy Roche, he worked on it with me, and a man who worked with him at the time, who is now up in Ottawa somewhere, he worked on it, and we refined it and polished it and when we got that methodology completed we sent it to the Bank of Canada in Ottawa and asked them to study it. We sent it to the Department of Finance of the Government of Canada and asked them to study it, and they did. We sent it to the big engineering firm in New York, Stone and Webster, and they studied it and this is the methodology. If you put money in an industry it is going to cost you something. That is what goes out of the Treasury. Now what comes in? It does not all go out. For instance, if you employ 100 men in that industry, 100 men, you can estimate beforehand approximately what their wages will be in a year in the aggregate for the whole 100 men; then you can estimate what income tax they will pay to the Government of Canada and how much of that comes back to Newfoundland; you can estimate what income tax they will pay to the Newfoundland Government; you can estimate what Social Security Tax, SSA, they will pay on their purchases that comes

MR. SMALLWOOD: to the government. You can estimate how much beer they will drink and what profit the government will make on that beer or liquor. You can estimate how many would have been on relief and half the relief you have to pay, the Canadian Government pays the other half. How much money do you save, and money saved is a dollar earned.

You can add it up. It is relatively simple to add up what the benefits are that come in to you from the direct employed, the taxes that the industry itself will pay to Ottawa, how much of that Ottawa passes back to us. Did I say the number that you estimate that might have been unemployed on relief? Yes, I did. You save that.

Now you have to add up the expense, what you have to pay out. First, the loan that you make to the industry in question. Second, any houses you have to build in that place, any streets or roads you have to put there, any water and sewerage you have to put there, you have to count up carefully every dollar that it is going to cost you, and count up carefully every dollar that you will take in, and you subtract one from the other. And either it shows a gain or a loss. If it is a substantial loss you drop the matter right there and then. That was our methodology. I assume the government are following the same methodology now.

People sometimes rather stupidly and sometimes maliciously, malevolently, for political reasons argue that in our twenty-three years in the industries that we started, or helped to start or helped to finance, we went into it blindly, ignorantly, foolishly and stupidly, whereas the fact of the matter is that we applied that methodology to virtually every one of them, not the very earliest of them, I admit that, but all the others we applied the methodology to to make sure that over a period of time the Province and the Province's economy and the Province's Treasury would benefit by it.

If I were in the Premier's place now, I do not know whether he is a gambler, I rather think he may be.



MR. NEARY: We got \$1,000 between the two of us recently.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. I did not mean that kind of gambling. That is not the kind of gambling I meant. Rather than let - there was a certain part of me that responded to the Minister of Mines and Energy, a part of me. The whole thing was so impossible, so impossible that on balance I have to oppose it, the purchase of the Churchill Falls, the shares of BRINCO in Churchill Falls so as to give the government virtually the ownership of Churchill Falls. I say this is a horrible blunder, it is unbelievable, it is - I still cannot believe it yet that such a blunder could have been made. But having said that, and meaning it, when the Minister of Mines and Energy argued here, "You know," he said, "you have got to gamble." There is something in me that rose up in response to that. Rather than go down with a whimper and a whine, do not give in, do not surrender, take a chance and gamble. Sometimes of course the gamble is beaten before you start, before you begin at all you are beaten and then it is stupid. It is stupid then to go into it. I think it was stupid to go into the Churchill Falls thing.

By the way, talking about Churchill Falls, there is not one single, solitary thing that the government can do now, not a step they can take, no process they can follow, no procedure, nothing they can do now in connection with getting more electricity from the Upper Churchill that they could not have done equally well if they had never bought BRINCO shares in Churchill Falls. They do not need to be the owners of CFLCo. or be the principle owners, the majority stockholders. They do not need to. There is nothing they can do by being majority stockholders of CFLCo. that they could not do if they did not own any, or if they did not own any more than the - what was it, nine or ten per cent that I suggested we buy and we did buy when I was in office.

I think it was a horrible blunder, horrible, horrible. It is almost unspeakable. It just staggers you, it just staggers you to think that that was done.

Mr. Smallwood.

But there is no use crying over spilled milk. It is done, and we are backing the government now through thick and thin on almost anything they will do to get this additional power. Their reason for getting it I disagree with completely. I think it is crazy to build a transmission line and a tunnel to bring that power all the way down across Labrador to the Strait of Belle Isle and across underneath the Strait of Belle Isle and down the West Coast to Deer Lake and across to St. John's. I think that is crazy. I suppose there is a possibility that I am wrong. I believe that that is crazy. However, that is why they want the power. I am going to blink that part out of sight, why they want it. I take the position that their wanting it is enough, that if Newfoundland wants it, if Newfoundland's Government says, "We want it," that is enough, and we should have it. We should have it.

I am hoping to get some briefing on it. I have not had it, and I am partly in the dark on it. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition also - I heard him say on television tonight that he had not been briefed. And we are desperately determined not to say or do anything that could in anyway injure the government's cause which is Newfoundland's cause in this matter at this time. But I would appreciate being briefed to make sure that I do not say the wrong thing in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Mr. Speaker, if I had been able to do what I wanted to do, but which the government stopped me from doing by this timing, starting this debate at quarter to twelve last night, it is four o'clock now, four hours, four and one-quarter hours, I would have preferred infinitely to spread my speech over a couple of days, say an hour and one-half one day, and an hour and one-half the next day. It would not have been a burden on the members then. They would not be staying up until four o'clock in the morning. That really does not make sense. It does not. It does not make sense. It is stupid. It is foolish. It is illogical. It is nonsensical, but

Mr. Smallwood.

do not blame me for that. I had some things I wanted to say, and I close as I began by saying that it is almost inconceivable. I do not see how the Government House Leader could tolerate it - he as a lawyer with legal training, training in English universities, training in law, training in Parliamentary Government, the principles, the great principles of Parliamentary Government - I do not see how he would not have protested violently against this desecration of the Speech from the Throne and the debate thereon. It is atrocious. It is absolutely atrocious. I do not see why the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) - maybe he did in private, in caucus, I do not know. But it is atrocious to have an Address in Reply to a speech that was delivered six and one-half months ago. That is atrocious to have the Come By Chance thing happen and no debate on it.

Now the House could well believe that I would have things to say in that debate if it were held on Come By Chance. The House will not find it difficult to believe that I know something about it. The House will not find it difficult to believe that I have been in touch with people who know the story inside out, and the House will not find it hard to believe that I would have something constructive and creative to say that will not have been said by the Minister of Mines and Energy or by the Leader of the Opposition. I would have something distinctive to say on the subject of Come By Chance, but I am not allowed. The debate was started and then stopped. It is highly questionable if it will ever come up again. The Leader of the Opposition spoke. He did not finish his speech, and he is the next on deck if, as and when that debate ever does come up again. Mr. Speaker, the enormity of that. It is staggering. It is just staggering that this House is not given the chance to debate that. It would be almost as bad if they were refused the chance to debate the estimates or to debate the budget. Here a great economic catastrophe overtakes us, an industry that would take \$400 million to \$500 million today to replace if you had to build it there from scratch, folds, closes down, and

Mr. Smallwood.

we are not allowed to debate it. It is unbelievable. Tell that to any parliamentarian in the British Commonwealth that weeks and weeks and weeks passed, and we are not allowed to debate it. It is unbelievable. It is incredible. It is past believing.

And that the Queen's representative should come here and open this session last November with a gracious speech to which now tonight, last night and this morning we are starting the debate - I do not know how many hon. members are going to take part in this debate - six and one-half months after, unprecedented, unheard of, never dreamed of, and I find it hard to believe that it has happened. Your Honour, Mr. Speaker, you, Your Honour with your knowledge of parliamentary life, parliamentary principles, parliamentary procedure, parliamentary practice, parliamentary precedent, with your acute preception on that and your appreciation of it, as the Government House Leader must have, as the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) must have, as I know I have, it is inconceivable that the Queen's representative should be treated in that fashion. There is a practice that has gone on for a long time. When the Governor comes and reads the Speech from the Throne - it is done in England - when the Queen comes and reads the speech and she retires, here her representative the Governor retires, and, Mr. Speaker, says, he reports to the House what they already know that His Honour the Lieutenant Governor has been here, and has been pleased to deliver a speech and so and so. And before that speech can be touched a minister rises in his place and does a bit of business. Now, at first it used to be a fictitious bill, not a fake bill but an unreal bill, and when the Attorney General, Mr. Curtis said to me after four or five years of this, he said, "Why do I not give notice of a real bill?" I said, "Well, all right, go ahead." And then he would get up and give notice of a bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

"I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled so and so!" Why did he do that? That was done to indicate the House's independence of the Monarch. Yes, the Monarch comes, the Queen comes and opens parliament by reading a Speech from the Throne. But to show the independence of parliament a bill is given notice of. That is all, and then comes the speech. But here we have gone further. On the day that the Governor read his speech one of the ministers - I think perhaps the government House Leader - got up and gave notice of a bill following the ancient tradition, fairly ancient. Well we have gone further. We have done that and then we said, "We will put off this debate for six and a half months. We will not take any notice of the Speech from the Throne for over six months." It is unbelievable.

