



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

---

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 25

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1976

**SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER**

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. J. CARTER: On February 16, 1976 I received my member's allowance which I am refusing. I, therefore, have a draft dated February 17, 1976 for \$1,050 made out to the Newfoundland Exchequer which I am placing upon the table of the House and directed to the department to which it relates.

MR. NEARY: Send it over to me, will you?

MR. CARTER: No, you will have to get in line.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: It does not prevent the rest of you from trying.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

HON. R. WELLS (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that members on both sides of the House were saddened on learning of the death over the weekend of Mr. Robert Wilson Shepherd who served ably as clerk of this House. Mr. Shepherd was born in Rose Blanche in 1895. His wife Margaret survives him as do his sons Reginald of St. John's, Lorne at Gander and Harry at South River.

Mr. Shepherd began his working career as a schoolteacher and he taught at Bishop's Falls, Bell Island and St. John's and was appointed assistant clerk of the House of Assembly in 1953 and became its clerk in 1956.

I knew Mr. Shepherd quite well, as I am sure did many of us, and in his ten years of service to this hon. House he served in a most exemplary fashion. He retired at the end of the 1966 session. His interests were very wide, and he served in high offices with organizations of the Anglican Church and with other organizations such as the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. He was associated with the Masonic Order as well as a number of other clubs and organizations and as his hobbies he enjoyed, gardening, fishing, shooting and, in his earlier days, tennis.

Mr. Wells.

I know on behalf of all members of the hon. House of Assembly, who will join with me in moving that a letter of condolence be sent to Mrs. Shepherd expressing the great sense of loss felt by the House of Assembly. In addition to the general expression of condolence, I want to add my sincere, personal regrets, and on behalf of all members of the House, to the Shepherd family, because in losing Mr. Shepherd this House and Newfoundland has lost a devoted and able citizen, and I am sure all members of the House will join with me and with the government in this expression.

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

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I would wish to associate ourselves with the motion so eloquently moved by the House Leader for the Government. Mr. Robert Shepherd was a magnificent servant at the table of this House. And many people, Sir, in reading of the House of Assembly or coming to see us from the galleries, or reading and watching reports on the television and in the press, are not aware of the fact that the efficient functioning of the House in very large measure is the result of the very effective, and very, very helpful service which not only Your Honour receives, as our Speaker, but which every member of the House gets from the clerks who sit at the table. They are not often recognized.

MR. ROBERTS: They sit between the Opposition side and the government side and they are in the midst of the debate but they are not part of the debate. But, Sir, we have a very proud tradition in this House of very fine service from the table. Mr. Shepherd during his ten years as clerk of the House, added greatly to that tradition, added greatly to the very fine parliamentary tradition of the clerks and of the officials of the House of Assembly. Sir, my colleagues and I are saddened by the news of his death. We would wish to be associated with the tributes which have been paid to him by the gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) on behalf of the government. We would like to add our personal condolences. Many of us on this side, Sir, knew Mr. Shepherd. He was a gentleman, a Newfoundlander in the best sense of that word, and we will all miss him very greatly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I join my voice to those who have spoken on the death of Bob Shepherd. He and I were school chums at Bishop Feild College and remained personal friends throughout most of his life. I had the pleasure and the honour of proposing him for his various positions at that table. I am proud of the fact that we were very close, warm and intimate friends.

Bob Shepherd was truly a very public-spirited man. He was a man of great idealism. He was a very keen-minded man. He was a man who had high principles and a great sense of personal honour. I knew his father, too. His father was, I think, a head constable in the constabulary, and he was stationed for a good many years at Bell Island. If I am not mistaken Bob Shepherd taught at Upper Island Cove for a number of years, and I think it was while he taught at Upper Island Cove, after we both had left Bishop Feild College as students, that I got to know him most intimately up to that time. This House has lost a good former servant, and Newfoundland, as the Leader of the House has said, has lost a good Newfoundlander. I join also in the expression of condolence to go to his family.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved, seconded and agreed that an appropriate letter of sympathy be extended to the family of Mr. Shepherd.

The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for all members of the House when I extend congratulations to Mr. William Marshall, Q.C. our colleague, member -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: - member for St. John's East, on his appointment to the position of being the first Chancellor of the new Anglican diocese of Central Newfoundland. Members will recall that in the session, the earlier part of this session which took place in the Fall, this House passed the act which separated the Anglican diocese in Newfoundland into three separate dioceses and of course that act came into force, as I recall it, the first of January of this year. This is the first Chancellor, Mr. Marshall is the first Chancellor, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who has been appointed under the new act, and, as I say, we certainly extend congratulations to him. His contribution, of course, to this House and to the community has been very great and is very great, and has been over the years. I know that all members will join with me in expressing congratulations to him at having attained this most deserved honour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, although we on this side have certainly had our differences with the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), and particularly when he filled the office now held by the gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells), that of House Leader for the government, still we all learned with delight of his selection, his appointment by Bishop-elect Cenge and the Synod of the new diocese of Central Newfoundland as the first Chancellor of that diocese. We wish him well. I feel that the diocese in a legal sense is in good hands as it is in a spiritual sense with Bishop-

MR. ROBERTS:

elect Genge and his brethren in the clergy.

All that I need add, I feel, other than my personal congratulations to the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) wishing him well, is to express the thought that the restructuring of the Anglican diocese has obviously gone ahead with much more expedition and much happier results than the restructuring of Her Majesty's Government four years past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to raise the matter that the Leader of the House has done.

AN HON. MEMBER: You can not help it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would like to add my voice to the congratulations that have been extended to the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). Now that we have in the House as one of us an hon. member who is the Chancellor of a Diocese, of a great church, I hope that his influence on all of us will be benign and that we will be more readily behave ourselves here, and that we will not earn his displeasure. I am sure the good wishes of all members go to the hon. member.

MR. NEARY: We will have the Our Father.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

#### PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. Leader of the Opposition, or indeed anyone on petitions, I would like to call to the attention of all hon. members the Standing Orders with relation to petitions and they are Standing Orders 90 to 97 on pages forty-seven to forty-eight, and particularly Standing Order 92 which starts off by stating "Every member offering a petition of the House shall confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it and the material allegations it contains." The Standing Order goes on to say, "In no case shall such a member occupy more than five minutes in so doing, unless by permission of the House upon question put."

It will be recalled that Thursday there was indeed a motion from an hon. member that that Standing Order be relaxed or not implemented for the time being. That was done essentially in relation to the time element where an hon. member wished to go beyond five minutes.

It is my understanding that in so doing the House wished temporarily and for that day to relax that particular rule, but not to repeal it, and that rule is still operative. Now I point that out because if not we would all be in great danger of not knowing what the

Mr. Speaker:

rules are or if there were any rules with relation to a petition. Certainly the House is master of its own rules, and the House can put in a different rule, but to repeal a rule and to substitute for it nothing else would leave hon. members in a difficult position knowing what was in order and what was not, and the Chair in an impossible position because there would then presumably be no rules. So I draw this to the attention of hon. members and unless there is a motion to the contrary, or unless the House exercises its right to change the rules, then I will request and require that the rules pertaining to petitions be adhered to.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like, Sir, to present a number of petitions, four in all, from citizens of the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland. One of them is from my own constituency, the district of the Straits of Belle Isle, three of them are from the district of Baie Verte-White Bay. The member for that district is at home with the flu, as I gather there are a number of other members. I am told the Minister of Finance is under the weather or under the influence of flu, and a number of other members I know, and public servants also come down with it, so I am presenting them in his behalf.

Sir, the point of the petitions is the same in each case, the petitioners are protesting against the proposal by the government to increase by 40 per cent the rate which the Hydro Corporation, the government owned corporation, charges for the power which they sell to the Newfoundland Light and Power Company.

Mr. Speaker, the petitioners, there are about 150 from the community of Conche, in my district led by Mr. Michael Byrne, the Chairman of the Community Council in that community; from the community of Englee, which was formerly in White Bay North, but is now in the district of Baie Verte-White Bay, a petition of



MR. ROBERTS:

about 250 names headed by Mr. Edgar W. Fillier, who is vice principal of the integrated school there and is the Deputy Mayor of that community, the mayor being absent; and then two others from further south in the district of Baie Verte-White Bay from Fleur de Lys and from LaScie in one case 100 names and in the other case fifty names, making in all Mr. Speaker, between 550 and 600 names on these four petitions.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting the petition perhaps I could add a word that is particularly relevant to the people of Englee and to the people of Conch. They have even a greater case, Sir, against electricity increases, in my view, than do anybody else because their electricity, as with so many of the people in Northern Newfoundland, in all of Labrador except Churchill Falls and the communities to the West, Labrador City and the city of Wabush, all of those people have electricity provided for them that is generated by diesel power. The rates are significantly higher to begin with than are the rates which are charged for hydro power. Of course, the rates - I think they are equalized to the first 500 kilowatt hours but after that they climb very rapidly. It is, I think, very unfair to these people. They are being heavily subsidized now by the Government of the Province. I do not have any figures, but diesel power is not being sold on a cost recovery basis whereas hydro generated power, I believe, is, or at least that is the theory which underlies the rate structures. Even given that fact, Sir, these people in Northern Newfoundland and in Southern Labrador, many of whom have lower incomes - they have a limited season for the fishery; they have limited access and alternate means of employment and they are being asked to pay a higher rate for electricity to begin with. Now if this increase goes through, an increase will be even more burdensome on them.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition. The prayer of them is the same as that which have been presented in a number of petitions presented in this House in the last two or three days. I would urge the government to give them every possible consideration and I would urge the government to insure that insofar as possible the prayer of these petitions is heeded

MR. ROBERTS:

and that these people do not have to face even greater increases in electricity costs than they have had to live with in the last year or so. I present them, Sir, to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further comments on this petition? The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

HON. J.C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we of course will be glad to receive this petition and give it every consideration. As the hon. gentleman mentions, in places like Conche and Englee and others where there is diesel power supplied by the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commissions through the Rural Electricity Authority, there is already a very, very large subsidy. I believe when the estimates of the House of Assembly for the year that is just concluding now, the cost of the subsidy in the rural areas where they now have diesel power is something in the order of \$8 million to \$9 million. In the estimates to come before the House for next year this will be in the order of \$11 million. So that is -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Can the hon. minister say how many communities are left on diesel power?

MR. CROSBIE: I cannot give you the exact number of communities, Mr. Speaker, but there still are a considerable number of communities supplied by diesel power, such as Ramea, Gaultois, Burgeo, Englee, Conche, Goose Bay-Happy Valley area and there are a large number of others. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said there is already a large subsidy. The rate in these areas for the first 500 kilowatt hours of energy used a month is the same as that in hydro areas. When the usage surpasses 500 kilowatt hours a month the rate increases as it must, Mr. Speaker, if we are not to run into just fantastic expenses in buying new diesel generating plants and in meeting the operating subsidies. The amount of 500 kilowatt hours a month is the amount normally used to heat a house and provide hot water.

AN HON. MEMBER: To heat?

MR. CROSBIE: I am sorry, not to heat, to provide light and hot water heating and not electric heating for a house. If the rates do not increase as you go beyond the 500 kilowatt hours a month, the usage in these areas will simply go up by a tremendous amount because of the subsidy and there is no way we can keep up with the increase in diesel units and the like that is requested. This whole matter, I am sure, will be debated in great detail

MR. CROSBIE:

later in the session. But I just want to point out to the House, Mr. Speaker, there is already a very extensive subsidy. I believe that the cost of providing energy from diesel plants is certainly well in excess of twenty-five mils a kilowatt hour. In fact in some areas it is up, I believe, if I am correct, it is around 100 mils per kilowatt hour -

MR. ROBERTS: You have got to be thinking about Hogan's Pond.

MR. CROSBIE: - because of your using diesel plants and oil and this is being sold at very subsidized rates. So it is a question of who can bear the cost. Is the taxpayer to bear all these costs, or is the user? Is the user to be encouraged to consume as much as he likes at subsidized rates or should he be encouraged to try to conserve energy by having to pay at least some significant part of its costs? These are some of the issues. But we will certainly consider these petitions, Mr. Speaker. But, you know, there is a limit to what any government can do and a limit to what the taxpayers can be asked to bear.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further comments on this petition?

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve petitions to present today, Sir.

This particular petition with the wording, "We the undersigned wish to protest the continuing increase in electrical power by the Newfoundland Light and Power Company in Newfoundland." It is just signed by miscellaneous people from no particular part of the Province, mainly in the St. John's area.

Then we have one here from Small Point, "We the undersigned do strongly protest the electrical rates and request that these rates be rolled back." There are sixteen names on that petition, Sir.

Another one with eighty-four names, mainly from Shea Heights, Mr. Speaker. All originals I might add, Mr. Speaker. They are subject to scrutiny by any member of the House who may be interested in going through

MR. NEARY: them.

Thirty-eight signatures and addresses here from people -

AN HON. MEMBER: We believe you.

MR. NEARY: Well they are here. All the others are inside. From people in St. John's mainly, right up to my hon. friend's district of Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), Manuels, Portugal Cove Road. "We the undersigned protest the rapid escalation of electricity rates."

Then I have an unusual petition, Mr. Speaker. It is one of these organized ones that have been sent out, petition against electricity rate increases, to the hon. House of Assembly, the petition of "We, the undersigned, being residents of and electors of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador humbly sheweth that we protest in the strongest possible terms against the government's decision to increase the electricity rates charged by the government owned corporation by forty per cent, making a total increase of more than 100 per cent in twelve months. We realize that this increase will be passed on to us whether we buy our power from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation or whether we buy it from Newfoundland Light and Power Company, that many people will suffer hardship if this increase is permitted and we therefore petition the government not to permit this increase. And your petitioners as is duly bound will ever pray." This is rather unusual, Sir, in as much as it is signed on behalf of the people of Burnt Islands, in the district of LaPoile, by a Committee of Concerned Citizens, and it is signed by Chairman of the Committee, Gerald Farrell. It is one of the petitions sent out by the Leader of the Opposition, I understand, returned to me.

I have another one here, Sir, with eighteen names, forty-three names, forty-three names, forty names, but anyway, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to delay the proceedings of the House. The petitions are still pouring into my office, Sir, the letters, postcards, telegrams are still pouring in as a result of this great crusade that I started several weeks ago and I am very happy to present these petitions.

Sir, I must say that I am not encouraged by the remarks made by the Minister of Mines and Energy. It may also interest the House, Sir,

MR. NEARY: to know I saw one member being astounded recently by the fact that the Public Utilities Board, any decisions that they make, any of their proceedings do not come under the Anti-Inflation Board. Well, Sir, that is written into the legislation that was passed by the Government of Canada, that no Crown Corporation, no Public Utilities Board come under the Anti-Inflation Board. I do not know if members are aware of that or not. That is why, Sir, that I say that we should keep, I agree with Wick Collins, we should keep the power in the hands of the politicians and not pawn it off on some Crown Corporation or the Public Utilities Board.

MR. WELLS: Point of order, please. This is now a debate.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been made. Order, please!

The hon. minister has raised a point of order that the hon. gentleman's remarks are tending to debate and that in fact is the case.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further comments on this petition?

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we are positively delighted to accept these petitions also submitted by the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary). We do not discriminate against any of these petitions because they come in on a form that supplied to the public by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: We know that he was very busy during the interregnum from December to now sending out a standard form petition to every community requesting that the people write in and protest the increase in power rates, and we are glad to see that his actions are bearing fruit.

As far as the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is concerned, Mr. Speaker, this great cause that he is leading is not a new cause. I think this is a cause which originally came in with Adam and Eve. when they struck their first cold season. They had exactly the same point of view as the hon. gentleman, They did not want to pay for the cover they needed for the cold weather.

MR. MURPHY: Make the announcement.

MR. CROSBIE: So there is nothing new.

I have an announcement to make, that 'Mr. Neary' leads in petitions 79 to 'Mr. Roberts' 68.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: I am sure this is going to be a very hot competition. I am glad also to see, Mr. Speaker, that the poor member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has now to hide behind the well-known columnist, Wick Collins. Any member in this house who has to depend on Wick for an argument is in sad and slack shape indeed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise in very hearty support of the petitions so ably presented, so ably counted,

MR. SIMMONS: by the member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary). We know he can count to at least twelve. That has now been verified without doubt. There is no question about it. We also know that he has a petition from his own district, and that should be one for the record too, Mr. Speaker. I waited for the unusual punch line as to what would be unusual about getting a petition from Burnt Islands, but I think that is what is unusual, the fact that he got one. Well, he did, Mr. Speaker, and I particularly want to support the petition from Burnt Islands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about prepared and unprepared petitions and so on. Let me say that to my knowledge I presented a couple of thousand or three thousand or so names altogether here on behalf of the persons who had signed those names. To my knowledge there was no shotgun approach anywhere. They all signed quite freely without any arm twisting whatsoever. I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition made it easy for me by preparing the petitions and perhaps in that respect, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. CROSBIE: Someone had to make it easy for you.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes I agree with the Minister of Mines, someone has to make it easy for me. It is very hard for me. It is all right for him, he has a staff of people to back him up and do his work for him. I have to do mine for myself.