But when they will not let us debate Come By Chance, when they brought in an Act in this House limiting debate on the heart and essence of parliament, the estimates, the power of the purse, the Queen's ministers coming in here and giving us a big thick printed book with thousands of items. They ask us to give them money, cash, to give the Queen to spend on the Queen's public services. They give us seventy-five hours. I am now speaking clear of four hours. But the estimates, \$1.25 billion, seventy-five hours! And that done before there was a debate on the budget! You know it is unbelievable and either it is monumental stupidity, monumental mismanagement or monumental cunning.

I will say this, it has succeeded in fragmenting the business of the House. It has fragmented the debates. The debate on the Address in Reply should have gone on right away, last Fall. There had to be the interruption of the budget, the emergency budget last Fall, but as soon as that was out of the way then the Address in Reply debate, and let nothing interfere with it, go on for a week, for ten days debating the Address in Reply. No, it was fragmented. Look at my own case. I get up on March 12, Friday, four days later, March 16 I am up again.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Three days later March 19, three days later, March 22 and seventy-two days later, tonight, last night.

There are two great debates in every session, the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The Speech from the Throne is a statement of the government's plans and intentions for the new session. It is a programme. It is an outline and the Address in Reply debate gives every hon. member a chance for the widest possible scope. You can talk about almost anything under the sun. There is no rule of relevancy. You can talk about your district. You can talk about anything under the sun in that debate, the debate on the Address in Reply. It should be a great state occasion, ten days, two weeks with everybody taking part in it and letting off steam, not sitting here for weeks and weeks and weeks grinding your teeth because they will not bring on the debate.

The other great debate every year is the debate on the budget. What did they do with that? Now I do not believe it is stupidity. I do not think the hon. gentlemen who arranged this schedule, this timetable, are stupid. I do not believe it. But I think it is wonderfully cunning. I think it is wonderfully clever. It has just broken up the Opposition. We are just broken up. I mean taking the whole crowd on this side of the House as the opposition. We are not part of the official Opposition but we are in opposition to the government. So we are the opposition. The opposition have been fragmented, broken up. There has not been a continuous, completed debate on Come By Chance, on the Address in Reply, on Churchill Falls. That is not the way to run a parliament. It is disgusting. It is revolting, Mr. Speaker. I cannot understand how some at least of the hon. members on the other side of the House tolerated it. I cannot understand it. It is more than I can understand.

However, I have said what I wanted to say now on the motion and on the amendment that I have moved. And the amendment is good for a couple of hours but I will not take any time. I have sent it

MR. SMALLWOOD:

up to Mr. Speaker. Was anybody got a copy of the amendment? This is an amendment which if it were not a lack of confidence motion every member on the other side should vote for it. Technically it is a want of confidence motion and I did not move it as a motion of lack of confidence. If I wanted to vote against the government and really bring them down it would be on a bigger issue than this. I moved this amendment so that I could have a few more minutes than the forty-five and I have had a few more minutes.

"The House deplores the extent to which after twenty-seven years of Confederation the economy of the Province depends upon grants gifts, contributions and special concessions received from the Government of Canada." Where would we be without these special grants and gifts and donations and concessions from the Government of Canada? We would die. We would perish. The Province would perish and we are just as dependent on Ottawa now after twenty-seven years of Confederation as we were at the end of the first year. It is shocking. It is absolutely shocking. We can thank Ottawa. We can thank God that we are part of Canada. We can thank God. We are ingrates if we do not. Although you get the occasional complete fool, you get the occasional complete and utter ignoramus who will say we would be better off if we were not part of Canada.

MR. MURPHY: You could not say you would not be either, because how can you prove it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course you can prove it.

MR. MURPHY: How do you intend to do that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will prove it right now that it is not true.

MR. MURPHY: You gave away everything we owned, our own fishery included.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. Maybe the minister needs to be educated.

MR. MURPHY: Perhaps I might.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right. Well let me try it. I am tempted to -

MR. MURPHY: I have listened for seventeen years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am tempted to say to the hon. minister, and I would



MR. SMALLWOOD:

say it if I thought I would not offend him by doing it, but I used to say it frequently when I sat over on that side of the House; I can explain a thing to you but only the good God in heaven can give you the brains to understand it when I do explain it. Now do not take that as meaning - it is not the hon. minister. I do not mean him.

MR. MURPHY: I have only been seventeen years at it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. Let me prove it in a couple or three sentences.

MR. MURPHY: Wasting time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it is not wasting time and the minister perhaps needs to hear it.

MR. MURPHY: Perhaps like Bourassa, we do not rush.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, maybe the minister needs to hear this. This year, this calendar year, starting January 1 past, all the industries of the Province, everything, all the industries of Newfoundland, all the fisheries, farming, forestry, forest industries, mining, electrical, factories, everything, all industries in Newfoundland this year will put into the hands, the pockets of our Newfoundland people, \$1 billion - and as the Americans would say, "That ain't bad," \$1 billion split up among 550,000 is quite a bit of money. But over and above that \$1 billion originating here in Newfoundland, coming into Newfoundland for the fishery ship out, coming into Newfoundland for the ores, the minerals we ship out, coming into Newfoundland for the pulp and paper we ship out, coming into Newfoundland for anything else we ship out while we **earn ourselves** coming into this Province for what we produce, \$1 billion will go into the pockets of our people this year.

How much will go into the pockets of our people this year coming from Ottawa? A couple of hundred millions or more in unemployment insurance, a couple of hundred million - there is a fifth of \$1 billion right off - family allowances, old age assistance, or whatever they call it now, Canada Pension,



MR. SMALLWOOD: Civil Service salaries, the National Health Plan, M.C.P., grants of all kinds to the Newfoundland people through the Newfoundland Government, operation of airports, operation of light houses, the great CNR, the great CNT, the great CBC, housing, airports, harbours, pouring it in here and the RCMP, federal judges, county court judges. I cannot think of half of them and add it up and we are producing ourselves for our people this year \$1 billion, \$1,000 million, Ottawa is putting into the pockets of our people this same year \$250,000,000 more than that, \$1,250,000,000 as against \$1,000 million. Now take that \$1,250,000,000 out, let us not have it and would we be worse off? And could we have it if we were not part of Canada? If we had not got Confederation would that \$1,250,000,000 be coming in here? It would not. It would not.

MR. MURPHY: Canada gained nothing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course Canada gained -

MR. MURPHY: All the taxes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Canada gained enormously.

MR. MURPHY: Sure they did.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will tell you the main thing she gained. I am tempted to say she gained what now number over a half a million splendid people. That is not her main gain. Her principle gain was the fact that the people of Newfoundland, being the only people in the world that I know of in the present century who by secret ballot voted to join another country. Now some parts of the world had been absorbed by force, by arms, by bloodshed, but this country, Newfoundland, which is what we were, this country by secret ballot voted to join Canada and that prestige for Canada was terrific and Canada now truly her gates from sea to sea, from East to West, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, she had already lost the - what is it they call it on the West Coast there, the something corridor is it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Leader of the Opposition if he were here would remember. What is the name?

MR. ROBERTS: The Alaska Panhandle.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the Panhandle. Canada had lost the Panhandle, she had lost a big slice of her West Coast on the Pacific Ocean. Now if she had lost Newfoundland and Labrador, then nationally and prestige-wise she would be in a very poor - it was her national gain.

I will tell you something else, the House may not be aware of this, but one of the great ambitions of Louis St. Laurent, he discussed it with me, he never made a speech about it, never said it publicly, there were some people who knew it privately, Louis St. Laurent's great ambition was to make the Gulf of St. Lawrence a Canadian sea. Now the Minister of Justice probably is aware of this. It has had a great bearing on this question of the 200 mile limit zone for control over the fisheries. Louis St. Laurent for year, manoeuvring, manoeuvring through diplomacy and a little move here and a little move there, a little concession here and a little concession there had been manoeuvring up to the time he died almost, well while he was Prime Minister, manoeuvring to get the Gulf of St. Lawrence a Canadian sea. But that could never have been if Newfoundland had not become part of Canada and rounded off the East Coast of the Continent.

So Canada gained enormously in prestige. It is not that she needed the territory all that much, but she got half a million pretty fine people, as good as there are. We are not the best people in Canada but we are as good as the best. We are as good as the rest of them, any of them, as good as the best of them. Canada is lucky that she has got us.

So it is not one-sided but having said that surely the minister, who I suspect was not the most ardent Confederate -

MR. MURPHY: Still am not the most ardent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Still am not that even he -

MR. MURPHY: - of Newfoundland,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that even he will admit that Confederation, though it is not perfect, though it has not solved all our problems, as no one is foolish enough to think it would or could, that Confederation has been a blessing from Heaven, a gift from God to the Newfoundland people. Surely he admits that. Surely.

MR. MURPHY: We are getting the minimum wage over the past twenty-five or thirty years. Canada was nothing before the Second World War.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes but we were not in there before the Second World War. We joined her after the Second World War.

But that is not the point, what Canada was or what Canada is. The point is what Newfoundland is now and what she would have been if she had not been a Province of Canada. There is no question -

MR. MURPHY: A great nation to herself.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. Now the hon. gentleman if he had to vote now on the subject, will we remain a Province of Canada or get out and become an independent British colony again, in a secret ballot, with nobody knowing, he would vote to stay in.

MR. MURPHY: Master of our own House. The fishery would be ours.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think I prefer the Minister of Finance. I think I prefer his wit and humour to the hon. minister.

Well that is enough. I wish the Premier had heard my denunciation of the terrible fashion in which the business of the House, the stately debates, the principle debates, have been butchered and fragmented here. I do not believe the Premier would have agreed to that. I wonder whose bright idea was it? I wonder who cooked it up? Who connived to fragment and break up and prevent a decent, formal, full-dressed debate in this House. There has not been one yet

MR. SMALLWOOD: and we opened now six and a half months ago.

I do not know. I would not be proud of it if I were minister.

I thank the members. It is only half past four.

We open at ten o'clock again, do we? At ten o'clock?

Well I mean surely we are going to open at ten are we not?

Or would the House like to keep on until ten?

Well, anyway I do thank the hon. members for their very big attendance here all through my few remarks and their courtesy to me, their toleration to me and I do hope that the Liberals who have heard me will feel that - like the father who spans his child, "This is for your own good." I hope that they will feel that it is for their own good because that is how I meant it to be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): It has been moved that the debate do now adjourn, all those in favour say, "Aye," all those against say, "Nay," I declare the "Nays" have it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate the hon. —

AN HON. MEMBER: You spoke once. That is it.

MR. NEARY: No, I did not take my seat.

AN HON. MEMBER: You spoke then.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) on making such a magnificent speech. It was absolutely outstanding, Sir. I have over the past fourteen or fifteen years heard the hon. gentleman make some wonderful speeches. I have heard some wonderful oratory flow from the lips of the hon. gentleman. But tonight, Sir, I think I saw him at his finest. I am sure that the new members of the House who sat in this House for the first time and really saw the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) in full flight could not help but be impressed with the hon. gentleman. I know one minister came across the House to me while the hon. member was speaking and told me that he had never heard anything like it in his life, never heard or seen anything like it in his life. He was proud, I think, tonight to be a member of this hon. House to hear such a magnificent contribution to the debates that have taken place in this hon. House.

It certainly did not sound to me, Mr. Speaker, like a swan song. It sounded to me like an hon. gentleman who was making his debut, making his entry, or his re-entry into the political life of this Province. I could not help but thinking while the hon. gentleman was speaking - I do not remember, perhaps the hon. former Premier can remind me - who it was that said, "The old man, and the old flag, and the old policy."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sir John A., was it not?

MR. NEARY: Sir John A. MacDonald, that is right. We certainly, Mr. Speaker, have to take our hats off to the hon. the former Premier of this Province. I hope, Sir, that the message, I hope that the sincerity and I hope that the ideas and the suggestions and the proposals and the constructive ideas that were put forward by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) tonight will bear some

MR. NEARY:

fruit. There were a lot of things that the hon. member said that had to be said in this hon. House if for no other reason than to set the record straight.

I am particularly pleased personally, Mr. Speaker, to be sitting in the House even if it is four-thirty in the morning listening to the hon. gentleman because I am one of the few members of the old Liberal caucus, maybe not the new Liberal caucus, but the old Liberal caucus, who managed to maintain a good relationship with the hon. gentleman even when the hon. gentleman went down and passed in his resignation in 1972. Since that day, January 18, 1972, from that day on, Sir, I have personally managed to maintain a good relationship with the hon. gentleman. I am proud of that, Mr. Speaker, because there are other hon. gentlemen, both inside and outside of this House who the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) was responsible for making. He made them what they are today. I can understand his feelings when he talked about that famous convention and the back-stabbing that took place headed up by gentlemen who would probably with their qualifications would be sweeping floors in the legislature or the House of Commons but for this hon. gentleman.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the hon. members of the House did not stand in their places and give the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) a standing ovation because he certainly deserved it tonight. I am sure that the new members of the House must have been thrilled. I talked to a good many of them outside the House and inside the House as the hon. gentleman spoke tonight and they could not believe it. They could not believe that a man could go on for four and a half hours with material that was so interesting, that members were hanging on to every word except those of course, who are a skinful of hate, who hate the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), the former Premier of this Province.

I am sure if I was in certain offices, certain common rooms as I have been so often, that you would hear the snarky remarks and the

MR. NEARY:

little darts being stuck in here and there. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. new members can see through that sort of tactic. If they do not see it by now, they will never see it. I think the hon. gentleman was quite sincere in the advice, if you want to put it that way, that was passed out tonight to hon. members on both sides of the House.

I know, Sir, that I came into the Liberal Party, I was invited in by the hon. gentleman. I almost had to beat my way in, as I told the House on one or two occasions. I have never regretted it, Sir. I have never looked back since. I am proud of the fact that I have been able to maintain a good relationship with that hon. gentleman down through the years. I do not think we will ever become bad friends.

One thing I want to say about the hon. gentleman that maybe he was too modest to say himself, that is a feeling that went abroad in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman was a dictator. How many times did we hear that assassination on the hon. gentleman's character, "He is a dictator." It came from the lips of some of the hon. gentlemen now who are shocked when they get up and adopt a holier than thou attitude and talk about character assassination. No man in this Province had his character assassinated any more than that hon. gentleman who just took his seat. Probably the one thing that the present Premier of this Province will regret until the day he dies was allowing himself to be conned into instituting a witch hunt when the hon. Premier formed the administration of this Province. The RCMP went down to the former Premier's house a couple of weeks before Christmas and raided the place and confiscated his documents, including letters that were written by his grandchildren.



Mr. Neary:

I am sure if the hon. present Premier of this Province had his time back that would have never happened. When you start that sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, you never know where it is going to end. But I do not think that is the reason the Premier regrets it. I have discovered one feature about the present Premier that I like very much, and that is the hon. gentleman is not a vindictive man. And I am surprised the hon. gentleman on that particular occasion allowed himself to be conned in to starting that witch hunt. It was a mistake.

And I hope, and I do not wish the hon. member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) any harm, I hope the hon. gentleman lives to be a hundred. But I will be standing in this House one day maybe when the hon. gentleman is ten toes up, and I can see them standing over there now, on both sides of the House, saying what a wonderful Newfoundlander the member for Twillingate was, the former Premier of this Province, and what a major contribution he made to his native Newfoundland. And I will be sitting there biting my tongue and grinding my teeth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do not polish it. I am not gone yet.

MR. NEARY: No, I know the hon. Premier is not gone yet.

MR. DOODY: "Ambition should be made of sterner stuff."

MR. NEARY: No, I know them, Mr. Speaker, I can see the hypocrites now standing in their places in this hon. House. I paid tribute to the man while he is still on his feet. And I hope to God he is around for a good many more years yet. I think it was a pity, Mr. Speaker, it was a shame and a pity that that speech could not have been televised or that the hon. member could not have made that speech during the daytime, during a time when the members, our friends in the press gallery, were in a better mood to report what the hon. gentleman said. There is a message there that should have went out of this House right across this Island and Labrador. It was too bad the hon. gentleman was forced to make that speech, as I am forced now



Mr. Neary:

to speak at 4:30 in the morning, it is too bad the hon. gentleman was forced to make that speech starting at quarter of twelve, quarter to midnight. Whoever rigged it should be ashamed of themselves.

What is the hurry, Mr. Speaker? Why all the rush to get this House closed?

MR. DOODY: There is no rush.

MR. NEARY: There is a rush, Sir.

MR. DOODY: No, there is not.

MR. NEARY: Oh, oh, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance can say there is no rush. There is a rush. Why could I not have just adjourned the debate and carry on again tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock? Why?

MR. DOODY: You can if you want.

MR. NEARY: I could not, Sir. Could I move the adjournment of the debate right now?

MR. DOODY: No, I do not think so.

MR. NEARY: Well then - the hon. gentleman does not think so. I know so. I know, Mr. Speaker, how deals are cooked up in this hon. House. And I know there is a rush to close the House. The Government members are pooped. They are beat out. They have had it. Not only the members of the government, but some of the members of the official Opposition are going along with it. Get the House closed as soon as you can, so that the members can take off on holidays.