MR. CROSBIE: Count them every day and the like.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am rather happy that I had the petitions prepared because you see it made it a lot simpler for my people who want to protest this outrageous increase to do so. Whether or not our form of solicitation - if you want to introduce that term - was by the printed word as opposed to the open line programmes. Well, you know, I cannot see the merits or otherwise of either but they both achieved a purpose, and the purpose was that people who very much wanted to protest the outrageous decision by Cabinet in December are doing it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out to the hon. gentleman that he is now getting into the area of debate.



MR. SIMMONS: I shall try to restrain myself, Mr. Speaker. I heartily support the petitions, the prepared, solicited and unsolicited versions, even the surprise petitions that he has from his own district. I heartily support them and I hope that the net result of their having been presented so ably by him today will help wake the government up, shake the government to its senses.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further comments on this petition? Are there any further petitions? The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition on behalf of 341 voters in the community of Port au Port West, Aguathuna, Felix Cove. The prayer of the petition is as follows:

"We the undersigned taxpayers and voters of the community of Port au Port West, Aguathuna and Felix Cove humbly pray that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador rescind the previous decision to incorporate the above mentioned communities into a town council and initiate procedures which will culminate in the election and establishment of a community council."

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by a staggering 82 per cent of the voters of the above mentioned community. At present the town of Port au Port West is a Local Improvement District. Last Fall the councillors of this town asked the Department of Municipal Affairs to give them elections and the department decided to incorporate the area into a town council. None of the residents in the area knew that this had happened until the Minister of Municipal Affairs wrote to a resident of the area, Mr. Max Snow, in response to a earlier petition from that community. He told Mr. Snow that the trustees of the municipality had requested that the status of the area be changed to a town with an elected council. The minister further informed Mr. Snow that the request had been approved by the Lieutenant Governor and arrangements were being made for the election. The



Mr. Hodder.

residents had heard nothing until this point, and they were alarmed, because they were not consulted about the decision either by the trustees of the Local Improvement District or by the department of Municipal Affairs. As well, Mr. Speaker, the people felt that a town council was not what they wanted. In an attempt to inform the residents about town councils and other forms of local government, I contacted the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, and he sent Mr. Colbourne of that department to explain to the residents about a town council and to explain the alternatives. This meeting was attended by 126 voters of the community, which is a very large turnout for such a small community. Mr. Colbourne explained the various forms of local government to the residents and answered their questions for some two and one-half hours, and at the end of that time the people asked for a vote to show their preference, and 112 people voted for a community council rather than a town council. After that they circulated this petition.

Mr. Speaker, the residents of Port au Port West, Aguathuna, Felix Cove, understand the alternatives open to them. They feel that the community council concept is the most manageable and democratic. Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere belief that no other type of council will work in this area at present as the citizens are determined that this is the best form of local government for them. It is of great concern to me that the community get the type of government they want. At the moment the situation there is far from desirable. The residents want a form of local government where they can participate in the decision making and one where they will be better informed as to what is happening in their area.

\* I wrote the minister to this effect on January 27, but I have not received an answer. The meeting mentioned above was held on January 25 and the people have not received an answer. A copy of the petition was sent to the Department of Municipal Affairs on February 2,

Mr. Hodder.

and no answer has been given yet. I urge the Minister of Municipal Affairs to go out and meet the people of Port au Port West, and I further urge them to give them an answer quickly.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this petition be referred to the department to which it is concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

HON. B. PECKFORD (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on the petition presented by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), I should point out that a number of comments mentioned in the petition as to responses to the petition sent in or to letters and so on, I think some of the comments made are not correct and valid ones. Response has been sent out to Mr. Snow and other people involved. Members of the Department of Municipal Affairs have been out in that area since the dates that you have mentioned in your petition, that the hon. member mentioned in his petition, and also to point out that under the legislation governing incorporations or changes of municipal status from a local improvement district to a town council or some other form of local government, it is not necessary, and there was no illegal manoeuvres attempted or done by the Board of Trustees of that Local Improvement District. Under the act the Board of Trustees have the right to apply to the Department of Municipal Affairs to have their municipal status changed to a town council. If that then is approved the Board of Trustees are notified and then proper election procedures are implemented by the Board of Trustees in line with the Local Government Act, which, I think, stipulates that six or seven public notices must go up in the community, nominations are held and an election of seven town councillors ensues, and you have a town council. There is some implication in the petition that the people were not informed that the Board of Trustees were going to change the municipal status. Well, technically and legally speaking the Board of

Mr. Peckford.

Trustees, under the act, did not have to inform the people. It would be better for them to inform the people that they were going to change the municipal status. It would be in keeping with all common sense, I suggest, that they inform the people that they intended to change the status of the municipalities from one of an LID to a town council. But legally they were not obliged to do so. It was in their own best interest to do so, but if they did or if they did not, you know, legally they were okay.

The whole question of change of municipal status from a local improvement district to a town council as it relates to the Local Improvement District of Port au Port West, Aguathuna, Felix Cove, as it relates to Summerford, and as it relates to a number of other LID's who are now petitioning for other kinds of municipal councils other than town councils, will be cleared up within the next twenty-four hours, and I will be informing by telegram the position of the Department of Municipal Affairs, the position of the government, on this very current issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further comments on this petition?

Are there any further petitions?

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MP. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present two petitions from two communities in my district, the communities of Port Blandford and Terra Nova, 117 people, again protesting the recent accelerating costs of electricity. In supporting this petition, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that I do not think the people of this Province can absorb further increases in the cost of electricity. The prayer of this petition is that the government refrain from imposing further increases on electricity in this fiscal year. I ask that this petition be placed on the table of the House and be referred to the appropriate department.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further comments on this petition?

Are there any further petitions?

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the voters, the people of Chapel Arm in the district of Bellevue. This petition is not unlike the dozens of others that have been presented over the last couple of days. The prayer of this petition has already been read by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). However I will read it.

"To the hon. House of Assembly, the petition of we, the undersigned being residents of and electors in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador humbly sheweth that we protest in the strongest possible terms against the government's decision to increase the electricity rates charged by the government-owned corporation by 40 per cent making a total increase of more than 100 per cent in twelve months; that we realize that this increase will be passed on to us whether we buy our power from the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation or whether we buy it from the Newfoundland Light and Power Company; that many people will suffer

Mr. Callan:

hardship if this increase is permitted; and we, therefore, petition the government not to permit this increase, and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray."

This petition, Mr. Speaker, is signed by 117 voters and electors of the community of Chapel Arm. I ask that this petition be referred to the department concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further comments on this petition?

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Just once again, Mr. Speaker, we in the official Opposition want to go on record as heartily supporting the petition so ably presented by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan).

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further petitions?

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have several petitions again on the subject of electricity rates which I would like to have tabled. The covering letter which accompanies the petition from Corner Brook says in part, "I am pleased to submit the attached list hoping it will help your most thoughtful attempt in not permitting the government to grant this ridiculous increase in electricity rates." The petition itself again is in the wording similar to that read by my friend from Bellevue (Mr. Callan), addressed to the House of Assembly in which the prayer of the petition is that they are hoping government will do something about this increase in electricity rates. It is signed by 241 residents of Corner Brook: Aspen Road, 55; 63A; 65; etc. Nowhere in it is there any indication that they were forced to do it by open line hosts or anything of that nature. I think again they are all, one, originals, red ink, blue ink, green ink and all that. Secondly, I believe, we can assume that they did it quite spontaneously, Mr. Speaker, without any harassment from the Leader of the Opposition or any other person who might have been leaning over them the day they signed those petitions. No, Mr. Speaker.

It is time for us to get serious about this particular matter. These are people who are very seriously protesting. They are not at

Mr. Simmons:

all interested in the politics of the situation. They are very seriously protesting a situation that is affecting disastrously their pocket books. They are asking that this House take them seriously, and that this House and the government in particular do something about the issue which forms the prayer of this petition.

Mr. Simmons:

Mr. Speaker, it is also my pleasure to present a petition again from Corner Brook on behalf of the Bay of Islands-St. George's Integrated School Board signed by Frank Janes, Chairman, on behalf of the Board, again protesting the electrical rates.

A petition bearing a number of signatures from the St. John's Lionettes; again for the record, all original signatures as far as I can determine.

A petition, Mr. Speaker, from the Kinetite Club of West St. John's bearing quite a number of names, twenty-six in all, once again protesting the electricity rate increase. And the covering letter reads in part, "Our club gives you every support, and hope it can help to keep this increase in electricity rates from being realized."

Then a petition from one of the CBC locals, Mr. Speaker, again protesting the increase in electricity rates. I do not have it totalled here, but it would look to be about probably thirty or thirty-five names.

The prayer of these petitions, Mr. Speaker, is all the same. It all relates to the outrageous electricity rates which the government gave its stamp of approval last December, has temporarily frozen it, and all of us together with these petitions are waiting to hear what the ultimate outcome of this matter will be, and whether or not the freeze will be allowed to continue for any extended period beyond April 30. We certainly hope so.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further comments on these petitions?  
Are there any further petitions?

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS: I am sorry. Is it too late for petitions? I had a petition on another subject.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have leave to revert to petitions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, we will remember that.

MR. WHITE: We will remember that. Okay.

MR. SIMMONS: Do not be so childish, boy, for God's sake.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. J. CROSBIE: What is the matter with the hon. gentleman from wherever he is from? The hon. gentleman should have had some help from the Leader of the Opposition there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: Bunkum!

MR. CROSBIE: I would like to table a document that outlines Newfoundland's action on energy conservation, Mr. Speaker, which we presented to the Energy Minister's Meeting last Friday, and which I will not read in detail. There are copies for members and for the press. It's an Energy Conservation Programme adopted by the government itself which includes the review and amendment of housekeeping practices for all provincial buildings, including schools and rented accommodation, to examine areas ranging from cooling and heating levels, heating plant efficiency and lighting of unoccupied space, the wastage of paper and the possibilities for paper recycling, review and restructuring of purchasing policies to emphasize energy conservation and lifetime cost. Actually I should have read this in answer to one of the petitions - because energy conservation is very important in view of the cost of energy. Also consideration of new policies with respect to the purchase of compact or smaller cars, unless there is specific justification for a larger size, inclusion of energy costs in consideration of new building leases, so that the developers will be encouraged not to skimp in insulation. Issue of clear instructions that all provincial employees are to practice energy conservation, including observation of a maximum fifty-five mile per hour speed limit for provincial vehicles; that is, the drivers of our vehicles owned by the government are not to drive them in excess of fifty-five miles per hour.

MR. ROBERTS: On a point of order.

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



MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. I understand we are now on the order of the day which is presenting reports. I have never before heard a minister refer to a report at quite the length that the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Mines and Energy is. I would ask if it is in order. And I might also suggest that perhaps one way to conserve energy would be if the hon. gentleman would table the report and let everybody read it, and it will speak for itself. If not, Sir, I submit it should have been a ministerial statement at which stage members representing groups in the House would have been allowed to make a few brief comments. I would ask if it is in order for the hon. gentleman in tabling a report to read either the report itself or a precise of it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: It is customary

MR. WELLS:

in this House that when a minister presents a report that he is allowed by courtesy and custom a few minutes to explain and to elucidate the matters that are in it. Now the hon. minister this afternoon up to this point has taken no more than two or three minutes at most and I would suggest that that is not an infringement of the rules in any sense, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear! Carried!

MR. SPEAKER: Now the point of order raised is when a minister is presenting a report to the House, to what extent he may comment on the content of that report. My understanding is that in tabling the report he may give an explanation of the report, of its contents, of what hon. members will find in it, but that he may not make what would be regarded as a ministerial statement of government policy. So I will certainly recognize the hon. minister and will just reiterate that the remarks in presenting a report should be one of explanation as of the contents and nature of the report. The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In conclusion we are requesting energy conservation suggestions from all departments and employees of the government. So there are copies here for the hon. gentlemen to peruse.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN: (See index)

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

HON. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to prove I took seriously the comments made by the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) last Friday -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Kindly remarks.

MR. MORGAN: - today I have some information for the same hon. gentleman, in reply to questions 440, 445, 434, 433, 412, 423, 446 and 444.

MR. ROBERTS: Well done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to two questions that were on the Order Paper, Thursday, March 4 asked by the hon. member for LaPoile, question 709 and question 711. These two questions, Mr. Speaker, have absolutely nothing to do with the Intergovernmental Affairs agency listing houses sold by Memorial University and the like. We have no knowledge of that and no responsibility for it. So if the question is in order it should be directed presumably to the Department of Education, I suppose. Question 711 which asks about contracts with a certain company. There have been no contracts by that person with Intergovernmental Affairs or even the government, as far as I know. Presumably that question should be directed to the Department of Public Works. The hon. gentleman should table those two questions again and direct them to, as I suggested, those two departments.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of information. When an hon. member directs a question to an hon. minister and he misdirects it, it really does not apply to that minister, is it not the normal course for the minister in question to forward it to the minister to whom it does relate so that the member of the House who asked the question is not put to the necessity of tabling the question again? Would that not be a simpler method? I think that is what always was done in the past. Could that not be done again?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may respond to that point.

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

MR. MURPHY: Precedent has established that when we did ask questions in previous years we were answered that it did not relate to that department, we should readdress it.

MR. WELLS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, actually what is before us now is, I think, a question from the hon. member from Twillingate.

MR. WELLS: Well yes, it is the question. My understanding as the way things have been done in the past is that if it was a different department

MR. WILLS:

the questioner simply addressed his question to the correct department. After all, it is not a lengthy or time consuming process, and that the question was in due course answered. Now if that is unsatisfactory, we could think in terms of another procedure. But I think that is what has been done in the past. We will endeavour to provide answers speedily.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by - my question, I guess, in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Energy - here he is. In view of the statement made by the General Manager of CFLCo at Churchill Falls, Mr. Burlington, that the fire which occurred there on the weekend was deliberately set and was an instance of arson, could the minister tell us, to begin with, Mr. Speaker, just what steps the government are taking to protect the property there, and then, secondly, what steps are going to be taken to enquire into this incident which, as I say, the General Manager has termed as arson. Now it may well be the Minister of Justice should be asked as well, or perhaps I could ask it of the House Leader and one of the three of them, Sir, could give us the answers.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: The position with CFLCo is that CFLCo is a company jointly owned by the Province of Newfoundland, sixty-five per cent roughly, and the Province of Quebec or Hydro Quebec owns approximately one-third of the company, and it is operating under an independent and distinguished Board of Directors. The Chairman is Mr. Dennis Groom, and I think the members are, the three members representing Hydro Quebec, Mr. Roland Giroux, Mr. Yvon DeGuise, another gentleman, Mr. Hanbley from Ontario, Mr. Tompkins from Morgan Stanley, Dean Angus Bruneau, Mr. James Greene, Q.C., and, I think, Mr. Roland Martin. So it operates under its own independent Board of Directors.

Now with respect to the recent troubles in Churchill Falls, we understand there is some suspicion that the recent fire on the weekend at Churchill Falls may have been caused by arson. I believe the company has brought that to the attention of the RCMP and my colleague the Minister of Justice will have some more information on that and he can give it now. But other than that that is all that we ourselves know about it.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, I guess, would be more appropriate, in view of the fact that we are the major shareholder, and in view of the fact that our shares have cost us \$160 million, will the minister undertake to make some enquiries as to whether or not steps are being taken to ensure that the property is being protected?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I just said that the management of Churchill Falls has brought this to the attention of the RCMP, and the Minister of Justice will have more attention on it, naturally. It is their responsibility as the managers of the Corporation to look after its property and you can rest assured that they have asked for this to be investigated and the Minister of Justice will explain what information he has.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, in further reply to the question by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I am advised there are thirteen members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police presently in Churchill Falls.

MR. ROBERTS: That is an increase?

MR. HICKMAN: That is an increase. The normal detachment, the normal Churchill Falls detachment carries two, sometimes three men, not more than three men. The investigation into the allegations of arson is being carried out under a Staff Sergeant who has expertise in that field and also a man from the Identification Division of the RCMP.

I am also advised by Chief Superintendent K.B.M. Fraser, the officer commanding the RCMP in Newfoundland, that the force are maintaining twenty-four hour patrols in Churchill Falls and are checking all persons in and around the site and/or property of Churchill Falls Corporation.