PREMIER MOORES: It will be quite a while yet.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

PREMIER MOORES: It will be quite a while yet.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, it may be quite a while yet. Why cannot we carry on for another month or two? We have not dealt with the real problems and the real needs, and we have not found any solutions to the real problems of the people of this Province in the

Mr. Neary:

last six months that we have been here. There is a rush, Sir. And when I was away the other day out visiting in my district of LaPoile there was a little cooked-up deal to ram some legislation through the House in my absence that certain hon. members knew that I wanted to debate. Despite the efforts on the part of the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) and on the part of the Leader of the Liberal Reform Party, a certain piece of legislation was brought into this House at 5:00 o'clock in the afternoon and at twenty past five was receiving second reading. Why, Mr. Speaker? Why? Because I was out in my district and the hon. member who engineered that and rigged that deal -

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

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A point of order has been raised.

MR. WELLS: Beauchesne is very clear, page 127, Section 149, "Besides the prohibitions contained in Standing Order 35, it has been sanctioned by usage both in England and in Canada, that a member, while speaking, must not:

(a) refer to any debate of the same session on any question not then under discussion; nor", and I refer to Section (k) "reflect upon the past acts and proceedings of the House." That is very clear, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. Mr. Speaker, this just bears out my statement that I made a few moments ago that there are certain gentlemen in this hon. House, Sir, who are afraid to hear what I have to say about that particular matter, and that is why we have that point of order. It is not a point of order at all, Mr. Speaker, because when you are on the Throne Speech, it is a wide-ranging debate that you can talk about any matter you want to. The hon. former Premier just told us that the Throne Speech is different than any other debate in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that that is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! I have read the whole of Section 149. There are sections from (a) to (o) in it. And as

Mr. Speaker (Dr. Collins):

the hon. House Leader points out on this point of order it is section (a) and (k) which seem to bear on the question. And I will just read those again "The member speaking must not (a) refer to any debate of the same session on any question not then under discussion;" and "(k) reflect upon the past acts and proceedings of the House." There was a bill, Bill No. 55, I believe the number was, entitled "An Act To Register Mortgage Brokers And To Control The Amounts Of Bonuses To Be Charged By Mortgage Brokers And Mortgage Lenders." And I believe this was the matter that give rise to the point of order. And from my reading of Section 149 I would say that except for a very indirect and brief reference to the fact that the House has considered that matter, the hon. member would be out of order in referring to the matter that was the subject of that bill.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thank Your Honour for your ruling. And I would certainly like to know, Your Honour, how the hon. Government House Leader anticipated that I was referring to that Bill when I did not even mention the Bill. Is the hon. gentleman having pangs of conscience?

Mr. Speaker, one of the matters that we have not dealt adequately with in this hon. House since it opened six months ago is the matter of consumer affairs. And I believe under that heading, Sir, that I have every right to talk about various and sundry matters that affect the consumers of this Province. And one of the matters, Sir, that concerns me very greatly about the

MR. NEARY: goings on in this Province over the last couple of years involves the matter, Sir, of second mortgages, involves the matter of dealings with finance companies and involves, Mr. Speaker, the ethics, if you want to put it that way, of certain legal firms in this Province.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A point of order has been raised.

MR. WELLS: The hon. member is simply trying to refer to the same matter which he brought up in a previous debate in this House on the interim supply which was part of the estimates debate in which he introduced a subject; this subject matter made an attack upon me and upon my family. That was a debate in this House of which the hon. member chose the subject matter. We are back exactly again both in respect to that debate, and into the debate on the bill, back to exactly the same subject matter as referred to on page 127 of Beauchesne and the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, is simply trying to introduce it under another heading, exactly the same thing.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, the hon. gentleman obviously, Mr. Speaker, is trying to cloud the issue. There was no attack on the hon. member and his family made by any hon. member in this House. There were a number of companies named in an address that I made in this House, I think seven companies. If the hon. gentleman took it as a personal affront, well then, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help that. But I submit to Your Honour that I am talking about Consumer Affairs. The matter, Sir, the matter that was raised several weeks ago by myself, there are new developments in that particular matter, Sir, that is a matter now that is under police investigation and I have no intention of referring to it. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the House on this point of order that the matter to which I am now referring has nothing to do with the bill that went through the House. It had something to do maybe with trying to get some of the money back from the people

MR. NEARY: who were ripped off in the process of some of these deals that were made.

MR. WELLS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think there is another question I am told, I have no personal knowledge of this but I am told that there is an action before the courts of this Province involving one of these companies, the thing that the hon. member has mentioned, and if that is so that in for another reason also this subject cannot be discussed in this House because it is before the courts. Section (c) "Refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending," and of course that is a third very clear reason why this subject cannot be debated.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order; Your Honour, I have a whole file full here, right here on the floor, a file full of cases. Not one of the names in that file involves any court action at this moment, although a lot of the files are the subject of a police investigation at this moment. And I have no intention of referring either to the case before the court or the cases that I have in this file that might be embarrassing to the hon. minister. And I submit, Your Honour, there is no point of order. It is merely a move to try to shut me up. It is a closure that the hon. gentleman is trying to invoke on the House.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may on that point of order. The hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is - may I refresh his memory? This same matter has come before this hon. House on many occasions, and if he will recall some years ago when Mr. Speaker Noel was in the Chair, and I amongst others was sitting in the cool shades of the Opposition, there had been a debate on the question of the leasing of some liquor stores. And when the estimates came up we sought to discuss this again under the heading of the vote in the Department of Finance, and it was ruled that it having been debated in any manner whatsoever during the sitting of the House, the present session was not the subject matter of the debate. And whether it was an attempt to shut me up, I am not at all concerned about it, the rule

MR. HICKMAN: was there and I had to obey it whether I liked it or not, and I cite that simply as a precedent of some assistance to Your Honour when you are interpreting the rules as they exist today.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. If I understand the hon. member's remarks correctly, they do bear upon the matter that was covered by the bill and I would like to read the title of the bill again, "An Act To Register Mortgage Brokers," and this seems to me the important part, "And To Control The Amount Of Bonuses To Be Charged By Mortgage Brokers And Mortgage Lenders." (Bill No. 55) Now I believe, I understood the hon. member to wish to debate that particular matter, the area covered by that phrase. If so I would say that the point of order is exactly similar to the one that was already ruled on, and that under section 149 of Beauchesne that that matter cannot be debated. It would be out of order to debate that matter, except for a passing remark to it and that point has now been passed. A passing remark has been made to it and the matter cannot be brought up again in this particular debate.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour. So far I have not even made reference to the bill. I have not mentioned the title of the bill, Sir. I am merely discussing consumer affairs and I do not know why the hon. Government House Leader is so sensitive about the matter of consumer affairs. If the hon. gentleman has nothing to hide -

MR. WELLS: That is all available from consumer affairs.

MR. NEARY: That is precisely what I am talking about, Sir, consumer affairs and I am referring -

MR. WELLS: Speaker's ruling.

MR. NEARY: Speaker's ruling, and I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to a letter that I received recently from a group called Traders Group Limited. It is a letter, Sir, that I do not mind reading

MR. NEARY: and tabling here in the House, and I have very strong feelings on a certain matter in this Province and I felt that it was my duty as an elected representative of the people to write the Traders Group to find out what their policy was on this particular matter. And I wrote Traders back in May and I received a letter from the Traders Group Limited on May 14, 1976 and I just merely read this letter, Mr. Speaker, for information of members of the House, just to show the members that by making a few enquiries on behalf of consumers once in a while that you can find out what the policies of big companies like the Traders Group Limited are. And I am sure the hon. gentleman is familiar with the Traders Group, and with Home Plan Realty because the hon. gentleman, I understand, the hon. gentleman's law firm represents Home Plan Realty and the hon. gentleman may be familiar with the letter but the House is not. And does the hon. gentleman have any objection to my reading the letter in the House?

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Speaker has ruled that under section 149 (a) (k) and (c), that these matters are entirely out of order because they have been previously debated in this House. One such matter is before the courts, and it is referring to past acts and proceedings of the House and referring to a debate of the same session. Now the hon. member is apparently refusing to accept the Speaker's ruling and is of course attempting to introduce the same subject matter under another guise. The rule is clear, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On that point of order, the matter of course refers to paragraph 149 in Beauchesne, page 127 (a) and this is what a member may not while speaking do, "refer to any debate of the same session on any question not then under discussion," and (k) "reflect upon the past acts and proceedings of the House. Now the sub judge, I think everybody is familiar with that. There is no need for me to



MR. SPEAKER: comment on that, A matter which is specifically, which is before the courts - it is not specifically, it can only be before the courts or not before the courts - a matter which is before the courts may not be commented upon, But (a) and (k), the effect of that is that with respect to Bill 55, on which the House has come to a determination, the House passed it, the House could also have rejected it or have amended it or have sent it to a select committee or whatever, but a matter upon which the House has made a determination may not be debated.

I think what we have to do obviously is refer to the bill and to see what specifically the House did make a determination on. The House made a determination essentially on - there are four matters, as I understand it, covered in the bill apart from minor questions of definition in this Act - you know, such and such means -



MR. SPEAKER:

and they are registration of mortgage brokers, the investigative powers of the registrar, the regulation of the percentages for bonuses, the question of bonusing, the disclosure of the cost of borrowing.

MR. WELLS: Lenders as well.

MR. SPEAKER: And mortgage lenders, as the hon. gentleman says.

Now on this matters the House has made a determination and no hon. member may debate them.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So far, Your Honour, I have not debated the matter although there has been three points of order obviously on the part of the Government House Leader to harass me, Sir, to use up my time. Because the hon. gentleman obviously is terribly worried, Sir, terribly worried about the revelations that I might have made if I had been in the House when that bill was debated. That is why, Mr. Speaker, the bill was rammed through the House in agreement -

MR. WELLS: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The bill was passed by the House. Now that is a reflection upon the past acts and proceedings of the House. Also to suggest that I, as Government House Leader, rammed the bill through is a reflection upon me in my capacity in this House, which is forbidden. My role as Government House Leader is to expedite and get through as much government business as is possible, and it is entirely out of order, Mr. Speaker, for any hon. member in a speech to reflect on that role in that manner or on the actions of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, are you going to rule on that point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. I thought the hon. gentleman was rising to speak to the point of order. The matter of course of reflecting on a former proceeding of the House is a valid point. An hon. member may not reflect upon a previous proceeding of the House.

MR. NEARY: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I was not in the House when the debate took place. I was in my district. I had to go out on business. The information that I want to give the House now, Mr. Speaker, can wait.

MR. NEARY:

I can give it outside the House. The hon. gentleman is not going to silence me, no way, shape or form. Outside the House I will have the letter xeroxed and circulated to the press and if they want to use it they may. But there is no way, Sir, no way that I am going to be silenced by that hon. gentleman. There is too much at stake and too many people have been hurt.

MR. WELLS: By whom?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman knows by whom. I do not have to tell the hon. gentleman. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not going to suck me in. I have been around too long for that.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is in order to talk about legal ethics if I cannot refer to a matter that has already gone through the House. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we have not - and I do not see it on the Order Paper - we do not have a bill dealing with amendments to the Newfoundland Law Society. I hope, Your Honour, even though I know Your Honour is a member of the bar society, that it will be in order for me to make a few references to the ethics that have been adopted by certain members of the legal profession.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I do not think the hon. gentleman meant it the way that to me it appeared to sound and could easily be interpreted, and that was the hon. gentleman's reference that even though the Speaker was a member of the legal profession the Speaker would not rule out of order comments on the legal profession. I do not think the hon. gentleman meant it that way, but I think it necessary to interject and to make that point.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour, I apologize. That is certainly not what I meant, Your Honour. But I do want to draw to the attention of the House, Sir, that certain members of the Newfoundland Law Society have a peculiar and strange code of ethics. Certain legal firms and certain lawyers, Sir, in this Province feel that it is perfectly okay to represent three or four individuals or three or four corporations

MR. NEARY:

or companies at the same time. Now, Your Honour, I know this matter has been discussed many times at law society meetings, because I have some friends who have attended the meetings and who feel that the Newfoundland Law Society should raise its standards, raise its sights and raise its code of ethics.

There is, I would say, an ever growing number of young lawyers, especially the young ones, who feel that it is high time that the Newfoundland Law Society in this Province cleaned its own house and that they bar members of the society from representing more than one client at any one time.

MR. DOODY: Maybe on the CMHC list, or the Liberal list.

MR. NEARY: They could possibly be on the CMHC list. That is something else I do not approve of.

MR. DOODY: But you are not going to go in and overthrow them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, somehow or other the old guard have been able to talk the young turks in the law society down. So they are continuing with their policy of representing more than one client at any one time. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that this is in the best interests of the consumer. It is not in the best interests of the parties that are forced in a good many cases to use that particular law firm or that particular lawyer. It is not right, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House again, and I ask the hon. Government House Leader who is a bencher in the law society, if the hon. gentleman can tell me that if the hon. gentleman's law firm, say, take his law firm, the hon. gentleman's law firm as an example, if his law firm is representing three parties, whose interests would come first? Could the hon. gentleman tell me that? Whose interests would come first? Would it be the interests of the individual? The customer? The client, as they are known as in the legal profession? Would the interests of the - say it is a mortgage brokerage company that the hon. gentleman's firm is dealing with - would it be the brokerage company or would it be the money lending company?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEAPY: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not coming back again. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whose interests would come first.

MR. DOODY: Direct your comments to the Chair.

MR. NEAPY: I am directing my comments straight at the hon. Government House Leader for a good reason.

MR. MORGAN: It is not question period, you know. It is not question period.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that it is high time that the Newfoundland Law Society changed their policy. Consumer groups are now becoming very active and they have developed into pressure groups. They are now becoming very influential in the community, coming out on the side of the consumer. I would submit to Your Honour that if the law society do not clean their own house and straighten out some of these matters to which I have referred that the consumer groups which are springing up in Newfoundland and the attitude now of our people towards the legal profession, that this House will be forced eventually to take action and bring in measures to regulate certain goings on by certain members of the legal profession.

I think it is high time, Sir, that something was done about this. Mr. Speaker, not only have we neglected consumer affairs in the last six months since this House has been opened but we have not come to grips with the other three major problems that we have in this Province. I just want to tell the hon. member that I am not finished with this subject yet. This subject will be dealt with quite adequately in due course even if it has to be dealt with in the courts. It will be dealt with adequately. I hope that the people will get their refunds. One has already gotten a \$600 refund as a result of my action. I hope there will be others.

Sir, there are three other matters that we have not dealt with in this session of the House

Mr. Neary.

of the House so far, and here we are trying to get her closed. Despite what the Minister of Finance says, it is obvious, Sir, that deals are being cooked up down behind the curtain.

MR. DOODY: What do you mean we closed her up? We are open until five o'clock.

MR. NEARY: Yes, we are open until five o'clock and then we do not meet tomorrow. Now what kind of a shambles, Sir, is the House in at the present time? We are in a complete shambles. It is like Disneyland.

MR. DOODY: Sure, what can you expect with a dinosaur that comes back.

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen are pooped, they are beat out, and they all want to get off on their vacation. They cannot even wait until the children get their vacation. They want to get out of the House now. I am sorry to say that -

MR. DOODY: I have to get back to work.

MR. NEARY: Yes, get back to work all right, but get back to work in the West Indies somewhere.

Mr. speaker, when this House closes there will be ministers scattered to the four corners of the earth. You will not see them for dust they will be so anxious to get out of this Province.

MR. DOODY: You will not see me for red ore dust where you ran.

MR. NEARY: They are beaten out. They are a beaten crowd. They cannot take it. And unfortunately - and I am sorry to have to say this - some of the members of the Opposition are being conned into going along with the government in getting the House closed. We should be here for another two or three months debating unemployment and job creation. Our friend from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) had a go at it yesterday during the Late Show, but it was just like water on a duck's back. When you talk about the real needs, and the real problems, and you recommend solutions to these problems in this House of the ordinary people, it is just like water on a duck's back, Sir. They do not pay the slightest bit of attention to it.

Mr. Neary.

And here we are the fifth of June, record unemployment in Newfoundland when we should have increased employment, when our employment picture should be looking good, should be looking up, should be improving, here we are with record unemployment. And the government rushing to close the House without even coming to grips with that problem. And then there is the matter that I have spoken about so often in this hon. House that is a real problem in Newfoundland and Labrador. And the hon. member - I do not know what district the hon. member represents, he has been here like a mute now for the last seven or eight months - the hon. gentleman said, "Oh, we have heard all your speeches before." Well if the hon. gentleman heard them before, the hon. gentleman is going to hear them again, because I am going to keep talking about the problems of the ordinary people of this Province until somebody wakes up, until the message gets through to the administration. And if the hon. gentleman thinks that he is so good at making speeches, I would like for him to get up and make a few.

MR. HICKEY: : After you.

MR. NEARY: Yes, after me. Make them after anybody, I do not care. The hon. member was not sent here to be silenced. The hon. gentleman was sent here to do a job on behalf of his constituents.

MR. HICKEY I am one of your fold, down where you live.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that in this hon. House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour.

I am wondering what they were serving in the backroom tonight.

MR. HICKEY : Coffee.

MR. NEARY: Coffee? My foot.

Mr. Neary.

But anyway, Sir, I am going to raise a matter that I have raised on a number of occasions, both inside and outside of this hon. House that seems to have gotten a favourable reaction from the hon. Premier, and that is the matter of setting up a Provincial Productivity Council in this Province -

MR. HICKEY: Of M.H.A.'s.

MR. NEARY: No, not of M.H.A.'s.

- setting up a Provincial Productivity Council.

The hon. minister thinks it is a great joke. Everything is a big joke with this crowd. Getting the House closed is a big joke. Talking about the real problems of the ordinary Newfoundlander is a real joke. The hon. gentleman is a real joke. He is over there like Charlie McCarthy. He only speaks when somebody pulls the string. Why does not the hon. gentleman get up and fight for his constituents, get up and make a few speeches.

MR. HICKEY: : They can fight for themselves.