MR. ROBERTS: And the site?

MR. HICKMAN: And the site.

MR. ROBERTS: The Corporation owns the Town.

MR. HICKMAN: I realize that. And I have also instructed that Fire Commissioner Frank Ryan go to Churchill Falls to give whatever professional advice and assistance may be required in investigating the two fires.

MR. ROBERTS: The two?

MR. HICKMAN: Well, there was also a fire in a trailer or a mobile home some time ago.

MR. ROBERTS: How long ago?

MR. HICKMAN: I have forgotten how long, not too long, between two and three weeks.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice, Sir. Would the minister inform the House if he has been requested or if he knows if any additional P.C.M.P. police have been sent to St. Anthony to protect the group from the Greenpeace when they arrive in that Northern community?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, again I received a report this morning from Chief Superintendent K.R.N. Fraser that there are presently seven or eight police officers stationed in St. Anthony.

MR. ROBERTS: Normally there are only three.

MR. HICKMAN: He does not anticipate that additional men will be required but there are men in the area along the West Coast as far South as Corner Brook who have been alerted and the necessary transportation is standing by, including that great helicopter that was presented to the Province of Newfoundland by the Solicitor General as part of the P.C.M.P. equipment, and that they are able to transport them to St. Anthony should this be necessary. The Flower's Cove detachment and other detachments can be summoned speedily and will be summoned speedily if and when they are required. I would hope that they will not be required. The reports that I have seen in the press indicate that the people of St. Anthony have absolutely no intention of breaking any law but that within the confines of the law and also of decency they intend to indicate to those who have proposed to come amongst us that they do not approve of their nefarious schemes.

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

MR. VOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, and possibly this is tied in, with your permission, with the Minister of Transportation. Either one of them perhaps would like to answer this. It is in reference to the licensing of farming equipment. I am thinking primarily in this case as applies to my own area where in some cases it is necessary for a constituent to bring their equipment, say, across the road to carry



MR. NOLAN:

on their agricultural business there and in some cases they are finding it very, very difficult because of the imposition of licensing and so on. I realize it presents a real problem in some areas, and I would appreciate any consideration, representation that they might have received or any information they could give us at this time from either source.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of individual representations from farmers around the Province. Not from organized groups but from individual farmers expressing their concern over the fact that they were forced to purchase third party liability insurance on tractors or equipment of that nature that they would not be normally using on the highways or sometimes, for example, maybe once or twice a year just to use their vehicle in crossing a highway.

So I will be, over the next number of days, in consultation with my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, discussing this matter in the hope that we can arrange some means of where only the vehicles they are going to use, for example, in hauling in their fertilizer or trucking out their product, only these will be forced to have third party liability and not the vehicles used on their own property, providing they could, of course, indicate to us that the equipment that we license, they must indicate to us that they will not be used on the highways.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation. Could the minister give us an assurance - and I have had representations, as have he - that in view of the fact that it is the thirty-first of March that is the deadline for licensing vehicles in the coming year, could the minister give us an assurance that this administrative action which he and his colleagues propose to take, or which he proposes to his colleagues that they jointly take, will in fact, some decision will be taken before the end of March

MR. ROBERTS:

because the question is now urgent. We have only twenty-three days left for these men either to have the problem resolved or else they will be in breach of the law as it now stands.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, there will be no urgency with regards to farming equipment because I am sure there will not be too much farming equipment in use prior to the end of March. So the equipment that will not be licensed will not be forced to have, or licensed without the compulsory third party liability insurance or equipment that will probably not go into use until early May month. But in the meantime we will be dealing with the matter in the next number of days.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Minister of Highways. Would the minister advise the House as to what plans the Department of Highways has for the reopening of that section of the Trans-Canada Highway in the vicinity of west of Grand Falls? A firm plan of when we can expect it to be open and what the programme will be that will bring about the reopening?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Highways.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, funds hopefully will be approved in the estimates, and the estimates, of course, will be approved when the budget is brought before the House of Assembly, and it is a priority with my department now, and as soon as the estimates are approved and the funds allocated the work will be commencing in early Spring, very early Spring.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary question? The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister advise the House as to what the estimate cost of repairs are and whether or not the Province is assuming all the cost of the repairing of that section of the highroad?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Highways.

MR. MORGAN: The first part of the hon. gentleman's question I will take under advisement, but the latter part of the question, unfortunately the Province will have to bear the total cost of that repair to the Trans-Canada Highway. We have held discussions with the company, and they will not assume any liability for damages to the highway.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one further supplementary, and then I will recognize another hon. gentleman.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister indicate when that road will be open in as far as he can? At what point in the Spring? How long will it take to reopen the road? I am not being petty here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Flight.

That situation right now is causing more concern in Central Newfoundland than any other issue that I can think of.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Highways.

MR. MORGAN: Well depending on two things: (1) the approval of the estimates; and (2) the weather conditions which will allow the commencement of the construction season. Work will commence at the very earliest possible date at the construction season this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Fisheries. Would the minister tell the House if the government or if the minister himself has made an official protest to Ottawa over the appointment of Parzival Copes to make a study of the Newfoundland fishery?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, we have not made an official protest but certainly through the news media we have expressed some concern with respect to Dr. Copes' appointment, and that is as far as it has gone at the present time.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question really for the Premier or the Minister of Finance, and in their absence, I would like to address the question to the Government House Leader. I wonder would the minister indicate to the House whether the EPA aircraft which carried a number of government personnel from Gander to Montreal, I believe in January or early February, was it charged out of public funds, and if so if he could indicate how much was the cost and also who travelled on that aircraft trip from Gander to Montreal?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: My information is, and the hon. member is quite, of course, at liberty to check with the Premier when the Premier returns, but my

Mr. Wells.

information is that that was not a charge out of public funds. As to who travelled on the aircraft I think it has been made public that the Premier travelled and one or two other public servants or ministers, I am not sure, but there is no great significance at any rate as far as I know to who travelled on the flight. And my information is that it will not be a charge out of public funds.

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

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary for the minister. I wonder to his knowledge or if not to his knowledge at present, would he undertake to find out whether this transportation on the occasion we are talking about to Montreal by EPA aircraft, - it was understood at the time the trip was undertaken to be a gift or understood not to be a charge on the public treasury at the time the trip was taken?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: It is completely outside my knowledge and the question should be directed to the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: A further supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the minister in the absence of the Premier. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the minister would indicate to the House whether the Premier and government ministers make a practise of accepting such a gift as transportation and other similar gifts? And if so, whether this does not constitute a fairly brazen conflict of interest on the part of the Premier and the minister's concerned?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: That is not a question, Mr. Speaker, and I have no intention of answering it.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

The hon. minister has refused to answer the question, and the hon. gentleman cannot debate that point.

MR. SIMMONS: I am asking the minister to answer a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize one further supplementary and then another hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would wonder whether the minister would indicate to the House whether to his knowledge it is a practice for the Premier and ministers to accept such gifts from private industry?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! That is a repetition of the previous question which the minister has refused to answer.

MR. SIMMONS: No way. Have they got something to cover up? We got the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. Would the Minister of Health tell the House what he knows about this fake doctor who was brought into Newfoundland and then later went to the Northwest Territories? Would the minister also tell the House if he searched through his records to see if the work that was done I believe in the Placentia Cottage Hospital by this fake doctor was satisfactory or what damage was done by this fake doctor who was recruited and brought in here into Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

HON. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I went through the files some two or three, three or four weeks ago. As I recall it the gentleman to which the hon. member refers did indeed practice in Newfoundland in the hospital at Placentia. There was some minor work done during his term of tenure in the hospital. There have been no complaints. He practiced for two months and took off to what he thought was greener pastures.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary question. I recognize the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question. Could the minister indicate to the House whether this fake doctor did any surgery, whether it was minor surgery or major surgery, while he was on the staff of the Cottage Hospital in Placentia? Did he actually perform surgery?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there was some surgical measures taken of a very minor nature under the supervision of the medical officer, as I understand it.

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this question is for the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications again. Very recently the minister made a public statement that he would be visiting Buchans with his Deputy Minister to familiarize himself with a route, proposed route of the Buchans-Howley Highway. The question is twofold: When does the minister intend to make this trip that is taken for granted that he will be making? The second part of the question is the fact that he has committed himself to do this, is this an indication that the government is indeed looking at the construction of that road as a viability? Are they indeed prepared to recognize that as a viable route and will construction be considered by the government for that road, Buchans-Howley?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the only commitment given to the sub-committee of the Buchans Task Force, committee on transportation, was that I would travel to the area to make myself familiar with their proposed route. I told the Task Force approximately the middle of I think it was January month I would be over in the area. The reason why I have not been there to date is because my engineers advise that it is more practical to do that study of the area and to meet with the committee when the snow is removed from the ground hopefully by mother nature.

MR. FLIGHT: The second part of the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it a supplementary?

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, the supplementary is that I did not get the second part of my question answered, and that is whether or not the minister is interested and the minister is indicating publicly that he would look at the route. I am asking if this is an indication that the government are

MR. FLIGHT:

receptive to that road, to the building of that road?

MR. SPFAWER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communication.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the decisions were all made there would be no point in my travelling to the area to discuss the matter with the people in the area concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Fisheries. Does the minister intend to travel to St. Anthony tomorrow to show the government's objection to this Greenpeace Foundation?

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

HON. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of going to St. Anthony to meet the bunch from British Columbia. I believe we probably would be all well advised to give as little publicity to this group as possible because they feed on it. Without publicity given to them by the media and by the hon. member, I am sure that the crusade will die before it gets started.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question



MP. NOLAN:

for the hon. House Leader. Is there any consideration being given by the government, or will you give consideration to a provincial enquiry concerning the reports given to a board within recent days concerning optometrists, ophthalmologists and so on indicating rip-offs here in Newfoundland and particularly since this has been going on for more than ten years, and table the names of those that are at fault?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the federal government.

MP. NOLAN: Never mind the federal government, you can do it provincially.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Of course this is a federal enquiry. In due course I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the results of it will be made available to people in this Province including the government. As things stand the only thing that we have is what has come out of the press reports unless some of us attended the hearing, and that is -

MR. CROSBIE: Like Neary.

MP. NEARY: I am the only member interested.

MR. WELLS: That is right. That is to the effect that there have been certain payments made, but these ended in 1972, so we are told. So I do not think that the provincial government, that any public good would be served in the provincial government going back before 1972 to see what people did in that particular profession or industry, whatever it is. But if things are correctly being done now that is much more to the point and much more important.

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

MP. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the hon. minister consider the fact that perhaps the Newfoundland public should know if they were being ripped-off before 1972 and expose the names of those responsible?

MR. CROSBIE: What about the federal enquiry?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: I think there is a federal enquiry into this and if something is going to be shown of this nature and come out of the enquiry, well and good, but I cannot see any point actually if things of this sort took place prior to 1972 I still cannot see any point in our initiating some sort of enquiry which would embarrass people for something four or five years, six, seven, eight, ten years past. I do not believe the public interest would be served. What I think is more to the point is that whatever steps that are necessary from here on be taken to make sure that people receive proper service for the amount of money that they pay.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir and afterwards the hon. member for LaPoile.

MP. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a related question but for the Minister of Justice. I wonder would the minister indicate to the House whether his department contemplates any plans to introduce legislation perhaps similar to the Ontario legislation, for example, to make the kickbacks in the eyeglass industry illegal in this Province?

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MP. HICKMAN: Well, number one, Mr. Speaker, that would not be the prerogative, I suggest, of my ministry to recommend that kind of legislation. Secondly, ordinary prudence would dictate that before introduce any legislation we should await the outcome of the enquiry that is being conducted by a very able commissioner appointed by the Government of Canada in the person of Mr. Robert McLellan, Q.C.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary? The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MP. SIMMONS: Yes. I would like to direct a question then to the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment. I would like to ask him whether his department is presently contemplating any such legislation to make kickbacks with reference to the eyeglass industry illegal in this Province?

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs.

MP. MURPHY: Not to my knowledge. My group did attend and present

MR. MURPHY:

numerous briefs on behalf of people who felt they were being overcharged for eyeglasses. But did we use the words kickbacks and loan sharks and all this type of thing? If someone could define just what a kickback is, and in way is it a discount that someone gets on something like this. And as he quoted it, it happened before 1972. We are following, we are waiting the report of the full hearing. We have presented our own brief, and if we feel that there are any actions that our department could take naturally we will go to the proper channels of the Justice Department to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one further supplementary.

MP. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do I gather from the minister's comments and particularly his wonderment about what I meant about kickbacks, that he has not heard the discussion that is going on in the hearings? Does he want me to elaborate on kickbacks so I can get an answer from him?

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

MR. SIMMONS: Is the minister -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: Sit down Popper, go on, like a good boy. Do not be making a nuisance of yourself.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's question is not in order.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this question should be directed to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Would the minister tell the House what repercussions the cutbacks, the DPPE cutbacks are going to have on roads in Bonavista North, especially the one called the Loop Road; what effect the cutbacks are going to have on the road construction and reconstruction on the Great Northern Peninsula, and the road in the Bay D'Espoir area? What result will these DREE cutbacks have on these three pieces of road?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, this matter is still under discussion with the representatives of the Government of Canada. And, of course, we take the position that there should be no cutbacks in the amount of DREE funds made available for highway purposes in the Province during the present year, and, in fact, our submission was that the DREE cash flow in this Province during the present year amounts to some \$65 million, and that is if we were just to keep up with inflation alone that the amount required for next year would be at least \$80 million. The Minister of DREE was down here about two weeks ago. He says that his budget is frozen, and he cannot spend any more than he has spent last year, that the most that they would spend in Newfoundland under DREE programmes in the year starting April 1, would be \$65 million, and that therefore they have suggested that there should be a cutback in the amount of money they are spending under the DREE Highway's Agreement in Newfoundland. Well, if they maintained that position, Mr. Speaker, we will then have to deal with that situation. But our submission to DREE is for work to continue on the Bonavista North Loop Road, for work to continue apace on the Great Northern Peninsula Road, included in our submission was work on the road - certain paving done on the Bay d'Espoir Highway, that continuation of the road from Bay d'Espoir to Harbour Breton, certain road work at Stephenville which is related to industrial development, the linerboard mill there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Burgeo.

MR. CROSBIE: And further work on the road to Burgeo. Yes, the Minister of Highways is telling me - I think that is -

MR. MORGAN: And the LaScie Road.

MR. CROSBIE: And certain paving on the LaScie Road.

Now all that work cannot be done, Mr. Speaker, unless DREE is willing to provide the amount of funds necessary which is in excess of what was spent during the present year. So this matter is still under discussion with them. If they adhere to their position that they cannot spend on roads in this Province next year even what they spent

Mr. Crosbie:

during the present year, obviously some of that work cannot be done, and it will have to be agreed with DREE just what work will not be done despite our request that it should be done. So we are requesting that all that work be done. If it is not all done it is because the Government of Canada will not provide the funds for it to be done. It will be over our strong protest. We will be urging that it all be done. And our decisions on what will or will not be done will be made in the next few weeks as we see whether we can encourage them to spend more rather than less in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile on a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell the House what form these negotiations, these protests are taking? Are they face to face correspondences, telegram, telephone? Just what form these protests and these discussions are taking?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: These discussions have taken place face to face, cheek to cheek, jowl to jowl, belly to belly - with a table in between. They have taken place like that, Mr. Speaker, heart to heart, except Mr. Lessard's heart is little on the cold side this year because of his estimates.

MR. NEARY: Dollar for dollar.

MR. CROSBIE: Dollar for dollar.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did the minister -

MR. CROSBIE: They are taking place between officials.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did the minister at one point tell them to go to hell?

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, no, Mr. Speaker. I am too careful, and too diplomatic to do that. One cannot bite the hand that partially feeds one. So -

MR. NEARY: You should have told your Premier that when he was on national television at the Tory Leadership Convention.

MR. CROSBIE: So, Mr. Speaker, there are discussions going on now between our officials and we hope to be able to tell the House in the next - you know, with some luck to be able to tell the House early in April just what will be done.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one further question and answer.  
The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for either the Minister of Transportation or possibly the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs relating to the proposed road from Manuels Bridge up to the Arterial Road. I am sure both ministers know the very serious situation there on traffic flow and so on at various hours of the day, particularly in the morning and evening. I am wondering if either one of the minister's have any information they could provide on this road or if they would perhaps agree to provide some information in the next day or so if there is any available?

MR. CROSBIE: It has nothing to do with DREE.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. WELLS: Motion 2, Mr. Speaker.