MR. NEARY: They can fight for themselves. They are not in this hon. House. They sent the hon. gentleman in here.

MR. HICKEY: Where is LaPoile?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have gotten a favourable -

MR. SPEAKER: Two minutes.

MR. NEARY: Only two minutes. Where has the time gone? I have gotten a favourable reaction from the hon. Premier. We have exchanged correspondence. We have exchanged letters. The Premier seems to favour the idea of the Productivity Council. And what I would like to know is why it is being delayed? Why does not the hon. Premier do something positive for a change, and set up this Productivity Council. If he does not want to call it that, call it by another name if the hon. Premier does not want to give me credit for it. But I think it is a good idea because one of the major problems in this Province at the present time is our very low production record that we have in this Province. And certainly it is something that we are going to have to come to grips



Mr. Neary.

with sooner or later. Now, Mr. Speaker, when I get back on the main debate, I can continue my few remarks.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is with some regret that I have to get up and speak at this hour of the morning on this particular debate. Certainly I have already spent, I suppose, one may say an hour and a half on matters of the Throne Speech and other motions, but I do have a lot more to say, and a lot of other matters, some of which are not convenient to deal with at this particular time, matters with respect to housing, the organization of government and other matters I was going to speak about. I feel for whatever the reason it is rather regrettable that we are sitting to this hour in considering this matter. In my own point of view I believe wholeheartedly in this particular institution. I believe it is, despite the way in which it has turned out in this session and other sessions, it is a difference really, basically, between a totalitarian system and a democratic system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And I think that the more it is used - but it cannot be used as far as I am concerned at this particular hour, not having, perhaps the youth, the perpetual youth of the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), but certainly there are matters that cannot be properly addressed at this particular time. However, there are certain things that I would wish to say, particularly with respect to the five hour speech of the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). I suppose that all of us, I think, in this House will remember - I think the hon. member will forgive me from referring to his age, when we say, I think all of us will remember and tell our grandchildren about having seen the hon member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) at his age, on his feet, making a speech for such a long period of time. And the way the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) was going today, he will probably be around to tell our grandchildren, when we are not here ourselves.



Mr. Marshall.

But despite his constitution, Mr. Speaker, and a constitution that is to be admired, there are many things with which he dealt with during that five hour marathon that I draw issue with, and I would like to discuss some of them right here.

The first thing is that we spent an awful lot of time talking about the Liberal as a reform party. And the hon. Minister of Finance mentioned to me, and it is with his usual wit that I think is worth-while repeating, he came over and observed that what has the Liberal Party done to deserve and need such reform, because obviously it needed an awful lot of reform, because we had heard an awful lot of talk about it. I did not

MR. MARSHALL

particularly agree with the philosophy that the only people who are interested in reform are the Liberal Party, people who are Crits, as they were, not people - this is the way I interpreted it anyway - and not people in the Tory Party. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the only vehicle of reform in this province for many years was the Progressive Conservative Party and what they were attempting to reform was the administration of the honourable member for Twillingate and that of the honourable the **Leader of the Opposition**, etc. Now Mr. Speaker, there were though, there were matters that I think merit attention. The first thing is this matter of public financing. I was **amazed at** the concession made by the former premier to the effect that public financing is necessary to avoid payment to contractors, and the fact that, I think he said approximately ten million dollars each year had been paid, he estimated, had been paid out as a result of the failure to have public financing. This to my mind is a very unusual admission from a former premier of the province with respect to his administration. I think it is a sad **indictment** maybe on the system but certainly on his administration and himself, not himself but his administration. Mr. Speaker, he also mentioned when he was talking about this matter public financing, he dealt with to quite a great length that this was the thing that was necessary in order to bring about the promised land, as it were, **the great reform**. I am not myself convinced necessarily that public financing of elections is the answer, although I am coming along to that point of view more so than I was in the past, because I do not know really how it can be effectively controlled, No. 1, but No. 2, I feel that this province at the present time is labouring under such financial constraints, such heavy, onerous financial constraints that not one single penny can be spent which is not absolutely essential to the welfare of the people, and I would not put top priority on that. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the answer is, was, and will be for quite a period of time, the answer to the problem that is raised by **political donations**

MR. MARSHALL

is full, complete open public tendering systems. And I mean a full, complete and open and stringent public tendering system, one that is complied with at all times as a matter of law and is complied with stringently and effectively by the administration. Mr. Speaker, this government moved to that end. We all remember the **Public Tendering Act** that was brought into this legislature and was passed and is now a matter of law with respect to large government contracts, buildings on lands, that there must be public tenders called.

I heard a question earlier yesterday asked of the Minister of Public Works with respect to the government building, **not being** able to debate or having any desire to debate it, I would just point out that tenders, for instance, there were not, first of all, tenders as such called last year, they were proposals invited. These proposals in any event, whether they are proposals or tenders are one year old by now and certainly have lapsed and **are ineffective**.

If any building is going to be built in this province there has to be full and complete compliance with the public tender system, both **directly with its terms** and to comply fully with its spirit. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is the major answer to the problem posed by the necessity of those who speak of public financing of election campaigns, and this is a full, as I say, a complete, absolute and open public tender system. The hon. member mentioned the fact about the government is a large business and should extend it to other areas, **commercial areas** where it buys articles of commerce. And I would draw to the attention of the House that this was also brought in, this was brought in the amendment to the department of Public Works act by this government, and it comprises really in effect what the officials did at the time, they took an act that I introduced myself as in the opposition called a act to provide for the equitable purchases of commodities.

That particular act, together with the public tender act, I might say, when I was in opposition was introduced and turned down by the

MR. MARSHALL.

administration of the hon. member for Twillingate. I am very proud of the fact that it is now on the books and I certainly know that it is being complied with. Of course, there are improvements that must be made, that must be made from the point of view of stern public disclosure of all of these matters and then we will have the improvement.

I think Mr. Speaker, I would also like to refer to the fact of the nature of the non-confidence motion itself proposed by the hon member for Twillingate, that the House deplores, after twenty seven years that we still depend on the government of Canada. I think that we can all deplore this fact but I think also that this is certainly a sad indictment of our activity in the Confederation with Canada since we joined the union in 1949. And I think it underscores and I think it is certainly true, that we are very dependent upon Ottawa and the government of Canada, and I feel that I do not know what the answer is, I suppose if anyone knew what the answer is that would assure his star in heaven.

The fact of the matter is that the economic development policies that we have been following in this province ever since 1949 have not worked, and there have to be dramatic changes among other things. But I would note in passing that this also to me appears to be certainly a sad indictment, particularly when it comes as an observation from the only living father of Confederation, that after twenty seven years we still depend upon the government of Canada to the extent that we do.

I could not agree more, Mr. Speaker, and I have already spoken about this in the House, so it is no need to labour it, with respect to the inadequacy of the procedure with respect to estimates. I re-emphasize again that these changes were made at the time, and they were made, Mr. Speaker, to avoid the necessity of having to have all night sessions. As I remember at the time, because of the obstinacy then of the opposition in refusing to, in filebustering as it were, within the rules, we had to sit all night on two occasions in order to get the estimates through, it was not thought that this was good

MR. MARSHALL

practice so we changed the rules. I agree that the rules were changed, but we ought to take an urgent look, and I believe an urgent look will be taken at them with review to clearing them up.

I had an note here to speak about his observations with respect to the raises that have come up for debate and have been referred to from time to time. My only comment on that is where as I can see, certainly that there may be an necessity for many things that this province requires, the fact of the matter is that this province is on its back right now, and it is my personal opinion that it is very difficult for us to be able at this particular time to afford. This does not mean that members who live farther away should not be-and have to travel back and forth to their homes-should be treated in probably a more equitable manner. But I do not want to particularly deal with that aspect of the matter.

There are a couple of things though, Mr. Speaker, outside of this, in relation to the general theme of the throne speech that I would like to speak about, this being pretty well my last opportunity to bring up certain matters. Even though, as I say, it is not a propitious time to do it, I intend to exercise my right and my duty as a member for St. John's East in doing it.

First thing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about for a few brief moments is a matter of housing policy in this province, particularly as it pertains to my own district. Members are perhaps all aware of a program that has been very successful in my own district of St. John's East. This is the **Neighbourhood Improvement Program** with its consequential **Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Plan** program that is triggered with it.

I am very proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that this was instituted, I had a great deal of splendid co-operation from the present Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing in the matter. A committee was formed some time ago, and I am very happy to report to the House and I have received information to the effect that this is the first time in Canada that a pure **Neighbourhood Improvement Program** has worked in the manner as envisaged under the National Housing Act.

They had attempted this, Mr. Speaker, in places in Ontario they had attempted it in Prince Edward Island, but it had not worked out for

June 3, 1976.

Tape # 3233

AM - 5

MR. MARSHALL

various reasons because it is a very hard program to bring about  
and to implement. You need an input from the **residents in** the area,  
and we have in that district now, a committee, as we have



MR. MARSHALL:

had right from the first, which is a volunteer committee meeting every Tuesday night without any remuneration whatsoever. They have done a marvellous job in bringing about this particular programme. There are several millions of dollars going to be available and you are going to see the results of it particularly coming forth this Summer when residential rehabilitation loans come in. I note also, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Speaker in the Chair at present in his own district has organized one and I know that he will find it an extremely beneficial programme.

But, Mr. Speaker, on this whole matter of housing, I would like to advert to something that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing said in relation to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, tie it into my earlier plea with respect to a complete debate and examination of statements of Crown corporations. The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing read a statement here a little while ago concerning the activity, the large activity, widespread activity of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation in this Province. He talked of lots that were being developed all over the Island, everywhere, by this very active corporation.

However, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, he did mention a fact that I think most people are fairly aware of. It is the fact that within the city of St. John's and the environs of St. John's where this Housing Corporation is developing property, the cost of the building lots do not significantly vary from the costs of comparable building lots that are developed by private developers. Now that statement that the minister made which we all are aware of is one, I think, which is a matter of concern to this House because if you have the Housing Corporation involved in activity of a commercial nature, and if private enterprise can do it as cheaply as the government can do it, I do not believe myself that government should be in it and that government efforts should be in other areas perhaps outside of the city of St. John's where you

MR. MARSHALL:

cannot get developers ready to develop lots, to encourage.

But the big point I want to make about this, Mr. Speaker, is this: Why are lots not able to be developed by the Housing Corporation or for that matter I do not want to zero in on the Housing Corporation or the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, who is a minister who has done a great job as far as I am concerned and has co-operated fully with me in all endeavours, but I just use that as an example. If this Housing Corporation or this Crown corporation is not able to carry out its work and develop lots and sell lots cheaper than private enterprise since the private enterprise must have a profit, I would like to know the reason why. And there is only one reason, there is only one way in which we can know the reason why. The reason is of course that the costs are greater. The only way that we can examine the costs is to see the financial affairs of the Housing Corporation.

MR. PECKFORD: That is a bit simplistic. I say that because of the lots, and we are only developing in Newtown, it is a bit simplistic to say that the Housing Corporation lots are only \$1,000 less than the commercial lots, for the simple reason that the quality of the lots at Newtown are far superior to the quality of the lots, for example, at East Meadows.

MR. MARSHALL: Well the minister knows this, but this is a factor, I think, that we ought when we are spending large amounts of money and large amounts of money are being diverted to this particular Crown corporation, I think that this is a matter that we ought to be able to examine here in the House itself. I mean the fact of the matter is that there is not that significant a variation. Even if there is a variation we should be able to see the financial affairs of all Crown corporations including this particular Crown corporation because, Mr. Speaker, purely and simply the people who are running it if they know that they are not going to be subject to any accounting whatsoever beforehand, this House and the general public has no safeguards whatsoever.



MR. MARSHALL:

I say to the House at this time that I would hope - I could not hide my own particular disappointment with respect to the reaction I have received to this and I may as well say as to other matters to date but particularly with respect to this, from government. I hope government, in these times when we are in perilous financial times, is going to address itself to this matter and in the next session of the legislature come in with some effective and meaningful way whereby the affairs of Crown corporations that are owned by the government can be examined by this legislature or some committee of the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, a little word now if I may about Come By Chance. Come By Chance - there are indeed a number of debates that apparently are going to end that are debates that I would like to see. I think in the interests of the public I would like to see them aired. Come By Chance is one of them. The trouble with these debates is you have the government position, the Opposition position, and most other people get squeezed out. Another debate is called and you do not get an opportunity to participate in it.

I would like to say first off with respect to the Come By Chance thing that on Mr. Shaheen's proposal, I have no reason one way or another to -

AN HON. MEMBER: What proposal?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Shaheen's proposal to put in \$600 million apparently into the Come By Chance refinery to repurchase it and get the project back again and get it running again. I have no axe one way or another to bear with respect to Mr. Shaheen. But I will say this, that surely government, if it is going to deal in any manner at all with the previous operators of the plant, must surely secure the payment of all of the creditors except maybe the major creditor, that is Ataka who was, as far as I am concerned, foolish enough to get into the refinery to the tune of \$300 million. But government ought to first see that these creditors are first secured and secondly, Mr. Speaker, let us not hear any more foolishness with

MR. MARSHALL:

respect to petrochemical complexes unless we can have it absolutely proven that the petrochemical complex is not a possibility, not a dream but is going to be a reality.

I rather suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the petrochemical complex, the possibility of a petrochemical complex in the Come By Chance area is possibly fairly remote.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would allow me.

The market for petrochemicals is on the way up and that is a very definite, positive part of Shaheen's proposal.

MR. MARSHALL: I have no doubt the petrochemical market has come up. I have no doubt with respect to this. But all I say is this, that I remember when this refinery was going through that there was no justification - the Liberal government at the time said it. They admitted it as any reasonable person would admit it - there was no justification of a then investment to the tune of \$155 million for the purpose of 500 jobs, not all of which would come to Newfoundland because a lot of the 500 jobs required specialized skill and required people to be imported from away. But there was not even justification of the 500 jobs. And the justification of that particular refinery at the time was that it was going to lead to a petrochemical complex.

Then I remember hearing some time later on along the progression that in order to have a petrochemical complex there would have to be an investment almost as large as the cost of the refinery itself in order to convert the various by-products - I have not got a scientific mind or really a scientific understanding - but I do remember being told or hearing one of the officials of the Shaheen companies indicating that there would have to be an investment almost as large as the refinery itself just merely to convert the refinery so that it could be used as a petrochemical complex.

Now the point that I am making is this, that we had promises before of petrochemical complexes. We had promises before with respect to the refinery, of certain pie in the sky, as far as I am concerned, ideas along the lines of the great industrial dream for

MR. MAPSHALL:

this Province and they did not come to pass. If it is a part of the scheme of the former owners of the Come By Chance complex to regain the complex and it will require the consent of this government, I feel that the government should look at it with most jaundiced eyes unless there is an absolute and complete assurance that all creditors are going to be paid, save and accept any arrangement that may be made with Ataka, and that also there is an assurance and a definite assurance, not a promise but a definite, provable assurance that there is going to be a petrochemical complex.

Another note I have, Mr. Speaker, at this early hour of the morning,

Mr. Marshall:

is the matter with respect to Churchill Falls. I think perhaps at this particular time I should leave this, My own particular position with respect to it was known, and I think, not that this helps any, I think that events have proven that what was said when I voted against the legislation last November unfortunately have had come to pass. But I will be making reference to that, Mr. Speaker, when we debate the matter of the Loan Bill which must come before the House. But I do not think that - as the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) indicated - I do not think that right now, the immediate stage at this particular time, but not too long in the future there should be a debate on this Churchill Falls matter and where we are going with respect to Churchill Falls add what have you.

There are other things, Mr. Speaker, that I could speak about, I could talk about but, you know, quite frankly what is the use: What is the use of this hour of the morning talking about them? Sometimes I say what is the use of the House of Assembly, what is the use of membership of the House of Assembly, but that is something I will be considering over the recess.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The question before the House is as follows, moved by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): - seconded by the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. E. Dawe) that all words after the word "that" be stricken out, and the following words be substituted therefore, "The House deplores the extent to which after twenty-seven years of Confederation the economy of the Province depends upon grants, gifts, contributions, and special considerations received from the Government of Canada."

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the Motion? Those in favour of the motion please say "Aye", those against the motion

Mr. Speaker (Dr. Collins):

please say "No." In my opinion the "Noes" have it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question! Question!

MR. NEARY: I am still on my feet. I have not taken my seat.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously we are going to be forced again.

MR. HICKEY: Now, now, take it easy now.

MR. HICKMAN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, before the Chair that we must -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Relax now!

AN HON. MEMBER: You are hyper, boy!

MR. NEARY: Well I will show you how hyper I am in a minute when I drag out that Dick Greene.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: It is about time now we got down to brass tacks in this House, of the skullduggery that went on over there at the Health Sciences Complex. Trot that out now if we are going to have it out.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The motion before the Chair is that the debate be adjourned. All those in favour; all those against.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The Nays have it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are forced to -

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

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A point of order has been raised.