On motion of the hon. Minister Without Portfolio, a bill, "An Act To Provide Retiring Allowances On A Contributory Basis To Persons Who Have Served As Members Of the House of Assembly," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (No. 14).

On motion of the hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Amateur Sports Federation Act, 1972," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (No.23).

On motion of the hon. Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Quieting Of Titles Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (No.20).

On motion of the hon. Minister of Social Services, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Child Welfare Act, 1972," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (No.17).

On motion of the hon. Minister of Health, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Medical Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (No.18).

On motion of the hon. Minister of Health, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Pharmaceutical Association Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (No.22).

On motion of the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Crown Lands Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (No.21).

On motion of the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Development Areas (Lands) Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. (No.19).

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, the adjourned debate on the Address in Reply. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and may I begin my remarks this afternoon, Sir, by asking Your Honour for a ruling. It is not a hypothetical point. I suppose in effect I am raising a point of order on my own speech, a ruling with effect to the amount of time I have left. The precise point, I suppose, Your Honour, would be the amendment which we are now debating which I have put down as a motion of lack of confidence in the government, although it is not the usual

MR. ROBERTS: wording and I went into my reasons for that at some length.

It is not the usual wording of condemning the government for a number of reasons and sins of omission and commission but I submit it is a motion of non-confidence and I would ask for a ruling because if it is, of course, as I understand it I have an unlimited amount of time according to the rules of the House, If it is not I have only ninety minutes which would have begun as of the moment I moved the amendment. So the matter is not



Mr. Roberts,

entirely academic. I think it is quite practical. I do not know if hon. gentlemen opposite wish to speak to the point, but I am not sure that I made it entirely clear on Friday. At least, reading the weekend papers, I am not sure whether they grasped the point.

MR. WELLS: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, and the Leader of the Opposition will have to clarify this, I took it to be a motion of non-confidence. This is what I took it to be. Maybe I was mistaken.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. In my opinion, Sir, the amendment or so-called amendment put by the Leader of the Opposition is in actual fact not an amendment at all. An amendment, as I understand it, Sir, is supposed to do something. This amendment, Sir, is completely meaningless and empty and it does not do anything to the Throne Speech. It does not -

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

The hon. gentleman is now commenting upon the import or his opinion of the amendment. The point of order which has been raised is in effect whether the Leader of the Opposition has unlimited time and that is related to whether his amendment is an amendment of non-confidence. The hon. gentleman's opinions on the amendment are separate from his opinions on whether he thinks the amendment is a motion of non-confidence.

If there are no further points to be made, then I will rule on it. It is an important matter. If any other hon. member wishes to make a submission, I will hear it.

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have just been thinking over in my mind what kind of an amendment could be made to the motion

Mr. Smallwood.

that an Address in Reply be presented to His Honour for the gracious speech? That is the order before us. Now any amendment at all made to that is surely automatically, or almost automatically, a motion of lack of confidence in the government.

MR. ROBERTS: That is as I understand it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, any amendment - that our words brought in here, in effect, by the government, in effect, not actually, but in effect brought in by the government that so and so and so, that all words after the word 'that' be stricken out and that there be substituted certain other words. Surely 'that' - no matter what follows after the word 'that' then, no matter what words are in the amendment, it is a motion of lack of confidence in the government.

MR. NEARY: If you vote for the amendment, you are voting against the government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank hon. gentlemen for their submissions.

It is my opinion that the amendment is in fact, a motion of non-confidence. I agree that practically any amendment to the Address in Reply would be by its nature a vote of non-confidence, certainly one which replaces all the words after 'that'. One could conceivably perhaps think of an amendment which might add something, which may or may not be, but that is not the case before us here. This amendment, which asks the House to replace all the words after 'that' and substitute something else is, in my opinion, an amendment of non-confidence and this, of course, means that the Leader of the Opposition does have unlimited time in debating it.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It was an unusual way, I guess, to establish the point but I think it had to be done. I am not sure whether you could ever move an amendment that would be an amendment that would not be one of non-confidence as the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) pointed out. The only one

Mr. Roberts.

I could think of would be, you know, to add the words in something like, "This House commends the ministry for their wise or beneficent administration of the Queen's affairs." But the point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a non-confidence matter. It is phrased affirmatively and the point which I made when I spoke on Friday - and I have had a look at the Hansards and the Hansards bear me out - is that it is not in the usual form, and I explained at some length why, in our opinion on this side, an amendment in the usual form but not the right and proper amendment at this time. But let it be understood that if this amendment were to carry, the government would be forced, the Premier would be forced to wait upon His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor presumably to advise a dissolution, but in any event the government would have to leave office

MR. ROBERTS:

because it is a matter of confidence. Mr. Speaker, on Friday I began a few remarks on the subject of the financial troubles at Come By Chance. The gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) raised a point of order and there were some submissions to that point. Then Your Honour made a ruling to the effect that I could speak about Come By Chance even in the light of the fact that the bankruptcy petition by the Ataka firm is now this day, I believe, before the Supreme Court. In fact I would guess the hearing is now on. It began, I believe, at three of the clock and presumably carry on until five or five thirty, however long the judge keeps court and presumably continue tomorrow and maybe even the day after. But my understanding of the situation is that I am not breaching the sub-judice rule if I make comments on it provided I do not get into the merits of the matter before the courts. The merit of the matter before the court as I understand it is whether or not the petition of the Ataka firm is a sound one and whether or not that their request, which is that the Provincial Refining and Newfoundland Refining, two companies owned by the Shaheen Natural Resources interests, that company be declared bankrupt. Well, I expressed no opinion at all on that, Sir. The court are charged with deciding that issue and they will decide I have no doubt after full and exhaustive examination by all parties who have a right to appear and will then render their decision according to the statute law and according to the precedents which govern in this case.

Even so, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a part of a portion or aspects of the Come By Chance financial problems which are relevant to the Throne Speech debate particularly in light of the amendment which I have moved. The amendment which I have moved, Mr. Speaker, calls for two actions by the government. It calls for the government to reaffirm their faith in the Province. I think that is warranted and merited particularly in view of the statements which leading members of the ministry have made of late; and secondly, and much more importantly because I believe everybody will agree on the first part of the motion that is something to which we can all subscribe, we should all subscribe, secondly and more importantly in that sense, the sense I have just spoken out, to lay before the House a statement

MR. ROBERTS:

of their goals for the economic developments of this Province and a statement of the plans by which they hope to attain these goals, both in economic development and of course in all other aspects of development.

Now, Sir, I had on Friday made mention of the fact that one of the issues that is puzzling about the Come By Chance situation is the fact that in at least three important aspects of it we have directly conflicting statements being made on the one hand by the Shaheen Interests and their spokesman, and on the other hand by people representing the government or representing some of the secured as opposed to unsecured creditors. In fact the unsecured creditor, the principle one being the Ataka Company, I do not believe has made a statement, publicly. If so it has not come to my knowledge. There have been a number of statements made primarily by the government who appear on this interest of course as the second mortgagees holding, I believe, about \$41.5 million worth of secured debt. I believe the ECGD people have also made a statement.

Mr. Speaker, the three statements which are diametrically opposed, and I think it is worthy of bringing them to the House and I believe they must be answered and in my opinion none of them really affects in any way the matter now before the court - the first statement was whether or not the holders of the first mortgage who are Klienwort, Benson and a syndicate of British banks - I believe they are all British - but a syndicate of banks headed up by the Klienwort, Benson firm operating under the protection of a guarantee by the Export Credit Guarantees Department, the ECGD, the Export Credit Guarantees Department of the Government of the United Kingdom, whether they had offered or had agreed to share their position under the first mortgage with any person advancing more funds to the refinery. On one hand we have a statement that that offer was made.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not any person. Specifically Ataka.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) says Ataka. Well I have to be careful, Mr. Speaker, because I do not want to get into the merits of the matter which is now before the Supreme Court. The ECGD people have been quoted in the newspapers as saying that they had never

MR. ROBERTS: made such an offer. I sent a cable to the head of the E.C.G.D. about ten days or two weeks ago and to date I have not had the courtesy of a reply or even an acknowledgement. I can only assume that in the press of events in London they have not found time to deal with this. But in any event, for whatever reason, I have not got a reply. That is the way it stands right now.

The second question -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It may be because the British Government normally does not communicate with sub governments as the government of this Province would be, or the hon. member who is the leader of the opponent to the government.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) has his theory as to why they have not replied. I have mine. All I can say is that my cable made it quite clear that I was the Leader of the Opposition, as I would not want any spokesman for any branch of the Government of the United Kingdom replying to me under a misapprehension. I made it quite clear that I wanted the information for the public record. It was subsequent thereto that the spokesmen for E.C.G.D. were quoted in the newspaper, I believe in The Telegram. Whether or not my query had anything to do with it I do not know. But the fact remains we have two statements diametrically opposed to each other. Only one of those statements can be correct. Only one of them is correct. I think it is very much in the public interest, Mr. Speaker, that we know which is correct. I submit the only way we are really going to know is to ask all of the people concerned - and accordingly that was a suggestion I made and make again - that all the principals in this situation be invited - not commanded, we have no such power and even if we had we should not exercise it in this case - but invited to come before this House and to respond to enquiries and questions put by members of the House.

A second example of diametrically conflicting statements has to do with the third mortgage. Again we have statements on one hand that the Ataka firm, who are the major unsecured creditors as I

MR. ROBERTS: understand it, were not interested in a third mortgage. They are not at this stage. I would think that is a fair inference. On the other hand we have statements that they were interested. On one hand they were not, on the other they were. Well, Mr. Speaker, again only one of those statements can be correct. Either the statements coming from Mr. Shaheen and from his associates, his spokesmen, his employees and what have you, are correct or they are not correct. Either the statements which have been made by the Minister of Mines and Energy, who I believe spoke to this point in his press release, either they are correct or they are not correct.

Then thirdly -

MR. CROSBIE: They are correct.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the Minister of Mines and Energy says they are correct and he has said that before and I do not doubt his word. All I will say is I point out again that there are diametrically opposed statements which have been made publicly and repeatedly and only one of them can be correct.

The third -

MR. CROSBIE: I told you what was going on.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman has given us his opinion and belief. He has produced nothing to support his opinion or his belief.

MR. CROSBIE: Those statements were correct.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was not in the House Friday. He was in Ottawa agreeing to increases in the price of oil. But at that point a question was asked to the Premier, I believe, -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, that is going too far.

MR. ROBERTS: What is the -

MR. CROSBIE: I object to the statement -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman rising on a point of order or is he just rising out of tenderness?

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Well then, say it.

MR. CROSBIE: My point of order is that the hon. gentleman is making



MR. CROSBIE:

a false statement that I was in Ottawa on Friday agreeing to increases in the price of oil. I was not in Ottawa agreeing to increases in the price of oil. I was in Ottawa urging the Government of Canada not to increase the price of oil.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, that was no point of order. That is just the hon. gentleman. My statement was correct but the hon. gentleman, I submit, is not raising a point of order. He is merely trying to debate. Let him make a little note of it. When he gets his opportunity to speak in this debate, as I hope he will, perhaps he will deal with this point as well. Does Your Honour wish to rule on that point or shall I carry on?

MR. SPEAKER (COLLINS): I would take it that it was a difference of opinion more than a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour. I thank Your Honour very much for the - it was certainly a difference of opinion and there are two diametrically opposed opinions on the point.

Mr. Speaker, the third area where we have a complete conflict of statements is with reference to the local creditors. I think this house should pay more attention to the needs of the local creditors than almost to any other aspect of the entire Come By Chance situation. On one hand we have statements that had there been a third mortgage arranged all of the local creditors would have been paid off as a matter of preference and by agreement with all the other unsecured creditors. All of the local creditors to my knowledge are unsecured with the exception, of course, of the government. On the other hand we have denials that that was so. We are led to believe that the unsecured creditors local, and the unsecured creditors other than local, would have stood pari passu, the position which presumably they are now in.

Again, Sir, we



MR. ROBERTS: have diametrically opposed statements. Again, Sir, only one of them is correct.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy just said, he indicated, I supposed I could say he undertook to table some documents in the House in connection with the Come By Chance situation. I would hope very much that he keeps to that undertaking. He may not be aware that on Friday when he was away in Ottawa, agreeing to certain nameless acts, that a question was asked I believe of the Premier, it may have been the Minister Without Portfolio, but I believe it was asked to the Premier and the Premier refused to table any documentation at all. That was the answer he gave to the question. Well I hope we get all the documentation tabled because presumably once the Supreme Court decides this bankruptcy petition there is no longer any sub-judice matters to be dealt with, the matter has been dealt with by our courts because it is the only application to our courts of which I am aware. I am not aware of the difficulties of the Come By Chance Refinery have come or are about to come before our courts in any other connection.

Mr. Speaker, we should know the answers to these questions, the people of this Province should know the answers to these questions. Because, Mr. Speaker, in my view, and I know I speak for many on this, the Come By Chance difficulties are important for far more than just the \$41 million which we as a government, as a Province are owed. Now that is important. \$41 million is a lot of money. And we are secured under a second mortgage, we are protected under a second mortgage and we have whatever protection that affords us, but that is not the only important and I submit that is not only the most important fact to be drawn from the continuing difficulties at Come By Chance. What concerns me, Mr. Speaker, and what relates directly to this amendment is I want to know what effect the apparent collapse of the refining venture at Come By Chance will have upon our standing as a Province in the financial markets and upon our development as a Province.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am not at this point condemning the government over the Come By Chance situation. There will be an opportunity, we are told, to debate Come By Chance and debate it at some length and I will be able to speak then on those points. What I want to know, Mr. Speaker, what I want to know and what I think we must all ask is what effect it will have on our future development.

Now, Sir, the international financial community, I am told, is a very small world indeed. I do not know how many men there are whose opinions move millions but there are not a lot. There may be 200 or 300, 500, 1,000, they are all interconnected. They do business with each other. They meet frequently in this era of the jet aircraft and telephones and telex, instant communications, they are in close and intimate touch the one with the other each and every day of the week. What one knows they all know, and what one believes they all believe, and what effects one effects the other. It is these men, very few women, but these men who control the pools of capital that there are around the world. There are large pools of capital in the United States, and we have borrowed many millions of dollars there. There are smaller pools of capital in Canada, and we have borrowed many millions there. When I say we have borrowed, Mr. Speaker, I speak not only of the government of the Province going with their bond issues and their debentures and their notes and the various other forms of paper on which we raise money, but I speak of industrial development projects. I speak of industrial development projects running all the way from a fish farm that might need \$50,000 or \$100,000 in capital to something as large as the Churchill Falls project which will require \$2 billion or \$3 billion in capital. It all comes out of the same pool, Mr. Speaker, or the same capital pools and money is the most liquid and the most mobile commodity in the world.

We are all seeing what is happening today with what amounts to a flight against the British pound and the great fear is that the

MR. ROBERTS: Arab countries who hold large balances in sterling will decide to take their money out of the sterling block and put it into some other currency and the effect of that could be quite easily to knock the British pound far below even its present level which is the lowest it has ever touched.

I can remember when the pound was \$4.80, \$4.83 was it?

- \$4.83½. It was always the great measure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$4.83 2/3.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman whose memory -

MR. MURPHY: \$4.83 2/3, that was the standard.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I would bow to the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) over the gentleman from St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy). It was well over \$4.80 and today it is \$1.90 or \$1.95 or - you know obviously going up and down. But it is only one pool

MR. ROBERTS:

of capital. Whether it is American or Japanese or European or Euro dollars or the United Kingdom or Canadian does not essentially matter because it is all hooked one to the other, linked one to the other. What concerns me over the Come By Chance difficulties is that this Province - and I do not mean the government of Newfoundland and Labrador, I am not suggesting that. What I am suggesting is this Province, this Island of Newfoundland and this mainland of Labrador, will acquire a very black mark against our standing. Not that anybody will blame us. It is a commercial venture which has got into difficulties. There are reasons for it and we will have an opportunity to examine those reasons and to comment upon them insofar as they are valid to the purposes and the business of this House.

What concerns me is that the average man - and it all comes down, Mr. Speaker, to one man or two or three men sitting in a room somewhere saying, all right, we will buy \$50 million worth of bonds for the Lower Churchill, or we will buy \$20 million worth of bonds in this or we will lend \$50,000 for that. It always comes down to one or two men or a committee of men. There is no magic over it. There may be a lot of numbers, a lot of zeros behind the integers at the start of the sum, but it comes down to individuals who take decisions. They may be charged with controlling great pools of capital, great funds of capital or they may be charged with controlling and guiding small funds of capital. But what will that individual or that group think of our Province? That is what concerns me, because we are going to need as a Province and as an economy, whether it is government or private, to borrow millions and more millions to develop this Province.