MR. HICKMAN: I submit that the hon. gentleman is not permitted to continue speaking in this debate, in that particular, I draw Your Honour's attention to page 138 of Beauchesne, Paragraph (8) "A member who has moved or seconded the adjournment of the debate which has been negatived cannot speak to the original motion." The hon. gentleman has moved the motion to adjourn,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: And the motion has been lost. And I submit that under the rules of this House he is not entitled to speak on the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. That is not correct, Mr. Speaker. We have ample precedent in this hon. House, Sir, -

MR. HICKMAN: The motion carries -

MR. NEARY: No, unless you take your seat, Mr. Speaker. You have to take your seat, I did not take my seat. I stood -

MR. HICKMAN: Beauchesne says -

MR. NEARY: - here, Mr. Speaker, willing to carry on with the debate, and the hon. gentleman knows the difference of that.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne makes no mention at all of standing or sitting. It is very clear that a member who has moved or seconded the adjournment of the debate which has been negatived may not speak to the original motion. It is clear, unambiguous.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! It would seem to me that Subsection (8) of Section 165 in Beauchesne is quite clear on this point. However, there may be a matter of precedents in this House that I am not immediately aware of. So in view of that I would propose to -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have just read the citation in Beauchesne, and what is there is there. But there is a precedent earlier this evening in this House in an earlier portion of this debate, the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) moved the adjournment and the Speaker put the motion, and it was negatived and the hon. gentleman then carried on with a speech. No point of order was raised, it is true. But the absence of a point of order does not change the fact. I mean the hon. member did carry on with a speech, and I would think that precedent is found to be amply supported. I do not know if we record unsuccessful adjournment motions in the

Mr. Roberts:

journals. I just do not know. But if we do I will wager that there are a certain number of them over the years. I bring that up for Your Honour's attention because it is a precedent. It is a very recent one, because it happened in the House, what?, an hour and a half ago, I mean forty-five minutes from the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and forty-five minutes or whatever it was from the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). So it is a precedent. Well Beauchesne is there, and it certainly seems to be clear, but it is in conflict with our precedent, and my understanding is where that is so our precedents take precedents I have, you know, no particular desire to hear a speech at quarter of six, but the fact remains that the rules are the rules, and we must observe them. So I feel I should raise the point and bring it to Your Honour's attention.

MR. SPEAKER: (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. On the question of precedent, number one, may I direct Your Honour's attention to the fact that any motion to adjourn, and I can recall in the House where an hon. member who intends to participate in a debate on the main motion moves the adjournment and is carried. But this is where the motion has been defeated. And I do submit to Your Honour that, number one, if the Chair is going to rely on precedents, and I do submit that there has been no real precedent on this issue or on this matter as far as this hon. House is concerned, and it is going to disregard the clear and unambiguous rule that is laid down in Beauchesne, and it is very clear that if the rules in our House are silent then the rules of the House of Commons apply, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the question of precedent is not relevant. And this is the original motion, and I draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that it is the original motion, The motion to adjourn before by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was not on the original motion; it is on the amendment.



MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! I think this was the area I was getting into, but I am grateful to the Leader of the Opposition for bringing it up that there may be some bearing on this question from the former practices in the House, and I would therefore propose to adjourn for a short while to consult on the matter.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

The issue of the point of order is that the hon. member, having moved that the debate be adjourned, and this motion being negatived, whether or not he can then speak to the question. And I would bring to your attention again Subsection 8 of Section 165 in Beauchesne which states that, "A member who has moved or seconded the adjournment of the debate which has been negatived cannot speak to the original motion." And in May, "A member who has already spoken to the main question is not permitted to move either form of dilatory motion." That is one part of that paragraph. But the part that pertains to this question follows: "Nor having moved a dilatory motion can he later speak to the main question if his motion is negatived." The motion to adjourn the debate is clearly a dilatory motion. Therefore, and I will read May again on that, "Nor having moved a dilatory motion can he later speak to the main question if his motion is negatived!" It would accordingly appear both from Beauchesne and from May that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) cannot exercise a right to speak now to the main motion.

The point has also been raised that by recent precedent the hon. member should be allowed to speak, but I would bring to your attention that no ruling was made in terms of this. There was no positive ruling made in the debate an hour ago, and that in that sense a precedent has not been created. So from consideration of these points I would rule that the hon. member does not have a right to speak to the main motion.

Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is that the Address in Reply be adopted. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour of the motion, please say "aye". Those against, please say "nay." I rule that the "ayes" have it.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow Monday at 2:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): It is moved that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, June 7, 1976 at 2:00 P.M. All those in favour "aye". Also those contrary "nay". Carried.

Contents

June 3, 1976	Page
<b>Presenting Petitions</b>	
By Mr. Powe in behalf of residents of Hant's Harbour seeking paving of the roads to Custer's Head, Caplin Cove and Meade Gardens.	9745
Spoken to by:	
Mr. J. Winsor	9746
Mr. Neary	9747
Mr. Morgan	9748
Mr. Roberts	9748
By Mr. J. Winsor in behalf of the residents of Gaultois seeking changes in CN Coastal Boat service scheduling.	9753
Spoken to by:	
Mr. Morgan	9755
Mr. Neary	9755
Mr. Simmons	9756
By Mr. Powe in behalf of residents of Hant's Harbour asking that a sewage disposal system be provided for the community.	
Spoken to by:	
Mr. Peckford	9759
Mr. Roberts	9761
<b>Notices of Motion</b>	
Notice was given that on tomorrow leave would be sought to introduce Bills Nos. 87, 88, 91, 89 and 90.	9765
<b>Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given</b>	
Mr. Wells responded to a question asked earlier by Mr. Callan concerning a stadium for Placentia.	9765
Mr. Morgan tabled answers to Questions Nos. 436, 443, 441, 439, 438, and 432.	
<b>Oral Questions</b>	
Government's negotiations for additional office space. Mr. Roberts, Dr. Farrell.	9766
Query as to when a decision can be expected. Mr. Roberts, Dr. Farrell.	9767
Query as to whether prices submitted a year ago for provision of additional office space are still valid. Mr. Roberts, Dr. Farrell.	9767
Query as to whether there are not needs of greater importance than providing more office space. Mr. Smallwood, Dr. Farrell.	9768
Negotiations with NAPE. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	9769
Assurance sought that Treasury Board is negotiating in good faith. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	9770
Assurance sought that Government is not rushing to close the House. Mr. Smallwood, Premier Moores.	9772
Efforts of the Bowater Power Company to sell surplus power and its distribution system. Mr. Flight, Premier Moores.	9773

Oral Questions (continued)

Query as to whether Newfoundland Hydro would be permitted by Government to make such a purchase. Mr. Flight, Premier Moores.	9774
Query as to whether Government is locked into leasing arrangements which would make it difficult to construct a new building; and whether public tenders will be called before a large amount of office space is acquired. Mr. Nolan, Dr. Farrell.	9775
Issues to be discussed before the House closes. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	9775
Query as to whether Government plans to fight forest fires which break out in non-commercial timber stands in Labrador if equipment is available. Mr. Strachan, Premier Moores, Mr. Rousseau.	9777
Contributions of Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters towards the cost of fighting forest fires. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Pousseau.	9778
Query as to whether the paper companies pay a fair share of the cost of fighting forest fires. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Pousseau.	9780
Government plans to assist in new school construction. Mr. Lush, Mr. House.	9781
Future of the St. John's homemakers group. Mr. Hodder, Mr. Brett.	9782
Reduction in the number of homemakers. Mr. Hodder, Mr. Brett.	9783
Query as to what will happen to five elderly people formerly looked after by the homemakers. Mr. Hodder, Mr. Brett.	9783
Query as to whether a protest will be registered since the Joint Fisheries Commission was headquartered in Halifax and not in St. John's. Mr. Neary, Mr. W. Carter.	9783
Other topics to be discussed with Mr. LeBlanc. Mr. Neary, Mr. W. Carter.	9784
Query as to when the Department of Recreation and Rehabilitation will have a full-time minister appointed. Mr. Simmons, Premier Moores.	9784
Map sought of land owned by Newfoundland Refining in the Come By Chance area. Mr. Callan, Mr. Rousseau.	9784

Orders of the Day

Second reading of Bill No. 37	9785
Mr. Neary adjourned the debate.	9847
Debate on the adjournment	
Amount of control being exercised over big game poaching.	
Mr. Flight	9848
Mr. Hickey	9850
The closing of 20 beds at the Janeway Children's Hospital	

Contents - 3

Orders of the Day

Second Reading of Bill No. 37 (continued)

Mr. Neary 9852  
Mr. Wells 9854

Make-work projects of a community nature.

Mr. Callan 9856  
Mr. Lundrigan 9857

The House rose at 6:00 P.M. 9860

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M. 9861

Orders of the Day

Second reading of Bill No. 37 (continued) 9861

Second reading of Bill No. 68 9872

Committee of the Whole

Bill No. 37 9899  
Bill No. 68 9899  
Bill No. 47 (Brought back to the Committee by leave) 9954

The Committee reported Bill No. 37 without amendment, and Bills Nos. 68 and 47 with amendment. 9954

The Address in Reply

Mr. J. Carter 9955

The subamendment is defeated on division 9962

Mr. Smallwood 9963

Mr. Neary 10083

Mr. Marshall 10103

The amendment is defeated. 10116

Mr. Neary moved adjournment of the debate. 10116

The motion was defeated. 10116

On a point of order, Mr. Hickman quoted Beauchesne "that a member who has moved or seconded the adjournment of the debate which has been negatived cannot speak to the original motion." 10116

The Speaker ruled Mr. Neary had lost his right to speak in the debate. 10120

The Address in Reply was adopted. 10120

Adjournment. 10121