I am not speaking just of large projects such as the Lower Churchill. If that is to go ahead it will need \$2 billion in non-equity capital, you know, immense sums of money. But even if we are to get smaller industries going and smaller ventures and smaller projects, in each case we will be talking of \$1 million or \$2 million or \$552,000 or \$829,000. In each case somebody must say aye or nay to the request to borrow that much money. That is what concerns me

MP. POBEPTS:

about the Come By Chance situation. I think we must meet it head-on because the international financial communities will certainly hear of this. It is a very large venture, spectacularly large. I do not know how much the Ataka firm are owed but I believe it is of the order of \$300 million. I think that is the figure which the Minister of Mines and Energy has given out in his press statement, incredibly large sums of money! It is bound to be commented upon, bound to be talked upon involving particularly as it does a Japanese firm and American firms and British firms and the people who supply the oil, the Iranian firms and of course Canadian firms and then the government of the United Kingdom and the government of this Province and the government of Canada who, of course, own the wharf out there and have a security in that, and also, I believe, only accounts receivable after mortgage one and mortgage two have had their bite at the accounts receivable.

All of these people will know of this problem and I want to know what effect it will have. I think, if anything, it makes it even more urgent and more important than hitherto that we as a Province when we go to the financial communities have our house in order and know exactly where we are going and what we are going to do with the money. Because my fear is, Sir, that - and I do not think that I am exaggerating - is if that is not done, if the government do not take some positive and some meaningful steps - and I do not mean the odd luncheon. It is all very well to go off to Boston or Los Angeles or wherever they have been and have a luncheon and have a group of businessmen in and give them a good time and make a speech to them. That is fine and dandy and it serves a certain purpose. But I am talking now of the realm of hard facts, not just the four volumes that the Minister of Finance and his officials produced in support of our request for a re-evaluation of our debt rating, a request which was not granted whatever the pros and cons of it. But we need a positive programme, a very positive and detailed programme because

MR. ROBERTS:

from now on when we go in as a government or when some businessman from Newfoundland or some international company thinking of coming into this Province to do business, the Come By Chance question will be raised, and people must be satisfied on it because it is a valid one to raise. What went wrong and what can be done to prevent it happening again? Those are the questions.

Mr. Roberts.

I am not going into the merits of why did the Ataka Company move, by petitioning on Friday 13, petitioning the courts for a bankruptcy proceeding against the Shaheen interests. There will be an opportunity to debate that, and that will be a very relevant question.

Mr. Speaker, we in this Province have a right to know, a right to know, what has happened, and more importantly what has happened is only of interest in that it relates to the second thing and that is, what affect will it have? An assurance from the Minister of Finance, while I accept it, is not good enough. It is not enough. It does not deal with the central problem. I am not particularly worried about our bond issues as a government. I do not think it will directly affect those, but I am concerned about the standing of this Province in the eyes of the financial community, the international financial community, in the light of this, in the light of the fact that we have difficulties with the Lower Churchill - they are well-known - in the light of the fact that we need large sums of capital, whether they come for one project or for many projects. We cannot develop this Province without access to large sums of capital. We cannot generate them in Newfoundland. There is not enough money in Newfoundland to provide the capital we need. There is not enough money in Canada to provide the capital that we need. There may not be enough in the world taking all the demands into account, but we are competing in a very tough international market against very great demands from other countries, other provinces. We must put forward the best possible case. And I would think that that is something to which the ministry should be very much addressing their thoughts, because that is what concerns me about Come By Chance.

The creditors, they can stand to their own rights.

I am particularly concerned about the local creditors, but I do not want to get into that now, as I think that may be unappropriate, but when we discuss this on the motion, or whatever proceeding the government intend to use to bring the matter before the House, then I will have

Mr. Roberts.

something to say on the local creditors, because I believe they have a special claim on the good offices of the government and of the House. I am very concerned about them, because I think the affect on them will be far greater, because I think they were encouraged, knowingly or unknowingly, by government's statements particularly statements made throughout the Fall by the Premier. I do not want to get into it in detail, but I do not think the Premier made the statements he ought to have made given what he ought to have known and did in fact know.

Mr. Speaker, at this stage I will not say a great deal about the employees at Come By Chance. These are the people who will most directly and most dramatically suffer. It is not enough just to find them other jobs. Many of them will get other jobs. Many will not. The ones with skills will get other jobs, and they may even get them at the same rates of pay. But to take those jobs they will have to leave this Province. That in itself should be a cause for sadness and a cause which should make all of us rebel. Mr. Speaker, even more so than that all of them, any of them who will have to leave, will lose whatever or just about whatever they have invested in their homes. I am told that it is the real dimensions of the tragedy, that many of those men, all of whom have been making - what? - \$10,000, \$12,000, \$15,000, \$20,000 a year, I mean, very good rates of pay indeed and have the benefits of an urban work situation with the even greater benefits of rural life or small community life, those men have built magnificent homes, have invested many thousands of dollars, have borrowed many thousands of dollars which they have committed themselves to repay most of them on mortgages, and if they have to leave Come By Chance, if they have to leave Clarendville or the whole area - I notice that the gentleman from Trinity North (Mr. Brett) is shaking his head in agreement - I think that is the dimensions of the human tragedy.

The creditors and the businessmen that is millions or many millions, but that is an entirely different world than the one I am talking about. I am worried about men, many of whom have been



Mr. Roberts.

to see me, many of whom have telephoned or written, men who can see losing their homes. I am sure down in Placentia, and in Dunville in the district of Placentia, there are many people in the same position. They thought they had a secure future, and they had planned for it, and they had built on it and were working towards it, and now it seems that their future is shattered. Well I think we should pay a lot of attention to that because, Mr. Speaker, the point which has not been made in talking about the troubles at that refinery is that when it starts again, as it will, whether it is - I have heard the Premier say it could be three months to three years - but whether it is three months or three weeks or three years or what, the refinery will start again, whether

Mr. Roberts:

Shaheen and his company are in control of it, or whether it is some other company is another question. But the refinery will operate. That must be our belief. And I believe it is a belief founded on reality. When it starts, Mr. Speaker, that refinery without a work force is just a very expensive and a very elaborate and a very technologically complicated, but it is just a pile of metal and of hoses and pipes and tanks and valves and all of the things that make up a refinery. Once that work force goes - its a good work force. It is largely Newfoundland - once that work force goes it will be not just difficult to get another work force to get those men back, but I would say almost impossible, because once burned is twice warned. And I would think the government, Mr. Speaker, should put their minds to that in an active way. It is not serving Newfoundland, it is not serving that industry if we find jobs by moving people away. Now maybe that is the only alternative. I do not believe it is. I think there are other alternatives we should look at, and I would hope that when we get to the debate we will look at those. Because, Sir, any company that wants to come in and open that refinery again, - and I have no doubt there are, and the receiver has said publicly that there are at least two reputable companies that have indicated a degree of interest. He has not named them, but they have indicated a degree of interest - that that refinery will need a work force, and it should be a Newfoundland work force. And I am sure a lot of Newfoundlanders are going to sit back and think twice if they look around and say, boy, the last crowd that were here lost their shirts. Because that is what we are talking of. Men who have socked their life's savings, their life earnings into a home, and still owe \$20,000 or \$15,000 or \$25,000 on a mortgage, and then end up having to sell that house at a distress price or forfeit it under the terms of their mortgage indenture.

I think the government should take a very long look at that with a view to bringing in some positive proposals. I believe that is absolutely essential, not in the interest of Mr. Shaheen and his creditors, I have no brief for either, except the local creditors, but I do have a brief for the men who work there, I do have a brief

Mr. Roberts:

for the future of that refinery.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say much, much more on the Come By Chance situation, but we are under a quite legitimate and a quite proper constraint. I do not want to get into the area that falls under the rule, the prohibition against discussing matters before the courts, and we will have an opportunity within the next two or three weeks. But I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the points which I have made are points which should concern every resident of this Province: What affect will it have on our international standing? Because we have got to go to those markets again and again and again to raise money. And what affect will it have? People probably will say it is not the government. Well, that is fine. At this stage I am not blaming the government. But what affect will it have? If in fact it is a bankruptcy, one of the most spectacular actions of its kind, I would submit in, certainly in Canadian history, and possibly in North American or in international business history. I must let somebody to find out whether there have been any - I suppose the Atlantic Acceptance failure was a larger one than the difficulties that they have had at Come By Chance.

The amounts involved are staggering, Mr. Speaker, and it is bound to come to the notice of everybody anywhere in the financial world, anybody the least bit interested. And I want the government to let us know what steps they are taking to make sure that the difficulties at Come By Chance do not become the difficulties for this Province. The difficulties which that industry, at present a private industry started with substantial government help, but a private industry at this time, that that industry - the difficulties they are having - do not become equal difficulties or do not affect any other proposal private or public to develop this Province further.

Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words on the fishery, to change to another topic altogether, because the fishery obviously is an integral part of any plans to develop this Province. And it should be an, not

Mr. Roberts:

only an integral part, but perhaps the crowning part. It is a cliché, I guess, to say that the fisheries are absolutely vital to our future. Every politician that ever has spoken on it to my knowledge has said that phrase or words to that affect, that it is absolutely vital to our future that without the fisheries we have no future, that with the fisheries we can have a glorious future. And then everybody

MR. ROBERTS:

goes on to talk about development of the fisheries. What strikes me, Mr. Speaker, is how little has been done. A lot of money has been spent, most of it government money. I noticed today the Minister of Fisheries for this Province quoted in the paper as saying that \$44 millions was a little enough money. It is about ten or twelve times what his department, his administration are spending on the fisheries in this Province this year, net. It might not be enough but it is a devil of a lot more than the government of this Province have ever put in.

AN HON. MEMBER: They cut back this year.

MR. ROBERTS: The government of the Province cut back. Yes, they have. Sure they have. They have slashed it savagely. The Minister of Fisheries has not even been heard to peep about it. In fact he entered the Cabinet after this had been done presumably indicating his acceptance of this and his desire to work within that type of framework. Well I am not going to say that what Ottawa are putting into the fisheries is enough. But what I will say is that \$44 million is a lot of money. It will do a lot of good. Maybe we need more and I would vote for that and I would vote - I am sorry, the Minister of Health?

MR. COLLINS: It is not only for Newfoundland, the \$44 million.

MR. ROBERTS: That is true. It is not only for Newfoundland. But I am only for Newfoundland. If I were interested in more than - the hon. gentleman was the Minister of Fisheries for a year or two and he has now said more on fisheries in this interchange in the House this moment than he has said in all the time he was Minister of Fisheries and he has made more sense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is for the groundfish industry in Eastern Canada. Newfoundland and Labrador is a very large part of the groundfish industry in Eastern Canada. The Minister of Fisheries made no distinction. The Minister of Health feels he should have, to which I say the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Health should get off and have a chat together.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that the government, all governments, and I am talking about the present government, the gentlemen

MR. ROBERTS:

who have been in office now for four years, have talked a great deal about the fisheries and they have done next to nothing. As a matter of fact I am not sure anybody can speak to fifty extra jobs that have been created in the fisheries of this Province as a direct result of any action taken or any action refrained by the government of this Province in the last four years. I am not sure they can point to fifty jobs.

MR. CROSBIE: Thousands!

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, who was one of the great disasters in the public relations sense as the Minister of Fisheries, a good minister in very many ways, in very ways, but a man - of course the fact that the Premier took an able man out of fisheries and put in another gentleman is in itself not only a compliment to the gentleman from St. John's West but an indication of the way the Premier approaches the problem. The Minister of Mines and Energy says thousands of jobs are created. That is just not correct. That is not even a difference of opinion. That is balderdash. There is not a jot or a tittle or an iota or a scintillating detail of substance in that statement, Mr. Speaker. The ministry have not created any jobs in the fisheries except I believe Mr. Al Evans has been hired as a fisheries man along the Southwest Coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Near, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: There have been a number of other regional offices opened. I believe there is one in Lewisporte, which is a great fishing community, Lewisporte. I think there is one in Lewisporte. There has been one in St. Anthony for a number of years. I believe there is one in Harbour Grace. There may be a number of others. There is one somewhere on the Southwest Coast in addition to Mr. Evans, one in Harbour Breton in my hon. friend's constituency of Fortune-Hermitage. There is one in Marystown, I am told, in the district of Burin-Placentia West. Of course, it is not without significance that every single district in this Province with the possible exception of Bonavista South - I do not think there is another - in which the fishermen are a preponderant vote, a preponderant element of the

MR. ROBERTS:

electorate that the present government party was disasterously wiped out. Oh, they won Grand Bank. The hon. Minister of Justice got forty per cent of the vote, I believe, in Grand Bank district.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thirty-eight.

MR. ROBERTS: Thirty-eight, was it? Thirty-eight per cent, thirty-eight per cent, and was saved by a certain unfortunate situation. The gentleman from St. Barbe who is not with us at present, a district of which there are a number of fishermen, managed to save his seat but only because of the gerrymandering. He lost his old district. The crowd of people who knew him and who had twice elected him turned him down. It is the same throughout the Province and there is a message in that. The message is not just political. The message is that in a very real sense the fishermen of this Province know they are not getting the attention they deserve and they merit from this government. Maybe they felt the same about this government's predecessors. Maybe they did. What is past is past and what concerns me is what is yet to come. I would like some - not just talk about the fishery. We have heard the talk. We have had - is it five Ministers of Fisheries in four years? We have had five Ministers of Fisheries like a revolving door. They come in and they go out. The present minister, I see, has returned to his seat. I hope he has a long and successful incumbency of that portfolio. But we have had a revolving door. Let us see. We had the Premier initially. Then we had Mr. Roy Cheeseman, who was succeeded in turn by the gentleman from Gander, who was succeeded in turn by the gentleman from St. John's West who in turn

MR. ROBERTS: Has been succeeded by the present minister, the gentleman from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. W. Carter). Have I lost anybody? The Premier as Acting Minister once or twice in there, in between the musical chairs.

MR. SIMMONS: Real bad acting.

MR. ROBERTS: We have not seen any of the plans, all of the great proposals and ideas that were put up four years ago. Remember down in the Hermitage by-election, that lovely blue publication that the hon. Mr. McLean produced, the PC Times it was called, told us of all the glowing things that were to be done. Here it is. Here it is. If we can find it. "New government fleet to aid plants in Hermitage district." There they are, Sir, a trawler typical of the new government-owned fleet. That is, at the very least, fraudulent misrepresentation, because of course not one of those trawlers has ever even had a keel laid let alone ever took to the water.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Take it to bed with you.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry the hon. gentleman from -

MR. ROUSSEAU: He must take it to bed with him.

MR. ROBERTS: I would rather, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) took this to bed with him than some of the propoganda put out by the hon. gentleman from Menihék (Mr. Rousseau). I do not think the hon. gentleman from Menihék (Mr. Rousseau) was responsible for this.

MR. SIMMONS: No.

MR. ROBERTS: I think he was ashamed of it, ashamed to be in a party that produced something as dishonest as that. Indeed he has all but repudiated it publicly. And I would urge him to do so in fairness to his conscience and to his constituents.

MR. ROUSSEAU: That is your advice.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry the gentleman from Menihék (Mr. Rousseau) is saying something. The gentleman from Menihék is saying nothing. I see.



MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that the fishery is one of these areas where the government of this Province have lamentably and notably failed to do what this motion asks them to do. They have not produced any statement of goals and they have not produced, they have not produced any statement of how they are going to achieve those goals.

My friend from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor) spent twenty-five years of his life working intimately in the fish business, Sir, and has made a great success of it, one of the most successfully and experienced and knowledgeable fish plant operators, so knowledgeable and successful that when the government got into the Burgeo situation and ended up paying infinitely more to Mr. Spencer Lake and his company than that plant at Burgeo was worth, who did they have had to send to to pull them out of the quagmire in which they had got themselves? My friend from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor) went up and spent what, six months in Burgeo running the plant - ten months in Burgeo running the plant and that will show in what high regard he is held. But he could tell us that government policies by this government of the Province have not created fifty - am I being generous to give them fifty jobs?

MR. WINSOR: Yes, I would say.

MR. ROBERTS: Twenty-five, you know. What happened to all the further processing we were told so much about? Why what was the phrase, "We were going to do that which we did best." And that is one of the great phrases of our time. It could mean everything and many people took it to mean everything, many people believed. But now, Sir, the phrase has meant nothing. That is why I move this amendment today. That is why I say let this government produce. Let the Minister of Fisheries when he speaks in this debate produce a plan. He has only been in office what six months. He is only a neophyte. He is well above - I am sorry, the hon. gentleman -

MR. W. CARTER: We cannot all have been here 25 years.

MR. ROBERTS: I have been here for twenty-five years! That is terrific, Sir. I am thirty-five years of age and he is accusing me of having been

MR. ROBERTS: here for twenty-five. Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, and if he wants to get into - the hon. gentleman and I have a lot in common. I followed him at least chronically in a political situation. I did not follow him in any other sense, I am happy to say.

MR. PATTERSON: You said he would not be elected in St. Mary's.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Placentia (Mr. Patterson) said something.

MR. PATTERSON: You said he would not be elected in St. Mary's.

MR. ROBERTS: Well fine enough. I was wrong. I was wrong. He was elected in St. Mary's, was he not? He was elected in St. Mary's. Of course he was. He won quite a good vote in St. Mary's. The hon. gentleman would not have been elected by a landslide as he was in Placentia. I mean if I, Mr. Speaker, on my eighth try in a district ended up squeaking in by twenty-five votes in a three way split -

MR. PATTERSON: You would not get nominated the second time.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, what did the gentleman say?

MR. PATTERSON: Take the wax out of your ears.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, what did the hon. gentleman say?

MR. PATTERSON: You heard it.

MR. ROBERTS: No I did not hear him, Sir.

MR. PATTERSON: Take the wax out of your ears.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's repartee is on a par with his courtesy.

MP. ROBERTS:

But, Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that this government have not done what they ought to have done in the fisheries, and I say again to the Minister of Fisheries that when he speaks in this debate, as I hope he will, I hope he will deal with this topic. He may politically be heir to the sins of his predecessors but he is not personally responsible. He is but come lately to this House and to this administration. He was here for a number of years - what - ten years past, but he now is once again here and he is a member of an administration and he is the Minister of Fisheries. Well let him tell us what is planned in the fisheries. It is not enough just to have press conferences. That is fine. But let him tell us what is planned. Let him tell us what the goals are. Let him tell us what is going to be done to achieve those goals.

We have had men of great intellect at the fisheries. The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, nobody would dispute his intellect or his ability to apply himself to a task, to master it. We have had men of lesser intellects, the gentleman from Gander (Mr. Collins), for argument's sake, but a man of great concern and feeling. Nobody doubts his desire to try to master it. But, Sir, all together have laboured and produced absolutely nothing. Well now I say to the Minister of Fisheries, a man of intellect and of concern, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MP. ROBERTS: - let him produce the great plan, let him show the House and the people that this government have some thoughts for the fisheries. Let him, I would be the very first to stand and praise him. I would be quite happy to do it. Let him tell us what is going to be done to keep the Northeastern Coast plants open, and I will come to joint ventures in a moment because there are some very real questions on this one. We may be witnessing another of the great con games. The hon. gentleman is not part of it. I do not think he would be part of that. But let him tell us what is going to be done with the deep sea

MP. ROBERTS:

fishery, about the problems which it faces, the fact that all the trawler fleets are getting old. Many of them are past their prime.

MP. W. CARTER: So I am a politician past my prime.

MP. ROBERTS: I am sorry? Yes, the hon. gentleman, Sir, is a politician past his prime but he said that, not me.

MP. W. CARTER: You just cannot help being nasty.

MP. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman opposite, as Your Honour said in a ruling earlier in this session, if hon. gentlemen venture forth into the fray with nasty remarks they have to be prepared if I fall prey to the temptation to reply at least in part in kind. I would say to the gentleman from St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. W. Carter) if he would but hold his peace and sit there quietly with that beatific smile on his face, Sir, - and whether he listens or not is a matter that only he can control, whether he believes or not only he can control - but if he would but listen there quietly he would have no cause at all to complain because I have invited him. I have said he is a man of intellect and a man of compassion, a man of concern - I have invited him to take a stand and make his mark by presenting some sort of detailed plan. Indeed the whole resolution, Mr. Speaker, could be drafted just for the sole and very pleasurable approach of giving the Minister of Fisheries a platform and let him use it. There is no better platform in this Province than the House of Assembly. Let him state his plans.

It is not enough to say, oh well we have sent another nasty telegram to Ottawa. It is not enough to say, ignore the Greenpeace. I would like to ignore the Greenpeace, but what do we do about the fact that the Columbia Broadcasting System are going to St. Anthony, the great national television network, the ABC, the American Broadcasting Company are sending television crews down whether we like it or not. I, for one, do not like it. Whether we like it or not the fact remains that that bunch of, I think "crackpot" was the term used by the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and it is not a bad one, that that group of people are going to be down in St. Anthony, and they are going

MR. ROBERTS:

to get more press attention than, I suppose, the whole Province of Newfoundland and Labrador put together has had in the last year or so.

MR. NEARY: Than the landing at Normandy.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. NEARY: Than the landing at Normandy.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, yes indeed. It is not enough for us to issue what I, with respect consider a fatuous statement in the circumstances saying, "Ignore it." We cannot ignore it. They are there. That is why I came before the House and the House unanimous - and the hon. gentleman was ill, I believe he was sick, was absent, I believe he was ill -

AN HON. MEMBER: Did he go to St. Anthony?

MR. ROBERTS: No, he did not make it down to the Northwest Coast. He has a reputation there of being "Mr. Deeply Regrets", a phrase which he will be familiar with. But he was ill on Friday and so was not able to go North and that is fair game. But the fact remains that the Greenpeace people will get a lot of attention and that is why I believe it to be important and why, I assume, why the House unanimously agreed with my request and passed without any debate a motion condemning the Greenpeace crowd, and condemning them for interfering with the lawful and proper business of the Newfoundlanders and the Labradorians, namely, the killing of seals according to the rules laid down by the appropriate government.

Mr. Roberts.

But we cannot ignore them, Sir. It would be folly to think that they will die of no publicity. These people are geniuses at publicity. They really are. I was shocked when I learned - shocked may be a too strong a word - I was unpleasantly surprised when I learned that the ABC people have got camera crews supposed to come down, and the CBS people have got camera crews supposed to come down, and they have booked rooms in St. Anthony. Indeed just about every hotel room in St. Anthony, and the area, now is booked, some by the Greenpeace and then one or two of the CBC programmes - Patrick Watson, is it? Does he do a programme on CBC? I watch a lot of television, obviously.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Watson Report.

MR. ROBERTS: The Watson Report. I believe Mr. Watson is supposed to be there. You know, but a lot of attention is going to be paid to it. Well then for us merely to stand aside is wrong. I think the minister should go down to St. Anthony, and if there is a picket line let him stand on it, and if he feels it appropriate I would be delighted to go and share the burden with it. If he feels it is not appropriate, I may go anyway. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that the government of this province should take their stand, and ignoring or trying to ignore these people is fatuous and folly. They are coming into this Province to disrupt something that is lawful. Some could say you admire their commitment, I do not admire their commitment. I think they are looking for trouble. I think they are trying to harm and to hurt. They might not know what harm and hurt they are doing. But the seal hunt is as humane and is properly carried out as any hunt. I will bet the Greenpeace people, Sir, think nothing of sitting down to a lovely steak, and I bet they would love to be in an abattoir, and see what happens to a cow which comes into the abattoir and goes in one end and comes out the other end as a filet mignon or a t-bone or something.

MR. W. CARTER: Baby lambs.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) talks of baby lambs, and I would assume that that is an unpleasant prospect as well. Is that what he is saying? Of course, if any of the Greenpeace people happen to believe in the kosher rite, the kosher rite of preparation of food, they -

MR. W. CARTER: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, when I finish my sentence, sure.

But if any of the Greenpeace people believe in the kosher rite and food prepared by that rite, as I understand it, an animal that is prepared in the kosher way, is hung by its heels, has its throat cut and then bleeds to death, because that is part of the preparation of food in the kosher sense. You know, it is awfully hard to accept this garbage they get off with that it is somehow inhumane. The gentleman from St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. W. CARTER: The hon. member is obviously agreeing with the understanding that the coverage this group will obviously get from ABC and NBC -

MR. ROBERTS: I have not heard anything from CBS.

MR. W. CARTER: - CBS and other media in the Province and in Canada that the success or failure of that exercise will depend to a large extent on the publicity they get. This group cannot possibly, thirteen or fourteen people inexperienced, cannot possibly stop the seal hunt. Therefore, the exercise is solely for the purpose of garnering publicity, and hopefully sympathy around the world.

MR. ROBERTS: Do you intend to ask a question?

MR. W. CARTER: The question I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is that, will not the hon. member agree that for us to go to St. Anthony to meet the Greenpeace would be dignifying their efforts -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It would be helping them.

MR. W. CARTER: - and giving them undue publicity and encouragement? Would he not agree that as Newfoundlanders, concerned Newfoundlanders,

MR. W. CARTER:

we should not encourage any group who are taking the law into their own hands and who would interfere with the rights of our fellow Newfoundlanders as this group from British Columbia intend to do? That is why I would not go to St. Anthony. I would be dignifying their cause, and I have no intention of doing that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen to my right feel that the minister is correct, I do not. I would agree with him in one part of his somewhat long question, or the preamble to his somewhat lengthy question, when he said that the Greenpeace venture is aimed at publicity. Nobody in his right mind, not even the Greenpeace people could possibly think they could stop the seal hunt. Indeed I am not even sure they realize that there are two seal hunts, you know, the landmen aspect of it and the hunt by ships out on the seas. I am not sure they realize that.



Mr. Roberts:

I am not sure they realize the people they are going to run into in St. Anthony when they get there today or tomorrow whenever it is are landsmen from -

MR. J. CARTER: They are going to take the seal hunt beyond the 12 mile limit.

MR. ROBERTS: They are talking of the seal hunt in international waters beyond the twelve mile limit, yes. But I am not sure they realize there is a landsman hunt which does not take as many seals but economically it is infinitively more important. What, that million and a half dollars, I think, it puts into our pockets.

MR. WELLS: They say that they are going directly to the front seal hunt.

MR. ROBERTS: They have said that but I do not think they realize it. I do not think they realize there is anybody else. You know, I have infinitive capacity to believe that Greenpeace have no idea what they are doing. But my difference with the hon. gentleman and the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) as well, is that I think they have got the publicity now, and they will get the publicity because they will be out there on the ice, and I can just picture it now, in lovely glowing colour some demented young lady who happens to be a stewardess when she is not off on the ice flows, you know, there lying on an ice flow over a seal or something. I can just picture! The possibilities are endless!

MR. W. CARTER: Where? Where? Where?

MR. ROBERTS: There are some hon. gentlemen opposite who would consider it a work of mercy to enter into a conjunction, a union of sorts with that young lady to show her the error of - perhaps the Minister of Justice -

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, no.

MR. ROBERTS: would wish to explain to her on a person to person bases -

MR. SIMMONS: Oh to be a puppet!

MR. ROBERTS: Because the seal fishery is of little import I would agree in Grand Bank district.

But, Mr. Speaker, my point is that if it were not for the way the facts are I would agree with the minister, the Minister of Fisheries. But given the way the facts are they are going to get the publicity. And I just hope and pray that one of them does not slip between two pans of ice, or something terrible happen or there is some injury because that is all we need. But they have the publicity now. Has anybody before ever heard of international film, of America film crews coming to Newfoundland? Maybe they have once or twice in the past. You know, for whatever reason this matter is of great interest to the American networks. The CBC, who normally pay us precious little heed in this Province when it comes to doing feature articles - I mean the news carries the odd item on the Province of one sort and another, but when it comes to doing feature programmes we get little attention - well, apparently they are very interested. So I think in that situation we cannot stop the publicity. I think it is incumbent upon the leaders of this Province, and we hold ourselves out in this House as being leaders of this Province, that we make it quite clear where we stand, that we think these Greenpeace people are wrong. And I -

MR. W. CARTER: Have not we said they are wrong?

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman asked if I am saying he has not. He has made it quite clear in this House. He has issued a press release that I can in kindest terms call fatuous. I could use stronger terms but I do not wish to. But I think what is important is to be there and to let the people who come from outside know that this just is not a group of men in St. Anthony under the guidance or the leadership of Mr. Roy Pilgrim, who is the postmaster on the east side of St. Anthony. You know, it is not just a group of 200 or 300 people from St. Anthony and Criquet and St. Lunaire and Cook's Harbour and Goose Cove and all that area, that they are voicing a concern which is shared by most of the people of this Province I venture to say, as well as by their government. And I think the minister shakes his head, and says, no.

Mr. Roberts:

Well that is fine. I mean he is entitled to his view. I think he is wrong. He asked me a question, and I have done my best to answer it. I think he is wrong. I think this crowd of Greenpeace will get publicity. We cannot stop that. What we can do -

MR. W. CARTER: Let us not aid and abet it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. gentleman says, let us not aid and abet it. Mr. Speaker, we have it incumbent upon us to make sure that that publicity is as favourable to Newfoundland and to the people of this Province as it can be. And I would commend that to the minister, and I would commend it prayerfully.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so much for Greenpeace for the time being. If I could talk for a minute about one of the great concerns of the fishery now, and that is the current problem that is being caused by the redfish situation, the situation which we are told alledgely will result in the diminution of work or possibly even the closure of the plants at Port aux Basques, the plant at - coming along the coast at Burgeo, the plant at Ramea, the plant at Harbour Breton, the plant at Gaultois, and it may affect the Burin Peninsula plants, but all the plants on the Southwest Coast, or as some people call it the Western Shore, all of

Mr. ROBERTS:

which depend upon the, primarily upon the Gulf fishery for their other than inshore fish. They all have a significant amount of inshore fish but they could not operate on just the inshore fish, all of which look to the Gulf fishery as their primary source of supply, and within the Gulf fishery in latter years have been looking primarily to the redfish stocks, or ocean perch, whatever you want to call it. I guess redfish is the more correct name. Ocean perch is the name by which it is sold in the markets.

The facts are straightforward as I understand them, Sir. Two or three years ago 150,000 tons of redfish were being taken annually in the Gulf, all of which is Canadian waters. ICNAP have no more to do with the Gulf than they have to do with the price of wheat in Manitoba or the cost of an apartment in downtown Toronto. The Gulf is a Canadian, entirely Canadian controlled water. Nobody may fish in the Gulf except by leave of the government of Canada. Nobody does fish there, I understand, with the exception of some historic rights. They are being phased out, affecting, I believe, the Spanish and possibly the French. What catch there is in the Gulf, what fish can be taken, (a) Canada can decide and (b) Canada can take. There is no international negotiation necessary, there is no need for a 100 mile limit or anything. We now have control of the Gulf. In fact we have the same control of the Gulf that we will have when we get the 200 mile limit whether that is six months from now or longer than that. We have complete control, complete management control of the fish resources in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Two or three years ago 150,000 metric tons of fish was being taken. Last year it was 60,000 tons of redfish, metric tons, and that is roughly 20,000 tons of finished product. This year, so the Minister of Fisheries at Ottawa has just announced - well what - this week past he has announced the quota, the allowable catch, a better term than quota in this context - the allowable catch will only be 30,000 tons and that figure will be retroactive to the first of January.

MR. ROBERTS:

Two comments on that, Sir. First of all the Gulf has been heavily fished in January and February with large catches coming out of it. So that means the 30,000 tons is already in large measure used up by companies who did not know or who had not been told in any event, if they did know, have not been told by Ottawa that there might be a reduction in the allowable fishing effort, the allowable fishing catch. Secondly, of course, that total amount of fish is not only for our use. The plants along our Southwest Coast have to draw from that stock, but so do plants in Nova Scotia and I am told plants in Quebec, the Magdalen Islands, part of Quebec, and Northern New Brunswick as well. So there will be a very great demand on that stock.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think those are the facts, and I do not know if the Minister of Fisheries wants to add anything but have I put the problem in - he is nodding acquiescence. Essentially that is the situation. Well now, Sir, the effect of restricting the catch, and it has been restricted - my understanding is that Mr. LeBlanc had made a decision. He has the power to make it and the power to enforce it. That is now law that the people, the operators of those plants are only allowed to catch a total of 30,000 tons, all the plants fishing in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. So that will force our plants - I do not know what is going to happen in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and Quebec but that is their problem, not ours - will force our plants to look elsewhere and that means in effect they will end up fishing outside the Gulf in the Banks, on the Grand Banks and primarily for flounder and yellowtail because there just is not enough redfish on the Grand Banks. I understand the Canadian quotas on the Grand Banks which are now in the ICNAF area are limited and are under very heavy pressure.

MR. W. CARTER: There is lots of fish but you have to wait for them.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that is it. There is not lots of fish for us. There is lots of fish there presumably although I am told, for example, there is 8,000 - the quotas are very intriguing - I am told there

Mr. ROBERTS:

are 8,000 tons of codfish out there assigned to Canada but nobody has ever been able to find it. According to the ICNAF quotas Canada can take 8,000 tons of codfish, and that is a lot of - what does a fish plant use in a year? 10 million pounds is 500 tons?

Mr. J. WINSCOP: Small plants like ours would use twenty odd million.

Mr. ROBERTS: Twenty odd millions is 1,000 tons of - so there is 8,000 tons of codfish out there allotted by ICNAF to Canada which could keep eight plants the size of Gaultois going and the Gaultois plant is the sole support of a very prosperous and very pleasant little community. You know that would keep eight of those plants going for a year. But we cannot find it, so I am told. The hon. Minister of Fisheries - go ahead.

MR. W. CARTER: The Atlantic Canada is not taking all of the codfish quotas. I think, as the hon. member from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor) will verify, that because of the scarcity of the fish that it is not feasible to have a directed cod fishery in certain areas. That is probably why the quotas are not being taken up. We might mention also the quotas on the Hamilton Banks. That is not being taken up for the reason that our ships are not fitted for the conditions that exist in that area.

MR. ROBERTS: We will come to the Hamilton Banks because I am going to work around the Province in a counter-clockwise direction. Because what will obviously happen, Sir, in the initial instance is the plants at Gaultois and at Harbour Breton and at Burgeo and at Ramea, all of which are trawler based operations. The plant at Port aux Basques is not. It buys fish from inshore and longliners and what have you. Those plants will be forced to look elsewhere for their fish, or close. I do not think they will close, not willingly, not voluntarily, not without a fight. So they will then be out in the Grand Banks and they have unsuitable boats. The side trawlers are not suitable for use on the Grand Banks but there are some stern trawlers. The Penny Hope - was that what she was called? - was launched the other day at Marystown, and she can fish on the Grand Banks. She is a modern stern trawler. They have one or two others. But essentially they are going to have a great deal of difficulty getting fish. That is going to have a marked effect on the prosperity of the whole Southwest Coast, a very marked effect.

Also, Mr. Speaker, very real problems could be caused for the plants on the Burin Peninsula at Marystown and at Burin and at Grand Bank and at Fortune, because as the Gulf plants come East they will be fishing on the same grounds to which the Burin plants, the Burin Peninsula plants look for a large part of their fish, namely the Grand Banks, the ICNAF areas with the prefix three. There are some large quotas out there, the cod alone, 3m is 40,000; 3no is 87,000. Redfish, the three areas, the areas in redfish have forty-one, sixty-one, 77,000 tons of redfish is the quota which Canada

MR. ROBERTS:

is only allowed -

MR. W. CARTER: 17,000 is it not?

MR. ROBERTS: Well it is not even 17,000 by the figures I have got. It is about 15,000 or 15,500 but a very small part. But it is large area. Then when you get into the yellowtails, you know, 35,000 ton allowable catch which 30,500 tons goes to - I am sorry. I am reading you last year's figures, Mr. Speaker - 9,000 tons allowable catch of yellowtail of which 7,800 tons goes to Canadian quota of the yellowtail, that particular kind of flatfish.

So we could see a whole chain reaction triggered, Mr. Speaker. I think that is the concern that people in the fishing industry have because I know that the Burin Peninsula plant even before the redfish fishery in the Gulf was restricted were worried about the yellowtail stock. Indeed I was told by a plant manager - it was the night they had the dinner for Harvey Mauger. All the plant managers were here. All the government members were in Ottawa. We have a cable from the Minister of Justice, a great friend of Mr. Mauger's although Mr. Mauger has never claimed to be a political supporter of hon. gentleman's. But I was talking to one of the plant managers there and he was very deeply concerned even then and that was long before there was any talk of the redfish quotas being reduced.

So, Mr. Speaker, the question comes where are our plants going to look for supplies or what is going to happen. I think the Minister of Fisheries here and at Ottawa has a duty encumbant upon him. The plants must have fish or they will close and they need substantial quantities of fish or they will close. If the Gulf fishery is to be restricted as it is, and I gather it must be - I have heard nobody challenge - does the Minister of Fisheries agree with that? - nobody has challenged the necessity for preservation of the stocks and of closing the Gulf fishery. I mean the scientists apparently have convinced everybody that unless the stocks are preserved in this way



March 8, 1976.

Tape 988

RH - 3

MR. ROBERTS:

there will be no redfish stock in a few years to come. I am not sure I understand it. It has got to do with the year classes. I gather the redfish are the slowest maturing of all the species that we fish commercially and that in the late 1960's the year

MR. ROBERTS: classes of reproduction, missed a couple of years and the stocks they are now taking are essentially older fish and there just is no newer fish to come along for two or three years. The stocks will come back. I do not know if that is a very good scientific explanation but that is what I am told by the people who should know, as being the cause of it. But the fact remains whatever the cause we are there now. And what is going to happen? If we get a 200 mile limit can we do something to those plants? Or I should say, when we get the 200 mile limit what will we do with those plants? We will have the 200 mile limit by the 1st. of January.

MR. HICKMAN: It has been predicted by Dr. Blackwood that extension of our limits will increase our catch.

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, I could not hear the minister, Mr. Speaker. Dr. Blackwood is a well known federal government scientist.

MR. HICKMAN: Who is here apparently in St. John's.

MR. ROBERTS: He is a Newfoundlander.

MR. HICKMAN: I know. He should be Deputy Minister but -

MR. ROBERTS: He should be Deputy Minister of Fisheries?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, I think so.

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad the minister said that and not me. It is a real vote of confidence in Mr. Slade, but go ahead.

MR. HICKMAN: No, I do not mean Deputy Minister here, in Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Federally.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I agree with that. Yes. But the minister made a point as to something with Dr. Blackwood said.

MR. HICKMAN: There is a conference going on today in St. John's, I guess, somewhere in Newfoundland, and Dr. Blackwood was quoted as saying that within one year, the first year that Canada asserts jurisdiction over the 200 mile limit there will be an eight per cent increase in fish production and landings in Newfoundland.

MR. ROBERTS: Which presumably all that the stocks will sustain, because once we take management control of that 200 mile limit -

MR. HICKMAN: And it predicts an increase each year up to -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes it is going up now. I have the figures here and I will refer to them not at length but to make one or two points because the Canadian share is going up. Better let me refer to them now. It is very relevant.

Take the 2J3K area which is the Hamilton Banks, that is the big mother lode and the total allowable catch up there of codfish, and that is the Hamilton Banks, you know, where all the codfish come from, we are told, indeed the 300,000 ton allowable catch is one-third of the total allowable catch of all the fish species under ICNAF in the North Atlantic. You know, it is a very large stock of fish. Of that 300,000 tons of fish Canada this year is only allowed to take 24,000 tons and I am not sure that we will even take that because we do not - The minister is shaking his head again in agreement with me. You know, we do not fish that stock although bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, and I will come back to this in a moment or two, that is also the base stock from which our entire Northeastern Coast inshore fishery draws its supplies and as I have heard the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) say time and time and time again, in a stunning insight into the obvious, but he is right, if the fish is caught offshore, it cannot be caught inshore and that the 2J3K stock in the ICNAF descriptions is the stock on which the fishery all the way from, I suppose, Port de Grave right around to Anchor Point is based. That is the basic stock for our - the traditional inshore fishery.

MR. MORGAN: The Hamilton Banks you mean.

MR. ROBERTS: The Hamilton Banks, 2J3K area is a little better way to describe it. But, Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is that while the total allowable catch between 1975 and 1976 has decreased by forty-five per cent in that area for cod, the Canadian catch has only gone down by sixteen per cent, the Canadian quota, which is a way of saying that our share of the available resource is going up and up and up and of course when we get a 200 mile limit we will have complete control,

MR. ROBERTS: subject only to the normal and sensible criteria of diplomacy and subject only to our ability to catch that fish, because I do not think the nations of the world will allow us to have it and not to catch it. You know, we cannot do that. Food is in too short supply and protein is too valuable. But if we can catch it we can have it. And that brings me right to the point of the joint ventures. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was an idea that needed to be approached with care and with caution it is this talk of joint ventures. And by joint ventures, as I understand the term, we mean making an arrangement of some sort with a European country, the East Germans, the West Germans, possibly even the British, the Poles, the Soviet Union, making some sort of an arrangement with them whereby they catch fish from

Mr. Roberts.

our stocks, given that we will control all the stocks, but Canadian stocks, and that they then as part of the deal, as the price in effect for landing or for catching that fish, landed in a Newfoundland port, process it in that Newfoundland port, and then ship it away to where they wish. That is, as I understand, the concept. It is one of these ideas, Mr. Speaker, that seems to be terribly, terribly attractive. On the surface it has everything going for it, and it may well be that upon examination it has everything going for it. But I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that as yet we are in any position to say whether the joint venture concept has in it the salvation of our fisheries. To hear the Premier talk it does. To hear the Premier talk we are going to get another 5,000 jobs cutting that fish. Well, Mr. Speaker, the only problem is I cannot find anybody - I cannot speak of the minister's officials, because I do not ask them about matters of policy, and I have not had the opportunity to speak to the minister about this. - but I cannot find anybody outside the Government of this Province who feels as enthusiastic or as confident about it as does the Premier of this Province. Now he may know more than all of us, although I may say on his record, Sir, that statement could be challenged. But, Mr. Speaker, nobody shares the enthusiasm. They all agree it might have a very great prospect, it might. But I want to raise a very large red flag, a flag of caution. We are going to have to look very carefully at this whole joint venture. I would commend this to all of the members of the cabinet and all of the members on the other side, because it is easy to get sucked in with thinking we have the magic answer and that if only we can make a deal with the British, or the Germans, or the Poles, or the Russians, or whoever else there is, we will have thousands of jobs in our fish plants, and that figure of 30 % utilization, which is an accurate figure but is not an accurate figure, that that figure will become 70% or 80%, and we will have fish plants going night and day all over this Province. That may be so or it may not be so.

The first fact that has got to be looked at is the fact that the total allowable catch in the ICNAF areas, and the total allowable catch is the figure set by the scientists on the basis of what, in their opinion,

Mr. Roberts.

can be sustained on a reproduction basis by the stocks; in other words, taking only the fish that are surplus to those fish which must be used to produce new stocks. But the total allowable catches have been going down dramatically.

Last year the ICNAF total allowable catch in the North Atlantic was 1,365,100 metric tons. This year it is a little over 900,000 tons. It is 916,300 tons, a decline of 450,000 tons which is 33 % or one-third. Now, Mr. Speaker, that does not mean that the fishery is doomed or anything like that, of course not. What it does mean is that the scientists, who a year ago were confident that we could take - we, the nations of the world - could take 1,365,000 metric tons of fish of all species from the North Atlantic, this year can only take 920,000 on the same basis. Mr. Speaker, let us realize that when we get into the 200 mile zone with total management the first thing we must do is look to the scientists or else we will end up with another redfish situation, and the sad thing about the redfish situation is that everybody knew it was coming.

Two or three years ago Mr. Jim Thoms, the Editor of The Daily News, a very fine and upstanding citizen, a very knowledgeable layman but not a lifelong expert on the fisheries - I think it was Mr. Thoms. It may have been Mr. Bill Callahan, the editor or the publisher of The Daily News, again not a lifelong expert in the fisheries but knowledgeable, interested, aware - but The Daily News did publish a series of articles on the front page having to do with this precise point of the decline of the redfish stocks and predicting that what in fact has happened would happen, and at the time we all ignored it. Governments ignored it. The Opposition ignored it. The industry ignored it. I was not aware that the plants along the Western Shore made any steps to guard against this. They may have known about it, they may have pretended it did not exist, but it was there on the basis of the reports the scientists made. It was quite public. The Daily News is about as public as anything can be in this Province.

Mr. Roberts.

It was two or three or four days in a row on the front page. So we can hardly be heard to hear now from either spokesman for industry or spokesman for government, they did not know this was coming, just as they now know that the allowable catch that we can take from the ICNAF areas may not be anything like what we think they are. And that is one point to look at when we come and look at joint ventures. Just how much in fact can we take? Then there is the question, Mr. Speaker, of exactly what it will cost us to take it? This

Mr. ROBERTS:

may be an argument in favour of joint ventures. The Hamilton Bank fishery is a Winter fishery. It is an ice fishery. It is not worthwhile to build boats just to deal with it. The Premier and his colleagues flirted with that idea, the \$5 million trawler which we were assured had been put out on tender. We were assured of that in this House when the gentleman from Gander (Mr. Collins) was the Minister of Fisheries. He said, tenders have been called for those ice strengthened trawlers. But those trawlers are not economic to deal with that fishery for only two months of the year. That may be an argument in favour of joint ventures. If the other countries have these trawlers now maybe we could borrow them for two months of the year and they can use them elsewhere in other high seas fisheries around the world the rest of the year.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is the question as well of how much of those stocks we should take ourselves. The 2J3K area, the Hamilton Banks area is, as I said, the mother lode for our Northeastern Coast fisheries. The joint venture idea, if it threatens our Northeastern Coast, must be rejected. The question is, does it? And the question is further, can we expand our Northeastern Coast fishery by other than a deep-sea fishery, can we equip ourselves to take more of that Hamilton Banks stock? It is not being fished now by anybody. The amount of fish being taken out of there, I am told, is nothing like what the scientists now estimate can be taken. That may or may not be a good estimate by the scientists but it is a fact, as I am told.

Now, can we take more of that fish ourselves? We cannot with the traditional inshore fishery of putting a trap down in the water and hoping and praying that God sends the fish to that trap at that point. But given the mobility of the fifty foot longliner is gone. But the eighty foot longliner or 100 foot longliner, call them small trawlers. Maybe the old side trawlers can be used. They are lying up now. Fishery Products have got a handful lying up and I would bet that the Caultois fishery would love to get rid of their



MR. ROBERTS:

trawlers because they are not suited for their fishery, the deep-sea fishery. They might be suited for fishing along the Northeast Coast within the great bight formed by the line drawn from Cape Bauld down to Cape Bonavista. They might be suited for that. We do not know how to catch the fish there, but surely to God we can learn that, we can learn how to catch the fish. Mr. Speaker, maybe that is the answer and not to say to the Germans or the Russians, come in and take our fish and give us a little bit of work cutting it and then off you go and we are glad, we are very glad tugging our figurative forelock.

Maybe what we should be doing is equipping ourselves and training ourselves to go out and catch that fish ourselves and bring it in to our plants because, Mr. Speaker, the inshore fishery on the Northeast Coast and on the Northwest Coast, and by the Northeast Coast I would bring it right down to Port De Grave. St. John's here and Catalina beyond Port De Grave are deep-sea ports now. The plants there are trawler based, trawler fed. But all the rest of that coast lives or dies by the fishery. I do not want to see an Northeast Coast with only four or five centers working with fish plants there. I want to see an Northeast Coast where we can produce a way of life that will enable people to live in the communities they now live in. I think that is very fundamental to any plan for the development of the parts of this Province North of the Trans-Canada Highway.

So when I hear talk of joint ventures sometimes my blood runs cold because I am not sure the Premier has the least idea of what they are all about based on what he has said. I am not pretending that I know all about them. I certainly do not. I have made a bit of an effort to find out. I have talked to a number of people. I have tried to grasp some of the ideas but I do not pretend to be expert on it. But I do know enough to know that a red flag should be raised. Again maybe when the Minister of Fisheries speaks he can

MR. DORRIS:

deal with this because I believe it is of the utmost importance. It could be a great leap forward or it could be a disaster. We could end up giving away large portions of our catch, of our possible catch without anything more than whatever labour there is in cutting the fish and packing it and freezing it and shipping it out.

Why can we not expand our own resources, our own catching ability? That is the approach I think we should take, because much of that fish on the Hamilton Banks - that is the only area in which the joint ventures are going to work. I have not heard even the Premier talk about joint ventures on the Grand Banks. It is going to be all the Grand Banks can do to sustain the plants we now have which are, I think, basically year 'round, and we are seeing that now and we will see it in the next few months as the boats that now fish in the Gulf move to the West - I am sorry, to the East and come down onto the Grand Banks and onto those stocks.

So let us look carefully. Let us see whether we can revitalize the Northeast Coast of this Province. That coast has had a steady decline now for fifty or sixty years. The Minister of Fisheries knows it. I hear the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), I think I hear him, talking about pooh-poohing it. Sure, the way of life those people knew there forty or fifty years ago is not possible this day nor is it desirable but can we revitalize it. My own constituency is on that coast. There are a number of others.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) lives in a constituency that is on - not lives, I am sorry - represents a Northeastern Coast constituency. Indeed, he and the gentleman from Trinity North (Mr. Brett) were the only survivors of what was once the Tory presence along the old Northeast Coast.

But can we revitalize that fishery? Can we revitalize that coast? A matter of twenty or thirty or forty thousand tons more caught by land-based boats going out for a day or two or three and bringing it in would be infinitely better for this Province than to have 50,000 or 100,000 tons caught by foreign ships, be they Russian or German does not really matter, and then brought to this Province for cutting. I would put that forward, Mr. Speaker, as a very, very important point and one on which public policy should be founded.

So I would say to the minister when he speaks, or perhaps when the Premier speaks, I hope that in this session of the house we will get a full explanation on the government's thinking on this joint venture proposal. It sounds attractive. but we have heard this from the Premier before. We heard of the \$40 million worth of trawlers - the great hoax that that represented. We heard of the further processing of fish. I have the film clips, I think, somewhere, produced by Mr. George McLean, that genius as he then was, showing the Premier looking and saying - looking into the camera - "We are going to best that which we do best and we are going to process fish in this Province." And there has not been one cod's tail processed anything further by virtue of anything this government has done.

MR. NEARY: Who did the one with you on the stern of that little boat?

MR. ROBERTS: The one on the stern? That was very good, Mr. Speaker. It was a very good one. It was not Mr. George McLean.

MR. NEARY: Who said George McLean?

MR. ROBERTS: The boat, Sir, would not have carried Mr. George McLean.

MR. NEARY: Maybe Edsel Bonnell.

MR. ROBERTS: It was a very good one, Sir, and I marvel at my nautical qualities whenever I see it. It was a lovely day. It was down the Southern Shore. A glorious day's work.

Mr. Speaker, the joint venture proposal has been put out as so many of these things often are, as panaceas, as an answer to all our problems. Well, it may be, but I am from Missouri, Sir, I want to be shown. And I think the people of this Province have a right to be shown. When I hear talk of 5,000 more jobs in the fish plants I welcome it, but then I ask, show me. Tell us where it will come. Tell us what it means, and tell us if it is the best course for us to follow. I think we can rebuild that Northeastern Coast fishery. I think that in the 200 mile limit, when we get control of it as we will - by the 1st of January, I understand we will have control of those stocks - then we must use that control. I think there is a great opportunity here for the Government of this Province. Let us not leave it to the Government of Canada, let us not leave it to them. Their constituency is not just this Province. Their constituency is all of the provinces. My concern is with this Province.

The Minister of Fisheries, Sir, a man newly returned to this House, a man new to ministerial office, has a great opportunity to do something that has not been done by all of his predecessors and that is to revitalize a large part of this Province. I hope he is worthy of the challenge, Sir. I put it to him. I think the challenge is there, but empty talk of joint ventures and glib phrases will not do. Let us have the facts, let us have the details. What is proposed? When will it come? What does it mean? What will it cost us? And can we do better? I am not against the joint ventures, but I am not for them. I want to know more and I think I speak for a lot of people. I think I speak for a lot of thoughtful people who have voiced the same concern, who have voiced the central concern, who have expressed the feeling that the government do not know what they are doing. In the words of one fish plant manager who has never,

March 8, 1976, Tape 992, Page 3 — apb

MR. ROBERTS: to my knowledge, taken a partisan stand - they will have to edit this because it certainly is not a parliamentary statement in view of the language used - the effect of it was that the hon. gentlemen opposite did not know one end of a cod from the other and that they done exactly that, they learned exactly that much in their four years in office. And that statement was made to me not four weeks ago here in St. John's at a dinner.

Mr. Speaker, does the government want to call it six o'clock or shall we go on? I am enjoying myself and I am working my way down through the notes.

MR. WELLS: Carry on for another minute.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the hon. gentleman. Well let me then talk, Sir, about a number of other points on the fishery.

MR. MORGAN: I do not agree.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) said something?

MR. SIMMONS: Not likely. Not very likely.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: No.

MR. SIMMONS: That was the member for Bonavista South.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I thank the hon. gentleman, Sir. That is the best contribution he has made. I am sorry, I thought I heard him say something and I apologize for him. The member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) -

MR. ROBERTS: unfortunately did open his mouth. Mr. Speaker, a number of other points on the fishery relevant to the question of getting a few more jobs, I would like to hear the government talk a little about further processing particularly if it relates to herring. The Premier in one of the phoned communiques from the depths of Germany told us we would have, I think, was it thirty million pounds of herring a year would be processed or could be processed or whatever the phraseology was. They are all in the lovely file, NIS sent them out and everybody in the Province was attentively waiting, because we knew that the Minister of Industrial Development and the Minister of Fisheries were at it night and day and we hoped that they will tell us a little of what they were at, in clean language, and that they will tell us exactly what is envisaged in the way of further processing. Can we stop the herring going into meal? Can we set up canning factories and can we make - why is it when I have kippers for breakfast in the morning, as I often do, they have to be made by John West and Company Limited, an English firm, or sold by John West under that brand name and I believe they are made in Nova Scotia. I think that particular product -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did the hon. member say he had flippers for brains?

MR. ROBERTS: No, the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) Sir, may have flipped on his own. I said kippers, not flippers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh.

MR. MORGAN: He would not know the difference.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) says we do not know the difference, Sir. All I can say to him, in a parliamentary sense, is that one of my constituents said he was awful glad to see the hon. gentleman last week because never in his life had he seen so much highroads equipment as he saw when the minister came, the entire department was out night and day sanding the roads and they had just -

AN HON. MEMBER: Power -

MR. ROBERTS: I was going to say it is power, Sir, and the hon. gentleman is welcome back at any time. As a matter of fact I would love nothing better than to see him operating a grader or a sand truck on one of the roads and in due course that is where he will be.

MR. SIMMONS: Do you not have to pass a test for that?

MR. ROBERTS: I mean, Mr. Speaker, it is really difficult with my own colleagues helping me and with hon. gentlemen opposite trying to harrass, it is really very difficult to make a few humble points about the need to have more kippers and for that matter more flippers.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is wrong -

MR. ROBERTS: There is nothing wrong. It was the hon. the minister who poured scorn on his employees at a public dinner for which he was booed and hooted down, when he stood and he said, you know, Mr. Chairman, I guess he said at the dinner, he said, "I was told a joke the other day that that group down there," he said, "if they move they are cattle and if they do not move they are my employees." He told that at a dinner and was hooted down. The Construction Bonspiel, an amazing performance! Never before has the Minister of Highways, whatever he is now called, so downed every one of his employees. Every one of his employees, Sir, he has desmirched them, befouled them and got his just due from all of the gentlemen at the Construction Bonspiel who stood up and booed him, hissed him down. He could not even finish his remarks. He had to go on in ignomy and in shame.

MR. MORGAN: Bunkum!

MR. ROBERTS: Is it now six o'clock, Mr. Speaker? I move the adjournment.

MR. WELLS: I move that this House adjourn until three o'clock tomorrow, Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MARCH 8, 1976



Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Transportation and  
Communication for an estimate of the numbers of motor cars,  
trucks, buses, etc. passing annually over the Trans Canada Highway  
or any part thereof.

Q. 440

MAR 8 1976

ANSWER TO QUESTION # 440 ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR TWILLINGATE  
DIRECTED TO THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS  
AS APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER OF NOVEMBER 24, 1975

These are the Annual Average Traffic Counts from our three permanent  
counters located at our scale houses:-

Donnovans	2,045,680 vehicles
Grand Falls	1,703,520 vehicles
Corner Brook	540,000 vehicles

Q. 445

Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Transportation and

Communication the number of fatal motor accidents in Newfound-

land in each of the financial years 1965-75.

MAR 8 1976

ANSWER TO QUESTION #445 ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR TWILLIGATE  
DIRECTED TO THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND  
COMMUNICATIONS APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER OF NOVEMBER 24, 1975

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>NO. OF FATAL ACCIDENTS</u>
1965	64
1966	78
1967	73
1968	61
1969	74
1970	61
1971	77
1972	91
1973	92
1974	99
1975 (Oct. 31)	70

*Handwritten note:*  
Total fatalities  
1975

Q. 434

Communication the capital cost of the Causeway built to connect New World Island and Chapel Island.

MAR 8 1976

ANSWER TO QUESTION #434 ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR TWILLIGATE  
DIRECTED TO THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND  
COMMUNICATIONS AS APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER OF NOVEMBER 24, 1975.

Total Cost - \$973,611

*Handwritten note:*  
Total cost  
\$973,611



3 Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Transportation and  
Communication the capital cost of constructing the Causeway  
connecting New World Island and Twillingate Islands.

MAR 8 1976

ANSWER TO QUESTION #433 ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR TWILLINGATE  
DIRECTED TO THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND  
COMMUNICATIONS AS APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER OF NOVEMBER 24, 1975

Capital cost of causeway, bridge and pavement for Twillingate  
Causeway was \$1,913,442.

*Handwritten:*  
1/27/76  
J.P.



ANSWER TO QUESTION #412 ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR TWILLINGATE  
DIRECTED TO THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND  
COMMUNICATIONS AS APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER OF NOVEMBER 24, 1975

1973-74

634,523.71

1974-75

807,845.12

1975-76 (end of October)

531,447.33

*find 8/22/76  
CRA*

NOV 13 1975

Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Transportation and  
Communication the total expenditure for operation, maintenance  
and repairs on the principal Government plane in each of the  
financial years 1970-75.

Q. 1112

MAR 8 1976

Q. 423

Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communication how many settlements, exclusive of Islands, there now remain in Newfoundland not connected by road with the principal networks of the Island of Newfoundland; the population of the said settlements; the total number of miles that would have to be built to take the settlements out of their isolation.

DEC 16 1975

*File*

DEC 16 1975

ANSWER TO QUESTION #423 ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR TWILLIGATE  
DIRECTED TO THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND  
COMMUNICATIONS APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER OF NOVEMBER 24, 1975

	<u>POPULATION</u>	<u>APPROX. MILEAGE</u>
Monkstown	131	13
S.E. Bight	65	16
Petite Forte	102	10
Rencontre East	235	32
McCallum	245	44
Grandois	124	06
N.E. Crouse	43	08
Petites	130	16
LaPoile	200	20
Grand Bruit	155	32
Burgeo	2,226	31
Francois	330	60
Grey River	270	46
Harbour Deep	329	40
14	4,585	374

H  
B 446

Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Transportation and  
Communication for the number of non-fatal motor accidents in  
the Province in each of the financial years 1965-75.

MAR 6 1976

ANSWER TO QUESTION #448 ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR TWILLINGATE  
DIRECTED TO THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND  
COMMUNICATIONS APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER OF NOVEMBER 24, 1975

---

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>NO. OF NON-FATAL ACCIDENTS</u>
1965	1409
1966	1673
1967	1595
1968	1647
1969	1823
1970	1749
1971	1699
1972	1804
1973	1895
1974	1779
1975 (Oct. 31)	----

*See Exhibit 1476  
CRJ*

Mr. Smallwood to ask the Minister of Transportation and  
Communication what is the present status of the Canadian  
Government's expressed intention to charge fees to motorists  
entering Terra Nova National Park; whether the Canadian Government  
plans also to charge similar fees to motorists entering the Gros  
Morne National Park; and what steps the Government are taking  
to emphasize to the Canadian Government the fact that the road  
through Terra Nova National Park forms part of the Trans Canada  
Highway; on no single inch of which, from Coast to Coast in  
Canada, is any fee collected for using it.

MAR 8 1976

ANSWER TO QUESTION #444 ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR TWILLINGATE  
DIRECTED TO THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND  
COMMUNICATIONS AS APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER OF NOVEMBER 24, 1975

The Department of Transportation and Communications has not been contacted in connection with fees charged to users of the Terra Nova National Park.

My predecessor objected to the construction of collecting booths near the driving lanes of the Trans Canada Highway at the Park entrances and Federal Authorities changed the location of the booths to be on the shoulder of the road so that they do not interfere with through-traffic. Motorists who do not use the park do not have to stop.

It is not known, at this time, if the Federal Government plans to charge fees for using the Gros Morne National Park.

*Answered on 7/6  
EAG*



C O N T E N T S

March 8, 1976	Page
Mr. J. Carter announced that he was refusing to accept his allowance as a Member of the House of Assembly.	2502
Resolution of condolences to the family of the late Mr. Robert Wilson Shepherd, former Clerk of the House.	
Moved by Mr. Wells.	2502
Supported by:	
Mr. Roberts	2503
Mr. Smallwood	2504
Congratulations extended to Mr. William Marshall on his appointment as first Chancellor of the New Anglican Diocese of Central Newfoundland.	
Moved by Mr. Wells.	2505
Supported by:	
Mr. Roberts	2505
Mr. Smallwood	2507
Presenting Petitions	
Mr. Roberts presented four petitions protesting any increase in electrical rates.	2508
Spoken to by Mr. Crosbie.	2510
Mr. Neary presented twelve petitions protesting any increase in electrical rates.	2511
Spoken to by Mr. Crosbie.	2514
Supported by Mr. Simmons.	2514
Mr. Hodder presented a petition from residents of Port au Port West-Aguathuna-Felix Cove seeking a change of municipal status from that of a town council to a community council.	2516
Spoken to by Mr. Peckford.	2518
Mr. Lush presented two petitions protesting any increase in electrical rates.	2520
Mr. Callan presented a petition protesting any increase in electrical rates.	2520
Supported by Mr. Simmons.	2521
Mr. Simmons presented several petitions protesting any increase in electrical rates.	2521
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees	
Mr. Crosbie tabled a document outlining Newfoundland's action on energy conservation first presented at a meeting of Energy Ministers on March 5.	2524
Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given	
Mr. Morgan tabled the answers to Questions Nos. 440, 445, 434, 433, 412, 423, 446, and 444.	2526

C O N T E N T S - 2

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given (continued)	Page
Mr. Crosbie answered Questions Nos. 709 and 711.	2527
 Oral Questions	
Steps taken by Government to protect CFLCo property during the strike at Churhcill Falls, especially since accusations of arson have been made in connection with a major fire. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Crosbie.	2529
Steps taken to protect CFLCo property. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Hickman.	2530
Additional RCMP officers to St. Anthony concerning the Greenpeace protest against the seal hunt. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickman.	2532
Licencing of farm equipment. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Morgan.	2532
Urgency of the matter. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Morgan.	2533
Re-opening of a section of the Trans-Canada Highway West of Grand Falls. Mr. Flight, Mr. Morgan.	2535
Cost of the highway repair programme, and whether or not it is shared. Mr. Flight, Mr. Morgan.	2535
Projected deadline for re-opening the highway. Mr. Flight, Mr. Morgan.	2535
Official protest to Ottawa on the appointment of Parzival Copes to conduct a study of the fishery. Mr. Neary, Mr. W. Carter.	2536
Query as to whether payment was made from public funds for charter of an EPA aircraft to transport Premier Moores and his party from Gander to Montreal, the cost involved and the names of those who travelled on the aircraft. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Wells.	2536
Whether the charter was a gift from EPA. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Wells.	2537
Query as to whether acceptance of such gifts constitutes a conflict of interest. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Wells.	2537
Query as to whether it is the practice of the Premier and ministers to accept such gifts.	2538
Activities in Newfoundland of an Italian with faked medical credentials. Mr. Neary, Mr. Collins.	2538
Query as to whether he performed surgery. Mr. Neary, Mr. Collins.	2538
Visit to the proposed route of the Buchans-Howley road by the Minister of Highways. Mr. Flight, Mr. Morgan.	2539
Query as to whether the Minister of Fisheries will visit St. Anthony to demonstrate government's objection to the Greenpeace campaign against the seal hunt. Capt. Winsor, Mr. W. Carter.	2540
Government acceptance of the route of the Buchans-Howley road. Mr. Flight, Mr. Morgan.	2540

C O N T E N T S - 3

Oral Questions (continued)	Page
Tabling of the names of local practioners involved in kickbacks in the eyeglass industry presently the subject of a federal inquiry. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Wells.	2540
Tabling of the names of local practioners involved in the practice prior to 1972. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Wells.	2541
Query as to whether government plans to pass legislation to make illegal kickbacks in the eyeglass industry. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Hickman.	2542
Query as to whether the Department of Provincial Affairs and the Environment plans to introduce such legislation. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Murphy.	2542
Repercussions of DREE cutbacks on road construction. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	2543
Form of protest on the DREE cutbacks. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	2545
Proposed road from Manuel's Bridge to the St. John's Arterial Road. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Crosbie.	2546
 Orders of the Day	
The following Bills were read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow: Bills Nos. 14, 23, 20, 17, 18, 22, 21, 19.	2547
The Address in Reply (specifically on the amendment)	
Mr. Roberts (continued)	2547
Mr. Roberts moved the adjournment of the debate.	2603
 Adjournment	2603